

**MINUTES**  
**November 19-20, 2008**  
**Vancouver, WA**

**MEMBERS PRESENT:** Lori Blanchard      Keith Hunziker      Ann Pulkkinen  
June Canty      Myra Johnson      Cindy Roaf  
Jim DePaepe      Roshni Jokhi      Stephen Rushing  
Roger Erskine      Shannon Lawson      Jill Van Glubt  
Ted Howard II      Dora Noble      Joyce Westgard (15)

**MEMBERS ABSENT:** Terry Bergeson (unrepresented), Gary Cohn, Grant Pelesky (3)

**STAFF PRESENT:** Esther Baker, Pamela Cook, Joe Koski, Mea Moore,  
Jennifer Wallace (5)

**CALL TO ORDER**

Chair Van Glubt called the meeting to order at 9:00 A.M.

**ANNOUNCEMENTS**

- Chair Van Glubt introduced three new Board members:
  - Cindy Roaf, a paraeducator at Olympic Middle School in the Shelton School District. Ms. Roaf has been appointed to the position designated for a classified instructional staff member.
  - James DePaepe, a Professor with the College of Education at Central Washington University. Mr. DePaepe has been appointed to one of the two positions designated for a representative from an educator preparation program at a public higher education institution.
  - Roshni Jokhi, a National Board certified teacher at Sedro Woolley High School in Skagit County. Ms. Jokhi has been appointed to one of the positions designated for a public school teacher.
- Chair Van Glubt reminded the Board that the green laminated sheets guide the process related to discussion and action on TAB items.
- The evaluation forms continue to provide useful information.

**MOTION** was made by Roger Erskine and seconded by June Canty to accept the consent agenda.

**MOTION** carried.

**TAB 4**

**SUMMARY OF ANNUAL REPORTS FROM THE PROFESSIONAL EDUCATION ADVISORY BOARDS (PEABs) OF EACH APPROVED EDUCATOR PREPARATION PROGRAM**

Larry Lashway, Program Specialist, Professional Education and Certification, OSPI

A Goal 1 committee was established to help ensure PESB Goal 1 is achieved. This goal is related to ensuring that policy makers and the public have access to clear and comprehensive information on educator preparation program quality. In the meantime, the PESB requested an interim step relating to the annual reports submitted by each PEAB at each approved preparation program. These are typically submitted separately and don't stand alone as particularly meaningful. The staff of the Professional Education and Certification (PEC) office at OSPI agreed instead to provide a summary of these reports and to highlight in particular any trends in PEAB focus this past year.

Mr. Lashway highlighted the key points of the 2008 PEAB Report, including membership and attendance, operating costs, enrollment and completers and recommendations.

## **DISCUSSION**

Members discussed the following issues related to the report:

- A comparison of recommendations and how institutions responded to the PEAB
- Aligning the enrollment period with the academic school year
- PEAB involvement after a site visit takes place at an institution
- Formal tracking of the process of unmet and recommendations from site visits
- Expenses of non-voting members
- Flexibility for the Board to ask questions of a PEAB or institution
- More budget information related to the number of members on a PEAB and the number of educators produced from a particular institution

Members expressed appreciation to PEC staff and felt the PEAB training was great. The valuable contribution PEABs provide to institutions was discussed.

## **TAB 5**

### **THE EDUCATIONAL BENCHMARK INCORPORATED (EBI) REPORT ON SURVEY OF TEACHER PREPARATION PROGRAM COMPLETERS; PROGRESS ON DEVELOPMENT OF A NEW SURVEY INSTRUMENT**

Coleen Putaansuu, Program Specialist, Professional Education and Certification, OSPI  
Corrine McGuigan, Assistant Superintendent, Professional Education and Certification, OSPI

Related to PESB Goal 1, better data to how beginning teachers perform once they're in the classroom is needed for both program improvement and accountability. The current instrument used to gather this information is limited and provides for low return rates.

Ms. Putaansuu provided information on the 2008 survey results. Her presentation focused on the following 3 areas:

- 2008 survey results
- The return rate and how to improve them
- The development of a new beginning teacher survey

## **DISCUSSION**

Members discussed the timeline for using the new survey and the issues around not having a contractor in place to perform the surveys. The results from the survey are critical and deciphering and analyzing the data is difficult for institutions. The issue of incentives was discussed as well as a survey for educational staff associates and principals.

## TAB 6

### FINAL DRAFT REPORT AND RECOMMENDATIONS FROM ENGLISH LANGUAGE LEARNERS (ELL) WORK GROUP

Mea Moore, Coordinator of Educator Programs & Standards, PESB

The ELL Work Group was formed in response to Senate Bill 6673 which directed the PESB to develop recommendations for the Governor and education and higher education committees of the legislature regarding pre-service and in-service training for teachers to address the needs of English language learners in Washington State public schools.

Ms. Moore introduced representatives from the English Language Learner (ELL) Work Group:

Carol Maloney, ELL Teacher, Battleground School District  
Elizabeth Autio, Northwest Regional Educational Lab (NWREL)  
Naomi Elliott, ELL Teacher, Auburn School District – not present  
Michael Coe, Northwest Regional Educational Lab  
Bruce Hawkins, Superintendent ESD 123  
Craig A. Hughes, Central Washington University (via phone)

Ms. Moore discussed the process used to collect stakeholder information. Ms. Autio provided information NWREL collected related to what teachers should know in order to work effectively with English language learners. Mr. Hughes discussed the ELL work group survey results and findings as well as recommendations. Ms. Maloney discussed the intervention strategies districts have utilized to support ELL student academic success. Mr. Hawkins discussed incentives needed to support professional development and continuing education opportunities for teachers to work effectively with ELL students in school districts.

### DISCUSSION

Members discussed the correlation between the recommendations in the report and the ELL competencies. Panelists responded that the recommendations are imbedded in the competencies. If the recommendations were supported and implemented, success would be measured by the fact that students at each grade level would meet academic standards. Qualified faculty is necessary to work with ELL students and the importance of training teachers to work effectively with a skilled interpreter was discussed. Members expressed that there is a need to keep in mind the challenges associated with implementation of the recommendations at both the higher education and K-12 levels.

### PUBLIC COMMENT

#### **Dennis Sterner, Dean School of Education, Whitworth University**

Mr. Sterner expressed appreciation for the work of the ELL committee and offered his support. He discussed the English as a Second Language endorsement program at Whitworth.

**MOTION** was made by Roger Erskine and seconded by Dora Noble to accept the final draft report and recommendations from English Language Learner's Work Group.

**MOTION** carried.

**MOTION** was made by June Canty and seconded by Stephen Rushing to amend the report by striking the words "graduation requirement" and changing them to "certification requirement."

**MOTION** carried.

### **PUBLIC COMMENT**

#### **Jeanne Harmon, Center for Strengthening the Teaching Profession (CSTP)**

Ms. Harmon highlighted the importance of addressing the issue of ELL training for teachers by relating findings of a survey CSTP conducted of teachers in Washington. The survey found that this issue is not geographically based and there are ELL students in every classroom.

### **TAB 7**

#### **LEGISLATIVE CHARGE: ANALYSIS AND RECOMMENDATIONS RELATED TO ENSURING AN ADEQUATE SUPPLY OF MATH AND SCIENCE TEACHERS**

##### **Overview of the Charge**

Jennifer Wallace, Executive Director, PESB

Ms. Wallace provided an overview of the legislative charge related to ensuring an adequate supply of math and science teachers.

##### **Presentation of Results from Washington State Institute for Public Policy Study on Differential Pay Plans for Teachers in High-Demand Subject Areas**

Steve Aos, Washington State Institute for Public Policy (WSIPP)

Mr. Aos discussed the WSIPP report on differential pay for teachers in high-demand areas.

##### **Presentation of Data from University of Washington: view of undergraduates regarding teaching as a career**

Ana Elfers, University of Washington

Jeanne Harmon, Center for Strengthening the Teaching Profession (CSTP)

Ms. Elfers discussed the preliminary findings of undergraduates' views of teaching as a career choice.

##### **Analysis of District Data on Math and Science Teacher Credentials and Assignment**

Joe Koski, Policy & Research Analyst, PESB

Mr. Koski discussed the results of data received from school districts representing 89% of Washington's total student population.

##### **Task Force for Ensuring an Adequate Supply of Math and Science Teachers: Findings and Recommendations**

Joe Koski, Policy & Research Analyst, PESB

Jennifer Wallace, Executive Director, PESB

Ms. Wallace discussed the 4 strategies identified by the Task Force that seemed most relevant and able to bring about progress toward the goal of ensuring an adequate supply of math and science teachers. Those strategies are:

1. Identify and resolve policy barriers related to allowing part-time math or science community college faculty to teach secondary math and science part-time in Washington public schools.

2. Consideration of Washington Administrative Code (WAC) to allow community colleges to apply to become approved providers of add-on endorsement programs.
3. Support legislation to remove the 5 years of work experience requirement for Alternative Routes 3 and 4, relying instead on district and higher education preparation program judgment in screening applicants. Also, support reducing the work experience requirement for paraeducators in Alternative Routes 1 and 2 from 3 to 1.
4. Support third-party involvement in organizations such as The New Teacher Project and Teach for America, as long as they prepare candidates under PESB requirements.

She stated that the Board will assemble into small groups and focus on two issues:

1. Whether the Board can support the recommendations that would require policy change by the PESB.
2. Input to the Task Force related to the issue of responsibility - commitment to oversight on the recommendations.

## **PUBLIC COMMENT**

### **Jim Meadows, Washington Education Association**

Mr. Meadows discussed some points for consideration:

- Recognize what's working well currently in the system.
- Examine why the education system isn't producing the numbers of candidates needed.
- Resist simple policy solutions.
- Continue investing locally and resist outsourcing.
- What is the relationship of the supply and demand of math and science teachers with minority recruitment?

### **Mack Armstrong, Washington Association of School Administrators**

Mr. Armstrong discussed the complexity of this issue and believes building capacity and leadership is essential to long term success. He expressed appreciation for being a part of the Task Force.

### **Jerry Bender, Association of Washington School Principals**

Mr. Bender shared his observations on the issue and discussed the challenges around responsibility for ensuring there are adequate math and science teachers. He believes local needs are met through local partnerships and that the needs of rural and remote schools are different than those of urban schools. He believes the dollars should be targeted to the needs of the area.

After meeting in groups, group leaders reported the results of their discussion indicating which of the 4 strategies they supported. The groups also identified the following caveats for each of the 4 strategies:

#### **Strategy 1**

- What qualifications would faculty need and could they later use this experience toward a residency certificate?
- Is this a short term fix or would it actually add to the pool of math and science teachers?
- Are community college adjuncts interested or is this a project we've put a lot of money and effort into and no one is really interested?
- Members questioned the durability over time and would like further information for further consideration.

- Define more thoroughly - what exactly is part-time, adjunct, public vs. private colleges, retire/rehire issues and is there really a need for this?

#### Strategy 2

- A partnership with a 4 year university makes more sense.
- The knowledge and skills at 2 year courses at a community college are not the same as at a 4 year institution.
- Is this a part of a community college's mission and would their faculty be qualified to teach at upper level courses?

#### Strategy 3

- Eliminate the 5 year requirement.
- Initially addressing why that is important.

#### Strategy 4

- As long as they meet current requirements.
- Programs such as Teach for America are well recruited, but what's the point if people don't stay in the teaching profession?
- Concerns about retention, cost to support candidates and initial recruitment need to be made more apparent to candidate.
- Meet the same state requirements and pair with a teacher education program in Washington.
- They produce a small number of math and science candidates and more information is needed.

**MOTION** was made by Roger Erskine and seconded by Stephen Rushing to support moving forward with the 4 recommendations including the identified caveats.

#### **DISCUSSION**

Members discussed the other options that are already proposed or under consideration by the Board. Members expressed concern for the number 2 strategy due to a community colleges access, capacity and qualifications.

**MOTION** was made by June Canty and seconded by Ted Howard to amend the motion to eliminate number 2 from the motion.

#### **DISCUSSION**

Members supported removing number 2 so that time could be spent exploring the other good options.

**MOTION** carried.

Chair Van Glubt stated that the Board would vote on the amended motion to move forward with recommendations 1, 3, and 4 with the caveats.

**MOTION** carried.

Meeting was recessed at 4:23 P.M.

**November 20, 2008**

**MEMBERS PRESENT:** June Canty            Myra Johnson            Cindy Roaf  
                                 Jim DePaepe            Roshni Jokhi            Stephen Rushing  
                                 Roger Erskine            Shannon Lawson        Jill Van Glubt  
                                 Ted Howard II           Dora Noble            Joyce Westgard (14)  
                                 Keith Hunziker        Ann Pulkkinen

**MEMBERS ABSENT:** Terry Bergeson (unrepresented), Lori Blanchard, Gary Cohn, Grant Pelesky (4)

**STAFF PRESENT:** Esther Baker, Pamela Cook, Joseph Koski, Jennifer Wallace (4)

### **ANNOUNCEMENTS/MEMBER UPDATES**

- Chair Van Glubt reminded members to fill out the various forms in their binders.
- Roger Erskine provided an update from the recent State Board of Education (SBE) meeting he attended. He will send a full report to members. He announced that St. Martin's University, The Evergreen State College, University of Puget Sound, Whitworth University and Gonzaga University had all been recognized in the newly released edition of "Colleges of Distinction," a college guidebook. The 4 criteria used to select the colleges was:
  - Engaged students
  - Great teaching
  - Vibrant communities
  - Successful outcomes

### **TAB 8**

#### **STANDARD SETTING FOR NEW WEST-E TEST**

Esther Baker, Program Director – Teacher Assessments

Phil Gullion, Associate Director of Assessment Services, Evaluation Systems group of Pearson

Ms. Baker provided background and advised members they would be setting the passing scores on the new WEST-E tests implemented on September 1, 2008. Mr. Gullion described the test development process. He discussed the process used by panels of Washington educators and teacher educators to provide item ratings that indicate panel-based passing scores through the modified Angoff method. The Board's review of pass rate data is both a technical decision and a policy decision.

### **DISCUSSION**

Members discussed the difference between the bilingual and ELL test process. The tests are based on the endorsement competencies and have been reviewed to ensure alignment with those competencies. The issue of meaningful group-based data was discussed. In this case it does not yet exist. In the past when the Board lowered the pass rates, that decision was based on five years of impact data. Members discussed the costs of the tests. The composition and role of the technical advisory committee was explained. Test taking sites were discussed. The standard error of measurement (SEM) was explained.

## **PUBLIC COMMENT**

### **Dennis Sterner, Dean School of Education, Whitworth University**

Mr. Sterner acknowledged the difficulty of the task of setting passing scores. He discussed how the Board handled setting the WEST-E/Praxis II scores when he was a PESB member. He expressed concern regarding the issue of bias in panel setting as well as the test field being representative of the larger population taking the test. He discussed the impact of lowering the passing scores.

### **Sheila Fox, Professor Special Education, Western Washington University**

Ms. Fox believes standards and tests should be aligned. There are many variables to be considered, geographic isolation being one of those issues. With a new vendor comes the opportunity to consider locations for candidates to take the tests.

***MOTION** was made by Ann Pulkkinen and seconded by Dora Noble to accept the panel set score of 32 for 005 Elementary Education 1: Math, Science, and Health/Fitness with a review in 3 years when more data is available.*

## **DISCUSSION**

Members compared the purpose of the WEST-B as compared to the WEST-E and expressed their support of accepting the panel-based passing score for the WEST-E. Members felt a review of the data after a period of time in which data could be collected, would be helpful. Mr. Gullion felt that 3 years would be an adequate time to collect enough data. Concern was expressed by a few members that the panel-based passing scores were not the highest possible standards for educators.

***MOTION** carried.*

***MOTION** was made by Stephen Rushing and seconded by June Canty to accept the panel set score of 34 for 006 Elementary Education 2: English, Social Studies, Art with a review in 3 years when more data is available.*

***MOTION** carried.*

***MOTION** was made by Roger Erskine and seconded by Ann Pulkkinen to accept all the rest of the panel based scores, 010 through 072, with a review in 3 years when more data is available.*

## **DISCUSSION**

Members supported the motion and felt it would be best to accept the panel's recommendations and then review the passing scores when there is more data available. Some members spoke against the motion and felt setting the score at a -1 SEM would be preferable. Members expressed concern for the lack of data available at this point. It was pointed out that the pass rate recommendations are for the "just acceptably qualified candidate." Adjustments to the passing scores may need to be made in the future. Members expressed confidence in the process used to determine these passing scores set by the panel.

***MOTION** was made by Jim DePaepe to amend the motion to review the data annually for 3 years.*

Mr. Erskine stated he would be willing to amend his motion as moved by Mr. DePaepe.  
**Chair Van Glubt requested a hand vote:  
8 yes votes, 6 no votes.**

**MOTION** carried.

Attachment "A" displays the panel-based passing scores as approved by the board for each of the 24 WEST-E tests implemented on September 1, 2008.

## **TAB 9**

### **FINAL DRAFT REPORT AND RECOMMENDATIONS: AUTISM TASK FORCE**

Carol Taylor, Project Coordinator, Autism Outreach Project, Educational Service District 189

Ms. Wallace provided background on this particular 2008 legislative charge related to autism awareness. Ms. Taylor presented the Task Force's 7 recommendations.

#### **DISCUSSION**

Members expressed appreciation for bringing this issue to attention. Members discussed the importance of Standard V addressing diverse disabilities. Members discussed the goals in adopting the recommendations. Pre-service and in-service autism training and awareness was discussed. How autism awareness training currently occurs was explained. The use of parent panels was explained. Diagnosing children with autism spectrum disorder and the incidence of children was discussed.

#### **PUBLIC COMMENT**

No public comment.

**MOTION** was made by Roger Erskine and seconded by Myra Johnson to accept the final draft report and recommendations of the Autism Task Force.

#### **DISCUSSION**

Members felt the committee did great work and this is an important issue. Members expressed concern about adequate services for a broader array of disabilities including social, emotional, and behavioral.

**MOTION** was made by Stephen Rushing and seconded by Roger Erskine to amend the motion to include an attached memo that requests consideration for adding additional disorders that would apply to pervasive developmental disorders beyond autism.

#### **DISCUSSION**

Members asked for clarification on related disabilities. Ms. Taylor explained that there are 14 different categories they report on and she also described pervasive developmental disorders. Members spoke against the amendment and felt the report should be specific to autism.

**MOTION** failed.

**MOTION** was made by June Canty to amend the motion to include changing every reference to "disability" with "autism spectrum disorders."

Mr. Erskine and Ms. Johnson agreed with the amendment.

**MOTION** carried, one abstention.

**TAB 11**

**REPORT ON FIRST THREE YEARS OF USE OF PROFESSIONAL GROWTH PLANS (PGPs)**

Coleen Putaansuu, Program Specialist, Professional Education and Certification, OSPI

Three years ago, WAC was adopted establishing Professional Growth Plans as an optional for certificate renewal for any teacher in a participating school district. The WAC required that after three years, a report would be delivered as to implementation progress. Ms. Putaansuu described results of the PGP for clock hour survey from both non-implementing districts and implementing districts and ESDs.

**DISCUSSION**

Members discussed the ESDs charging for PGP clock hours, which they do not. Professional development committees are used in smaller districts and they add that on to what they are already doing. The executive committee will discuss this issue and report back to the Board.

**TAB 14**

**LESLEY UNIVERSITY TEACHER RESIDENCY PROGRAM FOCUSED SITE VISIT TIMELINE**

Coleen Putaansuu, Program Specialist, Professional Education and Certification, OSPI

Lesley University has requested a time extension related to the current schedule for their focused site visit scheduled for May 2009. The teacher residency program will not have any data needed to rate Standard V by this time as the program will not have any completers.

***MOTION** was made by June Canty and seconded by Dora Noble to have Lesley University provide a written report in May and a site visit in September.*

**PUBLIC COMMENT**

**Jim Meadows, Washington Education Association**

Mr. Meadows shared with the Board that there are 1,419 candidates waiting for their scores, which will be released November 21, for certification with the National Board for Professional Teaching Standards. This is the largest number of candidates in Washington State history.

***MOTION** carried.*

**TAB 12**

**REPORT ON THE COST TO COLLEGES/UNIVERSITIES OF OFFERING A PROFESSIONAL CERTIFICATE PROGRAM**

Corrine McGuigan, Assistant Superintendent, Professional Education and Certification, OSPI

Based on concerns the Board has heard from institutions, the PESB requested that PEC gather information on the cost to colleges/universities offering a Professional Certificate Program. Ms. McGuigan presented information on the revenue/expense balance and compensation and faculty load impact to various institutions.

## **DISCUSSION**

Members expressed frustration in not getting an overall picture of the costs by institution for ProCert programs. Members pointed out that the Interpretations in determining total expenses are different among institutions. There needs to be common criteria used in determining total expenses. Members expressed concern that the data related to running the program, isn't reliable. Ms. McGuigan will develop a worksheet template for deans to fill out. She will provide members detailed information for costs to both students and institutions.

## **TAB 13**

### **PESB LEGISLATIVE PLATFORM**

Jennifer Wallace, Executive Director, PESB

In September, the Board approved the package of legislative requests from OSPI to the Governor and the Office of Financial Management. Ms. Wallace presented the PESB legislative platform, which represents the Board's positions on issues they anticipate being addressed by the legislature this session.

***MOTION** was made by June Canty and seconded by Ted Howard to accept the 2009 PESB legislative platform as presented.*

## **DISCUSSION**

Members felt the report reflects the long-term work of the Board.

***MOTION** carried.*

## **TAB 10**

### **SUMMARY OF THE ANNUAL CAREER AND TECHNICAL EDUCATION (CTE) REPORTS**

Corrine McGuigan, Assistant Superintendent, Professional Education and Certification, OSPI  
Phyllis Lawson, Program Specialist, Professional Education and Certification, OSPI  
Judy Smith, Program Specialist, Professional Education and Certification, OSPI

Ms. McGuigan provided a summary of annual reports from Career and Technical Education preparation programs.

## **DISCUSSION**

Members discussed the discrepancy between the total number of candidates enrolled and those that actually complete the program.

### **PROGRESS REPORT: THE DEVELOPMENT OF CAREER AND TECHNICAL EDUCATION STANDARDS FOR BUSINESS AND INDUSTRY ROUTE TEACHER PREPARATION PROGRAMS**

Ms. McGuigan provided a progress report on the development of new standards for CTE business and industry route programs.

## **DISCUSSION**

Members requested regular updates on the development of the CTE standards.

The meeting was adjourned at 2:38 P.M.

## Attachment A

### Washington Educator Skills Tests – Endorsements (WEST-E) Preliminary Pass Rate Analysis All Tests at Panel-Based Passing Scores

November 20, 2008

### Washington Educator Skills Tests–Endorsements (WEST-E)

#### PASS RATE ANALYSIS

#### INTERPRETIVE NOTES

The notes below are an integral part of the accompanying table.

- Data presented in the table are from the September 13, 2008, test administration.
- The number of scorable items is 100 for each test. For the Elementary Education and Middle Level Humanities fields, the test is composed of two subtests, each of which includes 50 scorable items.
- **Number of Examinees and Their Percent At or Above Score** = The number of examinees and the percent of those examinees at or above the passing score for the test or subtest.
- **Panel-based Passing Score** = Sum of medians of panel member item judgments for the scorable item set, rounded to the nearest integer. (The maximum value is 50 for the Elementary Education and Middle-Level Humanities subtests and 100 for all other tests.)
- **Number Tested (N)** = Total number of examinees who took the subtest at the test administrations noted above.
- **Estimated Standard Error of Measurement (S.E.M.)** =  $\sqrt{c \times (i - c) / (i - 1)}$ , where  $i$  = number of scorable multiple-choice items on the test and  $c$  = panel-based passing score.
- **Percent (%) Pass** = The percent of examinees who would pass at the passing score indicated.

#### INTERPRETIVE CAUTIONS

- The examinees for whom results are presented in this document may not reflect the same proportion of all the types and capabilities of examinees in the population who will take the tests in the future.
- Extreme caution should be used in interpreting data for small numbers of examinees.

Number of Examinees and Their Percent At or Above Score			
WEST-E Test Field	Number Tested	Panel-based MC Passing Score	
		Score	% Pass
005 Elem. Ed. 1: Math, Sci., Health/Fitness	102	32	75
006 Elem. Ed. 2: English, Social Stud., Art	103	34	85
010 Mid. Lev. Humanities 1: Eng. Lang. Arts	4	36	100
011 Mid. Lev. Humanities 2: Social Studies	4	32	100
012 Middle Level Mathematics	4	70	75
013 Middle Level Science	2	69	50
020 English Language Arts	17	71	100
021 Science	4	67	75
022 Biology	7	66	57
023 Chemistry	1	68	100
024 Earth and Space Science	1	64	0
025 Physics	0	66	--
026 Mathematics	9	73	78
027 History	6	61	83
028 Social Studies	9	67	78
029 Health/Fitness	5	69	100
030 Reading	3	74	100
031 Dance	0	65	--
032 Theatre Arts	0	68	--
033 Visual Arts	4	72	75
034 Music: General	1	72	100
035 Music: Choral	0	71	--
036 Music: Instrumental	0	71	--
050 Bilingual Education	2	74	50
051 English Language Learners	11	69	82
072 Deaf Education	0	71	--

The accompanying notes are an integral part of this document.