

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

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

For reporting on  
**School Year 2015-16**



**PART I DUE THURSDAY, DECEMBER 15, 2016**  
**PART II DUE THURSDAY, FEBRUARY 9, 2017**

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

**PRIVACY PROTECTED VERSION**

**SOME DATA IN THIS REPORT HAVE BEEN SUPPRESSED OR BLURRED TO PROTECT STUDENT PRIVACY.**

## INTRODUCTION

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

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

The *ESEA* Consolidated State Performance Report (CSPR) for school year (SY) 2015-16 consists of two Parts, Part I and Part II.

### **PART I**

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

- | **Performance Goal 1:** By SY 2013-14, all students will reach high standards, at a minimum attaining proficiency or better in reading/language arts and mathematics.
- | **Performance Goal 2:** All limited English proficient students will become proficient in English and reach high academic standards, at a minimum attaining proficiency or better in reading/language arts and mathematics.
- | **Performance Goal 3:** By SY 2005-06, all students will be taught by highly qualified teachers.
- | **Performance Goal 4:** All students will be educated in learning environments that are safe, drug free, and conducive to learning.
- | **Performance Goal 5:** All students will graduate from high school.

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

### **PART II**

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

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

## GENERAL INSTRUCTIONS AND TIMELINES

All States that received funding on the basis of the Consolidated State Application for the SY 2015-16 must respond to this Consolidated State Performance Report (CSPR). Part I of the Report is due to the Department by **Thursday, December 15, 2016**. Part II of the Report is due to the Department by **Thursday, February 9, 2017**. Both Part I and Part II should reflect data from the SY 2015-16, 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 2015-16 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 2015-16 CSPR will be found on the main CSPR page of the EDEN web site (<https://EDEN.ED.GOV/EDENPortal/>).

		OMB Number: 1810-0724
		Expiration Date: 5/31/2018
Consolidated State Performance Report For State Formula Grant Programs under the Elementary And Secondary Education Act as amended in 2001		
Check the one that indicates the report you are submitting: <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Part I, 2015-16 <input type="checkbox"/> Part II, 2015-16		
Name of State Educational Agency (SEA) Submitting This Report: Office of Superintendent of Public Instruction		
Address: PO Box 47200 Olympia, WA 98504		
Person to contact about this report:		
Name: Tricia Teasley		
Telephone: 360-725-0425		
Fax: 360-586-3305		
e-mail: tricia.teasley@k12.wa.us		
Name of Authorizing State Official: (Print or Type): Gayle Pauley		
		<u>Thursday, April 13, 2017, 3:58:57 PM</u>
Signature		Date

**CONSOLIDATED STATE PERFORMANCE REPORT  
PART I**

For reporting on  
**School Year 2015-16**



**PART I DUE DECEMBER 15, 2016  
5PM EST**

**1.1 STANDARDS AND ASSESSMENT DEVELOPMENT**

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

**1.1.1 Academic Content Standards**

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

Response	Options
<u>No Revisions or changes</u>	No revisions or changes to academic content standards in mathematics, reading/language arts or science made or planned.
	State has revised or changed its academic content standards in mathematics, reading/language arts or science or is planning to make revisions to or change its academic content standards in mathematics, reading/language arts or science. Indicate below the year these changes were or will be implemented or "Not Applicable" to indicate that changes were not made or will not be made in the subject area.

Acceptable responses are a school year (e.g., 2015-16) or Not Applicable.

	Mathematics	Reading/Language Arts	Science
<b>Academic Content Standards</b>	N/A	N/A	N/A

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

The response is limited to 1,000 characters.

--

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

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

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

Response	Options
	No revisions or changes to academic achievement standards in mathematics, reading/language arts or science made or planned.
<u>No Revisions or changes</u>	State has changed its academic achievement standards or is planning to change its academic achievement standards in mathematics, reading/language arts or science. Indicate below either the school year in which these changes were or will be implemented or "Not Applicable" to indicate that changes were not made or will not be made in the subject area.

Acceptable responses are a school year (e.g., 2015-16) or Not Applicable.

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

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

The response is limited to 1,000 characters.

--



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

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

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

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

Acceptable responses are a school year (e.g., 2015-16) or Not Applicable.

Academic Assessments	Mathematics	Reading/Language Arts	Science
Regular Assessments in Grades 3-8	SY 2014-15	SY 2014-15	SY 2017-18
Regular Assessments in High School	SY 2014-15	SY 2014-15	SY 2017-18
Alternate Assessments Based on Grade-Level Achievement Standards (if applicable)	N/A	N/A	N/A
Alternate Assessments Based on Modified Achievement Standards (if applicable)	N/A	N/A	N/A
Alternate Assessments Based on Alternate Achievement Standards	SY 2014-15	SY 2014-15	SY 2017-18

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

The response is limited to 1,000 characters.

**1.1.3 Grants for State Assessments and Related Activities****1.1.3.1 Percentages of Funds Used for Standards and Assessment Development and Other Purposes**

For funds your State had available under *ESEA* section 6111 (Grants for State Assessments and Related Activities) during SY 2015-16, estimate what percentage of the funds your State used for the following (round to the nearest ten percent).

Purpose	Percentage (rounded to the nearest ten percent)
To pay the costs of the development of the State assessments and standards required by Section 1111(b)	0.00
To administer assessments required by Section 1111(b) or to carry out other activities described in section 6111 and other activities related to ensuring that the State's schools and local educational agencies are held accountable for the results	100.00
<b>Comments:</b> The response is limited to 4,000 characters. Washington State is part of the Smarter Balanced Assessment (SBA) Consortium; as a member the state pays for access to all services of the SBA system, which may include the development activities supporting future test administrations. Washington State uses state funds for its Next Generation Science Standards assessment development activities.	

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

For funds your State had available under *ESEA* section 6111 (Grants for State Assessments and Related Activities) during SY 2015-16 that were used for purposes other than the costs of the development of the State assessments and standards required by section 1111(b), for what purposes did your State use the funds? (Enter "yes" for all that apply and "no" for all that do not apply).

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

**1.2 PARTICIPATION IN STATE ASSESSMENT<sup>2</sup>**

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

**Note:** States are not required to report these data by the racial/ethnic groups shown in the table below; instead, they are required to report these data by the major racial and ethnic groups that are identified in their Accountability Workbooks. The charts below display racial/ethnic data that have been mapped from the major racial and ethnic groups identified in their workbooks to the racial/ethnic groups shown.

<sup>2</sup> The "Asian/Pacific Islander" row in the tables below represent either the value reported by the state to the Department of Education for the major racial and ethnic group "Asian/Pacific Islander" or an aggregation of values reported by the state for the major racial and ethnic groups "Asian" and "Native Hawaiian/Other Pacific Islander or Pacific Islander" (and "Filipino" in the case of California). When the values reported in the Asian/Pacific Islander row represent the U. S. Department of Education aggregation of other values reported by the state, the detail for "Asian" and Native Hawaiian or Other Pacific Islander" are also included in the following rows. Disaggregated reporting for assessment participation data is done according to the provisions outlined within each state's Accountability Workbook. Accordingly, not every state uses major racial and ethnic groups which enable detail of Asian American/Pacific Islander (AAPI) populations.

**1.2.1 Participation of All Students in Mathematics Assessment**

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

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

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

Student Group	# Students Enrolled	# Students Participating	Percentage of Students Participating
All students	S	522,893	87.9
American Indian or Alaska Native	S	6,648	84.2
Asian or Pacific Islander	S	44,922	88.8
Asian	S	39,273	89.2
Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander	S	5,649	86.1
Black or African American	S	22,952	84.1
Hispanic or Latino	S	120,255	89.2
White	S	288,845	87.5
Two or more races	S	38,732	88.7
Children with disabilities ( <i>IDEA</i> )	S	67,984	87.0
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	S	52,409	89.9
Economically disadvantaged students	S	238,014	89.0
Migratory students	S	10,337	88.8
Male	S	268,676	87.8
Female	S	254,217	87.9

**Comments:** The response is limited to 4,000 characters. The data have been verified, and the above is an accurate account of testing in Washington in Spring 2016.

**1.2.2 Participation of Students with Disabilities (IDEA) in Mathematics Assessment**

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

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

Type of Assessment	# Children with Disabilities (IDEA) Participating	Percentage of Children with Disabilities (IDEA) Participating, Who Took the Specified Assessment
Regular Assessment without Accommodations	24,176	35.56
Regular Assessment with Accommodations	38,413	56.50
Alternate Assessment Based on Grade-Level Achievement Standards		
Alternate Assessment Based on Modified Achievement Standards		
Alternate Assessment Based on Alternate Achievement Standards	5,395	7.94
Total	67,984	////////////////////////////////////
<b>Comments:</b> The response is limited to 4,000 characters.		

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

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

Student Group	# Students Enrolled	# Students Participating	Percentage of Students Participating
All students	S	547,521	91.9
American Indian or Alaska Native	S	6,919	87.5
Asian or Pacific Islander	S	47,153	93.0
<i>Asian</i>	S	41,360	93.8
<i>Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander</i>	S	5,793	88.1
Black or African American	S	23,872	87.2
Hispanic or Latino	S	123,413	91.4
White	S	305,174	92.3
Two or more races	S	40,467	92.6
Children with disabilities ( <i>IDEA</i> )	S	68,960	88.2
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	S	52,225	89.3
Economically disadvantaged students	S	244,885	91.5
Migratory students	S	10,493	89.9
Male	S	279,970	91.4
Female	S	267,551	92.4

**Comments:** The response is limited to 4,000 characters. The data have been verified, and the above is an accurate account of testing in Washington in Spring 2016.

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

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

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

**1.2.4 Participation of Students with Disabilities (IDEA) in Reading/Language Arts Assessment**

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

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

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

Type of Assessment	# Children with Disabilities (IDEA) Participating	Percentage of Children with Disabilities (IDEA) Participating, Who Took the Specified Assessment
Regular Assessment without Accommodations	34,500	50.03
Regular Assessment with Accommodations	29,011	42.07
Alternate Assessment Based on Grade-Level Achievement Standards		
Alternate Assessment Based on Modified Achievement Standards		
Alternate Assessment Based on Alternate Achievement Standards	5,449	7.90
LEP < 12 months, took ELP		
Total	68,960	////////////////////////////////////
<b>Comments:</b> The response is limited to 4,000 characters.		

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

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

Student Group	# Students Enrolled	# Students Participating	Percentage of Students Participating
All students	S	229,728	89.6
American Indian or Alaska Native	S	2,868	80.4
Asian or Pacific Islander	S	20,414	92.6
Asian	S	17,926	93.9
Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander	S	2,488	84
Black or African American	S	10,012	83.2
Hispanic or Latino	S	49,593	88.0
White	S	130,674	90.5
Two or more races	S	15,922	89.4
Children with disabilities (IDEA)	S	27,074	81.6
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	S	17,169	85.2
Economically disadvantaged students	S	97,956	87.4
Migratory students	S	4,347	86.4
Male	S	117,352	88.9
Female	S	112,376	90.2

**Comments:** The response is limited to 4,000 characters. The data have been verified, and the above is an accurate account of testing in Washington in Spring 2016.

**1.2.6 Participation of Students with Disabilities (IDEA) in Science Assessment**

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

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

Type of Assessment	# Children with Disabilities (IDEA) Participating	Percentage of Children with Disabilities (IDEA) Participating, Who Took the Specified Assessment
Regular Assessment without Accommodations	20,849	77.01
Regular Assessment with Accommodations	4,052	14.97
Alternate Assessment Based on Grade-Level Achievement Standards		
Alternate Assessment Based on Modified Achievement Standards		
Alternate Assessment Based on Alternate Achievement Standards	2,173	8.03
Total	27,074	////////////////////////////////////

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

### 1.3 STUDENT ACADEMIC ACHIEVEMENT <sup>3</sup>

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

**Note:** States are not required to report these data by the racial/ethnic groups shown in the table below; instead, they are required to report these data by the major racial and ethnic groups that are identified in their Accountability Workbooks. The charts below display racial/ethnic data that have been mapped from the major racial and ethnic groups identified in their workbooks to the racial/ethnic groups shown.

#### 1.3.1 Student Academic Achievement in Mathematics

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

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

#### 1.3.2 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 States reading/language arts assessment, and the difference noted in the paragraph below.

The student group "limited English proficient (LEP) students" does not include recently arrived students who have attended schools in the United States for fewer than 12 months and who took an assessment of English language proficiency in lieu of the States reading/language arts assessment. Do not include former LEP students.

#### 1.3.3 Student Academic Achievement in Science

This section is similar to 1.3.1. The only difference is that this section collects data on the States science assessment administered at least once in each of the following grade spans: 3 through 5, 6 through 9, and 10 through 12.

Limited English Proficient (LEP) students include recently arrived students who have attended schools in the United States for fewer than 12 months. Do not include former LEP students.

<sup>3</sup> The "Asian/Pacific Islander" row in the tables below represent either the value reported by the state to the Department of Education for the major racial and ethnic group "Asian/Pacific Islander" or an aggregation of values reported by the state for the major racial and ethnic groups "Asian" and "Native Hawaiian/Other Pacific Islander or Pacific Islander" (and "Filipino" in the case of California). When the values reported in the Asian/Pacific Islander row represent the U. S. Department of Education aggregation of other values reported by the state, the detail for "Asian" and Native Hawaiian or Other Pacific Islander" are also included in the following rows. Disaggregated reporting for assessment participation data is done according to the provisions outlined within each state's Accountability Workbook. Accordingly, not every state uses major racial and ethnic groups which enable detail of Asian American/Pacific Islander (AAPI) populations.



## 1.3.1.1 Student Academic Achievement in Mathematics - Grade 3

Grade 3	# Students Who Received a Valid Score and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned	# Students Scoring at or Above Proficient	Percentage of Students Scoring at or Above Proficient
All students	83,260	S	59.9
American Indian or Alaska Native	958	S	37
Asian or Pacific Islander	6,889	S	73.4
<i>Asian</i>	5,991	S	78.8
<i>Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander</i>	898	S	38
Black or African American	3,593	S	41.3
Hispanic or Latino	20,381	S	42.4
White	44,336	S	67.4
Two or more races	7,036	S	63.0
Children with disabilities ( <i>IDEA</i> )	11,252	S	31.4
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	13,081	S	31.7
Economically disadvantaged students	40,313	S	44.5
Migratory students	1,658	S	31
Male	42,851	S	60.6
Female	40,409	S	59.2

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

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

Grade 3	# Students Who Received a Valid Score and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned	# Students Scoring at or Above Proficient	Percentage of Students Scoring at or Above Proficient
All students	83,229	S	55.2
American Indian or Alaska Native	957	S	28
Asian or Pacific Islander	6,821	S	67.8
<i>Asian</i>	5,919	S	73.1
<i>Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander</i>	902	S	33
Black or African American	3,596	S	37.4
Hispanic or Latino	20,348	S	35.6
White	44,384	S	63.6
Two or more races	7,052	S	59.5
Children with disabilities ( <i>IDEA</i> )	11,283	S	27.4
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	12,949	S	20.9
Economically disadvantaged students	40,324	S	38.1
Migratory students	1,648	S	21
Male	42,811	S	51.3
Female	40,418	S	59.3

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

1.3.3.1 Student Academic Achievement in Science - Grade 3

Grade 3	# Students Who Received a Valid Score and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned	# Students Scoring at or Above Proficient	Percentage of Students Scoring at or Above Proficient
All students			
American Indian or Alaska Native			
Asian or Pacific Islander			
<i>Asian</i>			
<i>Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander</i>			
Black or African American			
Hispanic or Latino			
White			
Two or more races			
Children with disabilities ( <i>IDEA</i> )			
Limited English proficient (LEP) students			
Economically disadvantaged students			
Migratory students			
Male			
Female			
<b>Comments:</b> The response is limited to 4,000 characters. Washington does not test 3rd graders in Science.			

## 1.3.1.2 Student Academic Achievement in Mathematics - Grade 4

Grade 4	# Students Who Received a Valid Score and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned	# Students Scoring at or Above Proficient	Percentage of Students Scoring at or Above Proficient
All students	80,616	S	56.2
American Indian or Alaska Native	968	S	32
Asian or Pacific Islander	6,666	S	72.5
<i>Asian</i>	5,821	S	77.6
<i>Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander</i>	845	S	37
Black or African American	3,554	S	35.1
Hispanic or Latino	19,403	S	37.7
White	43,459	S	64.0
Two or more races	6,511	S	56.9
Children with disabilities ( <i>IDEA</i> )	11,212	S	26.3
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	11,200	S	24.0
Economically disadvantaged students	38,427	S	39.3
Migratory students	1,630	S	24
Male	41,418	S	57.3
Female	39,198	S	55.0
<b>Comments:</b> The response is limited to 4,000 characters.			

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

Grade 4	# Students Who Received a Valid Score and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned	# Students Scoring at or Above Proficient	Percentage of Students Scoring at or Above Proficient
All students	80,657	S	57.8
American Indian or Alaska Native	968	S	33
Asian or Pacific Islander	6,614	S	70.2
<i>Asian</i>	5,766	S	75.3
<i>Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander</i>	848	S	36
Black or African American	3,562	S	39.4
Hispanic or Latino	19,409	S	39.1
White	43,531	S	66.0
Two or more races	6,518	S	59.3
Children with disabilities ( <i>IDEA</i> )	11,245	S	25.8
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	11,126	S	20.6
Economically disadvantaged students	38,479	S	40.6
Migratory students	1,630	S	25
Male	41,437	S	53.7
Female	39,220	S	62.1
<b>Comments:</b> The response is limited to 4,000 characters.			

1.3.3.2 Student Academic Achievement in Science - Grade 4

Grade 4	# Students Who Received a Valid Score and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned	# Students Scoring at or Above Proficient	Percentage of Students Scoring at or Above Proficient
All students			
American Indian or Alaska Native			
Asian or Pacific Islander			
<i>Asian</i>			
<i>Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander</i>			
Black or African American			
Hispanic or Latino			
White			
Two or more races			
Children with disabilities ( <i>IDEA</i> )			
Limited English proficient (LEP) students			
Economically disadvantaged students			
Migratory students			
Male			
Female			
<b>Comments:</b> The response is limited to 4,000 characters. Washington does not test 4th graders in Science.			

## 1.3.1.3 Student Academic Achievement in Mathematics - Grade 5

Grade 5	# Students Who Received a Valid Score and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned	# Students Scoring at or Above Proficient	Percentage of Students Scoring at or Above Proficient
All students	78,732	S	50.1
American Indian or Alaska Native	964	S	24
Asian or Pacific Islander	6,931	S	68.2
<i>Asian</i>	6,017	S	73.9
<i>Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander</i>	914	S	31
Black or African American	3,418	S	28.8
Hispanic or Latino	18,484	S	31.0
White	42,919	S	57.6
Two or more races	5,938	S	50.5
Children with disabilities ( <i>IDEA</i> )	11,032	S	20.8
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	9,063	S	15.6
Economically disadvantaged students	36,713	S	33.2
Migratory students	1,590	S	20
Male	40,414	S	51.0
Female	38,318	S	49.2

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

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

Grade 5	# Students Who Received a Valid Score and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned	# Students Scoring at or Above Proficient	Percentage of Students Scoring at or Above Proficient
All students	78,780	S	60.8
American Indian or Alaska Native	970	S	32
Asian or Pacific Islander	6,900	S	72.7
<i>Asian</i>	5,984	S	77.9
<i>Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander</i>	916	S	39
Black or African American	3,432	S	41.6
Hispanic or Latino	18,495	S	42.5
White	42,969	S	68.8
Two or more races	5,940	S	62.7
Children with disabilities ( <i>IDEA</i> )	11,058	S	24.7
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	9,013	S	19.0
Economically disadvantaged students	36,774	S	43.8
Migratory students	1,589	S	28
Male	40,447	S	55.3
Female	38,333	S	66.7

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

## 1.3.3.3 Student Academic Achievement in Science - Grade 5

Grade 5	# Students Who Received a Valid Score and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned	# Students Scoring at or Above Proficient	Percentage of Students Scoring at or Above Proficient
All students	78,639	S	66.3
American Indian or Alaska Native	952	S	40
Asian or Pacific Islander	6,927	S	73.9
<i>Asian</i>	6,010	S	79.5
<i>Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander</i>	917	S	37
Black or African American	3,406	S	43.8
Hispanic or Latino	18,419	S	44.7
White	42,932	S	76.5
Two or more races	5,924	S	67.8
Children with disabilities ( <i>IDEA</i> )	10,995	S	36.4
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	9,055	S	23.3
Economically disadvantaged students	36,604	S	49.9
Migratory students	1,588	S	30
Male	40,343	S	65.4
Female	38,296	S	67.2
<b>Comments:</b> The response is limited to 4,000 characters.			

## 1.3.1.4 Student Academic Achievement in Mathematics - Grade 6

Grade 6	# Students Who Received a Valid Score and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned	# Students Scoring at or Above Proficient	Percentage of Students Scoring at or Above Proficient
All students	78,317	S	48.9
American Indian or Alaska Native	1,038	S	22
Asian or Pacific Islander	6,999	S	67.2
<i>Asian</i>	6,150	S	72.2
<i>Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander</i>	849	S	31
Black or African American	3,398	S	27.0
Hispanic or Latino	17,795	S	29.2
White	43,346	S	56.2
Two or more races	5,649	S	51.4
Children with disabilities ( <i>IDEA</i> )	10,247	S	14.9
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	6,990	S	9.5
Economically disadvantaged students	35,723	S	31.1
Migratory students	1,606	S	20
Male	40,150	S	47.9
Female	38,167	S	50.0
<b>Comments:</b> The response is limited to 4,000 characters.			

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

Grade 6	# Students Who Received a Valid Score and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned	# Students Scoring at or Above Proficient	Percentage of Students Scoring at or Above Proficient
All students	78,441	S	57.1
American Indian or Alaska Native	1,044	S	30
Asian or Pacific Islander	6,973	S	71.6
<i>Asian</i>	6,122	S	76.2
<i>Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander</i>	851	S	39
Black or African American	3,399	S	37.1
Hispanic or Latino	17,821	S	37.8
White	43,447	S	64.5
Two or more races	5,666	S	60.9
Children with disabilities ( <i>IDEA</i> )	10,296	S	17.4
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	6,936	S	10.9
Economically disadvantaged students	35,819	S	39.6
Migratory students	1,613	S	25
Male	40,193	S	51.1
Female	38,248	S	63.5
<b>Comments:</b> The response is limited to 4,000 characters.			

## 1.3.3.4 Student Academic Achievement in Science - Grade 6

Grade 6	# Students Who Received a Valid Score and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned	# Students Scoring at or Above Proficient	Percentage of Students Scoring at or Above Proficient
All students			
American Indian or Alaska Native			
Asian or Pacific Islander			
<i>Asian</i>			
<i>Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander</i>			
Black or African American			
Hispanic or Latino			
White			
Two or more races			
Children with disabilities ( <i>IDEA</i> )			
Limited English proficient (LEP) students			
Economically disadvantaged students			
Migratory students			
Male			
Female			
<b>Comments:</b> The response is limited to 4,000 characters. Washington does not test 6th graders in Science.			



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

<b>Grade 7</b>	<b># Students Who Received a Valid Score and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned</b>	<b># Students Scoring at or Above Proficient</b>	<b>Percentage of Students Scoring at or Above Proficient</b>
All students	77,285	S	50.9
American Indian or Alaska Native	1,091	S	27
Asian or Pacific Islander	6,916	S	69.4
<i>Asian</i>	6,087	S	75.4
<i>Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander</i>	829	S	25
Black or African American	3,338	S	29.2
Hispanic or Latino	17,146	S	31.7
White	43,347	S	57.6
Two or more races	5,392	S	52.5
Children with disabilities ( <i>IDEA</i> )	9,822	S	14.9
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	5,137	S	11.2
Economically disadvantaged students	34,234	S	33.3
Migratory students	1,421	S	21
Male	39,533	S	50.4
Female	37,752	S	51.4

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

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

<b>Grade 7</b>	<b># Students Who Received a Valid Score and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned</b>	<b># Students Scoring at or Above Proficient</b>	<b>Percentage of Students Scoring at or Above Proficient</b>
All students	77,371	S	59.4
American Indian or Alaska Native	1,093	S	35
Asian or Pacific Islander	6,868	S	73.5
<i>Asian</i>	6,044	S	78.9
<i>Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander</i>	824	S	34
Black or African American	3,348	S	40.7
Hispanic or Latino	17,191	S	40.8
White	43,411	S	66.4
Two or more races	5,405	S	61.4
Children with disabilities ( <i>IDEA</i> )	9,882	S	17.2
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	5,087	S	10.1
Economically disadvantaged students	34,308	S	42.3
Migratory students	1,431	S	26
Male	39,590	S	52.9
Female	37,781	S	66.3

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

## 1.3.3.5 Student Academic Achievement in Science - Grade 7

Grade 7	# Students Who Received a Valid Score and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned	# Students Scoring at or Above Proficient	Percentage of Students Scoring at or Above Proficient
All students			
American Indian or Alaska Native			
Asian or Pacific Islander			
<i>Asian</i>			
<i>Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander</i>			
Black or African American			
Hispanic or Latino			
White			
Two or more races			
Children with disabilities ( <i>IDEA</i> )			
Limited English proficient (LEP) students			
Economically disadvantaged students			
Migratory students			
Male			
Female			
<b>Comments:</b> The response is limited to 4,000 characters. Washington does not test 7th graders in Science.			

## 1.3.1.6 Student Academic Achievement in Mathematics - Grade 8

Grade 8	# Students Who Received a Valid Score and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned	# Students Scoring at or Above Proficient	Percentage of Students Scoring at or Above Proficient
All students	76,104	S	49.2
American Indian or Alaska Native	996	S	26
Asian or Pacific Islander	6,807	S	69.1
<i>Asian</i>	5,987	S	74.9
<i>Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander</i>	820	S	27
Black or African American	3,373	S	28.1
Hispanic or Latino	16,590	S	30.3
White	43,123	S	55.4
Two or more races	5,124	S	50.1
Children with disabilities ( <i>IDEA</i> )	9,270	S	12.1
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	4,685	S	11.9
Economically disadvantaged students	33,113	S	31.3
Migratory students	1,469	S	21
Male	38,945	S	47.3
Female	37,159	S	51.1

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

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

Grade 8	# Students Who Received a Valid Score and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned	# Students Scoring at or Above Proficient	Percentage of Students Scoring at or Above Proficient
All students	76,389	S	60.9
American Indian or Alaska Native	1,001	S	39
Asian or Pacific Islander	6,775	S	74.5
<i>Asian</i>	5,950	S	79.0
<i>Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander</i>	825	S	42
Black or African American	3,395	S	41.9
Hispanic or Latino	16,638	S	42.7
White	43,344	S	67.5
Two or more races	5,142	S	62.7
Children with disabilities ( <i>IDEA</i> )	9,347	S	16.8
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	4,637	S	10.1
Economically disadvantaged students	33,275	S	44.1
Migratory students	1,475	S	30
Male	39,077	S	53.8
Female	37,312	S	68.3

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

## 1.3.3.6 Student Academic Achievement in Science - Grade 8

Grade 8	# Students Who Received a Valid Score and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned	# Students Scoring at or Above Proficient	Percentage of Students Scoring at or Above Proficient
All students	76,193	S	68.9
American Indian or Alaska Native	1,001	S	47
Asian or Pacific Islander	6,806	S	77.2
<i>Asian</i>	5,988	S	81.7
<i>Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander</i>	818	S	44
Black or African American	3,376	S	46.6
Hispanic or Latino	16,558	S	49.5
White	43,233	S	77.0
Two or more races	5,127	S	70.3
Children with disabilities ( <i>IDEA</i> )	9,263	S	28.2
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	4,680	S	15.6
Economically disadvantaged students	33,058	S	52.6
Migratory students	1,474	S	35
Male	38,937	S	68.1
Female	37,256	S	69.7
<b>Comments:</b> The response is limited to 4,000 characters.			

## 1.3.1.7 Student Academic Achievement in Mathematics - High School

High School	# Students Who Received a Valid Score and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned	# Students Scoring at or Above Proficient	Percentage of Students Scoring at or Above Proficient
All students	48,579	S	35.9
American Indian or Alaska Native	633	S	21
Asian or Pacific Islander	3,714	S	51.3
<i>Asian</i>	3,220	S	56.6
<i>Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander</i>	494	S	17
Black or African American	2,278	S	18
Hispanic or Latino	10,456	S	20.6
White	28,315	S	41.3
Two or more races	3,082	S	36.2
Children with disabilities ( <i>IDEA</i> )	5,149	S	21.3
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	2,253	S	11
Economically disadvantaged students	19,491	S	22.4
Migratory students	963	S	12
Male	25,365	S	36.6
Female	23,214	S	35.2

**Comments:** The response is limited to 4,000 characters. Our high school testing grade for accountability testing changed from grade 10 to grade 11 with the introduction of the SBA in 2014-15. Many 11th graders in the 2014-15 and 2015-16 school years chose not to participate in the annual Smarter Balanced assessments as they had fulfilled their state-specific assessments for graduation purposes on a different test in a previous year.

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

High School	# Students Who Received a Valid Score and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned	# Students Scoring at or Above Proficient	Percentage of Students Scoring at or Above Proficient
All students	72,654	S	85.2
American Indian or Alaska Native	886	S	72
Asian or Pacific Islander	6,202	S	87.8
<i>Asian</i>	5,575	S	90.3
<i>Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander</i>	627	S	66
Black or African American	3,140	S	71.0
Hispanic or Latino	13,511	S	73.8
White	44,088	S	89.5
Two or more races	4,744	S	86.5
Children with disabilities ( <i>IDEA</i> )	5,849	S	52.4
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	2,477	S	28
Economically disadvantaged students	25,906	S	74.2
Migratory students	1,107	S	61
Male	36,415	S	82.3
Female	36,239	S	88.1

**Comments:** The response is limited to 4,000 characters. Our high school testing grade for accountability testing changed from grade 10 to grade 11 with the introduction of the SBA in 2014-15. Many 11th graders in the 2014-15 and 2015-16 school years chose not to participate in the annual Smarter Balanced assessments as they had fulfilled their state-specific assessments for graduation purposes on a different test in a previous year. Many of the scores reported for ELA in 2015-16 represent students who had met standard on Smarter as 10th graders in 2014-15.

## 1.3.3.7 Student Academic Achievement in Science - High School

High School	# Students Who Received a Valid Score and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned	# Students Scoring at or Above Proficient	Percentage of Students Scoring at or Above Proficient
All students	74,896	S	78.4
American Indian or Alaska Native	915	S	55
Asian or Pacific Islander	6,681	S	82.4
<i>Asian</i>	5,928	S	86.1
<i>Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander</i>	753	S	53
Black or African American	3,230	S	58.2
Hispanic or Latino	14,616	S	61.3
White	44,509	S	85.2
Two or more races	4,871	S	80.5
Children with disabilities ( <i>IDEA</i> )	6,816	S	37.6
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	3,434	S	23.8
Economically disadvantaged students	28,294	S	64.2
Migratory students	1,285	S	45
Male	38,072	S	77.6
Female	36,824	S	79.3

**Comments:** The response is limited to 4,000 characters. The data have been verified, and the above is an accurate account of testing in Washington in Spring 2016.

**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**

Per the *Every Student Succeeds Act (ESSA)* FAQs located at the following link, some data in this section are no longer required: <http://www2.ed.gov/policy/elsec/leg/essa/faq/essa-faqs.pdf>

For an SEA that has not received ESEA flexibility, or an SEA that received availability without the optional waiver to not make AYP determinations for LEAs and schools:

In the table below, provide the total number of public elementary and secondary schools and districts in the State, including charters, and the total number of those schools and districts that made AYP based on data for SY 2015-16. The percentage that made AYP will be calculated automatically.

Entity	Total #	Total # that Made AYP in SY 2015-16	Percentage that Made AYP in SY 2015-16
Schools			
Districts			

**Comments:** The response is limited to 4,000 characters. Per the Transitioning to ESSA FAQ issued by ED on 6/29/2016, "A State is no longer required to respond to accountability questions in section 1.4 of the CSPR (specifically, 1.4.1 Number and percentage of schools and districts that made AYP; 1.4.1 Number and percentage of schools and districts that met all AMOs, 95 percent participation rate, and other academic indicator...)"

For an SEA with an approved ESEA flexibility request that includes the optional waiver to not make AYP determinations for LEAs and schools:

In the table below, provide the total number of public elementary and secondary schools and districts in the State, including charters, and the total number of those schools and districts that made all of their AMOs, the 95 percent participation rate, and other academic indicator <sup>4</sup> based on data for SY 2015-16. The percentage will be calculated automatically.

Entity	Total #	Total # that Met All AMOs, 95 Percent Participation Rate, and Other Academic Indicator in SY 2015-16	Percentage that Met All AMOs, 95 Percent Participation Rate and Other Academic Indicator in SY 2015-16
Schools			
Districts			

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

<sup>4</sup> For a high school, the other academic indicator is always graduation rate.

**1.4.2 Title I School Accountability**

Per the *ESSA* FAQs located at the following link, some data in this section are no longer required:

<http://www2.ed.gov/policy/elsec/leg/essa/faq/essa-faqs.pdf>

For an SEA that has not received ESEA flexibility, or an SEA that received ESEA flexibility without the optional waiver to not make AYP determinations for LEAs and schools:

In the table below, provide the total number of public Title I schools by type and the total number of those schools that made AYP based on data for SY 2015-16. 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 2015-16	Percentage of Title I Schools that Made AYP in SY 2015-16
All Title I schools			
Schoolwide (SWP) Title I schools			
Targeted assistance (TAS) Title I schools			

**Comments:** The response is limited to 4,000 characters. Per the Transitioning to ESSA FAQ issued by ED on 6/29/2016, "A State is no longer required to respond to accountability questions in section 1.4 of the CSPR (specifically, ...1.4.2, Number and percentage of Title I schools that made AYP; 1.4.2, Number and percentage of Title I schools that met all AMOs, 95 percent participation rate, and other academic indicator...)"

For an SEA with an approved ESEA flexibility request that includes the optional waiver to not make AYP determinations for LEAs and schools:

In the table below, provide the total number of public Title I schools by type and the total number of those schools that made all of their AMOs, the 95 percent participation rate, and the other academic indicator <sup>5</sup> based on data for SY 2015-16. Include only public Title I schools. Do not include Title I programs operated by LEAs in private schools. The percentage will be calculated automatically.

Title I School	# Title I Schools	# Title I Schools that Met All AMOs, 95 Percent Participation Rate, and Other Academic Indicator in SY 2015-16	Percentage of Title I Schools that Met All AMOs, 95 Percent Participation Rate, and Other Academic Indicator in SY 2015-16
All Title I schools			
Schoolwide (SWP) Title I schools			
Targeted assistance (TAS) Title I schools			

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

<sup>5</sup> For a high school, the other academic indicator is always graduation rate.

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

Per the ESSA FAQs located at the following link, some data in this section are no longer required: <http://www2.ed.gov/policy/elsec/leg/essa/faq/essa-faqs.pdf>

For an SEA that has not received ESEA flexibility, or an SEA that received ESEA flexibility without the optional waiver to not make AYP determinations for LEAs and schools:

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 2015-16. The percentage that made AYP will be calculated automatically.

# Districts That Received Title I Funds in SY 2015-16	# Districts That Received Title I Funds and Made AYP in SY 2015-16	Percentage of Districts That Received Title I Funds and Made AYP in SY 2015-16
<p><b>Comments:</b> The response is limited to 4,000 characters. Per the Transitioning to ESSA FAQ issued by ED on 6/29/2016, a State is no longer required to respond to accountability questions in section 1.4 of the CSPR (specifically, ... 1.4.3 Number and percentage of districts that received Title I funds that made AYP; and 1.4.3 Number and percentage of districts that received Title I funds that met all AMOs, 95 percent participation rate, and other academic indicator).</p>		

For an SEA with an approved ESEA flexibility request that includes the optional waiver to not make AYP determinations for LEAs and schools:

In the table below, provide the total number of districts that received Title I funds and the total number of those districts that met all of their AMOs, the 95 percent participation rate, and other academic indicator<sup>6</sup> based on data for SY 2015-16. The percentage will be calculated automatically.

# Districts That Received Title I Funds in SY 2015-16	# Districts That Received Title I Funds and Met All AMOs, 95 percent Participation Rate, and Other Academic Indicator in SY 2015-16	Percentage of Districts That Received Title I Funds and Met All AMOs, 95 percent Participation Rate, and Other Academic Indicator in SY 2015-16
<p><b>Comments:</b> The response is limited to 4,000 characters.</p>		

<sup>6</sup> For a high school, the other academic indicator is always graduation rate.



**1.4.4.3 Corrective Action**

In the table below, for schools in corrective action, provide the number of schools for which the listed corrective actions under *ESEA* were implemented in SY 2015-16 (based on SY 2014-15 assessments under Section 1111 of *ESEA*).

<b>Corrective Action</b>	<b># of Title I Schools in Corrective Action in Which the Corrective Action was Implemented in SY 2015-16</b>
Required implementation of a new research-based curriculum or instructional program	113
Extension of the school year or school day	28
Replacement of staff members, not including the principal, relevant to the school's low performance	17
Significant decrease in management authority at the school level	3
Replacement of the principal	24
Restructuring the internal organization of the school	31
Appointment of an outside expert to advise the school	66
<b>Comments:</b> The response is limited to 4,000 characters.	

**1.4.4.4 Restructuring – Year 2**

In the table below, for schools in restructuring – year 2 (implementation year), provide the number of schools for which the listed restructuring actions under *ESEA* were implemented in SY 2015-16 (based on SY 2014-15 assessments under Section 1111 of *ESEA*).

<b>Restructuring Action</b>	<b># of Title I Schools in Restructuring in Which Restructuring Action Is Being Implemented</b>
Replacement of all or most of the school staff (which may include the principal)	28
Reopening the school as a public charter school	
Entering into a contract with a private entity to operate the school	
Takeover the school by the State	
Other major restructuring of the school governance	208
<b>Comments:</b> The response is limited to 4,000 characters.	

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

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

--

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

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

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

Under the Washington Accountability System and the No Child Left Behind law, school districts are expected to meet Adequate Yearly Progress (AYP) performance targets. For 2015-16, a district moved into (a) Step 1 of Improvement and sanctions when the Participation Rates or "other indicator(s)" were not met for two consecutive years at all of their grade levels (i.e., elementary, middle, and high) or (b) Step 2 of Improvement and sanctions when the Participation Rates or "other indicator(s)" were not met for one year at all of their grade levels (i.e., elementary, middle, and high).

##### Requirements/Sanctions

The criteria for sanctions are:

- Set by the State and the State Board of Education in accordance with the Revised Code of Washington (RCW 28A.657.110) requiring the state to establish an accountability framework that creates a unified system of support for challenged schools and recognition of schools for exemplary performance;
- Based on Adequate Yearly Progress decisions; and
- Applied uniformly across public schools and districts.

All districts in Step 1 or 2 of Improvement must set aside an amount equal to 10 percent of their total Title I, Part A allocation for professional development. Additional requirements for Districts in Step 1 or Step 2 of Improvement follow.

- Districts in Step 1 are required to develop or revise a district improvement plan and implement the plan within 90 days from the date of AYP notification.

The development of the plan must involve parents, school staff, and others. The district improvement plan must:

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

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

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

##### OSPI Technical Support for District Improvement

A total of 97 districts were identified for improvement in 2015-16:

- New in Step 1: 12 districts
- Continuing in Step 1: 14 districts
- New in Step 2: 1 district
- Continuing in Step 2: 113 districts

Technical assistance provided to districts in improvement may vary in order to meet the needs of districts as they are developing their plans or are in various stages of implementing their plans. Among the most common supports are:

1. Guidance to develop/revise plans: In collaboration with divisions across OSPI and the Washington Association of School Administrators (WSAS), the Central Office Action Planning: Guidance for Districts with Priority and Focus Schools handbook offers steps to guide the action-planning processes for districts with Priority and Focus schools, so that evidence-based practices and innovations reach ALL students who can benefit. Teams use processes, protocols, and tools described in the guide to measure current effectiveness and inform the district's strategic plan, policies, infrastructure, and systems supporting action-planning efforts across their schools.

In addition, the handbook provides clear direction regarding expectations for districts with Priority and Focus schools to address 14 evidence-based practices ("Expected Indicators") using an online action-planning tool (Indistar®), supports leadership teams from districts in Step 1 or Step 2 of Improvement based on Adequate Yearly Progress to integrate their District Improvement Plan and Action Plan in Indistar®. The intent for these plans is the same: implement district- and school-wide reform strategies that create a systematic approach to engage low-achieving students and the whole school population in rigorous career- and college-ready curriculum, instruction, and assessments so all graduate prepared for post-secondary opportunities and expectations.

2. Additional support: In collaboration with regional Educational Service Districts, the Office of Student and School Success and Title I Section convene regional outreaches for district/school teams each fall and spring. OSPI outlines requirements for district improvement plans and provide assistance for teams to use Indistar® as they develop/revise, implement, and monitor their plans.

3. Review of district improvement plans: District improvement plans for districts with Priority and Focus schools are reviewed annually by OSPI's Office of Student and School Success; the remaining district improvement plans are reviewed by OSPI's Title I Section. The review provides district teams with feedback regarding plan requirements and recommendations for next steps.

4. External Facilitator: The Office of Student and School Success assigns each identified Priority and Focus school a Leadership Coach to work side-by-side with district and school staff, students, parents, and community to build capacity to improve student learning outcomes. Coaches are highly qualified experts with Turnaround Leadership experience. They help build capacity at the school and district levels to support implementation of high-quality, data-driven, and research-based improvement plans.

5. Professional development and expertise: Additional resources for professional development and expertise OSPI could provide (e.g., working with diverse student populations and implementing research-based practices and programs) are determined on a case-by-case basis for Priority and Focus schools and their districts.

6. Designation of districts for required action: OSPI is required to annually recommend to the State Board of Education school districts for designation as Required Action Districts (RAD). These districts include at least one school identified as persistently lowest achieving, with the lowest levels of achievement and rates of improvement in the "all students" group on state assessments in ELA/reading and mathematics for the last 3 consecutive years. These districts

and their schools receive state funding to implement one of the four federal turnaround models or the state-approved Synergy Model.

The Office of Student and School Success created the document, Required Action Districts: Level One Plan Guidance, to serve several purposes.

1. To describe exactly what districts need to do to satisfy requirements for Required Action Districts and to exit required action status; and
2. To clarify OSPI's intention that districts identified for required action build upon their current Student and School Success Action Plans when addressing concerns raised in an external audit of the district and school.

**1.4.5.3 Corrective Action**

In the table below, for districts in corrective action, provide the number of districts in corrective action in which the listed corrective actions under *ESEA* were implemented in SY 2015-16 (based on SY 2014-15 assessments under Section 1111 of *ESEA*).

Corrective Action	# of Districts receiving Title I funds in Corrective Action in Which Corrective Action was Implemented in SY 2015-16
Implemented a new curriculum based on State standards	57
Authorized students to transfer from district schools to higher performing schools in a neighboring district	96
Deferred programmatic funds or reduced administrative funds	0
Replaced district personnel who are relevant to the failure to make AYP	17
Removed one or more schools from the jurisdiction of the district	0
Appointed a receiver or trustee to administer the affairs of the district	0
Restructured the district	0
Abolished the district (list the number of districts abolished between the end of SY 2014-15 and beginning of SY 2015-16 as a corrective action)	0
<b>Comments:</b> The response is limited to 4,000 characters. Replacement of personnel includes staff members and/or principals.	

**1.4.7 Appeal of AYP and Identification Determinations**

In the table below, provide the number of districts and schools that appealed their AYP designations based on SY 2015-16 data and the results of those appeals.

Entity	# Appealed Their AYP Designations	# Appeals Resulted in a Change in the AYP Designation
Districts	1	1
Schools	2	0
<b>Comments:</b> The response is limited to 4,000 characters.		

In the table below, provide the data by which processing appeals based on SY 2015-16 data was complete.

Processing Appeals completion	Date
Date (MM/DD/YY) that processing appeals based on SY 2015-16 data was complete	09/30/16

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

In the section below, "schools in improvement" refers to Title I schools identified for improvement, corrective action, or restructuring under Section 1116 of *ESEA*.

**1.4.8.5 Use of Sections 1003(a) and (g) School Improvement Funds.****1.4.8.5.1 Section 1003(a) State Reservations**

In the space provided, enter the percentage of the FY 2015 (SY 2015-16) Title I, Part A allocation that the SEA reserved in accordance with Section 1003(a) of *ESEA* and §200.100(a) of ED's regulations governing the reservation of funds for school improvement under Section 1003(a) of *ESEA*: 4.00 %

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

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

The data for this question are reported through *EDFacts* files and compiled in the EDEN012 "Section 1003(a) and 1003(g) Allocations to LEAs and Schools" report in the *EDFacts* Reporting System (ERS). The *EDFacts* files and data groups used in this report are listed in the CSPR Crosswalk. The CSPR Data Key contains more detailed information on how the data are populated into the report.

Before certifying Part I of the CSPR, a state user must run the EDEN012 report in ERS and verify that the state's data are correct. The final, certified data from this report will be made publicly available alongside the state's certified CSPR PDF.

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

Section 1003(g)(8) of ESEA allows States to reserve up to five percent of Section 1003(g) funds for administration and to meet the evaluation and technical assistance requirements for this program. In the space below, identify and describe the specific Section 1003(g) evaluation and technical assistance activities that your State conducted during SY 2015-16.

This response is limited to 8,000 characters.

Washington State reserved the allowable 5% of 1003(g) funds for administration to assist selected districts/schools with evaluation, monitoring, intervention, and technical assistance in support of the SEA's School Improvement Grant (SIG) Cohort III.

**Purpose and Background:**

The major shift in Federal policy focuses on the bottom 5% of Title I and Title I-eligible secondary schools identified through a composite score on reading/language arts and math achievement measured by the state assessment over the past three consecutive years and graduation rate of less than 60% has allowed the Office of Student and School Success to provide continued support to 13 schools statewide identified as SIG Cohort III.

In the 2015-16 school year, OSPI's Office of Student and School Success continued their current work in the SIG Cohort III schools based on an approved state application for SIG funds that has allowed the SEA to provide continued support and services to implement required elements aligned to the LEAs selected intervention model (transformation, turnaround, closure, and restart).

In addition, the Washington State Service Delivery Model continued to support a variety of services to identified SIG districts/schools. These services included but were not limited to needs assessments, contextual survey data and assessment analytic support, classroom walkthrough training/PD, improvement planning support and monitoring/tracking for accountability purposes, onsite visits to SIG districts and schools, and executive coaching from the Office of Student and School Success FTEs.

**Evaluation and Technical Assistance:**

The SEA continues to provide evaluation and technical assistance support through agency FTEs and third-party contractors. Data from the evaluation of SIG are assisting the SEA in continued funding decisions while providing evidence of effective structures and conditions that is essential for continuous improvement of teaching and learning and to help sustain reforms once the grant funding is no longer available.

Continued technical assistance from agency FTE and third-party contractors that is in alignment with Turnaround Principles described in Federal guidance and helps target specific outcomes within the themes of:

- Providing strong leadership;
- Ensuring that teachers are effective and able to improve instruction;
- Redesigning the school day/week/year to include additional time for student learning and teacher collaboration;
- Strengthening the school's instructional program based on student needs and ensure that the instructional program is research-based, rigorous, and aligned with State academic content standards;
- Using data to inform instruction and for continuous improvement, including providing time for collaboration on the use of data;
- Establishing a school environment that improves school safety and discipline and addresses other non-academic factors that impact student achievement, such as students' social, emotional, and health needs;
- Providing ongoing mechanisms for family and community engagement.

**Enhanced Technical Assistance Efforts:**

The implementation of effective instruction, assessment, and intervention systems is essential to enabling all students to achieve at high levels. OSPI's Student and School Success FTE and third-party contractors continue to provide technical assistance in the content areas of English Language Arts, Mathematics, English Learners, Students with Disabilities, and Positive Behavior Supports. All professional learning and technical assistance offered are aligned to both Washington State Teacher Criteria and School Success Principles.

Specific areas of continued focus will depend on district context relative to implementation of Common Core State Standards, aligned instructional materials, assessment and intervention systems. Ongoing training for key district staff in accessing, using, and analyzing data continues to supplement content-specific activities.

The Office of Student and School Success third-party contractors with both leadership and instructional expertise have been assigned to each of our SIG schools. These experienced, exemplary educators work in an ongoing capacity with district personnel, supporting the effective implementation of strategies in leadership, instruction, data analysis, assessment, intervention, and the alignment of district and school improvement plans. Our ability to maintain this level of technical assistance will be critical to sustain the ongoing efforts to the existing districts and schools.

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

In the space below, describe actions (if any) taken by your State in SY 2015-16 that were supported by **funds other than Sections 1003(a) and 1003(g) funds** to address the achievement problems of schools identified for improvement, corrective action, or restructuring under Sections 1116 of ESEA.

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

**Background and Purpose:**

In 2013 Washington State Legislature passed E2SSB 5329 to support three main performance outcomes within the public schools in Washington State.

1. Create a differentiated system of accountability and support that permeates all schools in Washington State. Rewarding exemplar schools and identifying schools that are under-performing, both Title I and non-Title.
2. Recommend to the State Board of Education those schools within Washington State that, despite significant intervention, continue to be amongst the lowest performing, for RAD (Required Action District).
3. Support through targeted investment: Fiscal Grant, Leadership and Instructional Coaching to ensure the success of all Non-Title Priority, Focus, and RAD schools statewide.

**Services Provided:**

The services provided to schools as a result of E2SSB 5329 legislation include: fiscal grants to identified schools to support their Student and School Success Action Plan, leadership coaching provided to the building principals of identified schools and targeted district staff, instructional coaching provided in the classrooms of identified schools, and data analysis/assessment to support the improvement planning process. A fixed amount is also assigned to support the administrative expenses and investment within OSPI related to the growth in program by increasing the number of schools identified statewide and differentiating the fiscal support.

Criteria for receiving services and/or grants include the following:

1. Priority Schools: Based on low performance in the "All Students" category
  - a. Schools with proficiency in Reading/Math (combined) over three (3) years that is less than forty percent (40%);
  - b. Schools with an Adjusted 5-year Graduation Rate over three (3) years that is less than sixty percent (60%);
  - c. Lowest performing schools based on Achievement Index;
  - d. Current Priority schools continuing forward to 2016-17; and
  - e. Bottom five percent (5%) of persistently lowest achieving schools (PLAs) in Reading and Math over three (3) years.
2. Focus Schools: Based on Subgroup performance
  - a. Exclude the priority schools from consideration;
  - b. Schools with proficiency in any subgroup in Reading/Math (combined) over three (3) years that is less than thirteen point eight-two percent (13.82%) (13.82% represents the threshold for the lowest ten percent (10%) in WA state in reviewed period);
  - c. Schools with an Adjusted five (5) year Graduation Rate for any sub-group over three (3) years that is less than sixty percent (60%);
  - d. Non-title schools with sub-group performance less than 13.82% proficient over 3 years in Reading/Math;
  - e. Current Focus schools continuing forward to 2016-17 because they are not eligible to exit. (Their three (3) year performance in Reading/Math did not exceed thirteen point eight-two percent (13.82%).
3. RAD (Required Action District)

Our current work is based on an approved Agency Fiscal Note for to support Title/Non-Title Priority and Focus schools and also RAD schools. The beneficiaries in 2015-16 included 257 schools in 111 districts.

**Evaluation and Technical Assistance:**

Each identified school in Washington State is required to submit a Student and School Success Action Plan that is reviewed at least three times annually by the Office of Student and School Success. These plans, along with ongoing data analysis provide the "prescription" to ensure ongoing growth and proficiency of the students in identified schools. In addition to the student performance gains, the Office of Student and School Success monitor changes/improvements in educator practice of both the building leadership and teaching staff. Through the formalized Instructional Review Process, all Priority, Focus, and RAD schools who are not exhibiting growth will continually be both scrutinized and supported for growth and targeted intervention. In addition, continued Technical Assistance from FTE and third-party contractors is in alignment with school structures and practices Turnaround Principles described in state and federal guidance

**Enhanced Technical Assistance Efforts:**

The implementation of effective instruction, assessment and intervention systems in reading/language arts and mathematics is essential to enabling all students to achieve at high levels. Within the context of Student and School Success district action plans, OSPI staff are providing technical assistance in the content areas of reading and mathematics and in meeting the needs of English Learners and Students with Disabilities.

Specific areas of continued focus will depend on district context relative to implementation of Common Core State Standards, aligned instructional materials, assessment and intervention systems. Ongoing training for key district staff in accessing, using, and analyzing data continues to supplement content-specific activities.

The Office of Student and School Success Coaches with both leadership and instructional expertise have been assigned to each of our Non-Title Priority, Focus, and RAD schools/districts. These experienced, exemplary educators work in an ongoing capacity with district personnel, supporting the effective implementation of strategies in leadership, instruction, data analysis, assessment, intervention, and the alignment of district and school improvement plans. Our ability to maintain this level of technical assistance will be critical to sustain the ongoing efforts to the existing districts and schools.



**1.4.9 Public School Choice and Supplemental Educational Services**

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

**1.4.9.1 Public School Choice**

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

**1.4.9.1.2 Public School Choice – Students**

In the table below, provide:

The number of students who were eligible for public school choice, the number of eligible students who applied to transfer, and the number who transferred under the provisions for public school choice under Section 1116 of *ESEA*.

The number of students who were eligible for public school choice should include:

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

The number of students who applied to transfer should include:

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

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

<b>Public School Choice</b>	<b># Students</b>
Eligible for public school choice	279,459
Applied to transfer	2,085
Transferred to another school under the Title I public school choice provisions	1,027
<b>Comments:</b> The response is limited to 4,000 characters.	

**1.4.9.1.3 Funds Spent on Public School Choice**

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

<b>Transportation for Public School Choice</b>	<b>Dollars Spent</b>
Dollars spent by LEAs on transportation for public school choice	\$ 1,319,479

**1.4.9.1.4 Availability of Public School Choice Options**

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

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

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

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

In addition, the State may consider costs for transporting a student meeting the above conditions towards the funds spent by an LEA on transportation for public school choice if the student is using district transportation services to attend the non-identified school.<sup>7</sup> Adapted from Public School Choice Non-Regulatory Guidance, Available at: <http://www.ed.gov/policy/elsec/guid/schoolchoiceguid.doc>

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

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

<b>Comments:</b> The response is limited to 4,000 characters.
---

**1.4.9.2 Supplemental Educational Services**

This section collects data on supplemental educational services.

**1.4.9.2.2 Supplemental Educational Services – Students**

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

The number of students who received supplemental educational services should include all students who were enrolled with a provider and participated in some hours of services. States and LEAs have the discretion to determine the minimum number of hours of participation needed by a student to be considered as having received services.

<b>Supplemental Educational Services</b>	<b># Students</b>
Eligible for supplemental educational services	182,177
Applied for supplemental educational services	18,295
Received supplemental educational services	14,396
<b>Comments:</b> The response is limited to 4,000 characters.	

**1.4.9.2.3 Funds Spent on Supplemental Educational Services**

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

<b>Spending on Supplemental Educational Services</b>	<b>Dollars Spent</b>
Dollars spent by LEAs on supplemental educational services	\$ 14,074,237
<b>Comments:</b> The response is limited to 4,000 characters.	

**1.5 TEACHER QUALITY**

This section collects data on "highly qualified" teachers as the term is defined in Section 9101(23) of 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 the grade levels listed, the number of those core academic classes taught by teachers who are highly qualified, and the number taught by teachers who are not highly qualified. The percentage of core academic classes taught by teachers who are highly qualified and the percentage taught by teachers who are not highly qualified will be calculated automatically. Below the table are FAQs about these data.

Classes	Number of Core Academic Classes (Total)	Number of Core Academic Classes Taught by Teachers Who Are Highly Qualified	Percentage of Core Academic Classes Taught by Teachers Who Are Highly Qualified	Number of Core Academic Classes Taught by Teachers Who Are <u>NOT</u> Highly Qualified	Percentage of Core Academic Classes Taught by Teachers Who Are <u>NOT</u> Highly Qualified
All classes	237,526	226,545	95.38	10,981	4.62
All elementary classes	29,890	28,827	96.44	1,063	3.56
All secondary classes	207,636	197,718	95.22	9,918	4.78

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

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

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

--

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

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

Washington State counts elementary classes as a full-day self-contained classroom equal to one class.
---

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

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

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

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

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

<b>1.5.2.1 Elementary School Classes</b>	
<b>Elementary School Classes</b>	<b>Percentage</b>
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	64.04
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	16.06
Elementary school classes taught by teachers who are not fully certified (and are not in an approved alternative route program)	17.37
Other (please explain in comment box below)	2.53
<b>Total</b>	<b>100.00</b>

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

The data includes bilingual, alternative education, and juvenile detention teachers.

<b>1.5.2.2 Secondary School Classes</b>	
<b>Secondary School Classes</b>	<b>Percentage</b>
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)	54.75
Secondary school classes taught by certified special education teachers who have not demonstrated subject-matter competency in those subjects	22.27
Secondary school classes taught by teachers who are not fully certified (and are not in an approved alternative route program)	10.30
Other (please explain in comment box below)	12.68
<b>Total</b>	<b>100.00</b>

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

The data includes bilingual, alternative education, and juvenile detention teachers.

### 1.5.3 Poverty Quartiles and Metrics Used

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

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

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

School Type	Number of Core Academic Classes (Total)	Number of Core Academic Classes Taught by Teachers Who Are Highly Qualified	Percentage of Core Academic Classes Taught by Teachers Who Are Highly Qualified
Elementary Schools			
High-poverty elementary schools	9,169	8,759	95.53
Low-poverty elementary schools	7,186	6,936	96.52
Secondary Schools			
High-poverty secondary schools	31,090	29,136	93.72
Low-poverty secondary schools	61,161	58,473	95.61

#### 1.5.3.1 Poverty Quartile Breaks

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

	High-Poverty Schools (more than what %)	Low-Poverty Schools (less than what %)
Elementary schools	80.90	16.30
Poverty metric used	Free and Reduced Lunch	
Secondary schools	71.20	18.80
Poverty metric used	Free and Reduced Lunch	

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

- 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.
- 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.
- 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.
- 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 program.

**1.6.1 Language Instruction Educational program**

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

**Table 1.6.1 Definitions:**

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

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

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.



**1.6.2 Student Demographic Data**

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

In the table below, provide the October 1 count of ALL LEP students in the State who meet the LEP definition under Section 9101(25).

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

Number of ALL LEP students in the State	112,808
<b>Comments:</b> The response is limited to 4,000 characters.	

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

In the table below, provide the October 1 count of LEP students in the State who received services in Title III language instructional education programs.

LEP Students Receiving Services	#
LEP students who received services in a Title III language instruction educational program in grades K through 12 for this reporting year.	110,924
<b>Comments:</b> The response is limited to 4,000 characters.	

**1.6.2.3 Most Commonly Spoken Languages in the State**

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

Language	# LEP Students
Spanish; Castilian	74,586
Russian	4,555
Vietnamese	3,548
Chinese	2,738
Somali	2,683

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

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

--

**1.6.3 Student Performance Data**

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

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

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

<b>All LEP Testing</b>	<b>#</b>
Number tested on State annual ELP assessment	119,142
Number not tested on State annual ELP assessment	2,136
<b>Total</b>	<b>121,278</b>

**Comments:** The response is limited to 4,000 characters. Previous to the spring 2016 test administration, non-testers were identified solely from students recognized as potential testers by a pre-identification process used by the test vendor to ensure there was a booklet for each student. Only students with a pre-ID, who did not meet the criteria for test completion, were counted as non-testers. The spring 2015 administration relied completely on the state's enrollment information which recognized all students receiving program services, not just those entered into the test vendor's student testing system. The past administration (2015) likely identified as non-testers students who were expected to test, as well as those who were not known to need testing (receiving program services, but not identified in the vendor's testing system). Similarly, by using the state enrollment information to identify potential testers, all Native American students were recognized as potential testers, however, not all Native American students participated.

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

<b>All LEP Results</b>	<b>#</b>
Number attained proficiency on State annual ELP assessment	S
Percent attained proficiency on State annual ELP assessment	13.2
<b>Comments:</b> The response is limited to 4,000 characters.	

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

In the table below, provide the number of Title III LEP students tested and not tested on annual State English language proficiency assessment.

<b>Title III LEP Testing</b>		<b>#</b>
Number tested on State annual ELP assessment		116,963
Number not tested on State annual ELP assessment		2,093
Total		119,056
<b>Comments:</b> The response is limited to 4,000 characters. Previous to the spring 2016 test administration, non-testers were identified solely from students recognized as potential testers by a pre-identification process used by the test vendor to ensure there was a booklet for each student. Only students with a pre-ID, who did not meet the criteria for test completion, were counted as non-testers. The spring 2015 administration relied completely on the state's enrollment information which recognized all students receiving program services, not just those entered into the test vendor's student testing system. The past administration (2015) likely identified as non-testers students who were expected to test, as well as those who were not known to need testing (receiving program services, but not identified in the vendor's testing system). Similarly, by using the state enrollment information to identify potential testers, all Native American students were recognized as potential testers, however, not all Native American students participated.		

In the table below, provide the number of Title III students who took the State annual ELP assessment for the first time and whose progress cannot be determined and whose results were not included in the calculation for AMAO 1. Report this number ONLY if the State did not include these students in establishing AMAO 1/ making progress target and did not include them in the calculations for AMAO 1/ making progress (# and % making progress).

<b>Title III First Time Tested</b>		<b>#</b>
Number of Title III students who took the State annual ELP assessment for the first time whose progress cannot be determined and whose results were not included in the calculation for AMAO 1.		32,114

**1.6.3.2.2 Title III LEP English Language Proficiency Results**

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

**Table 1.6.3.2.2 Definitions:**

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

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

<b>Title III Results</b>	<b>Results #</b>	<b>Results %</b>	<b>Targets #</b>	<b>Targets %</b>
Making progress	S	18.2	79,651	68.10
Attained proficiency	S	13.2	9,357	8.00
<b>Comments:</b> The response is limited to 4,000 characters. The first row's results are lower than our targets because we did not calculate growth during our base year under ELPA 21 assessment.				

**1.6.3.5 Native Language Assessments**

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

**1.6.3.5.1 LEP Students Assessed in Native Language**

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

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

**1.6.3.5.2 Native Language of Mathematics Tests Given**

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

<b>Language(s)</b>
None
<b>Comments:</b> The response is limited to 4,000 characters.

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

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

Language(s)
None
<b>Comments:</b> The response is limited to 4,000 characters.

**1.6.3.5.4 Native Language of Science Tests Given**

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

Language(s)
None
<b>Comments:</b> The response is limited to 4,000 characters.

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

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

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

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

Monitored Former LEP (MFLEP) students include:

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

**Table 1.6.3.6.1 Definitions:**

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

# Year One	# Year Two	Total
18,588	11,809	30,397

**Comments:** The response is limited to 4,000 characters. Students tested in spring 2015 were administered the state's previous instrument (for the last time); the associated form was a second use for the state, but with planned adjustments to specific grade-span/item directions that the state viewed as necessary in providing more accurate information on each student's abilities and skills with the English language. Additionally, a possible explanation may have been fluctuations in student transitions due to the test form in use; a tested cohort from the previous year may have experienced a higher than expected number of retained students, who when testing the next year with another form, experienced a higher number of students exiting program. These two explanations are potential contributing factors to the noted change.

**1.6.3.6.2 MFLEP Students Results for Mathematics**

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

**Table 1.6.3.6.2 Definitions:**

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

# Tested	# At or Above Proficient	% Results	# Below Proficient
19,198	S	47.7	S

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

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

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

**Table 1.6.3.6.3 Definitions:**

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

# Tested	# At or Above Proficient	% Results	# Below Proficient
18,785	S	54.9	S
<b>Comments:</b> The response is limited to 4,000 characters.			

**1.6.3.6.4 MFLEP Students Results for Science**

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

**Table 1.6.3.6.4 Definitions:**

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

# Tested	# At or Above Proficient	% Results	# Below Proficient
6,182	S	54.4	S
<b>Comments:</b> The response is limited to 4,000 characters.			

**1.6.4 Title III Subgrantees**

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

**1.6.4.1 Title III Subgrantee Performance**

Per the ESSA FAQs located at the following link, this section is no longer required: <http://www2.ed.gov/policy/elsec/leg/essa/faq/essa-faqs.pdf>

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

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

<b>Title III Subgrantees</b>	<b>#</b>
Total number of subgrantees for the year	0
////////////////////////////////////	
Number of subgrantees that met all three Title III AMAOs	0
Number of subgrantees that met AMAO 1	0
Number of subgrantees that met AMAO 2	0
Number of subgrantees that met AMAO 3	0
////////////////////////////////////	
Number of subgrantees that did not meet any Title III AMAOs	0
////////////////////////////////////	
Number of subgrantees that did not meet Title III AMAOs for two consecutive years (SYs 2014-15 and 2015-16)	0
Number of subgrantees implementing an improvement plan in SY 2015-16 for not meeting Title III AMAOs for two consecutive years	0
Number of subgrantees that have not met Title III AMAOs for four consecutive years (SYs 2012-13, 2013-14, 2014-15, and 2015-16)	0

Provide information on how the State counted consortia members in the total number of subgrantees and in each of the numbers in table 1.6.4.1. If applicable, also please note if this method is the same or different from the previous year.

The response is limited to 4,000 characters.

**Comments:** The response is limited to 4,000 characters. This section is no longer required under ESSA

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

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

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



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

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

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

**1.6.5.1 Immigrant Students**

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

**Table 1.6.5.1 Definitions:**

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

# Immigrant Students Enrolled	# Students in 3114(d)(1) Program	# of 3114(d)(1) Subgrants
31,887	2,505	5

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

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

**1.6.6 Teacher Information and Professional Development**

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

**1.6.6.1 Teacher Information**

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

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

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

<b>Title III Teachers</b>	<b>#</b>
Number of all certified/licensed teachers currently working in Title III language instruction educational programs.	1,073
Estimate number of <b>additional</b> certified/licensed teachers that will be needed for Title III language instruction educational programs in the next 5 years*.	1,573

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

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

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

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

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

**Table 1.6.6.2 Definitions:**

1. **Professional Development Topics** = Subgrantee professional development topics required under Title III.
2. **#Subgrantees** = Number of subgrantees who conducted each type of professional development activity. A subgrantee may conduct more than one professional development activity. (Use the same method of counting subgrantees, including consortia, as in 1.6.1 and 1.6.4.1).
3. **Total Number of Participants** = Number of teachers, administrators and other personnel who participated in each type of the professional development activities reported.
4. **Total** = Number of all participants in professional development (PD) activities.

Professional Development (PD) Topics	# Subgrantees
Instructional strategies for LEP students	152
Understanding and implementation of assessment of LEP students	70
Understanding and implementation of ELP standards and academic content standards for LEP students	103
Alignment of the curriculum in language instruction educational programs to ELP standards	27
Subject matter knowledge for teachers	29
Other (Explain in comment box)	43

PD Participant Information	# Subgrantees	# Participants
PD provided to content classroom teachers	168	18,085
PD provided to LEP classroom teachers	137	3,442
PD provided to principals	116	862
PD provided to administrators/other than principals	114	717
PD provided to other school personnel/non-administrative	151	5,453
PD provided to community based organization personnel	17	42
Total	//////////	28,601

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

Other Topics includes multicultural education, ELLs w/disabilities, language test proctor training, SEA webinars (various topics), GLAD trainings, and student transition workshops.

**1.6.7 State Subgrant Activities**

This section collects data on State grant activities.

**1.6.7.1 State Subgrant Process**

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

**Table 1.6.7.1 Definitions:**

1. **Date State Received Allocation** = Annual date the State receives the Title III allocation from U.S. 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 2015-16 funds July 1, 2015, and then made these funds available to subgrantees on August 1, 2015, for SY 2015-16 programs. Then the "# of days/\$\$ Distribution" is 30 days.

Date State Received Allocation	Date Funds Available to Subgrantees	# of Days/\$\$ Distribution
7/1/2015	7/1/2015	30
<b>Comments:</b> The response is limited to 4,000 characters.		

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

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

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

N/A Met Target

**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>.

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

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

This section collects data on homeless children and youth 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 youth and the McKinney-Vento program. The totals will be automatically calculated.

LEAs	#	# LEAs Reporting Data
LEAs without subgrants	291	291
LEAs with subgrants	34	34
Total	325	325
<b>Comments:</b> The response is limited to 4,000 characters.		

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

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

**1.9.1.1 Homeless Children And Youth**

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

<b>Age/Grade</b>	<b># of Homeless Children/Youth Enrolled in Public School in LEAs Without Subgrants</b>	<b># of Homeless Children/Youth Enrolled in Public School in LEAs With Subgrants</b>
Age 3 through 5 (not Kindergarten)	490	344
K	1,799	1,352
1	1,841	1,351
2	1,846	1,339
3	1,750	1,422
4	1,692	1,265
5	1,713	1,209
6	1,533	1,082
7	1,447	1,085
8	1,445	1,097
9	1,348	1,146
10	1,352	1,188
11	1,578	1,340
12	2,081	1,992
Ungraded	0	0
Total	21,915	17,212

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

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

In the table below, provide the number of homeless children and youth 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.

<b>Primary Nighttime Residence</b>	<b># of Homeless Children/Youth - LEAs Without Subgrants</b>	<b># of Homeless Children/Youth - LEAs With Subgrants</b>
Shelters, transitional housing, awaiting foster care	2,486	3,537
Doubled-up (e.g., living with another family)	16,860	11,722
Unsheltered (e.g., cars, parks, campgrounds, temporary trailer, or abandoned buildings)	1,234	889
Hotels/Motels	1,335	1,064
Total	21,915	17,212

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

**1.9.1.3 Subgroups of Homeless Students Enrolled**

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

<b>Special Population</b>	<b># Homeless Children/Youth - LEAs Without Subgrants</b>	<b># of Homeless Children/Youth - LEAs With Subgrants</b>
Unaccompanied homeless youth	1,101	2,611
Migratory children/youth	1,415	382
Children with disabilities ( <i>IDEA</i> )	4,361	3,616
Limited English Proficient (LEP) students	3,873	2,621

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

**1.9.2 LEAs with McKinney-Vento Subgrants**

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

**1.9.2.1 Homeless Children and Youth Served by McKinney-Vento Subgrants**

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

<b>Age/Grade</b>	<b># Homeless Children/Youth Served by Subgrants</b>
Age Birth Through 2	307
Age 3 through 5 (not Kindergarten)	649
K	1,454
1	1,466
2	1,452
3	1,538
4	1,372
5	1,298
6	1,182
7	1,170
8	1,184
9	1,219
10	1,266
11	1,414
12	2,061
Ungraded	0
Total	19,032

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

**1.9.2.2 Subgroups of Homeless Students Served**

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

<b>Subgroup</b>	<b># Homeless Students Served</b>
Unaccompanied homeless youth	2,824
Migratory children/youth	415
Children with disabilities ( <i>IDEA</i> )	3,721
Limited English Proficient (LEP) students	2,693

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



**1.9.3 Academic Achievement of Homeless Students**

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

**1.9.3.1 Reading Assessment**

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

Grade	LEAs Without Subgrants - # of Homeless Students Who Received a Valid Score and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned	LEAs Without Subgrants - # of Homeless Students Scoring at or above Proficient	LEAs Without Subgrants - % of Homeless Students Scoring at or above Proficient	LEAs With Subgrants - # of Homeless Students Who Received a Valid Score and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned	LEAs With Subgrants - # of Homeless Students Scoring at or above Proficient	LEAs With Subgrants - % of Homeless Students Scoring at or above Proficient
3	1,322	S	29	1,161	S	29
4	1,270	S	33	1,034	S	33
5	1,299	S	31	986	S	36
6	1,097	S	28	886	S	31
7	1,061	S	31	843	S	34
8	1,043	S	34	876	S	34
High School	912	S	69	796	S	68

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

**1.9.3.2 Mathematics Assessment**

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

Grade	LEAs Without Subgrants - # of Homeless Students Who Received a Valid Score and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned	LEAs Without Subgrants - # of Homeless Students Scoring at or above Proficient	LEAs Without Subgrants - % of Homeless Students Scoring at or above Proficient	LEAs With Subgrants - # of Homeless Students Who Received a Valid Score and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned	LEAs With Subgrants - # of Homeless Students Scoring at or above Proficient	LEAs With Subgrants - % of Homeless Students Scoring at or above Proficient
3	1,331	S	35	1,155	S	34
4	1,273	S	32	1,019	S	31
5	1,297	S	23	986	S	23
6	1,084	S	22	882	S	23
7	1,062	S	23	832	S	25
8	1,026	S	22	866	S	24
High School	668	S	17	501	S	16

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

**1.9.3.3 Science Assessment**

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

Grade	LEAs Without Subgrants - # of Homeless Students Who Received a Valid Score and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned	LEAs Without Subgrants - # of Homeless Students Scoring at or above Proficient	LEAs Without Subgrants - % of Homeless Students Scoring at or above Proficient	LEAs With Subgrants - # of Homeless Students Who Received a Valid Score and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned	LEAs With Subgrants - # of Homeless Students Scoring at or above Proficient	LEAs With Subgrants - % of Homeless Students Scoring at or above Proficient
3						
4						
5	1,291	S	41	989	S	45
6						
7						
8	1,031	S	41	868	S	44
High School	765	S	53	701	S	54

**Comments:** The response is limited to 4,000 characters. Blank fields for the science assessment (above) are due to the fact that our state did not test in those grade levels.