

**CONSOLIDATED STATE PERFORMANCE REPORT:
Part II**

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

**For reporting on
School Year 2018-19**

Washington



PART II DUE THURSDAY, MAY 28, 2020

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

INTRODUCTION

The Consolidated State Performance Report (CSPR) is the required annual reporting tool for each State, the Bureau of Indian Education, District of Columbia, and Puerto Rico as authorized under Section 8303¹ of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act (ESEA), as amended by the Every Student Succeeds Act of 2015(ESSA)².

Paperwork Burden Statement

According to the Paperwork Reduction Act of 1995, no persons are required to respond to a collection of information unless such collection displays a valid OMB control number. The valid OMB control number for this information collection is 1810-0724. The time required to complete this information collection is estimated to average 35.00 hours per response, including the time to review instructions, search existing data resources, gather the data needed, and complete and review the information collection. The obligation to respond to this collection is required to obtain or retain a benefit under the Elementary and Secondary Education Act (ESEA), as amended by the Every Student Succeeds Act (ESSA). If you have any comments concerning the accuracy of the time estimate(s) or suggestions for improving this form, please write to: U.S. Department of Education, Washington, D.C. 20202-4537. If you have comments or concerns regarding the status of your individual submission of this form, write directly to: Office of Elementary and Secondary Education, U.S. Department of Education, 400 Maryland Avenue, S.W., Washington, D.C. 20202.

¹ SEC.8303. Consolidated Reporting – (a) In general: In order to simplify reporting requirements and reduce reporting burdens, the Secretary shall establish procedures and criteria under which a State educational agency, in consultation with the Governor of the State, may submit a consolidated State annual report. (b) Contents: The report shall contain information about the programs included in the report, including the performance of the State under those programs, and other matters as the Secretary determines are necessary, such as monitoring activities. (c) Replacement: The report shall replace separate individual annual reports for the programs included in the consolidated State annual report.

² All citations to the ESEA in this document are to the ESEA, as amended by the ESSA.

OMB Number: 1810-0724
Expiration Date: 10/31/2022

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:

Part I, 2018-19 Part II, 2018-19

Name of State Educational Agency (SEA) Submitting This Report:

Address:

Person to contact about this report:

Name:

Samantha Diamond

Telephone:

360-972-6241

Fax:

n/a

e-mail:

samantha.diamond@k12.wa.us

Name of Authorizing State Official: (Print or Type):

Samantha Diamond

Submitted Date and Time:

2.1 ACCOUNTABILITY

2.1.1 School Performance on Accountability Indicators

The following indicators are collected through ESS and compiled in the EDEN036 report via the ED*Facts* Reporting System (ERS) and will be posted as an accompanying report for every State:

- LEA Name
- NCES LEA ID
- State LEA ID
- School Name
- NCES School ID
- State School ID
- Title I School Status - DG 22 (FS129)
- Academic achievement indicator status – DG 835 (FS200)
- Other academic indicator status DG 836 (FS201)
- Graduation rate indicator status – DG 834 (FS199)
- Progress achieving English language proficiency indicator status - DG 837 (FS205)
- School quality or student success indicator status – DG 838 (FS202)

The ED*Facts* 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 II of the CSPR, a state user must run the 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 DOCX.

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

2.1.2 Schools Identified for Comprehensive Support and Improvement

In the table below, provide the number of schools identified for comprehensive support and improvement, overall and by reason identified.

	Number of Schools	Number of Title I Schools	Number of non-Title I Schools
Lowest performing five percent of Title I schools	77		
High schools failing to graduate one third or more of their students	131	23	106
Title I schools that have received additional targeted support under Section 1111(d)(2)(C) of the <i>ESEA</i> and that have not exited that status after a State-determined number of years			
Total Identified	208		

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

2.1.3 Schools Implementing Targeted Support and Improvement Plans

In the table below, provide the number of schools implementing targeted support and improvement plans.

	Number of Schools	Number of Title I Schools	Number of non- Title I Schools
Schools with One or More Consistently Underperforming Subgroups of Students	602	389	210
Schools in which any Subgroup of Students, on its own, would lead to Identification Under <i>ESEA</i> Section 1111(c)(4)(D)(i)(I) (i.e., Schools Receiving Additional Targeted Support)	117	74	42

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

2.1.4 Section 1003 of the ESEA School Improvement Funds

In the tables below, provide the amount of Section 1003 funds of the *ESEA* allocated to each district and school.

2.1.4.1 Section 1003 of the ESEA Allocations to LEAs

For each LEA receiving a 1003(a) allocation, list the amount of the allocation. The data for this question are reported through *EDFacts* files and compiled in the EDEN012 "Section 1003 Allocations to LEAs and Schools" report in the *EDFacts* Reporting System (ERS).

- Name of LEA with One or More Schools Provided Assistance through Section 1003(a) of the *ESEA* Funds in SY 2018-19
- NCES LEA ID
- Amount of LEA's Section 1003(a) of the *ESEA* Allocation

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 II 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 DOCX.

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

2.1.4.2 Section 1003 of the ESEA Allocations to Schools

For each school receiving a Section 1003(a) allocation of the *ESEA*, list the amount of the allocation. The data for this question are reported through *EDFacts* files and compiled in the EDEN012 "Section 1003 Allocations to LEAs and Schools" report in the *EDFacts* Reporting System (ERS).

- Name of School Provided Assistance through Section 1003(a) of the *ESEA* Funds in SY 2018-19
- NCES School ID
- Amount of School's Section1003(a) of the *ESEA* Allocation

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 II 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 DOCX.

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

2.2 GRADUATION RATES AND POSTSECONDARY ENROLLMENT

This section collects data on graduation rates and rates of postsecondary enrollment.

2.2.1 Four Year Adjusted Cohort Graduation Rates

In the table below, provide the state's four year adjusted cohort graduation rates for the current reporting period.

Student Group	# Students in Cohort	# of Graduates	Graduation Rate
All students	84,098	S	81.1%
American Indian or Alaska Native	1,078	S	62%
Asian or Pacific Islander	7,737	S	90.5%
<i>Asian</i>	6,807	S	88.6%
<i>Native Hawaiian or Other Pacific Islander</i>	930	S	75%
Black or African American	3,873	S	73.7%
Hispanic or Latino	18,239	S	75.7%
White	47,443	S	82.9%
Two or more races	5,728	S	81.3%
Children with disabilities (<i>IDEA</i>)	10,456	S	62.2%
English Learners	6,060	S	62.6%
Economically disadvantaged students	42,669	S	72.3%
Children in foster care	674	S	46%
Children who are homeless	6,450	S	55.8%

Frequently Asked Questions (FAQs) on graduation rates:

What is the adjusted cohort graduation rate? The adjusted cohort graduation rate is described in sections 8101(23) and 8101(25) of the ESEA.

Comments: The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

2.2.2 Postsecondary Enrollment

In the table below, provide counts of students who enrolled in programs of postsecondary education during the current reporting period. If data are missing or incomplete, please explain in the comments.

	# Enrolled in an IHE	# Not enrolled in an IHE	# for which data are unavailable	Total
All students	42,836	27,374		S
American Indian or Alaska Native	368	435		S
Asian or Pacific Islander	4,800	1,448		S
<i>Asian</i>	4,541	1,108		S
<i>Native Hawaiian or Other Pacific Islander</i>	259	340		S
Black or African American	1,932	1,154		S
Hispanic or Latino	6,929	6,119		S
White	25,991	16,444		S
Two or more races	2,816	1,772		S
Children with disabilities (<i>IDEA</i>)	1,898	4,891		S
English Learners	1,063	1,280		S
Economically disadvantaged students	12,771	13,458		S

Comments: The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

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

2.3 TITLE I, PART A PROGRAM PARTICIPATION

The following sections collect data on students participating in Title I, Part A by various student characteristics.

2.3.1 Student Participation in Public Title I, Part A by Special Services or Programs

In the table below, provide the number of public school students served by either Public Title I Schoolwide Programs (SWPs) or Targeted Assistance programs (TAS) at any time during the regular school year for each category listed. Count each student only once in each category even if the student participated during more than one term or in more than one school or district in the State. Count each student in as many of the categories that are applicable to the student. Include pre-kindergarten through grade 12. Do not include the following individuals: (1) adult participants of adult literacy programs funded by Title I, (2) private school students participating in Title I programs operated by local educational agencies, or (3) students served in Part A local neglected programs.

Special Services or Programs	# Students Served
Children with disabilities (<i>IDEA</i>)	72,029
English learners	92,614
Homeless students	21,189
Migrant students	19,685

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

2.3.2 Student Participation in Public Title I, Part A by Racial/Ethnic Group

In the table below, provide the unduplicated number of public school students served by either Title I SWP or TAS at any time during the regular school year. Each student should be reported in only one racial/ethnic category. Include pre-kindergarten through grade 12. The total number of students served will be calculated automatically.

Do not include: (1) adult participants of adult literacy programs funded by Title I, (2) private school students participating in Title I programs operated by local educational agencies, or (3) students served in Part A local neglected programs.

Race/Ethnicity	# Students Served
American Indian or Alaska Native	8,101
Asian	21,850
Black or African American	25,315
Hispanic or Latino	160,366
Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander	7,466
White	176,196
Two or more races	33,713
Total	433,007

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

2.3.3 Student Participation in Title I, Part A by Grade Level

In the table below, provide the unduplicated number of students participating in Title I, Part A programs by grade level and by type of program: Title I public TAS, Title I SWP, private school students participating in Title I programs (private), and Part A local neglected programs (local neglected). The totals column by type of program will be automatically calculated.

Age /Grade	Public TAS	Public SWP	Private	Local Neglected	Total
Age Birth through 2	8	2,968			2,976
Age 3 through 5 (not Kindergarten)	137	11,987	2		12,126
K	978	46,263	140		47,381
1	1,510	45,502	210		47,222
2	1,367	45,444	188	1	47,000
3	1,147	45,120	170	2	46,439
4	1,057	46,016	185	1	47,259
5	1,359	45,504	155	1	47,019
6	1,045	32,669	111	5	33,830
7	699	26,987	79	5	27,770
8	572	25,063	71	11	25,717
9	381	12,067	17	17	12,482
10	369	11,766	10	14	12,159
11	239	11,894	13	14	12,160
12	332	12,775	8	9	13,124
Ungraded					
TOTALS	11,200	422,025	1,359	80	434,664

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

2.4 EDUCATION OF MIGRATORY CHILDREN

This section collects data on the Migrant Education Program (MEP) (Title I, Part C) for the performance period of September 1, 2018 through August 31, 2019. This section is composed of the following subsections:

- Population data of eligible migratory children
- Academic data of eligible migratory students
- Data of migratory children served during the performance period
- School data
- Project data
- Personnel data

Report a child in the age/grade category in which the child spent the *majority of their time* while residing in the State during the performance period.

There are two exceptions to this rule:

1. A child who turns 3 during the performance period is reported as "Age 3 through 5 (not Kindergarten)," **only if the child's residency in the state was verified after the child turned 3.**
2. A child who turns 22 years of age during the performance is reported at the appropriate age/grade category for the performance period.

2.4.1 Migratory Child Counts

This section collects the Title I, Part C, MEP child counts which States are required to provide and may be used to determine the annual State allocations under Title I, Part C. The child counts should reflect the performance period of September 1, 2018 through August 31, 2019. This section also collects a report on the procedures used by States to produce true, reliable, and valid child counts.

To provide the child counts, each State Education Agency (SEA) should have implemented sufficient procedures and internal controls to ensure that it is counting only those children who are eligible for the MEP. Such procedures are important to protecting the integrity of the State's MEP because they permit the early discovery and correction of eligibility problems and thus help to ensure that only eligible migratory children are counted for funding purposes and are served. If an SEA has reservations about the accuracy of its child counts, it must disclose known data limitations to the Department, and explain how and when it will resolve data quality issues through corrective actions in the box below, which precedes Section 2.4.1.1 *Category 1 Child Count*.

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

FAQs on Child Count:

a. How is "out-of-school" defined? Out-of-school means children up through age 21 who are entitled to a free public education in the State but are not currently enrolled in a K-12 institution. This term could include students who have dropped out of school, youth who are working on a high school equivalency diploma (HSED) outside of a K-12 institution, and youth who are "here-to-work" only. It would not include children in preschool, nor does it include temporary absences (e.g., summer/intersession, suspension or illness). Enrollment in school is not a condition affecting eligibility for the MEP. Therefore, out-of-school youth who meet the definition of a "migratory child" are eligible for the MEP.

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

c. How is reporting a child "in the age/grade category in which s/he spent the majority of his/her time while residing in the State" defined? A State must report a child in **only one** age/grade category in which the child spent the majority of his/her time **while residing in the State**. For example, a migratory child resided in State A for three months and in State B for nine months in SY2018-19. While in State A, the child enrolled in ninth grade for two months and in tenth grade for one month. Therefore, State A will report the child in the age/grade category of ninth grade, because the child spent the majority of his/her time in ninth grade in State A. In State B, the child enrolled in eighth grade for one month and in ninth grade for eight months. Therefore, State B will report the child in the age/grade category of ninth grade, because the child spent the majority of his/her time in ninth grade in State B.

In the space below, discuss any concerns about the accuracy of the reported child counts or the underlying eligibility determinations on which the counts are based and how and when these concerns will be resolved.

Comments: The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

Please note - Item C does not appear to be included in the definitions for the 2018-19 File Specification 121 used to populate this component of the CSPR. Washington State currently filters unique count of migrant students to include highest grade attained by the student during the performance period.

2.4.1.1 Category 1 Child Count (Eligible Migratory Children)

In the table below, enter the unduplicated statewide number by age/grade of **eligible** migratory children age 3 through 21 who, within 3 years of making a qualifying move, resided in your State for one or more days during the performance period of September 1, 2018 through August 31, 2019. This figure includes all eligible migratory children who may or may not have received MEP services. Count a child who moved from one age/grade level to another during the performance period only once in the age/grade category in which s/he spent the majority of his/her time while residing in the State, during the performance period. The unduplicated statewide total count is calculated automatically.

Do not include children age birth through 2 years.

Age/Grade	Eligible Migratory Children
Age 3 through 5 (not Kindergarten)	3,116
K	1,886
1	1,701
2	1,791
3	1,882
4	1,957
5	2,005
6	2,079
7	2,006
8	1,949
9	2,055
10	1,786
11	1,834
12	2,002
Ungraded	0
Out-of-school	2,255
Total	30,304

Comments: The response is limited to 4,000 characters.
No comment needed.

2.4.1.2 Category 1 Child Count Increases/Decreases

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

Comments: The response is limited to 8,000 characters.
No comment needed.

2.4.1.3 Birth through Two Child Count

In the table below, enter the unduplicated statewide number of eligible migratory children from birth through age 2 who, within 3 years of making a qualifying move, resided in your State for one or more days during the performance period of September 1, 2018 through August 31, 2019.

Age/Grade	Eligible Migratory Children
Age Birth through 2	1,440

Comments: The response is limited to 4,000 characters.
No comment needed.

2.4.2 Category 2 Child Count (Eligible Migratory Children Served by the MEP During the Summer/ Intersession Term)

In the table below, enter by age/grade the unduplicated statewide number of **eligible** migratory children age 3 through 21 who, within 3 years of making a qualifying move, were **served** for one or more days in a MEP-funded project conducted during either the summer term or during intersession periods that occurred within the performance period of September 1, 2018 through August 31, 2019. Count a child who moved from one age/grade level to another during the performance period only once in the age/grade category in which s/he spent the majority of his/her time while residing in the State, during the performance period. Count a child who moved to different schools within the State and who was served in both traditional summer and year-round school intersession programs only once. The unduplicated statewide total count is calculated automatically.

Do not include:

- Children age birth through 2 years
- Children who received only referred services (non-MEP funded).

Age/Grade	Eligible Migratory Children Served by the MEP During the Summer/Intersession Term
Age 3 through 5 (not Kindergarten)	65
K	185
1	269
2	260
3	287
4	262
5	239
6	199
7	128
8	214
9	186
10	163
11	198
12	49
Ungraded	0
Out-of-school	0
Total	2,704

Comments: The response is limited to 4,000 characters.
 No comment needed.

2.4.2.1 Category 2 Child Count Increases/Decreases

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

Comments: The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

File Specification 122 for program period 2018-19 indicates 2,704 migrant students were served with program funds during Summer/Intersession as compared to 2,372 during the 2017-18 program period. That's an increase of 332 students from the previous period or 12.28%.

This increase can be attributed to an increase in the number of local summer programs who served migrant students during the 2019 Summer period as compared to 2018. The addition of a two health science academies, an additional academic academy, and an additional high school and beyond student engagement/leadership academy conducted in partnership with universities located across the state also increased the number of students served under Category 2.

2.4.2.2 Birth through Two Eligible Migratory Children Served by the MEP During the Summer/Intersession Term

In the table below, enter the unduplicated statewide number of eligible migratory children from age birth through 2 who, within 3 years of making a qualifying move, were served for one or more days in a MEP-funded project conducted during either the summer term or during intersession periods that occurred within the performance period of September 1, 2018 through August 31, 2019. Count a child who moved to different schools within the State and who was served in both traditional summer and year-round school intersession programs only once.

Do not include:

- Children who received only referred services (non-MEP funded).

Age/Grade	Eligible Migratory Children Served by the MEP During the Summer/Intersession Term
Age Birth through 2	0

Comments: The response is limited to 4,000 characters.
 No comment needed.

2.4.3 Child Count Calculation and Validation Procedures

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

2.4.3.1 Methods Used to Count Children

In the space below, please describe the procedures and processes at the State level used to ensure all eligible children, ages 3-21 are reported. In particular, describe how the State includes and counts only:

- The unduplicated count of eligible migratory children, ages 3-21. Only include children two years of age whose residency in the state has been verified after turning three.
- Children who met the program eligibility criteria (e.g., were within 3 years of a qualifying move, engaged or had parents engage in migratory agricultural or fishing work, and were entitled to a free public education through grade 12 in the State, or preschool children below the age and grade level at which the agency provides free public education). Children who were resident in your State for at least 1 day during the performance period (September 1 through August 31).
- Children who graduated from high school or attained a High School Equivalency Diploma (HSED) *during the performance period* and ensures that these children are not counted in the subsequent performance period's child count.
- Children who—in the case of Category 2—were served for one or more days in a MEP- funded project conducted during either the summer term or during intersession periods.
- Children once per age/grade level for each child count category.
- Children who had an SEA approved Certificate of Eligibility (COE) and were entered in the State's migratory student database.

Comments: The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

Washington's MEP guidelines include trainings on procedures and processes to ensure all eligible children, ages 3-21 are reported. State reports unduplicated counts of eligible migrant children, ages 3-21, for Category 1 and Category 2 children by conducting student database checks using identified data entry fields that may indicate the child is already enrolled in the database system. Data checks use state developed procedures and run the MSIX worklists and data quality reports, i.e., Potential Duplicate, Merges and Splits by User, Data Logic, etc., to compare data or possibly merge potential duplicates. The MSIX Child Count Reconciliation Report is reviewed for near matches and potential duplicates.

Students entered into the database system are assigned a unique identifier called the State Migrant ID. Data management specialists conduct student searches and checks to ensure the child is not already in the database before creating a State Migrant ID in the database. Data management specialists search for matches within MSIX in order to ensure a duplicate record of the child was not entered into MSIX by the State. If the child is found in MSIX, the data management specialist will then search the state database system with the State Migrant ID listed in MSIX. Staff will run the MSIX Worklist report on a regular basis to check for possible merges and splits.

In order to verify residency in the state during the 2018-2019 Performance Period of September 1 to August 31, MEP staff conducted home visits, or telephone calls when a face-to-face visit was not feasible, for every child in the Category 1 count not enrolled in school. For every child enrolled in school, MEP staff verified the child's residence through school enrollment/attendance records. A residency date was recorded in the state's student database system (MSIS). Residency for children 2 years old turning 3 years was verified by a recruiter after the child turned 3 either by a home visit or a telephone call, when the face-to-face visit was not feasible. That date of verification was entered into the system to confirm residency after the child turned 3 years of age.

Before a record is created, the State database checks for duplication based on the student's last name or similar last name by using a system-generated wild card prompt. Potential duplicates are checked against additional fields such as first name, birth date, birth city and parents' names. Matches generate further manual review by State MEP data staff. Duplicate records are consolidated. State MEP staff run the MSIX Potential Duplicate Report to search for possible duplicates. If a child appears on the report as a potential duplicate, MEP Staff manually review all the information available to ensure records were in fact different. If it is determined that a child had been entered twice, the data is merged via the merge process on the MSIX database merging the two records into one and assigns one State Migrant ID to the child's record, deleting the second ID.

Implemented procedures and processes ensure only children who meet program eligibility are enrolled in the program and reported and include strict quality control activities that adhere to the Quality Control section in the state's MEP Identification and Recruitment Manual. Annually trained state and local student recruitment staff conduct face-to-face eligibility interviews and complete either a paper or electronic Certificate of Eligibility submitted to the state's ID&R office for further review. COE reviews are conducted by trained MEP staff with levels of quality controls including multiple edit checks either enabled on the electronic COE or incorporated into the paper form review. State MEP quality control staff review each COE before the child/family can be approved as eligible. Only state approved COES can be entered into the state's migrant student database system.

Data on child eligibility is managed through a centralized database system. When generating data for Consolidated State Performance Report (CSPR) and respective EdFacts File Specifications, the programming logic for eligibility aligns to file specification logic and includes the following five data checks:

- 1) The child resided in the state during the 2018-2019 Performance Period (September 1, 2018 – August 31, 2019) by checking one or more of the following dates: enrollment date, residency date, recertification/residency verification date, or withdrawal date between 9/1/2018 and 8/31/2019.
- 2) The child is only included if he/she is between the ages of 3 through 21 years of age based on the child's birthdate.
- 3) The child's qualifying arrival date (QAD) is within 36 months (QAD must be on or after 9/2/2015) of his/her residency date which occurs between 9/1/2018 and 8/31/2019.
- 4) The child graduated or received a High School Equivalency Diploma during the performance period and was not reported in a previous reporting period as receiving a high school diploma or equivalency.
- 5) The child was reported as served under the Continuation of Services provision during the 2018-2019 Performance Period and was noted as previously eligible and residing in the state for at least one day during the Performance Period.

The State’s child count algorithm uses a graduation date to flag students who have obtained a high school diploma or equivalent. Using the date of graduation, students who obtained a high school diploma or equivalent prior to the performance period are excluded from all counts. Migratory children served during summer or intersession periods met program eligibility criteria as described in the program eligibility logic 1-5 and enrolled in the state database system with a “Summer” enrollment indicator for one or more days for enrollment verification in a MEP-funded summer/intersession project and should be included in the Category 2 count. The state’s database system has an edit check to ensure that children are between the ages of 3 through 21 at the time of enrollment into the MEP-funded summer project.

A child enrolled in multiple grades during the year are calculated into a single grade using CSPR Guidelines ensuring that a child is only counted once in the highest grade-level on record. The state’s child count calculation (algorithm) uses a unique student ID number to ensure each child is counted only once per age/grade level and category. Grade levels are totaled and compared to overall counts to ensure they match as part of a report quality check.

Eligible migratory children can only be enrolled into the state’s student database system if they have a SEA approved COE entered into the database. A completed COE for an eligible child is reviewed and approved by the SEA reviewer. The approved COE is processed for enrollment by educational staff. Edit checks contained within the MSIS prevent a student enrollment from being processed without the qualifying move information being entered first.

Child count reports are compared to the COE to verify eligible children on the COE are enrolled in the system. Monthly reviews are conducted by the State ID&R Coordinator using a random sampling method. Re-interviews, as part of the prospective re-interview process, are done on a rolling basis as an additional check for ensuring student program eligibility.

The SEA has multiple levels of data preparation and review in place to ensure the system that transmits migrant data to the Department accurately accounts for all the migrant children in every ED Facts data file. Under the cycle of continuous improvement, the state has annual meetings to review the ED File Specifications for any changes or updates to the data collection process for the upcoming performance period. Programming staff run the report inquiries multiple times for data consistency and files are reviewed for any anomalies. Data is compared to previous year reporting for any significant discrepancies and are entered into Department provided Data Checklists.

Does the State ensure that the system that transmits migrant data to the Department accurately accounts for all the migratory children in every ED Facts data file? See the Office of Migrant Education’s CSPR Rating Instrument for the criteria needed to address this question. Please respond in the table below.

Accuracy of ED Facts Data Files	Yes/No
The State deployed a process that ensured that it transmits accurate migrant data to the Department in every required ED Facts data file.	YES

Use of MSIX to Verify Data Quality	Yes/No
Does the State use data in the Migrant Student Information Exchange (MSIX) to verify the quality of migrant data?	YES

If MSIX is utilized, please explain how.

Comments: The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

Washington State’s Migrant Student Information System (MSIS) staff review reports and student records to compare data within the MSIS and MSIX to ensure that data elements uploaded to MSIX are displaying accurately.

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

2.4.3.2 Quality Control Processes

In the space below, describe the results of any re-interview processes used by the SEA during the performance period to test the accuracy of the State's MEP eligibility determinations.

Results	#
The number of eligibility determinations sampled.	167
The number of eligibility determinations sampled for which a re-interview was completed.	159
The number of eligibility determinations sampled for which a re-interview was completed and the child was found eligible.	158

Procedures	SY
What was the most recent year that the MEP conducted independent prospective re-interviews (i.e., interviewers were neither SEA or LEA staff members responsible for administering or operating the MEP, nor any other persons who worked on the initial eligibility determinations being tested)? If independent prospective re-interviews were not administered in any of the three performance periods, please provide an explanation in the "Comment" row at the end of this table.	2016-2017

Comments: The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

FAQ on independent prospective re-interviews:

What are independent prospective re-interviews? Independent prospective re-interviews allow confirmation of your State's eligibility determinations and the accuracy of the numbers of migratory children in your State reports. Independent prospective interviews should be conducted at least once every three years by an independent interviewer, performed on the current year's identified migratory children.

Obtaining Data from Families	Re-interview Method
Select how the re-interviews were conducted: Face-to-face re-interviews Phone Interviews Both	Face-to-face interviews

Obtaining Data from Families	Yes/No
Was there a protocol for verifying all information used in making the original eligibility determination?	YES
Were re-interviewers independent from the original interviewers?	YES

If you did conduct independent re-interviews in this reporting period, describe how you ensured that the process was independent. Only enter a response if your State completed independent re-interviews in SY 2018-19.

Comments: The response is limited to 8,000 characters.
 Independent re-interviews are scheduled to be conducted during the 2019-20 performance period.

In the space below, refer to the results of **any** re-interview processes used by the SEA, and if any of the migratory children were found ineligible, describe those corrective actions or improvements that will be made by the SEA to improve the accuracy of its MEP eligibility determinations.

Comments: The response is limited to 8,000 characters.
 School district staff were notified in writing of children who were found to have been inaccurately qualified. Local recruiters accompanied the reviewer during the re-interview and observed proper interviewing techniques. In addition, re-interview results are used in the next program period trainings, weekly eligibility emails, and in eligibility surveys presented to recruitment staff. Recruiters who were found to have inaccurately qualified children for the migrant program during the 2018-2019 school-year will have additional COEs reviewed during the 2019-2020 school year.

In the space below, please respond to the following question:

	Yes/No
Does the state collect all the required data elements and data sections on the National Certificate of Eligibility (COE)?	YES

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

2.4.4 Eligible Migratory Children

2.4.4.1 Priority for Services

In the table below, provide the unduplicated number of **eligible** migratory children who have been classified as having "Priority for Services." The total is calculated automatically.

Age/Grade	Priority for Services During the Performance Period
Age 3 through 5 (not Kindergarten)	1
K	681
1	323
2	732
3	650
4	755
5	771
6	808
7	788
8	747
9	793
10	558
11	758
12	673
Ungraded	0
Out-of-school	223
Total	9,261

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

The definition of priority for services changed at beginning of the performance period 2018-19 to include students who made a qualifying move within the last 12 months as compared to migrant students who made a qualifying move during the 180-day school year 2017-18 and were most at-risk of meeting state standards. In addition, during the 2018-19 performance period, drop out students were added as priority for services. Washington State also expanded its listing of proxy factors to use when state assessment information was not available to determine PFS from four to eight factors. The eight proxy factors include students identified as English learners from state EL assessment, students retained in the same grade the following school year, students whose age/grade placement was more than two years, high school students who are credit deficient for their grade placement, migrant students whose attendance rate is less than 90% for the time they are enrolled, migrant students also enrolled in Special Education, migrant students identified as Homeless under McKinney-Vento, and migrant students enrolled in regular school year for less than 90 days.

FAQ on priority for services:

Who is classified as having "priority for service?" Migratory children who have made a qualifying move within the previous 1-year period and who 1) are failing, or most at risk of failing to meet challenging State academic standards, or 2) have dropped out of school.

2.4.4.2 English Learners (ELs)

In the table below, provide the unduplicated number of **eligible** migratory children who are also ELs. The total is calculated automatically.

Age/Grade	ELs During the Performance Period
Age 3 through 5 (not Kindergarten)	10
K	1,153
1	1,336
2	1,317
3	1,205
4	1,163
5	963
6	948
7	932
8	892
9	901
10	717
11	755
12	610
Ungraded	0
Out-of-school	0
Total	12,902

Comments: The response is limited to 4,000 characters.
No comment needed.

2.4.4.3 Children with Disabilities (IDEA)

In the table below, provide the unduplicated number of **eligible** migratory children who are also children with disabilities (*IDEA*) under Part B or Part C of the *IDEA*. The total is calculated automatically.

Age/Grade	Children with Disabilities (<i>IDEA</i>) During the Performance Period
Age Birth through 2	4
Age 3 through 5 (not Kindergarten)	77
K	155
1	194
2	222
3	231
4	264
5	246
6	282
7	276
8	256
9	239
10	220
11	210
12	230
Ungraded	0
Out-of-school	0
Total	3,106

Comments: The response is limited to 4,000 characters.
No comment needed.

2.4.4.4 Qualifying Arrival Date (QAD)

In the table below, provide the unduplicated number of **eligible** migratory children whose QAD occurred within 12 months from the last day of the performance period, August 31, 2019 (i.e., QAD during the performance period). The total is calculated automatically.

Age/Grade	QAD During the Performance Period
Age Birth through 2	824
Age 3 through 5 (not Kindergarten)	1,153
K	648
1	529
2	596
3	588
4	589
5	635
6	592
7	599
8	591
9	637
10	532
11	491
12	260
Ungraded	0
Out-of-school	1,387
Total	10,651

Comments: The response is limited to 4,000 characters.
No comment needed.

2.4.5 Academic Status

The following questions collect data about the academic status of **eligible** migratory students.

2.4.5.1 Dropouts

In the table below, provide the unduplicated number of **eligible** migratory students who dropped out of school. The total is calculated automatically.

Grade	Dropouts During the Performance Period
7	33
8	38
9	49
10	79
11	90
12	132
Ungraded	
Total	421

Comments: The response is limited to 4,000 characters.
No comment needed.

FAQ on Dropouts:

How is "dropouts" defined? The term used for students, who, (1) were enrolled in a school for at least one day during the 2018-19 performance period, (2) were not enrolled at the beginning of the current (2018-19) performance period, (3) who have not graduated from high school or completed a State- or district-approved educational program, and (4) who do not meet any of the following exclusionary conditions: (a) transfer to another school district, private school or State- or district-approved educational program (including correctional or health facility programs), (b) temporary absence due to suspension or school-excused illness or (c) death. Students who dropped out-of-school prior to the 2018-19 performance period should not be reported in this item.

2.4.5.2 HSED (High School Equivalency Diploma)

In the table below, provide the total unduplicated number of **eligible** migratory students who obtained a High School Equivalency Diploma (HSED) by passing a high school equivalency test that your state accepts (e.g. GED, HiSET, TASC).

Obtain HSED	#
Obtained a HSED in your State During the Performance Period	19

Comments: The response is limited to 4,000 characters.
No comment needed.

2.4.6 MEP Services - During the Performance Period

The following questions collect data about MEP services provided to migratory children during the performance period.

FAQ on Services:

What are services? Services are a subset of all allowable activities that the MEP can provide through its programs and projects. “Services” are those educational or educationally related activities that: (1) directly benefit a migratory child; (2) address a need of a migratory child consistent with the SEA’s comprehensive needs assessment and service delivery plan; (3) are grounded in scientifically based research or, in the case of support services, are a generally accepted practice; and (4) are designed to enable the program to meet its measurable outcomes and contribute to the achievement of the State’s performance targets/annual measurable objectives. Activities related to identification and recruitment activities, parental involvement, program evaluation, professional development, or administration of the program are examples of allowable activities that are not considered services. Other examples of an allowable activity that would not be considered a service would be the one-time act of providing instructional packets to a child or family, and handing out leaflets to migratory families on available reading programs as part of an effort to increase the reading skills of migratory children. Although these are allowable activities, they are not services because they do not meet all of the criteria above.

In the table below, provide the unduplicated number of **eligible** migratory children who received MEP-funded instructional or support services at any time during the performance period. Do not count the number of times an individual child received a service intervention. The total number of students served is calculated automatically.

Age/Grade	Served During the Performance Period
Age Birth through 2	9
Age 3 through 5 (not Kindergarten)	235
K	859
1	815
2	825
3	892
4	871
5	900
6	1,013
7	1,082
8	1,154
9	1,237
10	1,087
11	1,162
12	1,258
Ungraded	0
Out-of-school	640
Total	14,039

Comments: The response is limited to 4,000 characters.
No comment needed.

2.4.6.1 Priority for Services – During the Performance Period

In the table below, provide the unduplicated number of **eligible** migratory children who have been classified as having “priority for services” and who received MEP-funded instructional or support services during the performance period. The total is calculated automatically.

Age/Grade	Priority for Services During the Performance Period
Age 3 through 5 (not Kindergarten)	0
K	346
1	199
2	379
3	342
4	375
5	372
6	449
7	500
8	497
9	591
10	399
11	514
12	470
Ungraded	0
Out-of-school	28
Total	5,461

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

The definition of priority for services changed at beginning of the performance period 2018-19 to include students who made a qualifying move within the last 12 months as compared to migrant students who made a qualifying move during the 180-day school year 2017-18 and were most at-risk of meeting state standards. In addition, during the 2018-19 performance period, drop out students were added as priority for services. Washington State also expanded its listing of proxy factors to use when state assessment information was not available to determine PFS from four to eight factors. The eight proxy factors include students identified as English learners from state EL assessment, students retained in the same grade the following school year, students whose age/grade placement was more than two years, high school students who are credit deficient for their grade placement, migrant students whose attendance rate is less than 90% for the time they are enrolled, migrant students also enrolled in Special Education, migrant students identified as Homeless under McKinney-Vento, and migrant students enrolled in regular school year for less than 90 days. This expanded definition led to more students being reported as served under the PFS indicator than during the 2017-18 performance period.

2.4.6.2 Continuation of Services – During the Performance Period

In the table below, provide the unduplicated number of migratory children who received MEP-funded instructional or support services during the performance period under the continuation of services authority Section 1304(e)(2–3). Do **not** include children served under Section 1304(e)(1), which are children whose eligibility expired during the school term. The total is calculated automatically.

Age/Grade	Continuation of Services During the Performance Period
Age 3 through 5 (not Kindergarten)	0
K	0
1	0
2	0
3	0
4	0
5	0
6	0
7	0
8	3
9	8
10	4
11	2
12	4
Ungraded	0
Out-of-school	0
Total	21

Comments: The response is limited to 4,000 characters.
No comment needed.

FAQ on Continuation of Services:

What is Continuation of Services? The “continuation of services” provision found in Section 1304(e) of the ESEA provides that: (1) a child who ceases to be a migratory child during a school term shall be eligible for services until the end of such term; (2) a child who is no longer a migratory child may continue to receive services for one additional school year, but only if comparable services are not available through other programs; and (3) secondary school students who were eligible for services in secondary school may continue to be served through credit accrual programs until graduation.

2.4.6.3 Instructional Service – During the Performance Period

In the table below, provide the unduplicated number of **eligible** migratory children who received any type of MEP-funded instructional service during the performance period. Include children who received instructional services provided by either a teacher or a paraprofessional. Children should be reported only once regardless of the frequency with which they received a service intervention. The total is calculated automatically.

Age/Grade	Instructional Service During the Performance Period
Age Birth through 2	0
Age 3 through 5 (not Kindergarten)	135
K	497
1	493
2	512
3	554
4	515
5	491
6	415
7	373
8	366
9	253
10	259
11	340
12	318
Ungraded	0
Out-of-school	7
Total	5,528

Comments: The response is limited to 4,000 characters.
 No comment needed.

2.4.6.4 Type of Instructional Service – During the Performance Period

In the table below, provide the number of **eligible** migratory children reported in the table above who received MEP-funded reading instruction, mathematics instruction, or high school credit accrual during the performance period. Include children who received such instructional services provided by a teacher only. Children may be reported as having received more than one type of instructional service in the table. However, children should be reported only once within each type of instructional service that they received regardless of the frequency with which they received the instructional service. The totals are calculated automatically.

Age/Grade	Reading Instruction During the Performance Period	Mathematics Instruction During the Performance Period	High School Credit Accrual During the Performance Period
Age Birth through 2	0	0	
Age 3 through 5 (not Kindergarten)	0	0	
K	7	3	
1	11	0	
2	19	12	
3	24	33	
4	19	21	
5	19	25	
6	53	16	
7	41	44	
8	45	13	157
9	6	7	167
10	4	7	191
11	9	8	266
12	8	4	258
Ungraded	0	0	0
Out-of-school	0	0	1
Total	265	193	1,040

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

There has been a continued concerted effort by program staff to ensure services provided by migrant-funded staff are consistently reported into the student database system. This has resulted in more students being reported as served. There were also more classified-funded staff providing academic supports to migrant students in reading and mathematics during the 2018-19 performance period.

FAQ on Types of Instructional Services:

What is "high school credit accrual"? MEP-funded instruction, funded in whole or in part by MEP funds, in courses that accrue credits needed for high school graduation provided by a teacher for students on a regular or systematic basis, usually for a predetermined period of time. High school credit accrual includes correspondence courses taken by a student under the supervision of a teacher. High school credit accrual may include the age/grade categories of Grade 8 through Grade 12. NOTE: Children receiving a MEP-funded high school credit accrual service should be reported only once, regardless of frequency.

2.4.6.5 Support Services with Breakout for Counseling Services – During the Performance Period

In the table below, in the column titled **Support Services**, provide the unduplicated number of **eligible** migratory children who received any MEP-funded support service during the performance period. In the column titled **Breakout of Counseling Services During the Performance Period**, provide the unduplicated number of **eligible** migratory children who received a counseling service during the performance period. Children should be reported only once in each column regardless of the frequency with which they received a support service intervention. The totals are calculated automatically.

Age/Grade	Support Services During the Performance Period	Breakout of Counseling Services During the Performance Period
Age Birth through 2	0	0
Age 3 through 5 (not Kindergarten)	127	67
K	479	210
1	493	217
2	481	233
3	554	235
4	536	246
5	636	269
6	834	352
7	900	452
8	1,034	685
9	1,198	704
10	1,053	666
11	1,128	758
12	1,204	850
Ungraded	0	0
Out-of-school	639	31
Total	11,296	5,975

Comments: The response is limited to 4,000 characters.
No comment needed.

FAQs on Support Services:

a. What are support services? These MEP-funded educationally-related services are provided to students. These services include, but are not limited to, health, nutrition, counseling, and social services for migratory children; necessary educational supplies, and transportation. Activities related to identification and recruitment, parental involvement, professional development, program evaluation, and the one-time act of providing instructional or informational packets to a child or family does not constitute a support service.

b. What are counseling services? Services to help a student to better identify and enhance his or her educational, personal, or occupational potential; relate his or her abilities, emotions, and aptitudes to educational and career opportunities; utilize his or her abilities in formulating realistic plans; and achieve satisfying personal and social development. These activities take place between one or more counselors and one or more students as counselees, or between students and students in MEP peer-to-peer counseling activities, or between students and MEP-funded staff members. The services can also help the child address life problems or personal crisis that result from the culture of migrancy. NOTE: Children who receive a MEP-funded counseling service should be reported only once, regardless of frequency.

2.4.7 School Data during the Regular School Year

The following questions are about the enrollment of eligible migratory children in schools during the regular school year.

2.4.7.1 Schools and Enrollment – During the Regular School Year

In the table below, provide the number of public schools that enrolled **eligible** migratory children at any time during the regular school year. Schools include public schools that serve school age (e.g., grades K through 12) children. Also, provide the number of **eligible** migratory children who were enrolled in those schools. Since more than one school in a State may enroll the same migratory child at some time during the regular school year, the number of children may include duplicates.

Schools	#
Number of schools that enrolled eligible migratory children	968
Number of eligible migratory children enrolled in those schools	27,833

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

No comment needed.

2.4.7.2 Schools Where MEP Funds Were Consolidated in SWPs – During the Regular School Year

In the table below, provide the number of schools where MEP funds were consolidated in an SWP. Also, provide the number of **eligible** migratory children who were enrolled in those schools at any time during the regular school year. Since more than one school in a State may enroll the same migratory child at some time during the regular school year, the number of children may include duplicates.

Schools	#
Number of schools where MEP funds were consolidated in a schoolwide program	
Number of eligible migratory children enrolled in those schools	

Comments: The response is limited to 4,000 characters.
There are no Washington State school buildings where MEP funds are consolidated into a SWP.

2.5 PREVENTION AND INTERVENTION PROGRAMS FOR CHILDREN AND YOUTH WHO ARE NEGLECTED, DELINQUENT, OR AT RISK

This section collects data on programs and facilities that serve students who are neglected, delinquent, or at risk under Title I, Part D, and characteristics about and services provided to these students.

Throughout this section:

- Report data for the program year of July 1, 2018 through June 30, 2019.
- Count programs/facilities based on how the program was classified to ED for funding purposes.
- Do not include programs funded solely through Title I, Part A.
- Use the definitions listed below:
 - **Adult Corrections:** An adult correctional institution is a facility in which persons, including persons 21 or under, are confined as a result of conviction for a criminal offense.
 - **At-Risk Programs:** Programs operated (through LEAs) that target students who are at risk of academic failure, dependency adjudication, or delinquency adjudication, have a drug or alcohol problem, are pregnant or parenting, have been in contact with the juvenile justice or child welfare system in the past, are at least 1 year behind the expected age/grade level, are English learners, are gang members, have dropped out of school in the past, or have a high absenteeism rate at school.
 - **Juvenile Corrections:** An institution for delinquent children and youth that is a public or private residential facility other than a foster home that is operated for the care of children and youth who have been adjudicated delinquent or in need of supervision. Include any programs serving adjudicated youth (including non- secure facilities and group homes) in this category.
 - **Juvenile Detention Facilities:** Detention facilities are shorter-term institutions that provide care to children who require secure custody pending court adjudication, court disposition, or execution of a court order, or care to children after commitment.
 - **Neglected Programs:** An institution for neglected children and youth is a public or private residential facility, other than a foster home, that is operated primarily for the care of children who have been committed to the institution or voluntarily placed under applicable State law due to abandonment, neglect, or death of their parents or guardians.
 - **Other:** Any other programs, not defined above, that receive Title I, Part D funds and serve non-adjudicated children and youth.

2.5.1 State Agency Title I, Part D Programs and Facilities – Subpart 1

The following questions collect data on Title I, Part D, Subpart 1 programs and facilities.

2.5.1.1 Programs and Facilities - Subpart 1

In the table below, provide the number of State agency Title I, Part D, Subpart 1 programs and facilities that serve neglected and delinquent students and the average length of stay by program/facility type, for these students. Report only programs and facilities that received Title I, Part D, Subpart 1 funding during the reporting year. Count a facility once if it offers only one type of program. If a facility offers more than one type of program (i.e., it is a multipurpose facility), then count each of the separate programs. The total number of programs/facilities will be automatically calculated. Below the table is a FAQ about the data collected in this table.

State Program/Facility Type	# Programs/Facilities	Average Length of Stay in Days
Neglected programs	0	0
Juvenile detention	0	0
Juvenile corrections	9	1,286
Adult corrections	0	0
Other	10	1,474
Total	19	

Comments: The response is limited to 4,000 characters. Enter the average number of days per student enrollment in the facility within the 2018-19 school year. The average should be weighted by number of youth and should include the number of days per visit each youth was enrolled during the year. Multiple visits for youth who entered more than once during the reporting year can be included.

FAQ on Programs and Facilities - Subpart I:

How is average length of stay calculated? The average length of stay should be weighted by number of students and should include the number of days, per visit, for each student enrolled during the reporting year, regardless of entry or exit date. Multiple visits for students who entered more than once during the reporting year can be included. The average length of stay in days should not exceed 365.

2.5.1.2 Programs and Facilities That Reported - Subpart 1

In the table below, provide the number of State agency Title I, Part D, Subpart 1 programs/facilities that reported data on neglected and delinquent students.

The total row will be automatically calculated.

State Program/Facility Type	# Reporting Data
Neglected programs	0
Juvenile detention	0
Juvenile corrections	9
Adult corrections	0
Other	10
Total	19

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

2.5.1.3 Students Served – Subpart 1

In the tables below, provide the number of neglected and delinquent students served in State agency Title I, Part D, Subpart 1 programs and facilities. Report only students who received Title I, Part D, Subpart 1 services during the reporting year. In the first table, provide in row 1 the unduplicated number of students served by each program, and in row 2, the total number of students in row 1 who are long-term. In the subsequent tables provide the number of students served by disability (*IDEA*) and EL status, by race/ethnicity, by sex, and by age. The total number of students by race/ethnicity, by sex and by age will be automatically calculated.

# of Students Served	Neglected Programs	Juvenile Detention	Juvenile Corrections	Adult Corrections	Other Programs
Total Unduplicated Students Served			782		1,120
Total Long Term Students Served			564		668

Provide the number of students served by special populations

Student Subgroups	Neglected Programs	Juvenile Detention	Juvenile Corrections	Adult Corrections	Other Programs
Children with disabilities (<i>IDEA</i>)			294		298
English Learners (ELs)			76		199

Provide the number of students served by race/ethnicity.

Race/Ethnicity	Neglected Programs	Juvenile Detention	Juvenile Corrections	Adult Corrections	Other Programs
American Indian or Alaska Native			66		37
Asian			16		52
Black or African American			154		370
Hispanic or Latino			205		283
Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander			27		20
White			261		256
Two or more races			53		102
Total			782		1,120

Provide the number of students served by gender.

Sex	Neglected Programs	Juvenile Detention	Juvenile Corrections	Adult Corrections	Other Programs
Male			737		686
Female			45		434
Total			782		1,120

Provide the number of students served by age.

Age	Neglected Programs	Juvenile Detention	Juvenile Corrections	Adult Corrections	Other Programs
3 through 5			0		0
6			0		0
7			0		0
8			0		0
9			0		0
10			0		0
11			0		0
12			2		0
13			6		3
14			20		24
15			69		122
16			141		227
17			205		285
18			210		200

Age	Neglected Programs	Juvenile Detention	Juvenile Corrections	Adult Corrections	Other Programs
19			89		145
20			39		76
21			1		38
Total			782		1,120

If the total number of students differs by demographics, please explain in comment box below.

Comments: The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

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

FAQ on Unduplicated Count:

What is an unduplicated count? An unduplicated count is one that counts students only once, even if they were admitted to a facility or program multiple times within the reporting year.

FAQ on long-term:

What is long-term? Long-term refers to students who were enrolled for at least 90 consecutive calendar days from July 1, 2018 through June 30, 2018.

2.5.1.4 Academic, Career and Technical Outcomes While in the State Agency Program/Facility or Within 90 Calendar Days after Exit

In the tables below, for each program type, provide the number of students who attained academic, career, and technical outcomes.

The first table includes outcomes a student is able to achieve only after exit. In this table, provide the unduplicated number of students who enrolled, or planned to enroll, in their local district school within 90 calendar days after exiting. A student may be reported only once, per program type.

The second table includes outcomes a student is able to achieve only one time. In this table, provide the unduplicated number of students who attained the listed outcomes either in the while enrolled in the State agency program/facility column ("in fac.") or in the within 90 calendar days after exiting column. A student may be reported only once across the two time periods, per program type.

The third table includes outcomes a student may achieve more than once. In the "in fac." column, provide the unduplicated number of students who attained academic, career and technical outcomes while enrolled in the State agency program/facility. In the "90 days after exit" column provide the unduplicated number of students who attained academic, career, and technical outcomes within 90 calendar days after exiting. If a student attained an outcome once in the program/facility and once during the 90-day transition period, that student may be reported once in each column.

Outcomes (once per student, only after exit)	Neglected Programs	Juvenile Detention	Juvenile Corrections	Adult Corrections	Other Programs
# of Students Who Enrolled in their local district school 90 days after exit			66		89

Outcomes (once per student) - # of Students Who	Neglected Programs - In fac.	Neglected Programs - 90 days after exit	Juvenile Detention - In fac.	Juvenile Detention - 90 days after exit	Juvenile Corrections - In fac.	Juvenile Corrections - 90 days after exit	Adult Corrections - In fac.	Adult Corrections - 90 days after exit	Other Programs - In fac.	Other Programs - 90 days after exit
Earned a GED					73	13			55	S
Obtained high school diploma					44	6			111	S

Outcomes (once per student per time period) - # of Students Who	Neglected Programs - In fac.	Neglected Programs - 90 days after exit	Juvenile Detention - In fac.	Juvenile Detention - 90 days after exit	Juvenile Corrections - In fac.	Juvenile Corrections - 90 days after exit	Adult Corrections - In fac.	Adult Corrections - 90 days after exit	Other Programs - In fac.	Other Programs - 90 days after exit
Earned high school course credits					684	46			853	14
Enrolled in a GED program					107	13			224	S
Accepted and/or enrolled into post-secondary education					9	4			20	S
Enrolled in job training courses/programs					143	20			330	S
Obtained employment					129	33			169	S

In the text box below, please account for any missing or incomplete data after exit.

Comments: The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

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

2.5.2 Academic Performance – Subpart 1

The following questions collect data on the academic performance of neglected and delinquent long-term students served by Title I, Part D, Subpart 1 in reading and mathematics.

2.5.2.1 Academic Performance in Reading – Subpart 1

In the table below, provide the unduplicated number of long-term students served by Title I, Part D, Subpart 1, who participated in reading pre-and post-testing. Students should be reported in only one of the four change categories.

Report only information on a student’s most recent testing data. Students who were pre-tested prior to July 1, 2018, may be included if their post-test was administered during the reporting year. Students who were post-tested after the reporting year ended should be counted in the following year. Below the table is an FAQ about the data collected in this table.

Performance Data (Based on most recent pre/post-test data)	Neglected Programs	Juvenile Detention	Juvenile Corrections	Adult Corrections	Other Programs
Long-term students with negative grade level change from the pre- to post-test exams			55		54
Long-term students with no change in grade level from the pre- to post-test exams			11		120
Long-term students with improvement up to one full grade level from the pre- to post-test exams			69		243
Long-term students with improvement of more than one full grade level from the pre- to post-test exams			104		91
Total students pre/post- tested			239		508

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

FAQ on long-term students:

What is long-term? Long-term refers to students who were enrolled for at least 90 consecutive calendar days from July 1, 2018 through June 30, 2019.

2.5.2.2 Academic Performance in Mathematics – Subpart 1

In the table below, provide the unduplicated number of long-term students served by Title I, Part D, Subpart 1, who participated in mathematics pre-and post-testing. Students should be reported in only one of the four change categories.

Report only information on a student's most recent testing data. Students who were pre-tested prior to July 1, 2018, may be included if their post-test was administered during the reporting year. Students who were post-tested after the reporting year ended should be counted in the following year. Below the table is an FAQ about the data collected in this table.

Performance Data (Based on most recent pre/post-test data)	Neglected Programs	Juvenile Detention	Juvenile Corrections	Adult Corrections	Other Programs
Long-term students with negative grade level change from the pre- to post-test exams			42		77
Long-term students with no change in grade level from the pre- to post-test exams			15		152
Long-term students with improvement up to one full grade level from the pre- to post-test exams			63		92
Long-term students with improvement of more than one full grade level from the pre- to post-test exams			124		67
Total students pre/post- tested			244		388

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

FAQ on long-term students:

What is long-term? Long-term refers to students who were enrolled for at least 90 consecutive calendar days from July 1, 2018 through June 30, 2019.

2.5.3 LEA Title I, Part D Programs and Facilities – Subpart 2

The following questions collect data on Title I, Part D, Subpart 2 programs and facilities.

2.5.3.1 Programs and Facilities – Subpart 2

In the table below, provide the number of LEA Title I, Part D, Subpart 2 programs and facilities that serve neglected and delinquent students and the yearly average length of stay by program/facility type for these students. Report only the programs and facilities that received Title I, Part D, Subpart 2 funding during the reporting year. Count a facility once if it offers only one type of program. If a facility offers more than one type of program (i.e., it is a multipurpose facility), then count each of the separate programs. The total number of programs/ facilities will be automatically calculated. Below the table is an FAQ about the data collected in this table.

LEA Program/Facility Type	# Programs/Facilities	Average Length of Stay in Days
At-risk programs	25	4,402
Neglected programs	0	0
Juvenile detention	21	629
Juvenile corrections	3	204
Other	0	0
Total	49	

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

FAQ on average length of stay:

How is average length of stay calculated? The average length of stay should be weighted by number of students and should include the number of days, per visit, for each student enrolled during the reporting year, regardless of entry or exit date. Multiple visits for students who entered more than once during the reporting year can be included. The average length of stay in days should not exceed 365.

2.5.3.2 Programs and Facilities That Reported - Subpart 2

In the table below, provide the number of LEA Title I, Part D, Subpart 2 programs and facilities that reported data on neglected and delinquent students.

The total row will be automatically calculated.

LEA Program/Facility Type	# Reporting Data
At-risk programs	25
Neglected programs	0
Juvenile detention	21
Juvenile corrections	3
Other	0
Total	49

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

2.5.3.3 Students Served – Subpart 2

In the tables below, provide the number of neglected and delinquent students served in LEA Title I, Part D, Subpart 2 programs and facilities. Report only students who received Title I, Part D, Subpart 2 services during the reporting year. In the first table, provide in row 1 the unduplicated number of students served by each program, and in row 2, the total number of students in row 1 who are long-term. In the subsequent tables, provide the number of students served by disability (*IDEA*), and EL status, by race/ethnicity, by sex, and by age. The total number of students by race/ethnicity, by sex, and by age will be automatically calculated.

# of Students Served	At-Risk Programs	Neglected Programs	Juvenile Detention	Juvenile Corrections	Other Programs
Total Unduplicated Students Served	1,293		2,352		
Total Long Term Students Served	721		139		

Provide the number of students served by special populations.

Student Subgroups	At-Risk Programs	Neglected Programs	Juvenile Detention	Juvenile Corrections	Other Programs
Children with disabilities (<i>IDEA</i>)	282		503		
ELs	37		110		

Provide the number of students served by race/ethnicity.

Race/Ethnicity	At-Risk Programs	Neglected Programs	Juvenile Detention	Juvenile Corrections	Other Programs
American Indian or Alaska Native	178		153		
Asian	12		68		
Black or African American	96		458		
Hispanic or Latino	233		363		
Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander	13		65		
White	652		1,119		
Two or more races	109		126		
Total	1,293		2,352		

Provide the number of students served by sex.

Sex	At-Risk Programs	Neglected Programs	Juvenile Detention	Juvenile Corrections	Other Programs
Male	789		1,721		
Female	504		631		
Total	1,293		2,352		

Provide the number of students served by age.

Age	At-Risk Programs	Neglected Programs	Juvenile Detention	Juvenile Corrections	Other Programs
3 through 5	0		0		
6	1		0		
7	1		0		
8	5		0		
9	4		0		
10	1		3		
11	15		12		
12	36		53		
13	68		132		
14	129		287		
15	139		443		
16	279		607		
17	356		667		
18	149		148		
19	75		0		

Age	At-Risk Programs	Neglected Programs	Juvenile Detention	Juvenile Corrections	Other Programs
20	28		0		
21	7		0		
Total	1,293		2,352		

If the total number of students differs by demographics, please explain in comment box below.

Comments: The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

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

FAQ on Unduplicated Count:

What is an unduplicated count? An unduplicated count is one that counts students only once, even if they were admitted to a facility or program multiple times within the reporting year.

FAQ on long-term:

What is long-term? Long-term refers to students who were enrolled for at least 90 consecutive calendar days from July 1, 2018 through June 30, 2019.

2.5.3.4 Academic, Career and Technical Outcomes While in the LEA Program/Facility or Within 90 Calendar Days After Exit

In the tables below, for each program type, provide the number of students who attained academic, career and technical outcomes.

The first table includes outcomes a student is able to achieve only after exit. In this table, provide the unduplicated number of students who enrolled, or planned to enroll, in their local district school within 90 calendar days after exiting. A student may be reported only once, per program type.

The second table includes outcomes a student is able to achieve only one time. In this table, provide the unduplicated number of students who attained the listed outcomes either in the while enrolled in the LEA program/facility column ("in fac.") or in the within 90 calendar days after exiting column. A student may be reported only once across the two time periods, per program type.

The third table includes outcomes a student may achieve more than once. In the "in fac." column, provide the unduplicated number of students who attained academic, career and technical outcomes while enrolled in the LEA program/facility. In the "90 days after exit" column provide the unduplicated number of students who attained academic, career and technical outcomes within 90 calendar days after exiting. If a student attained an outcome once in the program/facility and once during the 90-day transition period, that student may be reported once in each column.

Outcomes (once per student, only after exit)	At-Risk Programs	Neglected Programs	Juvenile Detention	Juvenile Corrections	Other Programs
# of Students Who Enrolled in their local district school 90 days after exit	183		970		

Outcomes (once per student) - # of Students Who	At-Risk Programs - In fac.	At-Risk Programs - 90 days after exit	Neglected Programs - In fac.	Neglected Programs - 90 days after exit	Juvenile Detention - In fac.	Juvenile Detention - 90 days after exit	Juvenile Corrections - In fac.	Juvenile Corrections - 90 days after exit	Other Programs - In fac.	Other Programs - 90 days after exit
Earned a GED	90	4			43	21				
Obtained high school diploma	43	12			6	5				

Outcomes (once per student per time period) - # of Students Who	At-Risk Programs - In fac.	At-Risk Programs - 90 days after exit	Neglected Programs - In fac.	Neglected Programs - 90 days after exit	Juvenile Detention - In fac.	Juvenile Detention - 90 days after exit	Juvenile Corrections - In fac.	Juvenile Corrections - 90 days after exit	Other Programs - In fac.	Other Programs - 90 days after exit
Earned high school course credits	672	118			1,476	485				
Enrolled in a GED program	279	13			141	32				
Accepted and/or enrolled into post-secondary education	30	14			18	5				
Enrolled in job training courses/programs	60	8			522	34				
Obtained employment	99	40			6	16				

In the text box below, please account for any missing or incomplete data after exit.

Comments: The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

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

2.5.4 Academic Performance – Subpart 2

The following questions collect data on the academic performance of neglected and delinquent long-term students served by Title I, Part D, Subpart 2 in reading and mathematics.

2.5.4.1 Academic Performance in Reading – Subpart 2

In the table below, provide the unduplicated number of long-term students served by Title I, Part D, Subpart 2, who participated in reading pre- and post-testing. Students should be reported in only one of the four change categories. Reporting pre- and post-test data for at-risk students in the table below is optional.

Report only information on a student's most recent testing data. Students who were pre-tested prior to July 1, 2018, may be included if their post-test was administered during the reporting year. Students who were post-tested after the reporting year ended should be counted in the following year. Below the table is an FAQ about the data collected in this table.

Performance Data (Based on most recent pre/post-test data)	At-Risk Programs	Neglected Programs	Juvenile Detention	Juvenile Corrections	Other Programs
Long-term students with negative grade level change from the pre- to post-test exams	66		21		
Long-term students with no change in grade level from the pre- to post-test exams	248		40		
Long-term students with improvement up to one full grade level from the pre- to post-test exams	79		33		
Long-term students with improvement of more than one full grade level from the pre- to post-test exams	54		28		
Total students pre/post- tested	447		122		

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

FAQ on long-term:

What is long-term? Long-term refers to students who were enrolled for at least 90 consecutive calendar days from July 1, 2018, through June 30, 2019.

Is reporting pre/post-test data for at-risk programs required? No, reporting pre/post-test data for at-risk students is no longer required, but States have the option to continue to collect and report it within the CSPR.

2.5.4.2 Academic Performance in Mathematics – Subpart 2

In the table below, provide the unduplicated number of long-term students served by Title I, Part D, Subpart 2, who participated in mathematics pre- and post-testing. Students should be reported in only one of the four change categories. Reporting pre- and post-test data for at-risk students in the table below is optional.

Report only information on a student's most recent testing data. Students who were pre-tested prior to July 1, 2018, may be included if their post-test was administered during the reporting year. Students who were post-tested after the reporting year ended should be counted in the following year. Below the table is an FAQ about the data collected in this table.

Performance Data (Based on most recent pre/post-test data)	At-Risk Programs	Neglected Programs	Juvenile Detention	Juvenile Corrections	Other Programs
Long-term students with negative grade level change from the pre- to post-test exams	57		17		
Long-term students with no change in grade level from the pre- to post-test exams	250		41		
Long-term students with improvement up to one full grade level from the pre- to post-test exams	90		40		
Long-term students with improvement of more than one full grade level from the pre- to post-test exams	53		21		
Total students pre/post- tested	450		119		

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

FAQ on long-term:

What is long-term? Long-term refers to students who were enrolled for at least 90 consecutive calendar days from July 1, 2018, through June 30, 2019.

Is reporting pre/post-test data for at-risk programs required? No, reporting pre/post-test data for at-risk students is no longer required, but States have the option to continue to collect and report it within the CSPR.

2.6 STUDENT SUPPORT AND ACADEMIC ENRICHMENT GRANTS (TITLE IV, PART A)

2.6.1 Funds Spent Under Title IV, Part A

This section collects data on the amount of funds spent by LEAs on the three content areas under Title IV, Part A of the *ESEA*. The data are reported through the Annual Performance Reporting Tool.

Content Area	Amount of Funds Spent
Well-Rounded	0.00
Safe and Healthy Students	0.00
Effective Use of Technology	0.00

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

OSPI did not collect this data for the 2018-29 reporting period.

OSPI has a very old grants management system that does not allow for sub-coding expenditures against a program specific budget category, e.g., Safe and Healthy vs. Well-Rounded. The narrative portion of each LEA's application includes detailed information on goals and activities tied to each of these categories, and includes an anticipated breakdown of planned spending by category, but the system does not provide any type of functionality that ties expenditures to program specific categories. It only captures standard allowable Object and Activity codes across all programs.

This performance metric was not officially presented to Title IVA State Coordinators until December 2019 – six months into the performance period following the one we are currently reporting on. This means that each LEA would need to go back and create documentation after the fact. LEAs that received more than \$30,000 were instructed to maintain documentation that demonstrated it met the statutory requirements related to minimum spending by category per annual allocation. And that this documentation would be requested and reviewed during compliance monitoring. However, they were not instructed that this tracking is inclusive of the private school share, or the indirect funds. Additionally, LEAs that received less than \$30,000 were not required to track expenditures by category at all. Though these applications also include detailed descriptions of goals and activities tied to one or more category and projected budget.

Many of the LEAs in Washington are small and rural and do not have district staff capacity to undertake a task such as recreating expenditure records. Of the 132 LEAs that received a Title IVA 2018-19 grant award, 73 LEAs (55%) received an allocation of less than \$30,000.

OSPI intends to address the need to collect this expenditure data in two ways.

1. The agency is in the process of a formal solicitation for vendors to develop a new grants management system. The ability to subcode budgets and expenditures against program specific categories was included as a requirement. The development of this new system will take some time before it is operational.
2. The agency will provide all LEAs with detailed, written program and associated data collection requirements at the time of application. This will make expectations clear and allow LEAs to plan accordingly as they move forward.

2.6.2 LEAs Who Spent Funds Under Title IV, Part A

This section collects data on the number of LEAs who spent funds by the content areas under Title IV, Part A of the *ESEA*. For the "Any" category, report the number of LEAs that spent funds in any of the three content areas. An LEA should be included in the count of each content area it spent funds on (i.e. an LEA may be represented in more than one content area in the table below). The data are reported through the Annual Performance Reporting Tool.

Content Area	Number of LEAs Spending Funds
Well-Rounded	104
Safe and Healthy Students	105
Effective Use of Technology	70
Any Content Area	132

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

2.7 FUNDING TRANSFERABILITY FOR STATE AND LOCAL EDUCATIONAL AGENCIES (TITLE V, PART A)**2.7.1 State Transferability of Funds**

In the table below, indicate whether the State transferred funds under the state transferability authority.

State Transferability of Funds	Yes/No
Did the State transfer funds under the State Transferability authority of Section 5103(a) during SY 2018-19?	NO

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

2.7.2 Local Educational Agency (LEA) Transferability of Funds

In the table below, indicate the number of LEAs that notified the State that they transferred funds under the LEA transferability authority.

LEA Transferability of Funds	#
LEAs that notified the State that they were transferring funds under the LEA Transferability authority of Section 5103(b).	92

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

2.7.3 LEA Funds Transfers

In the table below, provide the total number of LEAs that transferred funds from an eligible program to another eligible program.

Program	# LEAs Transferring Funds FROM Eligible Program	# LEAs Transferring Funds TO Eligible Program
Supporting Effective Instruction (Title II, Part A)	18	36
Student Support and Enrichment Grants (Title IV, Part A)	82	2
Improving Basic Programs Operated by LEAs (Title I, Part A)		56
Education of Migratory Children (Title I, Part C)		0
Prevention and Intervention Programs for Children and Youth Who Are Neglected, Delinquent, or At-Risk (Title I, Part D)		1
English Language Acquisition, Language Enhancement, and Academic Achievement Act (Title III, Part A)		4
Rural Education Initiative (Title V, Part B)		3

In the table below provide the total amount of FY 2018 appropriated funds transferred from and to each eligible program.

Program	Total Amount of Funds Transferred FROM Eligible Program	Total Amount of Funds Transferred TO Eligible Program
Supporting Effective Instruction (Title II, Part A)	1,271,040.00	2,524,545.00
Student Support and Enrichment Grants (Title IV, Part A)	4,350,017.00	55,133.00
Improving Basic Programs Operated by LEAs (Title I, Part A)		2,715,255.00
Education of Migratory Children (Title I, Part C)		0.00
Prevention and Intervention Programs for Children and Youth Who Are Neglected, Delinquent, or At-Risk (Title I, Part D)		52,675.00
English Language Acquisition, Language Enhancement, and Academic Achievement Act (Title III, Part A)		166,742.00
Rural Education Initiative (Title V, Part B)		106,707.00

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

2.8 RURAL EDUCATION ACHIEVEMENT PROGRAM (REAP)

This section collects data on the Rural Education Achievement Program (REAP) Title V, Part B, Subparts 1 and 2.

2.8.1 LEA Use of Rural Low-Income Schools Program (RLIS) (Title V, Part B, Subpart 2) Grant Funds

In the table below, provide the number of eligible LEAs that used RLIS funds during SY2018-19 for each of the listed purposes.

Purpose	# LEAs
Activities authorized under Part A of Title I	22
Activities authorized under Part A of Title II	17
Activities authorized under Title III	5
Activities authorized under Part A of Title IV	23
Parental involvement activities	6

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

2.8.2 RLIS Objectives and Outcomes

In the space below, describe the progress the State has made in meeting the objectives and outcomes for the Rural Low-Income School (RLIS) Program as described in the State's most current Consolidated State Application. If providing quantitative data along with your narrative, please ensure all data is converted to text format.

Comments: The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

OSPI awards Title V, Part B, Subpart 2 funds (Rural and Low-Income Schools) as a block grant to eligible LEAs in Washington. These grants allow for LEAs to use these federal funds in a way that addresses their unique gaps in serving students. These funds are then used to positively affect the educational outcome of their underserved students and to further provide for the unique needs of the educators that serve these students.

In the 2018–19 school year, Washington had 47 LEAs eligible to receive a Rural and Low-Income Schools (RLIS) Grant. Of these, 46 chose to participate in RLIS. Of these participating districts:

- 48% utilized a portion of their RLIS grant on activities allowable under the Title I, Part A program.
- 37% utilized a portion of their RLIS grant on activities allowable under the Title II, Part A program.
- 11% utilized a portion of their RLIS grant on activities allowable under the Title III program.
- 50% utilized a portion of their RLIS grant on activities allowable under the Title IV, Part A program.
- 13% utilized a portion of their RLIS grant on Parental Involvement activities.

Additionally, LEA's who have been designated for comprehensive or targeted support work closely with OSPI's Office of System and School Improvement, which provides them with meaningful support to further the effectiveness of educational outcomes for their students.

2.8.3 RLIS Technical Assistance

In the space below, describe the progress the State has made in providing technical assistance for RLIS LEA sub-grantees as described in the State's most current Consolidated State Application. If providing quantitative data along with your narrative, please ensure all data is converted to text format.

Comments: The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

OSPI offers regular and ongoing technical assistance to LEAs in Washington on an as-needed basis. The rural education program supervisor provides notices to LEAs regarding important Rural and Low-Income Schools (RLIS) grant deadlines and follows up via email and telephone when necessary. Additionally, that program supervisor regularly attends the semi-annual Rural Alliance Conference and, along with the director of consolidated program review and rural education, actively participates in the semi-annual Northwest Rural Innovation and Student Engagement (NW RISE) convenings. These activities allow for opportunities to provide technical assistance to attendees as needed.

OSPI conducted informational presentations on Title V, Part B – Rural Education Initiative to LEA's in ESD 171 on 9/17/2019, ESD 114 on 10/8/2019, ESD 101 on 10/10/2020, and virtually statewide on 10/15/2019. This presentation addresses REAP Alternative Fund Use Authority and Rural and Low-Income Schools grant programs, including basic information on SRSA and dual eligibility.

2.8.4 RLIS Subgrant Award Determination

Please report the method the SEA used to award grants to eligible LEAs. If the SEA used a competitive process, please describe that process and include a description of the methods and criteria the SEA used to review applications, award funds to LEAs, and how the LEAs were notified of the process. If the SEA used a formula besides one based on the number of students in average daily attendance served by eligible LEAs in the State, please describe that formula, including an explanation of how this alternative formula enables the SEA to allot grant funds in a manner that serves equal or greater concentrations of children from families with incomes below the poverty line, relative to the concentration that would be served if the SEA used a formula based on the number of students in average daily attendance served by eligible LEAs in the State.

Comments: The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

OSPI used a formula based on the number of students in average daily attendance served by eligible LEAs in the state.

2.8.5 RLIS State Administrative Funds

In the table below, provide information on state administrative funds.

Question	Percentage
What percentage of the RLIS grant funds were retained for State-level administration?	5.00%
What percentage of those funds retained for State-level administration were used specifically for technical assistance?	25.00%

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

2.8.6 RLIS LEAs Awarded Funds

Please list the NCES LEA ID and name of each LEA that received RLIS funds and the amount each received. This information will be collected from SEAs outside of the CSPR collection tool.

- NCES LEA ID
- LEA Name
- RLIS Award Amount

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

2.8.7 Small, Rural School Achievement (SRSA) Program, Alternative Fund Use Authority (AFUA)

	Number	Percentage
What number and percentage of SRSA- and Dual-eligible LEAs informed their SEA of an intent to utilize SRSA's AFUA, under Section 5211 of the ESEA.	93	77.50%

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