

**WASHINGTON LEARNS:
BRIEFING DOCUMENT ON A SUCCESSFUL DISTRICT
APPROACH TO SCHOOL FINANCE ADEQUACY**

**Prepared for
Washington Learns**



**Mark Fermanich
Lawrence O. Picus
Allan Odden**

**Lawrence O. Picus and Associates
4949 Auckland Ave.
North Hollywood, CA 91601**

**First Draft
January 2006**

Table of Contents

- 1. Successful District Approach**
 - 2. Proposed Successful District Study**
 - 3. Criteria for Selecting Successful Districts: A Look at Other Studies**
 - Illinois
 - Kansas
 - New York
 - Tennessee
 - 4. Washington’s Standards, Assessment and Accountability System**
 - Learning Standards
 - Assessments
 - Performance Standards
 - Report Card
 - 5. State Reported School District Accountability, Fiscal and Characteristics Data**
 - Assessment/Performance Data
 - Other Indicators
 - Teacher Quality Indicators
 - Fiscal Indicators
 - Student Demographics
 - District Characteristics
 - 6. Recommendations for Selection Criteria**
 - Criteria Recommendations
 - Filtering Atypical Districts
- References**
- Appendix A Washington Essential Learning Requirements**
- Appendix B Selected School District Characteristics**

Briefing Document on a Successful District Approach to School Finance Adequacy

The request for proposal issued by the State of Washington's Office of Fiscal Management requires that the analysis of the state's K-12 school finance system include a study of school funding adequacy using the successful district methodology. One of the key steps in carrying out the successful district approach is to establish the criteria by which successful districts will be selected. In our proposal we noted that we would work closely with the Washington Learns K-12 Advisory Committee and the Washington Learns Steering Committee to define these criteria. This report provides the necessary information for the Steering and Advisory Committees to offer meaningful input into the determination of selection criteria. The sections that follow in this report provide an overview of the successful district approach, outline our proposed strategy for conducting a successful district study, briefly discusses previous studies that have used this methodology, lays out the possible options for selection criteria and the data that are available from various state and federal sources, and lastly, provides recommendations on the criteria for selecting the successful districts whose financial levels and expenditure patterns will be analyzed in the study.

While the central purpose of this briefing report is to get the Steering and Advisory Committees up to speed on the issue of selection criteria, a broader discussion of the successful district approach to adequacy has also been included.

1. Successful District Approach¹

The successful district approach attempts to estimate an adequate base level of spending per student by identifying districts that successfully meet state proficiency standards

¹ This section draws heavily on Odden, Archibald & Fermanich (2003), and Odden, Picus & Fermanich (2003).

and then determining the average base cost of these districts. By base cost we mean the basic expenditures of a district for regular instruction and district and school operations and administration. The base cost excludes expenditures for programs for students with special needs and for most other non-instructional support programs, for example special education, limited English proficiency, transportation, and food service. Adjustments for these costs are generally made separately. The successful district method has been used in about a dozen states including Colorado, Illinois (Augenblick & Myers, 2001), Kansas (Augenblick, Myers, Silverstein, & Barkis, 2002), Louisiana, Maryland (Augenblick, 2001), Mississippi, Missouri, New Hampshire, New York (Standard & Poor's, 2004), Ohio (Alexander, Augenblick, Driscoll, Guthrie & Levin, 1995; Augenblick, 1997), Tennessee (Augenblick, 2004), and Vermont.

The successful district study process consists of establishing the criteria by which successful districts will be chosen, quantifying the base costs of these districts, and establishing a base cost amount, typically the weighted average of the base costs of the sample districts. In some cases, these costs have been adjusted for regional differences in the costs of doing business, for example salaries or energy costs. To avoid biased results outlier districts, often defined as those with extreme characteristics such as very high or low spending, high or low property wealth, or very large or small enrollment, are excluded from the analysis. However, excluding districts with these characteristics from the analysis often leads to a sample of districts consisting of non-metropolitan districts of average size and relatively homogeneous demographic characteristics and excluding large urban districts and small, isolated rural districts. Several studies have employed variations on the standard

successful district method in an attempt to compensate for the exclusion of atypical districts (Taylor, Baker & Vedlitz, 2005).

As is the case with any method for determining school funding adequacy, the successful district approach has both strengths and weaknesses. The approach is one of the few used in estimating adequacy that explicitly incorporates performance on state standards. Therefore, the base spending amount produced by the method reflects actual average spending by districts that have achieved a predetermined level of success on state performance standards or other appropriate performance measures. The method is also conceptually straightforward and therefore relatively easily understood by the public and policymakers.

However, the successful district approach also has its shortcomings. First, it is best suited for states that have well defined performance measures and accountability data. These are necessary for establishing valid criteria for the district selection process. Second, critics have argued that successful district studies may be susceptible to manipulation. For example, the criteria used to select sample districts may be constructed in such a way as to select lower spending school districts. Or, as in the case of New Hampshire, only the costs of lower spending districts in the sample may be used in determining the base cost (Verstagen, 2004). As discussed above, another disadvantage of the approach is that by the nature by which districts are selected, outlier districts, particularly urban or poor rural districts, are often excluded from the analysis. As a result, the higher costs that are typically associated with these districts are not addressed in the model. Other methods must be employed for developing cost adjustments for programs for special needs students or for other circumstances such as small size or geographic isolation. Finally, the results of the analysis

do little to illuminate *what* programs and strategies the successful districts employed to achieve their high level of performance.

2. Proposed Successful District Study

In our technical proposal (Picus, 2005), we proposed to augment the standard successful district methodology in order to address some of the weaknesses of the approach discussed above. Specifically we proposed:

1. To ensure that relevant and valid criteria were used to select the sample of successful districts, a comprehensive assessment of the district-level data collected by the state would be conducted. A list of potential criteria for identification of successful districts would then be presented to the Advisory Committee along with recommendations as to which would be most useful in estimating levels of adequacy funding for schools.
2. To ensure that districts with a wide range of fiscal, geographical and student characteristics were represented in the study, we would work with the Advisory Committee to consider multiple samples of successful districts representing categories of district characteristics that reflect varying education challenges such as poverty concentration or urbanicity/rurality.
3. To address the issue of variation in success over time, we would establish a three to five year time frame and, if feasible, only include districts that met the established success criteria throughout the entire time period. However, while doing so may enhance the consistency of the adequacy cost estimates, it may also dramatically reduce the number of districts identified as successful. If the districts are further divided into categories as discussed above, the number of districts may be too small to provide generalizable findings.

4. To conduct an analysis, in consultation with the Advisory Committee, of outlier districts, or those districts with characteristics significantly different from the norm for the state, to determine if some districts should be removed from the analysis before cost estimates are developed to ensure unbiased results. We would advise the Committee as to the statistical validity of “trimming” the sample and the implications of doing so to help them make an informed choice on this issue.
5. To explore whether specific patterns of resource use existed in the sample of successful districts by conducting field studies in up to 10 or 12 districts. If clear patterns of resource use for effective educational strategies were found in the districts, then the state would have additional information and more confidence in the adequacy estimates developed through this approach.

The following sections focus specifically on the selection criteria used for identifying school districts for the fiscal study. First, we provide a look at the criteria used in selected studies from other states. We then present a discussion of the accountability system and associated state data for the State of Washington. Finally, we make recommendations for:

1. Criteria to use in selecting districts in Washington.
2. The partition of districts into specific categories to ensure a broader representation of districts with varying characteristics.
3. Criteria for excluding certain outlier districts from the analysis.

3. Criteria for Selecting Successful Districts: A Look at Other Studies

This section takes a brief look at the selection criteria used in several successful district studies conducted in other states. The states included in this analysis are Illinois, Kansas, Tennessee and New York.

Illinois

The Illinois successful district study analyzed a large number of alternative criteria sets for elementary, unified and high school districts and calculated base costs for each of the multiple combinations of district type and criteria set (Augenblick & Myers, 2001). The outcome criteria consisted of the percentage of students meeting state performance expectations on state assessments in reading, writing and math. The standard ranged from a low of 67 percent of students meeting state performance expectations to a high of 83 percent meeting expectations. No non-academic indicators, such as attendance or graduation rates, were used because an earlier study had found that these indicators had little impact on base cost levels. However, some of the alternatives included a measure of test participation, with a minimum district-wide participation rate of 80 percent set as the standard. The study also controlled for the concentration of poverty in a district based on free and reduced lunch counts. Finally, a measure of efficiency was included in some of the criteria sets. This efficiency measure consisted of a regression analysis of actual to predicted spending. The regression model included measures of per pupil spending, per pupil assessed valuation, average teacher salaries, and operating tax rate.

Kansas

The study in Kansas originally intended to utilize both input and outcome criteria for the selection of successful districts (Augenblick, et al., 2002). The outcome criteria consisted of the percentage of students scoring at or above proficiency on the following state assessments:

- Reading in grades 5 (70% proficiency), 8 (65% proficiency), and 11 (60% proficiency).
- Math in grades 4 (65% proficiency), 7 (60% proficiency), and 10 (55% proficiency).

A total of 85 school districts met the outcome criteria established for the study.

The input criteria, or measure of efficiency, consisted of a regression analysis of actual to predicted base spending. Base spending included expenditures for instruction, operations and maintenance and administration. Those districts whose actual spending was equal to or less than the predicted spending were considered to have met the input standard. However, because only 35 of the 50 districts meeting the outcome standard also met the input standard, the input standard was dropped from the study.

New York

Similar to the Illinois study, the New York study also used multiple performance criteria and a measure of economic efficiency (Standard & Poor's, 2004). The criteria sets included 1) a comprehensive set of 15 indicators consisting of state test performance data and non-academic indicators; 2) the state's performance index targets for 2006 under No Child Left Behind; 3) the state's performance index targets for 2008 under No Child Left Behind; and 4) the Regents criteria.

Comprehensive criteria. The 15 indicators included in New York consisted of the percentage of students meeting state proficiency standards on state assessments for grade 4 language arts, math and science; grade 5 social studies; and grade 8 language arts, math, social studies, and science. Passing rates on the Regents exams for English, math, geography, social studies, and science were also included. The non-academic indicators included retention and dropout rates, cohort graduation rates and Regents diploma rates. A total of 102 districts met all 15 of these criteria.

2006 and 2008 Performance Targets. This criteria set consisted of an index representing the percentage of students scoring at basic or proficient levels on

English/language arts and math tests in grades 4, 8 and high school. A separate index was calculated for each test. Districts also had to have a Regents diploma rate above the state average and a dropout rate below the state average. The performance targets were similar for the two years except that the passing indices were raised for 2008. A total of 180 districts met the 2006 performance target and 108 met the 2008 target.

Regents Criteria. Districts meeting these criteria had to have 80 percent or more of their students scoring at proficient or above on the fourth grade English/language arts test and an average score of 65 or higher on five Regents tests required for graduation. A total of 281 districts met these criteria.

The study also included a measure of cost effectiveness, or efficiency, by calculating the average per pupil spending among the lowest spending 50 percent of districts in each of the four criteria sets. Districts whose per pupil spending exceeded this average were excluded from the analysis.

Tennessee

The Tennessee study used a combination of state assessment performance data and non-academic indicators to select its sample of districts (Augenblick, 2004). The assessment data consisted of a combination of elementary state achievement and value-added tests, high school graduation tests known as Gateway tests, and ACT and SAT scores. The assessment and non-academic indicators were further broken down into a total of 33 indicators on which districts were graded on a scale of A to F. The initial standard used in the selection process was an “A” rating on all 33 indicators. However, no districts met this standard so a revised standard was substituted. The new standard permitted districts to receive a “B” or above on the state achievement test and non-academic indicator components and an 80 percent

proficiency rate on the Gateway tests. Districts that met 28 of the 33 indicators under this new standard were included in the sample. Eight districts representing 88,733 students met this revised standard.

The indicators used in the study included the change in the number of students reaching proficiency or meeting or exceeding national norms on state achievement and value-added tests in:

- Grades K-8 reading, language arts, mathematics, science, and social studies
- Writing proficiency in grades 4, 7 and 11
- Gateway tests in algebra and biology
- SAT and ACT scores

The non-academic indicators included:

- Promotion from K-5 and 6-8
- Attendance for K-5 and 6-8
- Dropout rate

The performance goals for each criteria component are listed below:

- Value-added assessments – a year’s average growth compared to national norms in each subject area tested.
- Elementary achievement tests – an average score at the national norm in each subject.
- High school achievement tests – 80 percent of students met or exceeded proficiency in language and math as freshmen.
- Writing assessments – an average score at the competent level.
- ACT/SAT – a composite score of 19 or above on the ACT and 910 or above on the SAT.
- Promotion – 97 percent of students in grades K-8 are promoted each year.

- Attendance – system-level attendance rates of 97 percent in grades K-6 and 93 percent in grades 7-12.
- Dropout rate – 10 percent or fewer students entering high school as ninth graders dropped out prior to completing high school.

4. Washington’s Standards, Assessment and Accountability System²

The State of Washington features a comprehensive, standards-based assessment and accountability system that incorporates content standards in multiple subjects, assessments aligned to the standards, and a reporting system at the state, district and school levels. The following provides a brief overview of the state system.

Learning Standards

The foundation of the state’s learning and accountability system are the four State Learning Goals:

1. Read with comprehension, write with skill, and communicate effectively and responsibly in a variety of ways and setting.
2. Know and apply the core concepts and principles of mathematics; social, physical, and life sciences; civics and history; geography; arts; and health and fitness.
3. Think analytically, logically, and creatively, and integrate experience and knowledge to form reasoned judgments and solve problems.
4. Understand the importance of work and how performance, effort, and decisions directly affect future career and educational opportunities.

From these four learning goals are derived the Essential Academic Learning Requirements (EALRs), the standards for what students should know and be able to do in the

² The information presented in this section was largely taken from the state’s accountability plan for NCLB (Office of Superintendent of Public Instruction, 2005).

subjects of reading, writing, mathematics, science, social studies, communications, the arts, and health/fitness. The EALRs for reading, writing, math, and science may be found in Appendix A.

Assessments

Student performance on the EALR standards are assessed by the Washington Assessment of Student Learning (WASL), the standards-based state assessment that is currently administered in reading, writing and mathematics in grades 4, 7 and 10, and in science in grades 5 and 8. By spring of 2006, the state is expected to have assessments for reading and mathematics available for grades 3, 5, 6, and 8 as well. The state also provides an alternative assessment to the WASL, the Washington Alternate Assessment System (WAAS) for students with disabilities. The WAAS is administered to the same grades and in the same subjects as the WASL.

Through the 2004-05 school year, the state also administered the Iowa Test of Basic Skills (ITBS) in reading and mathematics in grades 3 and 6, and the Iowa Tests of Educational Development in reading, language arts, mathematics, and interest inventory in grade 9. These assessments will be replaced by the expanded WASL beginning in 2006.

Performance Standards

The performance standards adopted by the state are largely driven by the requirements of the federal No Child Left Behind (NCLB) act. The state has established annual proficiency benchmarks for reading and mathematics in grades 4, 7 and 10 through the year 2014, standards for student participation in the assessments, and benchmarks for graduation and unexcused absence rates.

Performance standards for the WASL. The performance of students taking the WASL is ranked at four levels: Level 1 is considered Below Basic, Level 2 is considered Basic, Level 3 is considered Proficient, and Level 4 is considered Advanced. Only students scoring at Proficient or Advanced are considered to have met the state standard. Districts are assessed on the basis on the percentage of students scoring at proficient or above on the WASL and WAAS. Table 1 below shows the progression of the benchmarks for students meeting proficiency standards from the current year's benchmark percentage (differing by grade level and subject) to 100 percent in 2014.

However, many districts are not currently meeting the standards benchmarks. Therefore, a safe harbor benchmark has been instituted to avoid identifying districts as failing to make Adequate Yearly Progress (AYP) under NCLB when they are making significant annual progress. The safe harbor provision is defined as an annual reduction of 10 percent in the percentage of students not meeting the state standards, or a reduction over two or three years that is equivalent to an annual 10 percent reduction. The choice of which of these benchmarks (or something in between) to use in defining successful schools for this study will be critical and will require balancing high standards with an adequately-sized sample.

The state standard for participation in all WASL assessments has been established at a rate of at least 95 percent for each subgroup, as required by NCLB.

Table 1
Annual Goals for Percent of Students Meeting State Standards
On WASL Assessments

Year	Grade 4		Grade 8		Grade 10	
	Reading	Math	Reading	Math	Reading	Math
2004	52.2	29.7	30.1	17.3	48.6	24.8
2005	64.2	47.3	47.6	38.0	61.5	43.6
2006	64.2	47.3	47.6	38.0	61.5	43.6
2007	64.2	47.3	47.6	38.0	61.5	43.6
2008	76.1	64.9	65.1	58.7	74.3	62.4
2009	76.1	64.9	65.1	58.7	74.3	62.4
2010	76.1	64.9	65.1	58.7	74.3	62.4
2011	88.1	82.4	82.5	79.3	87.2	81.2
2012	88.1	82.4	82.5	79.3	87.2	81.2
2013	88.1	82.4	82.5	79.3	87.2	81.2
2014	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0

On-time graduation rate. The on-time graduation rate is determined by the percentage of students who earn a regular diploma in four years. Students who graduate but take more than four years are excluded from the numerator. The graduation rate standard in 2005 was 66 percent, with the standard gradually increasing to 85 percent by 2014. A district's graduation rate is calculated using the previous year's data since these data are not available for the current year until after the year has ended. These data are available for subgroups and by school and district aggregates. Annual goals for the on-time graduation rate are shown in Table 2 below. The state also reports an extended graduation rate for those students who take more than four years to graduate. This group consists primarily of special education, LEP and migrant students.

Table 2
Annual On-Time Graduation Rate Goals

Year	Target Graduation Rate
2005	66
2006	67
2007	68
2008	69
2009	70
2010	73
2011	76
2012	79
2013	82
2014	85

Data on district and school dropout rates are also reported. At the school level, dropout data are used as an indicator in lieu of the on-time graduation rate for secondary schools without a graduating class (e.g. a 12th grade). The annual goal is a rate of 7 percent or less and to exhibit a reduction in the rate from the previous year.

Attendance/unexcused absences. The state reports the rate of unexcused absences as its indicator of attendance. The state standard for unexcused absences is one percent or less. Districts above the one percent standard must show a reduction from the prior year to make AYP. By 2014, all districts must be at or below the one percent standard.

Districts are considered to have met their AYP goals if they meet the proficiency and participation benchmarks for the state assessments and the standards for graduation and unexcused absence rates.

Report Card

The heart of the state’s accountability system is an annual report card that presents aggregate performance and contextual information at the state, district and school levels. At the school district level, the level of interest in this study, the state report card included the following elements for 2004-05:

- Percent of students in grades 4, 7 and 10 meeting standard in reading, mathematics and writing; and the percent meeting standard in science in grades 5 and 8. Data for the current year and the two previous years are included.
- Student data, including enrollment, the percent of students by ethnicity, and the percent of students who are male/female, eligible for free and reduced price lunch, eligible for special education, eligible for LEP, and who are migrants.
- The district's rate for unexcused absences, dropouts, on-time graduation, and extended graduation.
- Teacher and classroom information, including:
 - Number of classroom teachers
 - Total number of core academic classes
 - Number of teachers teaching core academic classes
 - Average years of teacher experience
 - Percent of teachers with at least a Masters degree
 - Percent of teachers with an emergency or conditional certification
 - Percent of classes taught by teachers who are highly qualified under NCLB
 - Percent of classes taught by teachers who are not highly qualified under NCLB
 - Percent of classes in both high poverty schools (schools in the state's top quartile of free and reduced price lunch concentration) and low poverty schools taught by teachers who are highly qualified under NCLB
 - Percent of classes in both high and low poverty schools taught by teachers who are not highly qualified under NCLB

- Per student revenue and expenditure data

The following section summarizes the state data collected to meet the needs of the state's accountability system and that of NCLB. These data will form the universe of data from which criteria for the selection of successful districts will be drawn.

5. State Reported School District Accountability, Fiscal and Characteristics Data

The state's accountability system is driven by data collected annually by the Office of Superintendent of Public Instruction (OSPI) at the student, school and district levels. These data report on a variety of performance, resource and operations characteristics. Many of these data elements are required as part of the state and federal (NCLB) accountability systems. Others are used for compliance monitoring for other programs (for example financial reporting). The data systems relevant to this study include:

- Student characteristics
- State assessment participation rates and performance levels
- Other performance indicators, such as unexcused absence and graduation rates
- Teacher quality indicators
- Fiscal indicators and other district financial data

In addition to the data collected by the OSPI, other data available through the Washington Office of Financial Management and the U.S. Department of Education's National Center for Education Statistics may be useful for further filtering or categorizing districts.

Our proposal suggested using a number of data elements that have commonly been found in similar studies. We also suggested going beyond those data to include additional data elements that may be useful in strategies for compensating for some of the weaknesses of

the successful district method. In summary, we suggested considering the following data for use as potential selection criteria:

- State performance benchmarks such as:
 - State or other standardized test results
 - Attendance rates
 - Graduation rates
 - Participation in AP or other gifted and talented courses
 - SAT/ACT scores
 - Teacher quality indicators
 - Fiscal indicators
- Data for categorizing subgroups of districts based on certain geographical or demographic characteristics such as:
 - Community or student demographics
 - Geographical regions
 - Urbanicity/rurality (locale)
 - Districts that “beat the odds” e.g. those districts with high levels of poverty and ethnicity that are also high performing

Our proposal also suggested looking at district data over time, such as a 3-5 year timeframe, to ensure that the districts selected have been consistently high performing.

The following section provides an overview of the available data elements for the state that should be considered in establishing selection criteria for the successful district study.

Assessment/Performance Data

WASL. The WASL is the primary state test for accountability purposes. Tests are administered in math, reading, writing and listening in grades 4, 7 and 10 and science in grades 5, 8 and 10. The grade and subject mix has changed slightly from year to year beginning in 2003 and earlier. Table 3 below summarizes the availability of WASL assessment data for the past five years. The data are reported both at the district aggregate level and by subgroups, including race/ethnicity, gender, free and reduced price lunch, migrant, special education, and LEP. Test data are readily available as far back as 1997-98, but become less consistent. The data reported includes participation rates and percent meeting or not meeting the state standard in each subject area tested.

WAAS. The WAAS is the alternative assessment to the WASL for students with disabilities. These data report participation rates and the percent of students meeting state standards by the same subjects and grades as the WASL. Data are available on the OSPI website for 2003-05 and may be available by request for earlier years. Students assessed using the WAAS do not take the WASL.

ITBS and ITED. The Iowa tests were given in grades 3, 6 and 9 through 2005, but will be replaced in 2006 by the expanded WASL. Web-based data are available from 2000 to 2005, with some variability in the subjects tested from year to year in grades 6 and 9. The data report participation rates, national ranking and quartiles. Table 4 below shows the subjects tested by grade and year.

**Table 3
School District WASL Test Results Availability
By Year, Grade and Subject Tested**

	Grade	Math	Reading	Writing	Listening	Science
2005	4	X	X	X	--	--
	5	--	--	--	--	X
	7	X	X	X	--	--
	8	--	--	--	--	X
	10	X	X	X	--	X
2004	4	X	X	X	--	--
	5	--	--	--	--	X
	7	X	X	X	--	--
	8	--	--	--	--	X
	10	X	X	X	--	X
2003	4	X	X	X	X	--
	5	--	--	--	--	--
	7	X	X	X	X	--
	8	--	--	--	--	X
	10	X	X	X	X	X
2002	4	X	X	X	X	--
	5	--	--	--	--	--
	7	X	X	X	X	--
	8	--	--	--	--	--
	10	X	X	X	X	--
2001	4	X	X	X	X	--
	5	--	--	--	--	--
	7	X	X	X	X	--
	8	--	--	--	--	--
	10	X	X	X	X	--

NCLB AYP Data. The OSPI maintains files on district performance on NCLB criteria that include both district summary and detail data for the years 2003-2005. More detailed data are reported for 2004 and 2005, while data for 2003 are limited to whether or not a district made AYP overall. The data reported include:

- Whether AYP was met as a district, in aggregate, by grade level, and by subgroup
- Participation rates in reading and math in aggregate and by subgroup
- Percentage of students reaching proficiency in reading and math and by subgroup
- Similar data for continuously enrolled students

- The district improvement step of the district

Table 4
School District ITBS/ITED Test Results Availability
By Year, Grade and Subject Tested

	Grade	Reading	Math	LA	Core	Expres- sion	Quant. Thinking
2005	3	X	X	--	--	--	--
	6	X	X	--	--	--	--
	9	X	--	--	X	X	X
2004	3	X	X	--	--	--	--
	6	X	X	X	X	--	--
	9	X	--	--	X	X	X
2003	3	X	X	--	--	--	--
	6	X	X	X	X	--	--
	9	X	--	--	X	X	X
2002	3	X	X	--	--	--	--
	6	X	X	X	X	--	--
	9	X	X	--	X	X	--
2001	3	X	X	--	--	--	--
	6	X	X	X	X	--	--
	9	X	X	--	X	X	--

Other Indicators

Attendance. The OSPI collects and reports data on unexcused absences for purposes of NCLB. These data are available as a district aggregate and by subgroups for 2004 and 2005, but only by district aggregate for 2003.

Graduation rates. The OSPI collects data on on-time graduation rates, the rate at which students earn a regular diploma following four years of high school. These data always lag one year behind, so the data reported on the 2005 report card are for 2004. The 2005 data include a district's on-time graduation rate and extended graduation rate (for students in continuation classes) in aggregate and by subgroups. Data for 2004 and earlier years do not report the extended graduation rate.

Dropout rates. Data on dropout rates are readily available for 2004 and 2005 in aggregate and by subgroups. Data for 2003 and earlier years may be available upon request.

Advanced Placement. The state does not collect data on the number of AP courses offered or the rate of participation. The CORE student file includes a flag for students eligible for GATE services, but there are no statewide criteria for identifying GATE students, thus GATE participation rates may not be comparable from district to district.

SAT/ACT Scores. The state does not collect data on SAT/ACT test participation or scores.

Teacher Quality Indicators

The state report card includes considerable data related to teacher quality, including:

- Years of teaching experience
- Percent of teachers with at least an MA
- Number of teachers with emergency or conditional credentials
- Various NCLB highly qualified teacher variables such as percent of teachers meeting the highly qualified (HQ) requirement, the percent of classes taught by teachers not meeting the HQ requirement, and the percent of classes taught by teachers not meeting the HQ requirement in both low and high poverty schools.

The data on years of experience and percent of teachers with a MA or above are available on the OSPI website for the years 2003-2005. The other data elements are available upon request, but may only be available for 2005.

Fiscal Indicators

The state report card includes summary data for fiscal indicators such as the number of classroom teachers, students per teacher and number of core academic classes. However, some of the report card fiscal indicator data may only be available for 2005. Detailed fiscal data at the district level are available from the annual financial report (F-195/F-196) files.

Data on the assessed valuation of property within districts are available through the annual levy worksheet files available from the OSPI.

Student Demographics

Data are available from the OSPI website for most common student demographic variables, including:

- Enrollment in aggregate and by grade and subgroups. These data are available in various forms as both headcounts and as FTE students used for funding purposes.
- Subgroup percentages, including race/ethnicity, gender, migrant, LEP, special education, and free and reduced price lunch.

The data reported in these files are fairly consistent for the years 2003-2005. Some minor differences in the variables reported and in the student subgroups used are found in the files for the years 2002 and earlier.

District Characteristics

The proposal suggests that an analysis of subgroups of districts by certain characteristics such as geographical region, urbanicity, or high poverty-high success may provide more reliable information on a wider variety of districts than is typically the case with successful district studies. While the state does not collect these data (other than by county or Educational Service District), preliminary 2004 data on certain district and community characteristics, such as urbanicity are available from the U. S. Department of Education's National Center for Education Statistics CCD (Common Core of Data) data. Geographical data reported in the CCD by district include:

- Metropolitan status – whether or not a district is located in a metropolitan statistical area

- Locale code – specifies the type of community a district serves: large city, mid-size city, urban fringe, large or small town, and rural

In the following section we summarize the district selection criteria available from data collected by the OSPI and other sources and offer our recommendations for an optimal set of selection criteria.

A table presenting data for many of the district variables discussed in this section is included in Appendix B.

6. Recommendations for Selection Criteria

Our goal for establishing a set of criteria for selecting districts for the successful district analysis is to choose the most representative, valid and reliable sample possible while keeping the model relatively parsimonious. We believe that the data are available to accomplish this goal. However, several important decisions regarding the criteria are required:

- What is the appropriate mix of academic performance, non-academic, fiscal, or other criteria for obtaining the optimal sample(s)? Should these criteria be composites or should districts be evaluated on each separately?
- How high should the standard for success be? Should it be the annual performance standards established under NCLB (State Uniform Bar Goals)? Should a standard lower (or higher) be used?
- Should the analysis consider a single, broadly representative sample of districts or two or more categories of districts to ensure the best representation of the state's districts?

- Should the sample of districts be chosen on the basis of district performance in the most recent year for which data are available or across multiple years?
- Should fiscal efficiency be considered in selecting districts? If so, at what level?
- Should certain outlier districts be excluded from the analysis, and if so, what criteria should be used to filter them out of the study?

Table 5 provides summary statistics for many of the variables that are available for use as selection criteria for the district sample.

Table 5
Summary Statistics for Selected School District Data
2004-05 (Assessed Valuation for 2005-06)

	Mean	Median	Min	Max	Q 1	Q 3
Enrollment	3,439	1,027	8	46,331	263	3,428
% Ethnic	24.2	15.1	0.0	100.0	8.8	32.0
% Free & Reduced Lunch	40.2	39.6	0.0	92.9	26.3	52.9
% Special Education	11.2	12.0	0.0	25.3	9.8	13.7
% LEP	5.7	1.0	0.0	67.4	0.0	6.7
Per Pupil Expenditures	\$7,885	\$6,569	\$5,021	\$27,327	\$6,202	\$8,000
Per Pupil Assessed Value	\$673,900	\$487,207	\$32,418	\$7,144,452	\$353,697	\$678,839

Table 6 presents a summary of the types of criteria that have been used in several studies around the country, the data that are available in the State of Washington for each category of criteria listed, and our recommendations for the criteria to be used for this study. The last row of the table is available for recording the decisions of the Committee.

**Table 6
Summary of District Selection Criteria Options**

	Outcome Criteria		Fiscal/ Efficiency	District Characteristics
	Academic	Non-Academic		
Other Studies	IL, KS, NY, TN	IL, NY, TN	IL, KS, NY	IL, NY
Washington Data Availability	WASL 1997-2005 ITBS 2000-2005 AYP 2003-2005	Graduation Rate Unexcused Absences Dropout Rate All 2003-2005	Financial Report F-196 2002-2005 # Classroom Teachers # Core Classes # Core Teachers 2005 Student-Teacher Ratio 2002-2005	Poverty Ethnicity Special Education LEP Migrant Gender Teacher Quality Achievement Gap Most available 2002-2005 Locale CCD 2004
Recommendation	WASL reading, writing and math 2003-2005	Graduation Rate 2003-2005	Financial Report F-196 2003-2005	Locale CCD 2004
Committee Decision				

Criteria Recommendations

Outcome criteria. Because the Washington Learns goals focus on improving student performance in reading, writing and mathematics and on reducing the dropout rate, we recommend that the outcome criteria reflect these goals (Washington Learns, 2005). Thus, our recommendation is to utilize WASL performance data in reading, writing and mathematics, and district graduation rates, as the outcome criteria. A further advantage of using these performance data is that they are also the primary standards by which districts are assessed under NCLB. The performance standards should be those established by the state for purposes of NCLB, e.g. the Uniform Bar Goals for reading, writing and mathematics for

grades 4, 7 and 10. The state does not report a separate standard for writing, but the composite reading/writing standard could be substituted. Further, we recommend evaluating a district against each of the performance standards separately rather than as a composite and for all subgroups. We also recommend that districts must meet the state test participation standard of 95 percent in each of the subject areas tested. Similarly, the performance standard for the graduation rate criterion should represent the State's NCLB standard of annual incremental progress toward the 2014 rate of 85 percent.

Fiscal/efficiency criteria. We recommend that criteria for fiscal efficiency be included in the selection process. We suggest using per student operating expenditures as the fiscal criteria because it represents a comprehensive measure across district programs and operations and also because the data are consistently available over several years. The level of fiscal efficiency that we recommend is at or below the average of all districts included in the sample. If we look at multiple samples of districts, we would evaluate a district against both the sample average and the average of the subgroup.

District characteristics criteria. These criteria would be used to disaggregate the larger sample of selected districts into subgroups so that groups of districts with certain common characteristics could be analyzed separately. We recommend including an analysis of districts disaggregated by locale. In this analysis, districts would be categorized as urban, suburban, mid-sized (non-urban), and rural. We believe that categorizing districts in this way will help to isolate a number of factors that drive cost differences, including geographic density, isolation, and wealth.

Other criteria for categorizing districts are also available through the state's data system, including the percentage of students in poverty, who are ethnic minorities, or who are

eligible for special education or limited English proficiency services. Districts could also be categorized according to the degree to which they have narrowed the achievement gap between white students and ethnic minority students or students in poverty, or by districts with high concentrations of at-risk students that are generating higher levels of achievement than would be predicted. However, we would prefer not to disaggregate districts by performance because the expectation at both the state and federal levels is for high academic achievement for all students. We would also caution that when categorizing districts using any of these criteria there is the possibility that the resulting subgroups may provide too small of a sample for confidently generalizing results.

Timeframe. We also recommend using multiple years of performance data in selecting districts to ensure that the districts included in the study have been consistently successful over several years. While much of the data are available for five years, and in some cases for even longer periods, to ensure data quality and consistency we recommend including a three year panel of data consisting of the years 2003-2005.

Finally, it is important to note that the criteria we are recommending set the bar high. It is possible that too few districts will meet these criteria to form an adequate sample. In the event that this occurs, it will be necessary to make reasonable modifications to the criteria to increase the sample to an appropriate size.

Filtering Atypical Districts

To avoid skewing the analysis, we recommend filtering outlier districts from the analysis on the basis of extreme size, per student spending, per student property wealth, and grade levels served. In many cases, the same district is filtered out on the basis of two or more of these criterion. Applying these criteria filter out a total of 75 districts, or 25 percent

of the state's 296 districts. However these districts represent only 8 percent of the state's K-12 students. Each of the filtering criterion is described more fully below.

Size. We recommend excluding districts with extreme enrollments in comparison to the norm for the state. Seattle is by far the largest district in the state. With an enrollment of 46,331, it is more than twice the size of the next largest district, Tacoma. At the opposite end of the spectrum there are 19 districts with fewer than 50 students. Many of them do not serve students in all grades K-12. We recommend excluding them from the analysis as well.

Per student spending. We also found extremes in the amount of spending per pupil across districts. The highest spending districts also tend to be among the smallest districts. We recommend excluding districts with spending one standard deviation above the mean of \$7,885 per student, or those districts exceeding \$11,151 per student. There are 32 districts with per student spending exceeding this benchmark amount. No district spent less than one standard deviation below the mean.

Per student assessed value. Districts also varied greatly in the amount of assessed value (property wealth) within their borders. This variation in assessed value did not vary with district size to the same extent as per student spending. For example, the Seattle school district is among the districts with the highest valuation per student. We recommend excluding districts with assessed valuation per student that is one standard deviation above the mean of \$673,900 per student, or those districts exceeding \$1,352,739 per student. A total of 22 districts exceeded this benchmark amount. Again, no district had an assessed valuation per student less than one standard deviation below the mean.

Grade levels served. Fifty districts do not serve students in all grades K-12. Most of these districts serve elementary and/or middle school grades of K-6 or K-8. However, two

districts did not serve students in the middle grades. We recommend excluding districts that do not serve the full range of grades K-12, or alternatively, conducting a separate analysis for districts that do not serve high school students.

Working Draft

References

- Alexander, K., Augenblick, J., Driscoll, W., Guthrie, J., & Levin, R. (1995). *Proposals for the elimination of wealth-based disparities in public education*. Columbus, OH: Department of Public Instruction.
- Augenblick, J. (1997). *Recommendations for a base figure and pupil-weighted adjustments to the base figure for use in a new school finance system in Ohio*. Columbus, OH: Ohio Department of Education.
- Augenblick, J. (2001). *Calculation of the cost of an adequate education in Maryland in 1999-2000 using two different analytic approaches*. Denver, CO: Augenblick and Meyers.
- Augenblick & Myers. (2001). *A procedure for calculating a base cost figure and an adjustment for at-risk pupils that could be used in the Illinois school finance system*. Report prepared for the Education Funding Advisory Board.
- Augenblick, J., Myers, J., Silverstein, J. & Barkis, A. (2002). *Calculation of the cost of a suitable education in Kansas in 2000-2001 using two different analytic approaches*. Report prepared for the Kansas Legislative Coordinating Council.
- Augenblick, Palaich & Associates (2004). *Calculation of the cost of an adequate education in Tennessee in 2001-02 using the professional judgment approach and the successful school district approach*. Report prepared for the Coalition for Tennessee's Future.
- Odden, A., Archibald, S., and Fermanich. (2003). Rethinking the finance and governance systems for improved student outcomes. In W. Boyd, (Ed.), *American educational governance on trial: Change and challenge* (pp. 82-113). Chicago: National Society for the Study of Education.
- Odden, A., Picus, L. O., & Fermanich, M. (2003). *An Evidence-Based approach to school finance adequacy in Arkansas*. Report prepared for the Interim Legislative Committee on Educational Adequacy. North Hollywood, CA: Lawrence O. Picus and Associates.
- Office of Superintendent of Public Instruction. (2005, July). *Washington's consolidated state application accountability workbook*. Olympia, WA: Author
- Picus, L. O. (2005). *A proposal to conduct a K-12 funding analysis in Washington State: Volume 2 technical proposal*. North Hollywood, CA: Lawrence O. Picus and Associates.
- Standard & Poor's. (2004). *Resource adequacy study for the New York State Commission on Education Reform*. New York: Standard & Poor's School Evaluation Services.

Taylor, L., Baker, B. & Vedlitz, A. (2005). *Measuring educational adequacy in public schools* (Bush School Working Paper No. 580). College Station Texas: Texas A&M University, George Bush School of Government and Public Service.

Verstegen, D. A. (2004). Calculation of the cost of an adequate education in Kentucky: A professional judgment approach. *Education Policy Analysis Archives*, 12(8). Available online at <http://epaa.asu.edu/epaa/v12n8/>.

Washington Learns. (2005). *Washington Learns 2005 interim report*. Olympia, WA: Author.

Working Draft

Appendix A
Washington Essential Academic Learning Requirements

Reading

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

- 1.1 Use word recognition skills and strategies to read and comprehend text.
- 1.2 Use vocabulary (word meaning) strategies to comprehend text.
- 1.3 Build vocabulary through wide reading.
- 1.4 Apply word recognition skills and strategies to read fluently.

2: The student understands the meaning of what is read.

- 2.1 Demonstrate evidence of reading comprehension.
- 2.2 Understand and apply knowledge of text components to comprehend text.
- 2.3 Expand comprehension by analyzing, interpreting, and synthesizing information and ideas in literary and informational text.
- 2.4 Think critically and analyze author's use of language, style, purpose, and perspective in informational and literary text.

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

- 3.1 Read to learn new information.
- 3.2 Read to perform a task.
- 3.3 Read for career application.
- 3.4 Read for literary/narrative experience in a variety of genres.

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

- 4.1 Assess reading strengths and need for improvement.
- 4.2 Develop interests and share reading experiences.

Appendix A
Washington Essential Academic Learning Requirements

Mathematics

1. The student understands and applies the concepts and procedures of mathematics.

To meet this standard, the student will:

- 1.1. Understand and apply concepts and procedures from number sense—number and numeration, computation, and estimation.
- 1.2. Understand and apply concepts and procedures from measurement—attributes and dimensions, approximation and precision, and systems and tools.
- 1.3. Understand and apply concepts and procedures from geometric sense—properties and relationships and locations and transformations.
- 1.4. Understand and apply concepts and procedures from probability and statistics—probability, statistics, and prediction and inference.
- 1.5. Understand and apply concepts and procedures from algebraic sense—patterns, representations, and operations.

2. The student uses mathematics to define and solve problems.

To meet this standard, the student will:

- 2.1. Investigate situations by searching for patterns and using a variety of approaches.
- 2.2. Formulate questions and define the problem.
- 2.3. Construct solutions by organizing the necessary information and using appropriate mathematical tools.

3. The student uses mathematical reasoning.

To meet this standard, the student will:

- 3.1. Analyze information from a variety of sources; use models, known facts, patterns and relationships to validate thinking.
- 3.2. Predict results and make conjectures based on analysis of problem situations.
- 3.3. Draw conclusions and verify results—support mathematical arguments, justify results, and check for reasonableness of solutions.

4. The student communicates knowledge and understanding in both everyday and mathematical language.

To meet this standard, the student will:

- 4.1. Gather information—read, listen, and observe to access and extract mathematical information.
- 4.2. Organize and interpret information.
- 4.3. Represent and share information—express and explain mathematical ideas using language and notation in ways appropriate for audience and purposes.

Appendix A
Washington Essential Academic Learning Requirements

5. The student understands how mathematical ideas connect within mathematics, other subject areas, and real-life situations.

To meet this standard, the student will:

- 5.1. Relate concepts and procedures within mathematics—use conceptual and procedural understandings among content strands and use equivalent models and representations.
- 5.2. Relate mathematical concepts and procedures to other disciplines—identify and use mathematical patterns, thinking, and modeling in other subject areas.
- 5.3. Relate mathematical concepts and procedures to real-life situations—understand the connections between mathematics and problem-solving skills used every day at work and at home.

Working Draft

Appendix A
Washington Essential Academic Learning Requirements

Writing

1. The student writes clearly and effectively.

To meet this standard, the student will:

- 1.1. Develop concept and design. Develop a topic or theme; organize written thoughts with a clear beginning, middle, and end; use transitional sentences and phrases to connect related ideas; write coherently and effectively.
- 1.2. Use style appropriate to the audience and purpose. Use voice, word choice, and sentence fluency for intended style and audience.
- 1.3. Apply writing conventions. Know and apply correct spelling, grammar, sentence structure, punctuation, and capitalization.

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

To meet this standard, the student will:

- 2.1. Write for different audiences.
- 2.2. Write for different purposes, such as telling stories, presenting analytical responses to literature, persuading, conveying technical information, completing a team project, and explaining concepts and procedures.
- 2.3. Write in a variety of forms, including narratives, journals, poems, essays, stories, research reports, and technical writing.
- 2.4. Write for career applications.

3.1 The student understands and uses the steps of the writing process.

To meet this standard, the student will:

- 3.1. Pre-write—generate ideas and gather information.
- 3.2. Draft—elaborate on a topic and supporting ideas.
- 3.3. Revise—collect input and enhance text and style.
- 3.4. Edit—use resources to correct spelling, punctuation, grammar, and usage.
- 3.5. Publish—select a publishing form and produce a completed writing project to share with chosen audience.

3. The student analyzes and evaluates the effectiveness of written work.

To meet this standard, the student will:

- 4.1. Assess own strengths and needs for improvement. Analyze effectiveness of own writing and set goals for improvement.
- 4.2. Seek and offer feedback.

Appendix A
Washington Essential Academic Learning Requirements

Science

- 1. Systems: The student knows and applies scientific concepts and principles to understand the properties, structures and changes in physical, earth/space, and living systems.**

The system concept includes inputs, outputs, and transfers of matter and energy, and information to understand how the natural universe functions. Systems of the Natural World can be understood in terms of the following three components of physical, earth /space and living systems:

- 1.1 Properties: Understand how properties are used to identify, describe, and categorize substances, materials, and objects; and how characteristics are used to categorize living things.
- 1.2 Structures: Understand how components, structures, organizations, and interconnections describe systems.
- 1.3 Changes: Understand how interactions within and among systems cause changes in matter and energy.

Students develop an understanding of the scientific concepts and principles in the contexts of physical, earth/space, and living systems that can be applied to solve human problems.

- 2. Inquiry: The student knows and applies the scientific ideas, skills, processes of investigation, and the nature of science.**

Inquiry describes the skills necessary to investigate systems and asks students to understand the nature of science which gives integrity to scientific investigations. Inquiry represents the application of science concepts and principles to the scientific investigative processes that aims to answer scientific questions about the natural world. These concepts, principles, and processes are expressed in two components:

- 2.1 Investigating Systems: Develop the knowledge and skills necessary to do scientific inquiry.
- 2.2 Nature of Science: Understand the nature of scientific inquiry

- 3. Application: The student knows and applies science ideas and inquiry to design and analyze solutions to human problems in societal contexts.**

Appendix A
Washington Essential Academic Learning Requirements

Scientific design process skills are used to develop and evaluate scientific solutions to problems in real world contexts. The application of an understanding of systems and inquiry is comprised of two components:

- 3.1 Designing Solutions: Apply knowledge and skills of science and technology to design solutions to human problems or meet challenges.
- 3.2 Science, Technology and Society: Analyze how science and technology are human endeavors, interrelated to each other, to society, and to the workplace and the environment.

Working Draft

Appendix B
Selected School District Characteristics

County	County SD #	District	Enrollment*	% Minority	% LEP	% Special Education	% Free/Red. Lunch	Collapsed NCES Location
Adams	01109	Washtucna School District	52	17.2%	0.0%	0.0%	58.9%	Small Town/Rural
Adams	01122	Benge School District	10	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	Small Town/Rural
Adams	01147	Othello School District	3,176	78.0%	37.5%	9.5%	75.5%	Small Town/Rural
Adams	01158	Lind School District	243	26.7%	11.5%	8.2%	64.6%	Small Town/Rural
Adams	01160	Ritzville School District	367	7.4%	0.0%	1.1%	41.9%	Small Town/Rural
Asotin	02250	Clarkston School District	2,774	6.4%	0.7%	15.8%	44.1%	Urban Fringe
Asotin	02420	Asotin-Anatone School District	583	5.5%	0.2%	17.6%	31.4%	Urban Fringe
Benton	03017	Kennewick School District	14,433	28.2%	8.0%	11.4%	34.7%	Mid-Size City/Town
Benton	03050	Paterson School District	111	53.2%	37.5%	13.4%	53.6%	Small Town/Rural
Benton	03052	Kiona-Benton City School District	1,632	24.9%	0.0%	0.0%	40.8%	Urban Fringe
Benton	03053	Finley School District	1,030	19.7%	8.9%	11.9%	51.7%	Mid-Size City/Town
Benton	03116	Prosser School District	2,836	48.5%	19.6%	11.0%	56.1%	Urban Fringe
Benton	03400	Richland School District	9,964	14.5%	2.7%	12.9%	22.6%	Mid-Size City/Town
Chelan	04019	Manson School District	586	65.9%	36.0%	11.5%	74.8%	Small Town/Rural
Chelan	04069	Stehekin School District	14	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	Small Town/Rural
Chelan	04127	Entiat School District	386	27.7%	13.9%	0.5%	48.3%	Small Town/Rural
Chelan	04129	Lake Chelan School District	1,320	44.0%	14.4%	11.9%	51.7%	Urban Fringe
Chelan	04222	Cashmere School District	1,481	30.6%	12.6%	8.9%	41.6%	Urban Fringe
Chelan	04228	Cascade School District	1,416	29.6%	13.2%	10.8%	42.7%	Small Town/Rural
Chelan	04246	Wenatchee School District	7,616	38.6%	20.7%	10.8%	48.9%	Mid-Size City/Town
Clallam	05121	Port Angeles School District	4,878	15.1%	0.5%	17.4%	38.7%	Small Town/Rural
Clallam	05313	Crescent School District	178	15.7%	0.0%	0.0%	38.7%	Small Town/Rural
Clallam	05323	Sequim School District	2,950	14.6%	1.8%	12.3%	30.3%	Small Town/Rural
Clallam	05401	Cape Flattery School District	546	70.1%	20.7%	14.6%	65.1%	Small Town/Rural
Clallam	05402	Quillayute Valley School District	1,304	35.5%	8.5%	13.7%	55.4%	Small Town/Rural
Clark	06037	Vancouver School District	22,213	23.6%	8.0%	12.7%	38.3%	Mid-Size City/Town
Clark	06098	Hockinson School District	1,952	4.8%	0.7%	9.6%	12.7%	Small Town/Rural
Clark	06101	LaCenter School District	1,373	7.9%	1.1%	10.2%	20.7%	Small Town/Rural
Clark	06103	Green Mountain School District	119	6.7%	0.0%	13.7%	26.6%	Urban Fringe

Appendix B
Selected School District Characteristics

Clark	06112	Washougal School District	2,870	8.3%	1.3%	10.6%	28.8%	Urban Fringe
Clark	06114	Evergreen School District (Clark)	25,345	19.6%	7.1%	12.5%	32.7%	Mid-Size City/Town
Clark	06117	Camas School District	4,989	11.4%	2.1%	12.5%	16.2%	Urban Fringe
Clark	06119	Battle Ground School District	12,693	8.2%	3.7%	11.5%	25.1%	Urban Fringe
Clark	06122	Ridgefield School District	1,890	10.7%	1.5%	8.6%	0.0%	Small Town/Rural
Columbia	07002	Dayton School District	563	16.3%	0.5%	9.9%	38.4%	Small Town/Rural
Columbia	07035	Starbuck School District	11	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	Small Town/Rural
Cowlitz	08122	Longview School District	7,441	19.2%	4.1%	14.8%	47.5%	Mid-Size City/Town
Cowlitz	08130	Toutle Lake School District	642	8.6%	0.0%	11.6%	27.9%	Small Town/Rural
Cowlitz	08401	Castle Rock School District	1,397	6.3%	0.6%	13.6%	30.1%	Small Town/Rural
Cowlitz	08402	Kalama School District	1,023	6.0%	0.0%	14.8%	26.1%	Small Town/Rural
Cowlitz	08404	Woodland School District	2,050	13.3%	1.1%	2.3%	27.8%	Urban Fringe
Cowlitz	08458	Kelso School District	5,305	17.8%	2.5%	12.2%	44.3%	Mid-Size City/Town
Douglas	09013	Orondo School District	255	70.6%	38.3%	7.0%	78.0%	Small Town/Rural
Douglas	09075	Bridgeport School District	590	86.7%	0.0%	11.9%	65.3%	Small Town/Rural
Douglas	09102	Palisades School District	46	76.1%	67.4%	10.9%	87.0%	Small Town/Rural
Douglas	09206	Eastmont School District	5,262	32.8%	14.9%	11.9%	45.3%	Urban Fringe
Douglas	09207	Mansfield School District	93	12.9%	0.0%	18.4%	64.4%	Small Town/Rural
Douglas	09209	Waterville School District	371	22.3%	8.7%	9.0%	53.2%	Small Town/Rural
Ferry	10003	Keller School District	50	92.0%	0.0%	0.0%	81.6%	Small Town/Rural
Ferry	10050	Curlew School District	258	10.0%	0.0%	12.5%	46.5%	Small Town/Rural
Ferry	10065	Orient School District	88	6.9%	0.0%	15.1%	67.7%	Small Town/Rural
Ferry	10070	Inchelium School District	236	87.7%	0.0%	7.1%	68.1%	Small Town/Rural
Ferry	10309	Republic School District	484	7.2%	0.0%	4.9%	49.1%	Small Town/Rural
Franklin	11001	Pasco School District	11,162	72.5%	40.3%	12.8%	70.7%	Mid-Size City/Town
Franklin	11051	North Franklin School District	1,894	62.3%	37.2%	11.2%	68.3%	Urban Fringe
Franklin	11054	Star School District	8	37.5%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	Urban Fringe
Franklin	11056	Kahlotus School District	80	16.3%	0.0%	0.0%	50.6%	Small Town/Rural
Garfield	12110	Pomeroy School District	403	9.4%	1.3%	16.5%	39.8%	Small Town/Rural
Grant	13073	Wahluke School District	1,774	89.2%	47.0%	13.3%	72.0%	Small Town/Rural
Grant	13144	Quincy School District	2,354	74.0%	0.2%	9.2%	72.8%	Small Town/Rural
Grant	13146	Warden School District	960	73.9%	35.4%	13.9%	72.2%	Small Town/Rural
Grant	13151	Coulee-Hartline School District	215	2.8%	0.0%	12.1%	37.4%	Small Town/Rural
Grant	13156	Soap Lake School District	423	25.9%	24.6%	4.0%	80.0%	Small Town/Rural
Grant	13160	Royal School District	1,415	73.9%	41.0%	9.9%	76.1%	Small Town/Rural

Appendix B
Selected School District Characteristics

Grant	13161	Moses Lake School District	7,063	36.8%	9.4%	13.2%	56.9%	Small Town/Rural
Grant	13165	Ephrata School District	2,203	20.8%	9.4%	12.4%	34.6%	Small Town/Rural
Grant	13167	Wilson Creek School District	140	8.6%	0.0%	12.9%	49.3%	Small Town/Rural
Grant	13301	Grand Coulee Dam School District	816	54.9%	0.0%	10.0%	45.8%	Small Town/Rural
Grays Harbor	14005	Aberdeen School District	3,925	25.9%	8.1%	12.9%	56.6%	Small Town/Rural
Grays Harbor	14028	Hoquiam School District	2,059	19.2%	1.1%	12.8%	55.1%	Small Town/Rural
Grays Harbor	14064	North Beach School District	738	21.4%	0.0%	10.6%	41.8%	Small Town/Rural
Grays Harbor	14065	McCleary School District	275	6.9%	0.0%	14.0%	38.0%	Small Town/Rural
Grays Harbor	14066	Montesano School District	1,288	10.6%	0.9%	10.8%	25.9%	Small Town/Rural
Grays Harbor	14068	Elma School District	1,937	13.2%	2.3%	15.6%	38.2%	Small Town/Rural
Grays Harbor	14077	Taholah School District	244	96.3%	0.0%	0.0%	67.3%	Small Town/Rural
Grays Harbor	14097	Lake Quinalt School District	265	37.3%	13.6%	22.9%	75.6%	Small Town/Rural
Grays Harbor	14099	Cosmopolis School District	190	13.2%	0.0%	3.9%	23.0%	Small Town/Rural
Grays Harbor	14104	Satsop School District	58	18.9%	0.0%	0.0%	52.5%	Small Town/Rural
Grays Harbor	14117	Wishkah Valley School District	208	4.8%	0.0%	3.8%	24.0%	Small Town/Rural
Grays Harbor	14172	Ocosta School District	743	18.4%	2.9%	11.4%	55.8%	Small Town/Rural
Grays Harbor	14400	Oakville School District	285	34.1%	0.0%	16.3%	54.8%	Small Town/Rural
Island	15201	Oak Harbor School District	6,063	29.0%	3.0%	10.8%	30.7%	Small Town/Rural
Island	15204	Coupeville School District	1,199	10.7%	2.6%	11.8%	23.5%	Small Town/Rural
Island	15206	South Whidbey School District	2,143	9.9%	0.5%	11.0%	19.5%	Small Town/Rural
Jefferson	16020	Queets-Clearwater School District	31	90.3%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	Small Town/Rural
Jefferson	16046	Brinnon School District	44	6.8%	0.0%	14.3%	53.1%	Small Town/Rural
Jefferson	16048	Quilcene School District	304	7.6%	0.0%	0.7%	48.9%	Small Town/Rural
Jefferson	16049	Chimacum School District	1,325	9.6%	0.0%	12.7%	33.5%	Small Town/Rural
Jefferson	16050	Port Townsend School District	1,603	12.0%	1.2%	12.8%	35.2%	Small Town/Rural
King	17001	Seattle Public Schools	46,331	58.7%	12.7%	12.4%	42.2%	Large City
King	17210	Federal Way School District	22,602	44.7%	10.0%	12.0%	39.6%	Urban Fringe

Appendix B
Selected School District Characteristics

King	17216	Enumclaw School District	4,867	9.7%	1.8%	12.0%	20.3%	Urban Fringe
King	17400	Mercer Island School District	4,145	21.2%	1.9%	8.8%	1.8%	Urban Fringe
King	17401	Highline School District	17,612	58.3%	14.2%	12.6%	54.0%	Urban Fringe
King	17402	Vashon Island School District	1,618	9.8%	1.4%	9.6%	10.1%	Small Town/Rural
King	17403	Renton School District	13,236	54.3%	11.3%	12.8%	30.3%	Mid-Size City/Town
King	17404	Skykomish School District	70	8.6%	0.0%	25.3%	0.0%	Small Town/Rural
King	17405	Bellevue School District	15,848	33.9%	8.8%	9.7%	18.6%	Mid-Size City/Town
King	17406	Tukwila School District	2,710	69.0%	29.0%	11.0%	67.2%	Urban Fringe
King	17407	Riverview School District	3,027	10.2%	1.6%	10.2%	9.3%	Urban Fringe
King	17408	Auburn School District	13,760	30.2%	7.4%	10.4%	36.6%	Urban Fringe
King	17409	Tahoma School District	6,745	10.2%	1.5%	12.3%	11.6%	Urban Fringe
King	17410	Snoqualmie Valley School District	4,964	9.1%	0.5%	10.4%	12.8%	Urban Fringe
King	17411	Issaquah School District	15,388	21.8%	1.9%	11.3%	6.6%	Urban Fringe
King	17412	Shoreline School District	9,812	32.4%	5.7%	14.0%	19.2%	Urban Fringe
King	17414	Lake Washington School District	24,177	23.4%	3.6%	9.5%	12.0%	Urban Fringe
King	17415	Kent School District	27,269	36.4%	13.3%	12.2%	34.7%	Urban Fringe
King	17417	Northshore School District	20,490	20.4%	3.2%	13.6%	12.1%	Urban Fringe
Kitsap	18100	Bremerton School District	5,412	33.8%	1.8%	12.4%	52.7%	Mid-Size City/Town
Kitsap	18303	Bainbridge Island School District	4,249	10.0%	0.7%	13.9%	5.0%	Urban Fringe
Kitsap	18400	North Kitsap School District	7,132	19.2%	2.3%	13.6%	24.4%	Urban Fringe
Kitsap	18401	Central Kitsap School District	12,760	17.0%	1.1%	15.6%	25.3%	Urban Fringe
Kitsap	18402	South Kitsap School District	11,136	17.1%	0.3%	12.8%	24.8%	Urban Fringe
Kittitas	19007	Damman School District	41	2.4%	0.0%	9.5%	0.0%	Small Town/Rural
Kittitas	19028	Easton School District	137	13.8%	0.0%	2.4%	34.6%	Small Town/Rural
Kittitas	19400	Thorp School District	174	9.7%	4.1%	0.0%	0.0%	Small Town/Rural
Kittitas	19401	Ellensburg School District	2,875	16.9%	4.6%	9.9%	32.7%	Small Town/Rural
Kittitas	19403	Kittitas School District	586	19.5%	6.2%	0.0%	28.0%	Small Town/Rural
Kittitas	19404	Cle Elum-Roslyn School District	979	8.8%	0.0%	0.0%	32.3%	Small Town/Rural
Klickitat	20094	Wishram School District	65	23.1%	0.0%	24.2%	77.4%	Small Town/Rural
Klickitat	20203	Bickleton School District	116	19.0%	0.0%	12.8%	0.0%	Small Town/Rural
Klickitat	20215	Centerville School District	76	3.9%	0.0%	11.4%	40.5%	Small Town/Rural
Klickitat	20400	Trout Lake School District	158	8.9%	1.3%	18.2%	0.0%	Small Town/Rural
Klickitat	20401	Glenwood School District	80	38.8%	0.0%	11.5%	38.5%	Small Town/Rural
Klickitat	20402	Klickitat School District	143	12.6%	0.0%	14.5%	65.2%	Small Town/Rural
Klickitat	20403	Roosevelt School District	13	92.3%	66.7%	0.0%	83.3%	Small Town/Rural

Appendix B
Selected School District Characteristics

Klickitat	20404	Goldendale School District	1,126	15.5%	3.3%	12.4%	50.9%	Small Town/Rural
Klickitat	20405	White Salmon Valley School District	1,204	32.7%	16.0%	14.1%	46.6%	Small Town/Rural
Klickitat	20406	Lyle School District	384	14.1%	0.0%	15.3%	60.9%	Small Town/Rural
Lewis	21014	Napavine School District	708	9.6%	0.0%	11.8%	39.8%	Small Town/Rural
Lewis	21018	Vader School District	64	9.4%	0.0%	20.0%	71.4%	Small Town/Rural
Lewis	21036	Evaline School District	40	0.0%	0.0%	12.2%	0.0%	Small Town/Rural
Lewis	21206	Mossyrock School District	650	16.5%	2.0%	7.9%	52.1%	Small Town/Rural
Lewis	21214	Morton School District	416	6.8%	0.0%	11.9%	52.2%	Small Town/Rural
Lewis	21226	Adna School District	579	5.7%	0.0%	8.2%	24.6%	Small Town/Rural
Lewis	21232	Winlock School District	782	14.4%	9.6%	7.5%	48.6%	Small Town/Rural
Lewis	21234	Boistfort School District	102	8.8%	0.0%	16.0%	59.6%	Small Town/Rural
Lewis	21237	Toledo School District	987	7.8%	0.1%	14.1%	45.8%	Small Town/Rural
Lewis	21300	Onalaska School District	893	16.5%	0.8%	13.9%	34.6%	Small Town/Rural
Lewis	21301	Pe Ell School District	325	9.5%	0.0%	10.0%	53.6%	Small Town/Rural
Lewis	21302	Chehalis School District	2,662	12.5%	2.2%	10.3%	34.7%	Small Town/Rural
Lewis	21303	White Pass School District	592	3.7%	0.0%	12.1%	50.8%	Small Town/Rural
Lewis	21401	Centralia School District	3,427	19.6%	4.5%	11.9%	52.9%	Small Town/Rural
Lincoln	22008	Sprague School District	98	11.2%	0.0%	11.9%	53.5%	Small Town/Rural
Lincoln	22009	Reardan-Edwall School District	646	5.6%	0.0%	9.1%	36.7%	Small Town/Rural
Lincoln	22017	Almira School District	62	4.8%	0.0%	19.7%	36.1%	Small Town/Rural
Lincoln	22073	Creston School District	127	6.3%	0.0%	12.5%	33.3%	Small Town/Rural
Lincoln	22105	Odessa School District	246	2.8%	0.0%	1.6%	43.8%	Small Town/Rural
Lincoln	22200	Wilbur School District	234	19.1%	0.0%	1.7%	49.6%	Small Town/Rural
Lincoln	22204	Harrington School District	146	14.4%	0.0%	10.1%	35.5%	Small Town/Rural
Lincoln	22207	Davenport School District	529	7.7%	0.0%	6.3%	39.1%	Small Town/Rural
Mason	23042	Southside School District	269	3.3%	0.0%	11.5%	40.0%	Small Town/Rural
Mason	23054	Grapeview School District	179	7.8%	0.0%	14.0%	33.7%	Small Town/Rural
Mason	23309	Shelton School District	4,209	25.2%	4.7%	14.3%	46.5%	Small Town/Rural
Mason	23311	Mary M Knight School District	202	11.4%	0.0%	7.8%	50.0%	Small Town/Rural
Mason	23402	Pioneer School District	754	11.3%	0.0%	13.8%	53.9%	Small Town/Rural
Mason	23403	North Mason School District	2,363	13.0%	1.7%	14.3%	34.0%	Small Town/Rural
Mason	23404	Hood Canal School District	287	42.0%	0.0%	17.9%	61.8%	Small Town/Rural
Okanogan	24014	Nespelem School District	181	99.4%	0.0%	21.3%	62.9%	Small Town/Rural
Okanogan	24019	Omak School District	1,769	42.8%	3.0%	17.3%	52.9%	Small Town/Rural
Okanogan	24105	Okanogan School District	1,023	34.9%	11.4%	11.5%	49.9%	Small Town/Rural

Appendix B
Selected School District Characteristics

Okanogan	24111	Brewster School District	969	78.8%	34.1%	13.4%	66.6%	Small Town/Rural
Okanogan	24122	Pateros School District	302	42.3%	1.3%	13.3%	50.3%	Small Town/Rural
Okanogan	24350	Methow Valley School District	642	5.4%	0.9%	0.3%	37.0%	Small Town/Rural
Okanogan	24404	Tonasket School District	1,084	28.4%	7.9%	13.6%	62.3%	Small Town/Rural
Okanogan	24410	Oroville School District	707	31.9%	15.6%	9.3%	64.9%	Small Town/Rural
Pacific	25101	Ocean Beach School District	1,081	17.8%	4.2%	13.7%	65.2%	Small Town/Rural
Pacific	25116	Raymond School District	549	31.5%	8.5%	16.2%	49.5%	Small Town/Rural
Pacific	25118	South Bend School District	602	42.6%	15.9%	12.2%	58.5%	Small Town/Rural
Pacific	25155	Naselle-Grays River Valley School District	315	8.2%	4.3%	9.5%	45.4%	Small Town/Rural
Pacific	25160	Willapa Valley School District	399	9.9%	0.0%	13.1%	31.9%	Small Town/Rural
Pacific	25200	North River School District	62	16.1%	0.0%	1.6%	0.0%	Small Town/Rural
Pend								
Oreille	26056	Newport School District	1,197	5.1%	0.0%	12.5%	56.7%	Small Town/Rural
Pend								
Oreille	26059	Cusick School District	272	31.1%	0.0%	14.4%	40.0%	Small Town/Rural
Pend								
Oreille	26070	Selkirk School District	373	10.2%	0.0%	10.6%	49.5%	Small Town/Rural
Pierce	27001	Steilacoom Hist. School District	2,195	33.9%	0.0%	14.1%	18.3%	Urban Fringe
Pierce	27003	Puyallup School District	20,096	18.7%	1.4%	11.7%	22.0%	Urban Fringe
Pierce	27010	Tacoma School District	31,787	48.1%	6.5%	14.3%	52.8%	Mid-Size City/Town
Pierce	27019	Carbonado School District	186	1.6%	0.0%	2.2%	0.0%	Small Town/Rural
Pierce	27083	University Place School District	5,361	33.8%	1.4%	12.2%	27.1%	Urban Fringe
Pierce	27320	Sumner School District	8,124	13.7%	1.6%	12.3%	23.9%	Urban Fringe
Pierce	27343	Dieringer School District	1,173	8.2%	0.0%	5.7%	6.5%	Small Town/Rural
Pierce	27344	Orting School District	1,984	10.4%	1.0%	15.4%	25.1%	Urban Fringe
Pierce	27400	Clover Park School District	12,546	47.5%	7.1%	14.8%	51.8%	Urban Fringe
Pierce	27401	Peninsula School District	9,733	11.2%	0.3%	10.9%	19.5%	Urban Fringe
Pierce	27402	Franklin Pierce School District	7,862	37.5%	3.0%	9.3%	48.8%	Urban Fringe
Pierce	27403	Bethel School District	17,798	31.1%	1.0%	14.0%	30.2%	Urban Fringe
Pierce	27404	Eatonville School District	2,178	8.8%	0.5%	10.2%	28.8%	Small Town/Rural
Pierce	27416	White River School District	4,418	8.9%	0.5%	14.1%	23.4%	Urban Fringe
Pierce	27417	Fife School District	3,242	28.2%	6.8%	9.1%	31.8%	Urban Fringe
San Juan	28010	Shaw Island School District	21	4.8%	0.0%	13.0%	0.0%	Small Town/Rural
San Juan	28137	Orcas Island School District	514	5.6%	1.0%	0.0%	32.7%	Small Town/Rural
San Juan	28144	Lopez School District	265	13.1%	3.8%	14.3%	42.1%	Small Town/Rural
San Juan	28149	San Juan Island School District	965	13.8%	1.6%	10.7%	21.4%	Small Town/Rural

Appendix B
Selected School District Characteristics

Skagit	29011	Concrete School District	804	9.8%	0.0%	0.0%	48.5%	Small Town/Rural
Skagit	29100	Burlington-Edison School District	3,799	28.0%	13.6%	12.9%	36.9%	Urban Fringe
Skagit	29101	Sedro-Woolley School District	4,540	16.3%	5.0%	15.2%	41.7%	Urban Fringe
Skagit	29103	Anacortes School District	3,036	11.6%	0.7%	10.6%	25.4%	Mid-Size City/Town
Skagit	29311	LaConner School District	637	33.0%	0.0%	3.8%	34.4%	Urban Fringe
Skagit	29317	Conway School District	448	18.4%	0.2%	11.7%	19.9%	Urban Fringe
Skagit	29320	Mount Vernon School District	5,901	47.5%	25.7%	15.2%	57.1%	Mid-Size City/Town
Skamania	30002	Skamania School District	64	12.5%	0.0%	19.7%	43.9%	Small Town/Rural
Skamania	30029	Mount Pleasant School District	65	1.5%	0.0%	17.5%	27.0%	Small Town/Rural
Skamania	30031	Mill A School District	79	12.7%	0.0%	13.8%	56.3%	Small Town/Rural
Skamania	30303	Stevenson-Carson School District	1,049	12.4%	1.3%	16.2%	41.1%	Small Town/Rural
Snohomish	31002	Everett School District	17,893	25.5%	7.7%	12.3%	31.0%	Mid-Size City/Town
Snohomish	31004	Lake Stevens School District	7,616	12.4%	1.8%	12.4%	23.1%	Urban Fringe
Snohomish	31006	Mukilteo School District	14,482	33.8%	12.8%	12.0%	40.6%	Urban Fringe
Snohomish	31015	Edmonds School District	21,115	28.9%	7.8%	13.5%	26.4%	Urban Fringe
Snohomish	31016	Arlington School District	5,464	11.3%	1.7%	12.6%	25.9%	Small Town/Rural
Snohomish	31025	Marysville School District	11,617	23.5%	5.0%	14.4%	31.0%	Urban Fringe
Snohomish	31063	Index School District	30	0.0%	0.0%	7.1%	57.1%	Small Town/Rural
Snohomish	31103	Monroe School District	6,383	16.9%	4.5%	12.3%	20.3%	Urban Fringe
Snohomish	31201	Snohomish School District	9,443	10.2%	1.0%	13.3%	13.4%	Urban Fringe
Snohomish	31306	Lakewood School District	2,623	16.4%	2.2%	13.1%	23.5%	Small Town/Rural
Snohomish	31311	Sultan School District	2,230	13.0%	2.2%	15.9%	34.9%	Urban Fringe
Snohomish	31330	Darrington School District	585	9.8%	0.0%	16.2%	45.2%	Small Town/Rural
Snohomish	31332	Granite Falls School District	2,466	9.2%	0.7%	15.9%	33.1%	Urban Fringe
Snohomish	31401	Stanwood-Camano School District	5,501	8.0%	1.2%	12.8%	20.7%	Urban Fringe
Spokane	32081	Spokane School District	30,923	15.1%	3.5%	14.0%	46.7%	Mid-Size City/Town
Spokane	32123	Orchard Prairie School District	63	0.0%	0.0%	10.8%	21.5%	Small Town/Rural
Spokane	32312	Great Northern School District	43	4.7%	0.0%	11.1%	0.0%	Small Town/Rural
Spokane	32325	Nine Mile Falls School District	1,667	4.2%	0.2%	12.8%	24.0%	Urban Fringe
Spokane	32326	Medical Lake School District	2,262	14.3%	0.2%	12.3%	29.8%	Small Town/Rural
Spokane	32354	Mead School District	8,889	7.1%	0.1%	11.0%	22.5%	Urban Fringe
Spokane	32356	Central Valley School District	11,685	8.7%	1.3%	11.3%	29.3%	Urban Fringe
Spokane	32358	Freeman School District	885	6.0%	0.0%	10.4%	20.3%	Small Town/Rural
Spokane	32360	Cheney School District	3,429	13.2%	0.0%	10.0%	38.9%	Urban Fringe
Spokane	32361	East Valley School District (Spokane)	4,405	10.1%	2.2%	13.1%	42.2%	Small Town/Rural

Appendix B
Selected School District Characteristics

Spokane	32362	Liberty School District	525	6.3%	0.0%	13.6%	34.9%	Small Town/Rural
Spokane	32363	West Valley School District (Spokane)	3,708	10.9%	0.3%	12.0%	40.6%	Urban Fringe
Spokane	32414	Deer Park School District	2,214	5.6%	0.0%	11.2%	10.8%	Urban Fringe
Spokane	32416	Riverside School District	1,944	4.8%	0.0%	13.3%	44.0%	Small Town/Rural
Stevens	33030	Onion Creek School District	44	13.6%	0.0%	22.6%	75.5%	Small Town/Rural
Stevens	33036	Chewelah School District	1,181	8.3%	0.2%	12.6%	52.0%	Small Town/Rural
Stevens	33049	Wellpinit School District	466	86.3%	0.0%	5.7%	39.6%	Small Town/Rural
Stevens	33070	Valley School District	315	3.1%	0.0%	9.4%	42.2%	Small Town/Rural
Stevens	33115	Colville School District	2,129	7.9%	0.8%	13.2%	47.2%	Small Town/Rural
Stevens	33183	Loon Lake School District	158	7.0%	0.0%	18.1%	60.1%	Small Town/Rural
Stevens	33202	Summit Valley School District	96	9.4%	0.0%	11.3%	42.3%	Small Town/Rural
Stevens	33205	Evergreen School District (Stevens)	22	9.0%	0.0%	17.4%	26.1%	Small Town/Rural
Stevens	33206	Columbia (Stevens) School District	230	37.8%	0.0%	9.1%	69.1%	Small Town/Rural
Stevens	33207	Mary Walker School District	585	13.7%	0.0%	20.0%	12.4%	Small Town/Rural
Stevens	33211	Northport School District	192	12.0%	0.0%	11.8%	71.8%	Small Town/Rural
Stevens	33212	Kettle Falls School District	863	6.8%	0.0%	13.2%	48.3%	Small Town/Rural
Thurston	34002	Yelm School District	4,936	14.9%	0.8%	11.5%	39.1%	Urban Fringe
Thurston	34003	North Thurston Public Schools	13,119	33.1%	1.2%	14.1%	32.6%	Urban Fringe
Thurston	34033	Tumwater School District	6,059	11.5%	0.1%	11.6%	26.8%	Urban Fringe
Thurston	34111	Olympia School District	9,141	19.3%	1.5%	12.4%	18.9%	Mid-Size City/Town
Thurston	34307	Rainier School District	916	10.3%	0.0%	12.4%	37.2%	Small Town/Rural
Thurston	34324	Griffin School District	679	16.0%	0.0%	6.8%	13.6%	Urban Fringe
Thurston	34401	Rochester School District	2,084	19.3%	3.7%	13.6%	45.5%	Small Town/Rural
Thurston	34402	Tenino School District	1,401	9.7%	0.1%	2.4%	35.2%	Small Town/Rural
Wahkiakum	35200	Wahkiakum School District	501	7.2%	0.0%	13.7%	45.9%	Small Town/Rural
Walla Walla	36101	Dixie School District	35	100.0%	0.0%	15.4%	30.8%	Small Town/Rural
Walla Walla	36140	Walla Walla School District	6,044	33.4%	10.8%	8.8%	46.0%	Mid-Size City/Town
Walla Walla	36250	College Place School District	849	44.0%	20.7%	13.0%	54.4%	Small Town/Rural
Walla Walla	36300	Touchet School District	312	36.3%	12.3%	12.0%	51.1%	Small Town/Rural
Walla Walla	36400	Columbia (Walla Walla) School District	968	22.2%	8.9%	14.1%	37.5%	Small Town/Rural
Walla Walla	36401	Waitsburg School District	369	10.0%	0.0%	14.6%	40.7%	Small Town/Rural
Walla Walla	36402	Prescott School District	264	68.9%	34.5%	12.9%	78.4%	Small Town/Rural
Whatcom	37501	Bellingham School District	10,763	19.2%	4.8%	11.4%	30.6%	Mid-Size City/Town
Whatcom	37502	Ferndale School District	4,955	23.1%	4.8%	13.8%	37.7%	Urban Fringe
Whatcom	37503	Blaine School District	2,272	15.0%	5.6%	11.5%	22.7%	Urban Fringe

Appendix B Selected School District Characteristics

Whatcom	37504	Lynden School District	2,761	22.7%	10.3%	9.2%	33.4%	Urban Fringe
Whatcom	37505	Meridian School District	1,520	17.1%	9.8%	15.6%	38.0%	Small Town/Rural
Whatcom	37506	Nooksack School District	1,863	29.4%	9.5%	16.1%	43.7%	Small Town/Rural
Whatcom	37507	Mount Baker School District	2,395	16.3%	9.4%	14.5%	50.8%	Small Town/Rural
Whitman	38126	LaCrosse School District	147	4.8%	0.0%	7.3%	27.7%	Small Town/Rural
Whitman	38264	Lamont School District	37	5.4%	0.0%	23.7%	57.9%	Small Town/Rural
Whitman	38265	Tekoa School District	206	7.3%	0.0%	12.6%	55.0%	Small Town/Rural
Whitman	38267	Pullman School District	2,277	21.3%	1.4%	10.0%	24.8%	Small Town/Rural
Whitman	38300	Colfax School District	726	4.0%	0.0%	11.8%	22.5%	Small Town/Rural
Whitman	38301	Palouse School District	221	6.4%	0.0%	11.7%	31.6%	Small Town/Rural
Whitman	38302	Garfield School District	126	4.0%	0.0%	14.3%	41.2%	Small Town/Rural
Whitman	38304	Steptoe School District	48	0.0%	0.0%	3.3%	0.0%	Small Town/Rural
Whitman	38306	Colton School District	203	0.5%	0.0%	6.6%	11.6%	Small Town/Rural
Whitman	38308	Endicott School District	109	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	54.2%	Small Town/Rural
Whitman	38320	Rosalia School District	277	7.9%	0.0%	7.2%	43.6%	Small Town/Rural
Whitman	38322	St. John School District	166	7.2%	0.0%	0.6%	24.7%	Small Town/Rural
Whitman	38324	Oakesdale School District	130	0.0%	0.0%	7.3%	37.4%	Small Town/Rural
Yakima	39002	Union Gap School District	585	58.8%	14.0%	14.3%	67.4%	Urban Fringe
Yakima	39003	Naches Valley School District	1,566	16.3%	4.7%	10.5%	31.7%	Small Town/Rural
Yakima	39007	Yakima School District	14,290	64.3%	28.3%	12.9%	72.1%	Mid-Size City/Town
Yakima	39090	East Valley School District (Yakima)	2,551	32.6%	4.9%	12.9%	46.1%	Small Town/Rural
Yakima	39119	Selah School District	3,480	18.7%	4.1%	12.4%	35.7%	Urban Fringe
Yakima	39120	Mabton School District	907	95.3%	34.6%	10.4%	72.8%	Small Town/Rural
Yakima	39200	Grandview School District	3,251	83.0%	23.9%	12.8%	78.9%	Urban Fringe
Yakima	39201	Sunnyside School District	5,732	84.0%	22.9%	10.3%	82.4%	Urban Fringe
Yakima	39202	Toppenish School District	3,345	94.8%	54.6%	11.3%	92.9%	Urban Fringe
Yakima	39203	Highland School District	1,178	58.7%	20.7%	6.8%	65.5%	Small Town/Rural
Yakima	39204	Granger School District	1,267	92.0%	33.7%	9.6%	90.3%	Small Town/Rural
Yakima	39205	Zillah School District	1,317	40.0%	8.9%	10.7%	48.5%	Urban Fringe
Yakima	39207	Wapato School District	3,410	92.3%	29.0%	12.5%	88.9%	Urban Fringe
Yakima	39208	West Valley School District (Yakima)	4,748	20.0%	1.0%	12.0%	21.8%	Urban Fringe
Yakima	39209	Mount Adams School District	1,098	89.6%	11.7%	15.3%	79.7%	Small Town/Rural