Northwest Educational Service District 189
Together We Can

1601 R Avenue
Anacortes, WA 98221
Office Telephone: 360-299-4000
Office FAX: 360-299-4070

TO: Orcas Island School District No. 137
c/o Susan McCaull, Board Director
Janet Brownell, Community Member

FROM: Jerry Jenkins, NWESD 189 Superintendent

DATE: July 28, 2005

SUBJ: School Size, Administrative Organization, and Student Achievement Study

This summary report, and supporting documents, are being provided in response to the Orcas Island School District request for assistance researching and reviewing Administrative Structure for similarly sized districts. Specifically, following please find:

1) examination of relevant research;
2) preparation of a research summary that presents findings/conclusions drawn;
3) general analysis/comment related to the impacts of personal administrative characteristics relative to themes/structural models;
4) copies of key research papers/articles considered; and,
5) a listing of comparable sized Washington State school districts, sorted by student achievement.

Examination of Relevant Research

Following is an annotated bibliography of related research which was reviewed. These articles provide interesting perspective related to the general focus, but were not considered to be as meritorious as the *Key Research Articles* presented in a subsequent section below (with copies attached):

Achilles, Charles M. et al. "Measuring Class Size: Let Me Count the Ways." Educational Leadership 59 (2002).

Abstract**:** Pupil-teacher ratio and class size are not the same things, and using the terms interchangeably confounds how people think about class size and accomplish class-size reduction. Class size involves organizing groups of students for the delivery of instruction, whereas pupil-teacher ratio is an administrative statistic that helps to account for the distribution of resources. Research indicates that such pupil-teacher ratio interventions as the use of specialized teachers, aides, and pullout programs are essentially ineffective in improving student achievement. By contrast, a growing body of research indicates that reducing class size may lead to positive student (and teacher) outcomes. Researchers have determined that class-size reduction programs that begin in the primary grades, that last for several years, and that keep students in small classes all day every day are most effective.

Bass, Gerald. "Carrot or Sticks:" How Do Your State's Policies Impact Small School Districts?" Rural Educator 22 (Win 2001-2002).

Abstract**:** Various strategies used by state policymakers to influence small school districts are discussed. Incentives can be used to help small districts survive or encourage them to reorganize or consolidate. Disincentives, or "the stick," can withhold funding from small districts or establish impossible goals, resulting in consolidation while avoiding the appearance that policymakers mandated it.

Biddle, Bruce J. and David C. Berliner. "Small Class Size and Its Effects." Educational Leadership 59 (2002).

Abstract: With so many studies on the effects of small class size, why are there so many disagreements about these studies' results? In this condensation of a research synthesis sponsored by the Rockefeller Foundation as part of its series, In Pursuit of Better Schools: What Research Says, the authors carefully examine and evaluate the findings and limitations of early research studies and subsequent programs in Indiana, Tennessee, Wisconsin, and California. They suggest that although the results of individual studies are always limited, the evidence overwhelmingly suggests several conclusions in favor of small classes, including that small classes in the early grades generate substantial gains for students in a variety of academic disciplines, that students retain these gains in later years, and that gains are greater for students who have traditionally been disadvantaged in education. The authors explore two theories for why small classes have positive effects and suggest several conditions that have held back reform efforts despite the available evidence. They conclude that the issue is not whether small classes work but whether citizens value a quality public education for all students.

Bryant, Miles. "Rural School District Reorganization on the Great Plains". Rural Educator 23 (2002).

Abstract: Rural school district reorganization and school consolidation are put into perspective by reviewing the large population increases that fueled small-school growth in the Great Plains, 1870-1930. Since the Dust Bowl and the Great Depression, population losses, improvements in transportation and arguments advocating economies of scale and increased educational offerings have resulted in school closings.

Bryant, Miles. "Rural School District Reorganization on the Great Plains". Rural Educator 23 (2002).

Abstract: The author, in a well-documented, carefully outlined description of major changes in education, identifies the increasing role of the federal government in involving itself in areas once the purview of school districts and individual states. Curriculum reform, funding formulas and testing programs are but a few of the areas that the federal government is now entering into "partnership" with state education systems. Conley cautions about the effects of small district consolidation into larger districts as a serious threat to local community interest and participation in those schools and programs in the community's locale.

Haas, Toni (2000). Balance Due: Increasing Financial Resources for Small Rural Schools. ED447991 ERIC Clearinghouse on Rural Education and Small Schools. Charleston WV. AEL Inc.

Abstract: Haas makes the following recommendations: "Basic strategies for improving resources at small rural schools include: increasing operating funds by changing the state funding formula (Increasing the basic budget) , using existing resources more effectively, and capturing new resources."

Howley, Craig and John Eckman, eds. (1997) Sustainable Small Schools Charleston, WV: Appalachia Educational Lab.

Abstract: Identified as a handbook for communities seeking to "find resources, design school options and take action together" should find very useful. The authors are very clear to point out that consolidation with larger school districts/communities may have very serious consequences, mainly negative. Even in the face of education "reform" movement, a.k.a. federal mandates, statewide testing and changing enrollment patterns, coupled with community economic pressures, big is not better! The authors also identify cooperative ventures with other districts as a cost-saving endeavor; suggest the "Foxfire" approach to curriculum reform and numerous other options that a small school district may adopt if financial issues are rising.

Johnson, Jean "A Public Agenda Survey / Do Communities Want Small Schools?" Educational Leadership 59 (2002).

Abstract: Although they tend to associate smaller schools with small class sizes, a strong sense of community, teachers who take a personal interest in students, low dropout rates, and high parental involvement, few parents or teachers have given the idea of reducing school size much serious consideration. In a survey of parents and teachers of high school students conducted by Public Agenda, respondents suggested that other issues—specifically; small class size, stronger discipline, and even improved teacher pay—are more critical. The research also indicates that proposals to break up large high schools could prompt considerable local debate. School and district leaders intent on reducing school sizes should actively engage the community in the process and ensure stakeholders that reducing school size won't inadvertently swell class sizes.

Lambert, L. (2002). The Constructivist Leader. 2nd ed. New York, NY: Teachers College Pr, Columbia University.

Abstract: In a multi-authored compendium of learning theories and educational leadership theories, prevalent thought and "best practices", dating back to Jefferson and Mann, are outlined. Years and names of important leaders of education theory are delineated that ultimately lead to the authors' conclusions that it is time for an educational leader style that outshines all others and is critical for our time. These same authors defined constructivist theory in 1995. In 2002, they have honed their arguments. "Constructivist Leadership addresses the need for sense-making, for coherence and for seeing educational communities as growth-producing entities". School districts involved in

significant change, i.e. new administration, may do well to assess a candidate's knowledge and opinions on leadership in the style of constructivism.

Leithwood, Kenneth, ed. (1995) Effective School District leadership: Transforming Politics Into Education. Albany, NY: State University Press.

Abstract: Both Canadian and U.S. researchers have contributed to this excellent review of research on recent events in the transformation of roles for school district superintendents throughout America and their counterparts in Canada. The subtitle of this monograph sums things up exceedingly well. "Political matters are the most frequently identified sources of constraints on what superintendents do," writes the editor himself in his opening introduction. Succeeding chapters include research reports, some empirical, from some thirteen school district heads, all giving evidence of their successful navigating through varying storms and heady accomplishments. Leithwood, himself, decries the role of "micro-manager' or other bureaucratic roles that some superintendents (not the thirteen mentioned above) have adopted as they have cowered under the demands from federal and state agencies.

McGoogan, Gail "The Bear Den: An Elementary Teaching Team" Educational Leadership 59 (2002).

Abstract: Growing enrollments, limited funding, and the necessity of using existing buildings often make it difficult or even impossible for school districts to create and maintain small schools. Yet educators recognize that smaller learning units can provide the continuity and sense of community that larger schools may lack. The author of this article describes how the benefits of the small school setting were achieved by a vertical teaching team encompassing grades 1 through 5. Challenges included getting administrative approval, setting up a workable space, determining curriculum content, and coordinating instruction across the grades. Functioning as a school-within-a school, the vertical teaching team enables the author and her colleagues to provide a more coherent curriculum, smooth transitions from grade to grade, and flexible grouping to meet students' individual needs. The results have been positive in terms of both student attitudes and student achievement.

Nathan, Joe "Small Schools: The Benefits of Sharing" Educational Leadership 59 (2002).

Abstract: Throughout the United States, educators, parents, and community groups are creating small schools and sharing facilities. The results of these innovative schools and collaborations are encouraging: improved student achievement, higher graduation rates, and better faculty morale. The author summarizes the research on small schools and then provides examples of small schools that have had significant success, including the El Puente Academy for Peace and Justice in New York City, a suburban schools-within-a-school at South Grand Prairie High School near Dallas, and the Minnesota New Country School, a rural cooperative school in Minnesota. The author argues that these innovations are desirable, cost-effective, and doable.

Noguera, Pedro A. "Beyond Size: The Challenge of High School Reform" Educational Leadership 59 (2002).

Abstract: Public high schools present the greatest challenge for school reform. Reducing the size of a high school is a necessary but insufficient step toward improving school quality. Beyond size, all schools must have a clear mission that teachers, students, and parents understand and find meaningful; empowered educators who can bring a sense of passion to creating new schools; clear criteria for accountability; and the determination to provide a high-quality education to all students.

Patterson, J. (2000). The Anguish of Leadership. Arlington, VA: American Assn of School Administrators.

Abstract: In his forward to this very short (72pp) monograph, Paul Houston, Executive Director of the Assn. of School Administrators, recounts Patterson's great service to the study of educational leadership with his profiles of 14 superintendents included in the book. These superintendents' stories "do not insulate others from the challenges of the job, but they do offer an invaluable view from the inside . . ." and could help superintendent search committees in their work to find the best candidate for their school district.

Raywid, Mary Anne "The Policy Environments of Small Schools and Schools-Within-Schools" Educational Leadership 59 (2002).

Abstract: School downsizing has become a growing movement, not only in large cities but also in other types of communities across the nation. In this article, author Mary Anne Raywid describes the ways that current education policies and structures act as barriers to school downsizing. Raywid describes seven models of school downsizing that have been implemented in schools and districts, varying from a superintendent's district wide mandate to a grassroots initiative created by parents and teachers in one school. She discusses why school districts must meet the challenges of school downsizing by creating new and different policies to govern new schools instead of dealing with conflicts by creating waivers and exceptions to existing policy

Schwahn, C. and Spady, W.G. (1998) Total leaders: Applying The Best Future-Focused Change Strategies To Education. Arlington, VA: American Assn. of School Administrators.

Abstract: Another very readable monograph that challenges the reader of it to dismiss any thoughts that perhaps one had "complete" knowledge of leadership theories, especially educational leadership theories. Schwahn and Spady have constructed a "strategic design" process that could serve to reconfirm or reconsider particular policies or practices that a school district, large or small, has in its administrative teamwork.

"Small Works"- the Series Summary. Rural Policy Matters Apr. 2004

Abstract: A key conclusion of the small schools/small districts review by the research reports included in this issue: "States should not consolidate districts thinking there will be no harm to achievement as long as they keep smaller schools. Smaller schools will not perform as well in larger districts as they do in smaller districts."

Toch, T. (2003). High Schools On A Human Scale. Boston, MA: Beacon Press.

Abstract: Once again a subtitle for this short book is "How small schools can transform American education" speaks loudly for the avoidance of school administrators to think, "big is better". Thomas Vander Ark, Director of education programs at the Bill and Melinda Gates Foundation praises Toch for his insightful chronicle of large high schools that no longer work. Toch presents a well-documented description of redesigned or brand new small high schools. Much of the rationale used in developing these schools can be considered by small school districts. Districts reviewing all their school plans, policies and practices, especially if they are currently searching for new educational leaders for their community, should find this monograph to be helpful.

Vander Ark, Tom. "The Case for Small High Schools" Educational Leadership 59 (2002).

Abstract: High schools have lagged behind in education reform efforts, and too many students—particularly students of color—are suffering the consequences, as indicated by low achievement levels and high dropout rates. The large size of many high schools appears to be a critical factor, and a growing number of educators are designing small schools as a remedy. Researchers have linked small high schools with positive effects in student achievement, safety, student involvement, cost-effectiveness, and professional community. Examples in urban and rural areas support their findings. Smallness doesn't ensure success, however. Good small schools display strong leadership at all levels, and they need autonomy to deal with curriculum, budget, and staffing. With the necessary elements in place, small schools provide a personalized learning environment that can help all students achieve.

Wasley, Patricia A. "Small Classes, Small Schools: The Time Is Now" Educational Leadership 59 (2002).

Abstract: Several factors have led to the resurgence of class size and school size issues, including the standards movement, the belief that all students can learn, and the desire to create schools and classrooms in which students are known well by caring adults. In fact, large schools are a fairly recent phenomenon in U.S. education. Research seems to indicate that small classes and schools promote learning for all students. The author's own experience has convinced her that smaller, more personal learning communities enable teachers to individualize the learning experience for students.

Research Summary with Findings/Conclusions

The research may largely be categorized among several related themes:

Consolidation— Historically consolidation of one-room school houses and smaller districts has been advocated for two purposes: 1) to increase cost effectiveness, and/or 2) to expand curricular offerings. Consolidation efforts are almost always resisted by the local communities. State and federal governments have traditionally "encouraged" consolidation through financial incentives, reduction of funding, and/or legislative action. Where consolidation has been successful (as measured by reduced costs without a loss of student achievement), meaningful staff and community participation established "buy-in" and support. Consolidation has never been shown to increase student achievement.

Diminishing Resources Coupled With Higher Expectations—There is no reason to believe that the decade-long trend of declining public school funding will change in the foreseeable future. In addition, while resources have decreased, reform initiatives (e.g., *Washington Education Reform Act*, the federal *Leave No Child Behind*) have substantially increased expectations. Small rural school districts face more significant challenges, as research suggests achievement scores can swing dramatically in rural schools where the testing sample can be small.

In Washington State the administrative funding formula generates partial support for four certificated administrators per 1000 student FTE. The allocation per administrator is based upon the average administrative salary paid administrators when the schedule was established in the 1970s. In the Orcas Island School District the 2004/05 student enrollment would appear to generate partial support for 2.343 FTE certificated administrators, at an average salary of $ 49,319 (totaling $115,554.42). This includes some enhancement for vocational programs and small school factor. However, a few years ago the legislature reduced administrative funding by 10%; most districts absorbed this reduction by reducing the number of administrators (rather than reducing anyone's salary). When this approach is applied in Orcas Island, the resultant administrative staffing level becomes 2.109 FTE certificated administrators, at an average salary of $49,319 (totaling $103,998.98). Orcas Island's current administrative staffing is well above 2.109 FTE and at an average salary considerably more than $49,319 (which is less than a teacher can make in fewer days).

It should be noted that Washington State does not require its superintendents to hold certification; with a few districts employing non-certificated superintendents. However, the funding formula assumes the superintendent will be certificated. As such, the superintendent FTE is generally deducted from the FTE allocation regardless of whether he/she is certificated.

Multidistrict Cooperatives— Joint rural (multi-district) projects/services are best sustained when developed by a collaborative group. Critical elements of the process include: 1) community readiness; 2) broad-based membership; 3) shared leadership structures that support group initiatives; 4) established shared decision making processes; 5) outside facilitation if the cooperative concept is new or a lack of trust exists; 6) clear communication to permit unfiltered conflict around key issues; and, 7) starting small, while being creative.

Board-Superintendent Relationships— Effective school districts enjoy effective board/ superintendent leadership teams. Specifically, the superintendent must: 1) work with the board as a "governance team;" 2) serve as an advisor to the board; 3) value, advocate, and support public education; 4) promote the success of all students; 5) develop effective organizational structures; 6) select all personnel; 7) respect and recognize different perspectives; 8) support/engage in lifelong learning; 9) understand ultimate authority rests with the board; 10) communicate openly with trust and integrity; and, 11) prepare/review board meeting agendas with board president.

Sharing a superintendent across two districts can divert energies from student learning. When a superintendent is expected to work with multiple boards, excessive time preparing for and participating in multiple board meetings can result. Time that should be focused on improving the achievement of children is spent preparing for the multi-board meetings and follow-up on board decisions, often quite similar in each district.

Superintendent Tenure/Selection— The average tenure of a public school district superintendent is 3.4 years. In general, board presidents report a preference for recommended practices (e.g., using a search consultant) when selecting a superintendent. However, the opposite was true for rural districts, where the board presidents showed a clear preference for traditional practices (conducting the search independently). In a supermajority of cases (64.6%) school boards selected a superintendent from outside of the district.

Size and Student Achievement— Significant research supports the establishment and development of small schools. However, size is not a panacea: small schools exist with poor student achievement. Seven factors of small schools have been positively linked to student achievement: 1) relationships between students and adults are strong and ongoing; 2) relationships with parents are strong and ongoing; 3) the school's organization is flat, with shared leadership; 4) small schools do not try to be comprehensive; 5) professional development is ongoing, embedded, and specific; 6) the school develops its own culture; and, 7) the community is engaged in educating students. Equally significant are the barriers present in small schools with lesser student achievement; small schools trying to act like big schools in program offerings, and decision makers focusing on short-term goals.

Facilities Planning and Efficiency— Thirteen factors exist for reducing the cost of providing small schools, where exceptional student achievement can occur: 1) don't build unless necessary; 2) maintaining what exists; 3) renovation; 4) challenge the need; 5) plan with community; 6) conserve energy; 7) challenge price; 8) share with community; 9) maximize facility use; 10) use local labor, 11) understand codes; 12) work with professionals; and, 13) seek federal/grant funding.

Analysis/Comment Re: Personal Administrative Characteristics and Structural Models

This research is consistent with my personal observations over the past 27 years as a Washington State public educator. Based upon the research and personal observation, the following conclusions are presented:

1) Consolidation— Consolidation of the Orcas Island School District with a neighboring district is highly unlikely and there is no evidence that such an approach would positively impact student achievement. In addition to the traditional challenges identified in the research, Washington State statute (RCW 28A.315, WAC 180-24) and case law generally provide that consolidation cannot occur unless both districts agree to the consolidation. An exception exists for districts with a student enrollment that drops below five FTE or if a district fails to offer the required basic education program. While it may be possible to persuade the communities of two districts that consolidation would provide a positive cost-savings, the research indicates the process typically results in contentious community division—that takes resources (time and money) away from student learning priorities.

2) Sharing Services— Multi-district sharing of, or contracting with the NWESD 189 for, certain services may result in a savings for the participating districts, depending upon the readiness (skills and willingness) of the staff involved. Potential examples might include: a) fiscal services; b) district-level administrative functions such as special programs, vocational programs, superintendent; and/or c) district publications/PR. Key prerequisites for success would be the meaningful involvement of the participants in any transition process and consideration/planning around staff transitions/retirements (so such transition discussions/planning are not person-specific).

3) Administrative Staffing Levels— Student programs have been affected by the level of administrative staffing in excess of that funded by the state formula (2.109 FTE). If the District were to reorganize its administrative structure such that it staffed with two certificated administrators, costs would be reduced—but, still exceed the state allocation (which is an expected and necessary practice, as the District must pay competitive salaries to attract and keep these highly demanded individuals). However, a reduction to two certificated administrators would require significant organizational revisions/consideration.

4) Typical Administrative Groupings— Small school districts must generally provide the same administrative functions as larger districts. Hence, fewer administrators require more diverse responsibilities with less specialization. The research is clear in that there is no one preferred district organizational structure. Rather, typically the distribution of responsibilities are matched to the skills/experiences of the individuals involved. However, some combinations appear more frequently (any of which have advantages and disadvantages) and might be worthy of consideration in Orcas Island. Following is a listing of these more common structures, based upon the target of reducing to two certificated administrators:

   A) *Part-time Supt & Reduced Principal FTE*. This is usually accomplished by either sharing a superintendent across multiple districts/boards, a retired administrator who only desires to work part-time, or a local person with the prerequisite business skills to oversee the business functions (assuming strong instructional/curricular leadership can be provided by the other administrator). This approach would also require reducing the principal FTE. For example, if the superintendent was a .5 FTE the total between the principals would need to be 1.5 FTE. Depending upon the staff available, this might be accomplished by considering a split assignment between a principal and some specialist position (e.g., librarian, school psychologist, PE specialist, kindergarten teacher).

   B) *Supt-Principal & Reduced Principal FTE w/Increased Responsibilities*. This usually occurs in combination with another administrator that complements the skills/experiences of the superintendent/principal. For example, a superintendent with a strong business background might oversee fiscal/personnel/operations and the principalship for one building, with another administrator overseeing district instructional program (e.g., curriculum, assessment, staff development) leadership and the principalship for the other building. Or a superintendent with a strong instructional background might take the district instructional program and the principalship for one building, with another administrator taking fiscal/personnel/operations and the principalship for the second building. Very often in addition to these distributions there are supplemental contracts to provide additional support (e.g., to the NWESD 189 for special education technical assistance, as appropriate).

   C) *Full-time Supt & Reduced Principal FTE*. In order for this option to provide any relief in administrative staffing levels in Orcas Island, it would have to be coupled with a combined principal who serves both schools. The superintendent would be responsible for all other administrative responsibilities (e.g., fiscal, personnel, operations, curriculum, assessment, staff development). Again, very often in addition to these responsibilities there are supplemental contracts to provide additional support (e.g., to the NWESD 189 for special education technical assistance, as appropriate).

5) Supplemental Administrative Staffing/Support— Regardless of which certificated administrative staffing structure is deemed to be the most appropriate, some additional classified support will be necessary. In virtually every situation, the prudent course of action has been to determine the desired certificated administrative organization and then to identify the complimentary classified staff that would be appropriate. In this

sized district the administrators must perform many hands-on functions, thereby reducing the level of additional support which might typically be expected in a school district.

6) Individual Strength Analysis/Considerations— Again, the research is clear in that: a) there is no one preferred district organizational structure; b) typically the distribution of responsibilities is matched to the skills/experiences of the individuals involved; and, c) taking the time to meaningfully involve those who would be impacted in the potential changes is prerequisite to buy-in and successful reorganization. As such, it would be prudent for the District to look forward over the next 2-3 years to identify anticipated administrative changes (e.g., any retirements that would permit open position-focused discussions without being affected by concern for the person in the position). Such changes might appropriately influence the targeted reorganization.

7) Short-Term vs. Long-Term Considerations— Unfortunately too often one method for dealing with declining resources is to defer facility maintenance and operations costs. The research is clear that such an approach actually ends up costing more through increased future facility renovation and replacement costs. The District is encouraged to review current situation maintenance and grounds staffing levels to determine whether this is a factor which should be considered in an administrative staffing reorganization and the resultant fiscal savings.

Key Research Articles Considered

Attached please find a collection of the following key research articles:

Bass, Gerald R. *Carrots or Sticks: How Do Your State's Policies Impact Small School Districts?* Rural Educator, Volume 22, Number 2, Winter, 2001.

Belsie, Laurent. *Rural schools at a disadvantage in the current education-reform climate.* Christian Science Monitor, February, 2003.

Boethel, Martha. *Making the Collaboration Process Work (Benefits)(Squared): The Exponential Results of Linking School Improvement and Community Development.* Southwest Educational Development Library, Issue Number 6, 2000.

Bryant, Miles. *Rural School District Reorganization on the Great Plains.* Rural Educator, Volume 23, Number 3, Spring, 2002.

Goodman, Richard H. and Zimmerman, William G. Jr. *Improved Leadership for Improved Achievement.* New England School Development Council, January, 2003.

Johnson, Steven and Howley, Aimee. *Superintendent Selection: Variation Based on District Size and Rurality.* Rural Educator, Volume 23, Number 2, Winter, 2001.

Lawrence, Barbara Kent. *Lowering the Overhead by Raising the Roof . . . and Other Rural Trust Strategies To Reduce the Costs of Your Small School.* Rural School and Community Trust, 2002.

Lawrence, Barbara Kent. *Back to the Agora: Workable Solutions for Small Urban School Facilities.* ERIC Digest, September, 2003.

Wasley, Patricia A. and Lear, Richard J. *Small Schools, Real Gains.* Educational Leadership, March, 2001.

Similarly Sized Washington State School Districts

This information was previously provided as an attachment to a May 4, 2005 email. A total of 41 districts (20 larger, and 20 smaller, FTE ranging from 281 to 667, with Orcas Island at 499 FTE) were identified:

Washington State School Districts Larger and Smaller than Orcas Island, Sorted by FTE		
	District	**FTE**
1	Pateros	281.15
2	Touchet	296.21
3	Pe Ell	312.81
4	Hood Canal	334.67
5	Waterville	342.07
6	Ritzville	357.22
7	Entiat	360.29
8	Waitsburg	368.99
9	Selkirk	369.00
10	Lyle	388.57
11	Pomeroy	392.10
12	Conway	397.45
13	Willapa Valley	410.19
14	Morton	457.01
15	Naselle-Grays River	471.19
16	Republic	471.54
17	Cape Flattery	476.59
18	Wahkiakum	486.24
19	Wellpinit	496.85
20	Davenport	497.32
	Orcas Island	**499.23**
20	Liberty	513.68
19	Soap Lake	520.12
18	Adna	539.65
17	Raymond	541.02
16	Kittitas	542.79
15	Darrington	555.87
14	South Bend	564.71
13	Union Gap	565.22
12	Mary Walker	568.21
11	Asotin	581.09
10	Dayton	587.58
9	Manson	603.54
8	White Pass	603.79
7	Mossyrock	604.07
6	Bridgeport	615.77
5	La Conner	616.02
4	Toutle Lake	617.31
3	Methow Valley	623.87
2	Reardan	643.88
1	Griffin	667.46

Identified school districts, sorted by 4th grade 2004 Washington Assessment of Student Learning (WASL) results:

Math	
District Name	**% Met Standard**
Entiat	20.8
Mossyrock	26.3
Darrington	35.0
Raymond	35.9
Lyle	36.7
Touchet	36.8
White Pass	43.2
Toutle Lake	43.5
Morton	44.4
Wahkiakum	44.8
Liberty	45.0
Mary Walker	45.5
Republic	48.3
Cape Flattery	50.0
Hood Canal	50.0
South Bend	51.1
La Conner	51.6
Manson	53.6
Adna	54.3
Bridgeport	56.4
Conway	56.8
Willapa Valley	57.1
Pe Ell	58.3
Selkirk	58.3
Union Gap	59.5
Griffin	59.7
Waterville	65.0
Pomeroy	65.2
Naselle-Grays River Valley	65.5
Methow Valley	65.6
Dayton	68.8
Ritzville	73.1
Reardan-Edwall	74.1
Wellpinit	74.2
Waitsburg	76.0
Kittitas	76.9
Soap Lake	77.8
Orcas Island	**78.3**
Asotin-Anatone	78.8
Davenport	85.7
Pateros	91.7

Reading	
District Name	**% Met Standard**
Entiat	37.5
Darrington	42.5
Lyle	44.8
Liberty	47.5
Bridgeport	51.3
La Conner	51.6
Republic	51.7
Mossyrock	55.3
Soap Lake	55.6
Willapa Valley	61.9
White Pass	62.2
Pe Ell	62.5
Selkirk	62.5
Raymond	63.2
Mary Walker	63.6
Cape Flattery	64.7
Dayton	68.8
Manson	69.6
Conway	70.5
Wellpinit	71.0
South Bend	71.1
Griffin	71.4
Adna	71.7
Toutle Lake	71.7
Methow Valley	71.9
Morton	72.2
Wahkiakum	72.4
Waterville	75.0
Naselle-Grays River Valley	75.9
Reardan-Edwall	75.9
Davenport	78.6
Hood Canal	83.3
Union Gap	83.8
Waitsburg	84.0
Touchet	84.2
Ritzville	84.6
Pomeroy	87.0
Asotin-Anatone	90.2
Pateros	91.7
Kittitas	92.3
Orcas Island	**95.7**

Writing	
District Name	**% Met Standard**
Pe Ell	8.3
Soap Lake	11.1
Mossyrock	15.8
Morton	22.2
Entiat	28.0
Willapa Valley	28.6
Republic	31.0
Liberty	40.0
Mary Walker	40.9
Cape Flattery	41.2
Pateros	41.7
White Pass	43.2
Waitsburg	44.0
Naselle-Grays River Valley	44.8
Dayton	45.8
Selkirk	45.8
Bridgeport	46.2
Kittitas	46.2
Manson	46.4
Griffin	50.6
Toutle Lake	52.2
Raymond	52.6
Ritzville	53.8
Lyle	55.2
Methow Valley	56.3
Conway	56.8
Davenport	57.1
Darrington	57.5
Touchet	57.9
Adna	58.7
La Conner	61.3
South Bend	64.4
Hood Canal	66.7
Wahkiakum	69.0
Reardan-Edwall	70.4
Asotin-Anatone	73.1
Wellpinit	74.2
Waterville	75.0
Pomeroy	78.3
Union Gap	79.7
Orcas Island	**82.6**

Identified school districts, sorted by 7th grade 2004 Washington Assessment of Student Learning (WASL) results:

Math	
District Name	**% Met Standard**
Oakville	7.1
Bridgeport	14.1
Mary Walker	19.6
Mccleary	24.2
Manson	24.4
White Pass	24.6
Davenport	26.7
Hood Canal	27.5
Pateros	27.8
Cape Flattery	28.6
Morton	28.6
Wellpinit	30.0
Touchet	30.8
La Conner	31.9
Toutle Lake	32.1
Soap Lake	33.3
Waitsburg	34.2
Union Gap	35.0
South Bend	36.7
Raymond	37.2
Kittitas	37.3
Willapa Valley	37.5
Dayton	38.2
Reardan-Edwall	39.7
Adna	41.2
Wahkiakum	41.5
Darrington	42.1
Cusick	43.8
Lyle	44.4
Republic	45.2
Selkirk	46.7
Mossyrock	46.8
Liberty	47.6
Quilcene	48.1
Methow Valley	49.0
Pe Ell	50.0
Ritzville	50.0
Waterville	50.0
Entiat	51.5
Naselle-Grays River Valley	51.7
Pomeroy	52.9
Asotin-Anatone	53.8
Odessa	57.1
Griffin	58.1
Orcas Island	**64.1**

Reading	
District Name	**% Met Standard**
Oakville	14.3
Wellpinit	30.0
Darrington	34.3
Bridgeport	35.4
South Bend	36.7
Mary Walker	37.3
Morton	38.1
Touchet	38.5
Soap Lake	42.4
Lyle	44.4
Manson	44.4
Hood Canal	45.0
Toutle Lake	46.4
La Conner	46.8
Mccleary	48.5
White Pass	49.1
Cusick	50.0
Kittitas	51.0
Raymond	51.2
Republic	51.6
Methow Valley	53.1
Cape Flattery	54.8
Waitsburg	55.3
Davenport	56.7
Liberty	57.1
Odessa	57.1
Wahkiakum	58.5
Reardan-Edwall	58.6
Adna	58.8
Pomeroy	58.8
Union Gap	60.0
Entiat	60.6
Mossyrock	61.7
Dayton	61.8
Naselle-Grays River Valley	62.1
Ritzville	64.3
Orcas Island	**66.7**
Asotin-Anatone	69.2
Pateros	72.2
Selkirk	73.3
Waterville	75.0
Willapa Valley	78.1
Griffin	78.5
Pe Ell	83.3
Quilcene	85.2

Writing	
District Name	**% Met Standard**
Oakville	7.1
Lyle	19.4
White Pass	21.1
Mary Walker	27.5
Bridgeport	28.1
Darrington	28.6
South Bend	28.6
Morton	31.0
Soap Lake	33.3
Willapa Valley	34.4
Republic	35.5
Hood Canal	37.5
Toutle Lake	37.5
Asotin-Anatone	42.3
Touchet	42.3
Selkirk	43.3
Adna	44.1
Wahkiakum	46.3
Davenport	46.7
Manson	46.7
Cusick	46.9
Dayton	47.3
Union Gap	48.3
Methow Valley	49.0
Pomeroy	50.0
Waitsburg	50.0
Wellpinit	50.0
Raymond	55.8
Reardan-Edwall	56.9
Liberty	57.1
La Conner	57.4
Mossyrock	57.4
Entiat	57.6
Cape Flattery	59.5
Mccleary	60.6
Ritzville	60.7
Griffin	62.4
Quilcene	63.0
Odessa	64.3
Naselle-Grays River Valley	65.5
Kittitas	66.7
Pateros	66.7
Orcas Island	**69.2**
Waterville	75.0
Conway	77.6

Identified school districts, sorted by 10th grade 2004 Washington Assessment of Student Learning (WASL) results:

Math	
District Name	**% Met Standard**
Wellpinit	6.4
Lyle	12.5
Waitsburg	12.5
Entiat	19.2
Quilcene	19.4
Cape Flattery	22.0
Ritzville	25.0
White Pass	26.9
Cusick	28.0
Morton	28.3
Bridgeport	29.7
Soap Lake	30.6
Toutle Lake	31.5
Manson	32.4
Waterville	32.5
Liberty	33.3
Naselle-Grays River Valley	34.6
South Bend	34.8
Touchet	34.8
Davenport	35.3
Pomeroy	36.6
Asotin-Anatone	37.5
Adna	39.0
Selkirk	39.3
Darrington	39.6
Willapa Valley	41.2
Republic	41.5
Oakville	41.7
Raymond	42.6
Mary Walker	43.8
Pateros	44.4
Reardan-Edwall	44.4
Kittitas	45.2
Pe Ell	50.0
Dayton	52.3
Mossyrock	54.4
Wahkiakum	58.3
Methow Valley	62.3
Odessa	64.0
La Conner	68.3
Orcas Island	**71.9**

Reading	
District Name	**% Met Standard**
Wellpinit	21.8
Lyle	40.6
Waitsburg	40.6
Cape Flattery	43.9
Toutle Lake	44.4
Naselle-Grays River Valley	50.0
Willapa Valley	51.0
Darrington	51.9
South Bend	52.2
Quilcene	52.8
Entiat	53.8
Bridgeport	54.1
Oakville	54.2
Waterville	55.0
Davenport	55.9
Morton	56.7
Kittitas	57.1
Liberty	58.3
Mary Walker	59.4
Cusick	60.0
Ritzville	60.7
Touchet	60.9
Soap Lake	61.1
White Pass	61.5
Republic	61.8
Manson	62.2
Pomeroy	63.4
Dayton	64.4
Raymond	66.0
Adna	70.7
Reardan-Edwall	71.1
Methow Valley	71.7
Asotin-Anatone	71.8
Pe Ell	72.2
Mossyrock	73.7
Pateros	74.1
La Conner	80.5
Wahkiakum	81.3
Orcas Island	**86.0**
Selkirk	92.9
Odessa	96.0

Writing	
District Name	**% Met Standard**
Wellpinit	30.8
Entiat	42.3
Cape Flattery	43.9
Davenport	44.1
White Pass	46.2
Liberty	47.9
Toutle Lake	48.1
Bridgeport	48.6
Oakville	50.0
Quilcene	50.0
Waitsburg	53.1
Lyle	56.3
Morton	56.7
Darrington	57.4
Soap Lake	58.3
Cusick	60.0
Dayton	60.0
South Bend	60.9
Republic	61.1
Mary Walker	62.5
Naselle-Grays River Valley	65.4
Kittitas	66.7
Pe Ell	66.7
Methow Valley	68.3
Willapa Valley	68.6
Raymond	70.2
Ritzville	71.4
Adna	72.5
Waterville	72.5
Touchet	73.9
Asotin-Anatone	75.0
Mossyrock	77.2
Pomeroy	78.0
Manson	78.4
Selkirk	78.6
Orcas Island	**84.2**
Pateros	85.2
Reardan-Edwall	86.4
Wahkiakum	89.6
La Conner	90.2
Odessa	96.0