

CONSOLIDATED STATE PERFORMANCE REPORT: Parts I and II

**for
STATE FORMULA GRANT PROGRAMS
under the
ELEMENTARY AND SECONDARY EDUCATION ACT
As amended by the
No Child Left Behind Act of 2001**

For reporting on
School Year 2004-2005



**PART I DUE MARCH 6, 2006
PART II DUE APRIL 14, 2006**

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

INTRODUCTION

Sections 9302 and 9303 of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act (ESEA), as amended by the No Child Left Behind Act of 2001 (NCLB) provide to States the option of applying for and reporting on multiple ESEA programs through a single consolidated application and report. Although a central, practical purpose of the Consolidated State Application and Report is to reduce "red tape" and burden on States, the Consolidated State Application and Report is also intended to have the important purpose of encouraging the integration of State, local, and ESEA programs in comprehensive planning and service delivery and enhancing the likelihood that the State will coordinate planning and service delivery across multiple State and local programs. The combined goal of all educational agencies -- State, local, and federal -- is a more coherent, well-integrated educational plan that will result in improved teaching and learning.

The Consolidated State Application and Report includes the following ESEA programs:

- o Title I, Part A - *Improving Basic Programs Operated by Local Educational Agencies*
- o Title I, Part B, Subpart 3 - *William F. Goodling Even Start Family Literacy Programs*
- o Title I, Part C - *Education of Migratory Children*
- o Title I, Part D - *Prevention and Intervention Programs for Children and Youth Who Are Neglected, Delinquent, or At-Risk*
- o Title I, Part F - *Comprehensive School Reform*
- o Title II, Part A - *Improving Teacher Quality State Grants (Teacher and Principal Training and Recruiting Fund)*
- o Title II, Part D - *Enhancing Education through Technology*
- o Title III, Part A - *English Language Acquisition, Language Enhancement, and Academic Achievement Act*
- o Title IV, Part A, Subpart 1 - *Safe and Drug-Free Schools and Communities State Grants*
- o Title IV, Part A, Subpart 2 - *Safe and Drug-Free Schools and Communities National Activities (Community Service Grant Program)*
- o Title IV, Part B - *21st Century Community Learning Centers*
- o Title V, Part A - *Innovative Programs*
- o Title VI, Section 6111 - *Grants for State Assessments and Related Activities*
- o Title VI, Part B - *Rural Education Achievement Program*

The NCLB Consolidated State Performance Report for the 2004-2005 school year consists of two information collections. Part I of this report is due to the Department by March 6, 2006 . Part II is due to the Department by April 14, 2006.

PART I

Part I of the Consolidated State Report, which States must submit to the Department by **March 6, 2006** , requests information related to the five ESEA Goals, established in the June 2002 Consolidated State Application, and information required for the Annual State Report to the Secretary, as described in section 1111(h)(4) of ESEA. The five ESEA Goals established in the June 2002 Consolidated State Application are as follows:

- o **Performance goal 1:** By 2013-2014, all students will reach high standards, at a minimum attaining proficiency or better in reading/language arts and mathematics.

- o **Performance goal 2** : All limited English proficient students will become proficient in English and reach high academic standards, at a minimum attaining proficiency or better in reading/language arts and mathematics.
- o **Performance goal 3** : By 2004-2005, all students will be taught by highly qualified teachers.
- o **Performance goal 4** : All students will be educated in learning environments that are safe, drug free, and conducive to learning.
- o **Performance Goal 5** : All students will graduate from high school.

PART II

Part II of the Consolidated State Performance Report consists of information related to State activities and outcomes of specific ESEA programs for the 2004-2005 school year. Part II of the Consolidated State Performance Report is due to the Department by **April 14, 2006**. The information requested in Part II of the Consolidated State Performance Report for the 2004-2005 school year necessarily varies from program to program. However, for all programs, the specific information requested for this report meets the following criteria.

1. The information is needed for Department program performance plans or for other program needs.
2. The information is not available from another source, including program evaluations.
3. The information will provide valid evidence of program outcomes or results.
4. The Consolidated State Performance Report is the best vehicle for collection of the data.

The Department is continuing to work with the Performance-Based Data Management Initiative (PBDMI) to streamline data collections for the 2004-2005 school year and beyond.

GENERAL INSTRUCTIONS AND TIMELINES

All States that received funding on the basis of the Consolidated State Application for the 2004-2005 school year must respond to this Consolidated State Performance Report (CSPR). Part I of the Report is due to the Department by **March 6, 2006**. Part II of the Report is due to the Department by **April 14, 2006**. Both Part I and Part II should reflect data from the 2004-2005 school year, unless otherwise noted.

The format states will use to submit the Consolidated State Performance Report has changed to an online submission. This online submission system is being developed through the Education Data Exchange Network (EDEN) and will make the submission process less burdensome. Please see the following section on transmittal instructions for more information on how to submit this year's Consolidated State Performance Report.

TRANSMITTAL INSTRUCTIONS

The Consolidated State Performance Report (CSPR) data will be collected online from the SEAs, using the EDEN web site. The EDEN web site will be modified to include a separate area (sub-domain) for CSPR data entry. This area will utilize EDEN formatting to the extent possible and the data will be entered in the order of the current CSPR forms. The data entry screens will include or provide access to all instructions and notes on the current CSPR forms; additionally, an effort will be made to design the screens to balance efficient data collection and reduction of visual clutter.

Initially, a state user will log onto EDEN and be provided with an option that takes him or her to the "2004-2005 CSPR". The main CSPR screen will allow the user to select the section of the CSPR that he or she needs to either view or enter data. After selecting a section of the CSPR, the user will be presented with a screen or set of screens where the user can input the data for that section of the CSPR. A user can only select one section of the CSPR at a time. After a state has included all available data in the designated sections of a particular CSPR Part, a lead state user will certify that Part and transmit it to the Department. Once a Part has been transmitted, ED will have access to the data. States may still make changes or additions to the transmitted data, by creating an updated version of the CSPR. Detailed instructions for transmitting the 2004-2005 CSPR will be found on the main CSPR page of the EDEN website (<https://EDEN.ED.GOV/EDENPortal/>).

According to the Paperwork Reduction Act of 1965, no persons are required to respond to a collection of information unless it displays a valid OMB control number. The valid OMB control number for this information collection is 1810-0614. The time required to complete this information collection is estimated to average 111 hours per response, including the time to review instructions, search existing data resources, gather the data needed, and complete and review the information collection. If you have any comments concerning the accuracy of the time estimates(s) contact School Support and Technology Programs, 400 Maryland Avenue, SW Washington DC 20202-6140. Questions about the new electronic CSPR submission process, should be directed to the EDEN Partner Support Center at 1-877-HLP-EDEN (1-877-457-3336).

OMB Number: 1810-0614
Expiration Date: 07/31/2006

Consolidated State Performance Report
For
State Formula Grant Programs
under the
Elementary And Secondary Education Act
as amended by the
No Child Left Behind Act of 2001

Check the one that indicates the report you are submitting:
 Part I, 2004-2005 Part II, 2004-2005

Name of State Educational Agency (SEA) Submitting This Report:
Wisconsin Department of Public Instruction

Address:
125 South Webster Street, P.O. Box 7841
Madison, WI 53707-7841

Person to contact about this report:

Name: Mary Jo Parman
Telephone: 608-266-2158
Fax: 608-266-5188
e-mail: maryjo.parman@dpi.state.wi.us

Name of Authorizing State Official: (Print or Type): Michael J. Thompson

Signature

10/1/2006 11:39 AM EST

Date

CONSOLIDATED STATE PERFORMANCE REPORT: PART II

For reporting on
School Year 2004-2005



PART II DUE APRIL 14, 2006

2.1 IMPROVING BASIC PROGRAMS OPERATED BY LOCAL EDUCATIONAL AGENCIES (TITLE I, PART A)**2.1.1 Student Achievement and High-Poverty Schools**

2.1.1.1 Please provide the number of public schools with poverty rates of 40% or greater reporting an increase in the number of students performing at the proficient or advanced levels of student achievement in **reading/language arts** as measured by State assessments administered in the 2004-2005 school year as compared to assessments administered in the 2003-2004 school year. 248

2.1.1.2 Please provide the number of public schools with poverty rates of 40% or greater reporting an increase in the number of students performing at the proficient or advanced levels of student achievement in **mathematics** as measured by State assessments administered in the 2004-2005 school year as compared to assessments administered in the 2003-2004 school year. 218

2.1.2 Title I, Part A Schools by Type of Program For the 2004-2005 school year, please provide the following:

2.1.2.1 Total Number of Title I schools in the State 1120

2.1.2.2 Total Number of Title I Targeted Assistance Schools in the State 797

2.1.2.3 Total Number of Title I Schoolwide Program Schools in the State 323

2.1.3 Title I, Part A Student Participation**Student Participation in Title I, Part A by Special Services/Programs and Racial/Ethnic Groups**

In the following tables, please provide the *unduplicated* number of children participating in Title I, Part A in the State by special services/programs and racial/ethnic groups during the 2004-2005 school year. Count a child only once (*unduplicated* count) in each category even if the child participated during more than one term or in more than one school or district in the State during the reporting period. Include students in both Title I schoolwide and targeted assistance programs.

2.1.3.1.1 Student Participation in Title I, A by Special Services or Programs 2004-2005 School Year

	Number of Students Served
Students with Disabilities	25922
Limited English Proficient	17347
Homeless	1405
Migrant	348

2.1.3.1.2 Student Participation in Title I, A by Racial or Ethnic Group 2004-2005 School Year

	Number of Students Served
American Indian/Alaskan Native	4348
Asian/Pacific Islander	7806
Black, non-Hispanic	69165
Hispanic	28234
White, non-Hispanic	74765

Additional racial/ethnic groups or combinations of racial/ethnic groups may be reported that are consistent with the major racial/ethnic categories that you use under NCLB.

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

Title I, Part A student participation counts by grade and by public, private and local neglected should be reported as *unduplicated* counts. Please enter the number of participants by grade in Title I public targeted assistance programs (TAS), Title I schoolwide *programs* (SWP), private school students participating in Title I programs, and students served in Part A local neglected programs during the 2004-2005 school year.

Student Participation in Title I, Part A by Grade Level 2004-2005 School Year						
	Public TAS	Public SWP	Private	Local Neglected	Total	Percent of Total
Age 0-2	0	0	0	0	0	0.0
Age 3-5	1720	8697	93	0	10510	5.7
K	5892	12458	312	8	18670	10.1
1	8535	12481	951	24	21991	11.9
2	7491	11722	1008	34	20255	11.0
3	6235	11707	872	22	18836	10.2
4	4388	11656	752	17	16813	9.1
5	3340	11823	636	16	15815	8.6
6	2866	9138	469	6	12479	6.8
7	2700	9177	438	13	12328	6.7
8	2477	8749	344	7	11577	6.3
9	782	8252	270	3	9307	5.1
10	523	5391	129	7	6050	3.3
11	683	4549	73	1	5306	2.9
12	589	3904	23	0	4516	2.5
Ungraded	0	0	23	3	26	0.0
TOTALS	48221	129704	6393	161	184479	100.2

2.1.3.3 Student Participation in Title I, Part A Targeted Assistance Programs by Instructional and Support Services - 2004-2005 School Year

In the following chart, please provide the number of students receiving instructional and support services funded by Title I, A in targeted assistance (TAS) programs during the 2004-2005 school year.

Instructional Services	
	Number of Students Served
Mathematics	13418
Reading/Language Arts	47091
Science	3905
Social Studies	4036
Vocational/Career	1725
Other (specify)	613
Support Services	
Health, Dental, and Eye Care	69
Supporting Guidance/Advocacy	2274
Other (specify)	613

2.1.4 Staff Information for Title I, Part A Targeted Assistance Programs - 2004-2005 School Year

In the following chart, please provide the number of full-time equivalent (FTE) staff funded through Title I, A targeted assistance (TAS) programs during the 2004-2005 school year by job category. For administrators and supervisors who service both targeted assistance and schoolwide programs, report the FTE attributable to their TAS duties only.

	Number of Title I Targeted Assistance Program FTE Staff
Administrators (non-clerical)	39
Teachers	986
Teacher Aides	0
Support Staff (clerical and non-clerical)	128
Other (specify)	16

2.2 WILLIAM F. GOODLING EVEN START FAMILY LITERACY PROGRAMS (TITLE I, PART B, SUBPART 3)**2.2.1 Subgrants and Even Start Program Participants**

For the 2004-2005 school year, please provide the following information:

2.2.1.1 Federally Funded Even Start Subgrants in the State

1. Number of federally funded Even Start subgrants in the State	<u>17</u>
---	-----------

2.2.1.2 Even Start Families Participating During the Year

("Participating" means participating in all required core services and following any period of preparation.)

1. Total number of families participating	<u>791</u>
2. Total number of adults participating	
("Adults" includes teen parents.)	<u>852</u>
3. Total number of adults participating who are limited English proficient	<u>534</u>
4. Total number of children participating	<u>1297</u>

2.2.1.3 Characteristics of newly enrolled families at the time of enrollment

(A newly enrolled family means a family who is enrolled for the first time in Even Start at any time during the year.)

1. Number of newly enrolled families	<u>395</u>
2. Number of newly enrolled adult participants	<u>453</u>
3. Percent of newly enrolled families at or below the Federal poverty level	<u>71.0</u>
4. Percent of newly enrolled adult participants without a high school diploma or GED	<u>88.0</u>
5. Percent of newly enrolled adult participants who have not gone beyond the 9th grade	<u>47.0</u>

2.2.1.4 Percent of families that have remained in the program

(Include families that are newly enrolled and those that are continuing.)

1. From 0 to 3 months	<u>14.0</u>
2. From 4 to 6 months	<u>14.0</u>
3. From 7 to 12 months	<u>25.0</u>
4. More than 12 months	<u>47.0</u>

2.2.2 Federal Even Start Performance Indicators

Using the format of the table below, describe the State's progress in meeting the federal performance indicators listed for Even Start participants in your State. States should report data if local projects are using the indicated measures and the state collects the data.

Indicator	Measure Measurement tool used to assess progress for indicator	Cohort Number of participants to whom the indicator applies	Result Number of participants who met the achievement goal	Explanation of Progress
1. Percentage if adults showing significant learning gains on measures of reading	TABE: TABE	TABE: 250.0	TABE: 104.0	TABE: 42% TABE grade level equivalents were converted to NRS level. Any learner who achieved an NRS level gain was included in the result.
	CASAS: N/A	CASAS: 0.0	CASAS: 0.0	CASAS:
2. Percentage of LEP adults showing significant learning gains on measures of English language acquisition	TABE: BEST Plus:	TABE: 439.0	TABE: 226.0	TABE: 51% BEST Plus standard scores were converted to NRS levels. Any learner who achieved an NRS level gain was included in the result.
	CASAS: N/A	CASAS: 0.0	CASAS: 0.0	CASAS:
3. Percentage of school age adults who earn a high school diploma or GED	Hs Diploma	3.0	3.0	100%
	GED			100%
	Diploma *Please Indicate diploma or GED	Diploma *Please Indicate diploma or GED	Diploma *Please Indicate diploma or GED	*Please Indicate diploma or GED
4. Percentage of non-school age adults who earn a high school diploma or GED	GED	97.0	85.0	88%
	GED *Please Indicate diploma or GED	GED *Please Indicate diploma or GED	GED *Please Indicate diploma or GED	*Please Indicate diploma or GED
5. Percentage of children entering kindergarten who are achieving significant learning gains on measures of language development	Peabody Picture Vocabulary Test (PPVT) receptive: N/A	Peabody Picture Vocabulary Test (PPVT) receptive:	Peabody Picture Vocabulary Test (PPVT) receptive:	Peabody Picture Vocabulary Test (PPVT) receptive:
6. The average number of letters children can identify measured by the PALS Pre-K Uppercase Letter Naming Subtask	PAL Pre-K Upper Case Letter Naming Subtask:	PAL Pre-K Upper Case Letter Naming Subtask:	PAL Pre-K Upper Case Letter Naming Subtask	PAL Pre-K Upper Case Letter Naming Subtask
	PALS Pre-K Upper Case Letter Naming	30	18.0	Wi has nearly 80% English Language Learners (ELLs). The children from families who

	Subtask: Alternative Uppercase Recognition Assessment (flash cards)			stay with the program more than one year show more gains on all assessments. In addition to the PALS, the alternative assessments for upper case recognition used were congruent with PALS. Not reported in the cohort were 22 ELLs. These newly arrived refugee children had an average letter recognition of 8.
7. Percentage of school-aged children who are reading on grade level	Classroom Teacher Rating Scale (Teacher observation and reporting instrument)	645.0	388.0	60%
	Please indicate source. N/A	Please indicate source.	Please indicate source.	Please indicate source.
8. Percentage of parents who show improvement on measures of parental support for children's learning in the home, school environment, and through interactive learning activities	Parent Education Profile (PEP) N/A	Parent Education Profile (PEP)	Parent Education Profile (PEP)	Parent Education Profile (PEP)

2.3 EDUCATION OF MIGRATORY CHILDREN (TITLE I, PART C)

Please complete the following tables for the Title I, Part C, Migrant Education Program.

General Data Reporting Information

1. The tables in this section contain annual performance report requirements for the **Title I, Part C, Migrant Education Program (MEP) for reporting year 2004-2005**.
2. Instructions for each table are provided just before the table.

Table 2.3.1.1 Population Data

Instructions: Table 2.3.1.1 (on the next page) requires you to report the statewide unduplicated number of *eligible* migrant children by age/grade according to several descriptive categories. Include only *eligible* migrant children in the cells in this table. Within each row, count a child only once statewide (*unduplicated* count). Include children who changed ages (e.g., from 2 years to 3 years of age) or grades during the 2004-2005 reporting period in only the higher age/grade cell. For example, a child who turns three during the reporting year would only be counted in the Ages 3 - 5 cell. In all cases, the Total is the sum of the cells in a row.

2.3.1.1 Population Data

	Ages 0-2	Ages 3-5	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	Un- grad- ed	Out- of- school	Total
1. ELIGIBLE MIGRANT CHILDREN																		
1. All Migrant Children Eligible for the MEP	119	201	82	104	103	102	113	96	101	107	88	112	116	64	105	5	26	1644
2. PRIORITY FOR SERVICES																		
1. All Migrant Children Eligible for MEP classified as having "Priority for Services"		10	20	34	43	26	29	40	34	38	33	59	60	26	57	4	21	534
3. LIMITED ENGLISH PROFICIENT (LEP)																		
1. Migrant Children who are LEP		10	6	14	14	8	6	10	1	9	7	6	11	1	2	0	0	105
4. CHILDREN ENROLLED IN SPECIAL EDUCATION																		
1. Migrant Children Enrolled in Special Education	0	1	1	1	3	0	4	2	3	0	1	0	4	0	2	0	1	23
5. MOBILITY																		
1. Migrant Children with a Last Qualifying Move within 12 Months (Counting back from the Last Day of the Reporting Period)	96	92	39	56	48	40	71	55	53	67	52	63	62	33	42	3	12	884
2. Migrant Children with a Last Qualifying Move within Previous 13 - 24 Months (Counting back from the Last Day of the Reporting Period)	18	56	23	26	27	29	22	24	20	17	21	33	32	20	34	0	7	409
3. Migrant Children with a Last Qualifying Move within Previous 25 - 36 Months (Counting back from the Last Day of the Reporting Period)	5	26	12	13	14	14	9	6	14	10	6	10	10	5	12	0	5	171
4. Migrant Children with any Qualifying Move within a Regular School Year (Count any Qualifying Move within the Previous 36 Months; counting back from the Last Day of the Reporting Period)	51	91	37	46	40	35	43	34	45	34	23	37	45	20	49	0	14	644

Numbers represent eligible migrant children and are unduplicated for 1.1-5.4. State verified reporting periods were appropriate for 5.1-5.4 and 5.4 has been verified as "Any Qualifying Move within Regular School Term." 5.1-5.3 have been verified as "Last Qualifying Moves."

2.3.1.2 Academic Status

Instructions: Table 2.3.1.2 asks for the statewide *unduplicated number* of *eligible* migrant children by age/grade according to several descriptive categories. Include only *eligible* migrant children in the cells in this table. Within each row, count a child only once statewide (*unduplicated* count).

Include children who changed grades during the 2004-2005 reporting period in only the higher age/grade cell. In all cases, the Total is the sum of the cells in a row

	Ages 0-2	Ages 3-5	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	Un- grad- ed	Out- of- school	Total
1. HIGH SCHOOL COMPLETION -- (Note: Data on the high school completion <u>rate</u> and school dropout <u>rate</u> has been collected through Part I of the Consolidated State Performance Report.)																		
1. <i>Dropped out of school</i>										0	0	0	0	0	0			0
2. Obtained GED																		0
2. ACADEMIC ACHIEVEMENT -- (Note: The results of state assessments in mathematics and reading/language arts are collected in Part I of the Consolidated State Performance Report. However, information on the number of eligible migrant students who participated in the state assessment will be collected below.)																		
Number of Migrant Students Enrolled During State Testing Window (State Assessment - 1. Reading/Language Arts)						0	99	0	0	0	69	0	65	0	0			233
Number of Migrant Students Tested in Reading/Language Arts (State Assessment)						0	92	0	0	0	62	0	56	0	0			210
Number of Migrant Students Enrolled During State Testing Window (State Assessment - 3. Mathematics)						0	99	0	0	0	69	0	62	0	0			230
Number of Migrant Students Tested in Mathematics (State Assessment)						0	95	0	0	0	65	0	56	0	0			216

Note: Data not available on migrant dropout students. For "dropped out of school," zeros should be considered "N/A," because the state does not have this data at this time. Also, WI state assessment system only tested grades 4, 8, and 10 so that is why the data was reported only in the columns for these grade levels.

2.3.1.3.1 MEP Participation - Regular School Year

Table 2.3.1.3.1 (on the next page) asks for the statewide, unduplicated number of children who were served by the MEP in the regular school year by age/grade according to several descriptive categories. Include children who changed ages, e.g., from 2 years to 3 years of age, or grades during the 2004-2005 reporting period in only the higher age/grade cell. Within each row, count a child only once statewide (*unduplicated* count). In all cases, the total is the sum of the cells in a row.

Participation information is required for children who received instructional or support services funded in whole or in part with MEP funds. *DO NOT count migrant children served through a schoolwide program (SWP) where MEP funds were combined, in any row of this table.*

Count only those children who were actually served; do not count unserved children. Include in this table all children who received a MEP-funded service, even those children continuing to receive services in the year after their eligibility ended, and those children previously eligible in secondary school and receiving credit-accrual services.

Served in a Regular School Year Project. Enter the number of *children who* participated in MEP-funded instructional or supportive service only. *DO NOT* include children who were served only by a "referred" service. Count a child only once statewide by age/grade in row 1 if he/she received any type of MEP-funded instructional or supportive service. Do not count the number of times an individual child received an instructional intervention.

Continuation of Services. In row 3, report only the numbers of children served under Sections 1304 (e) (2) - (3). Do not report in row 3 the children served in Sections 1304 (e) (1), children whose eligibility expired during the regular school year.

Instructional Services. For each listed instructional service, enter the number of *children who* participated in MEP-funded services. Count a child only once statewide by age/grade in row 4 if he/she received any type of MEP-funded instructional service (regardless whether provided by a teacher or paraprofessional). Count each child only once statewide in row 5, once in row 6, and once in row 7 if he/she received the MEP-funded instruction (and provided by a teacher) in the subject area noted. Do not count the number of times an individual child received an instructional intervention.

Support Services. For each listed support service, enter the number of children who participated in MEP-funded services. Count a child only once statewide by age/grade in row 8 if he/she received any type of MEP-funded supportive service. Count a child only once statewide in row 9 if he/she received the specific MEP supportive service noted (*i.e.*, do not count the number of service interventions per child).

Referred Services. Count a child only once statewide by age/grade in row 10 if he/she received a referred service. This is *NOT* a count of the referrals themselves, but instead represents the number of children who are placed in an educational or educationally-related service funded by another non-MEP program/organization that they would not have otherwise obtained without the efforts of MEP funds. (Do not count the number of service interventions per child).

2.3.1.3.1 MEP Participation - Regular School Year

	Ages 0-2	Ages 3-5	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	Un- grad- ed	Out- of- school	Total
PARTICIPATION - REGULAR SCHOOL YEAR																		
1. Served in MEP (with an MEP-funded Instructional or Supportive Service Only -- do not include children served in a SWP where MEP funds are combined)	15	66	51	75	78	81	83	61	87	75	64	88	84	60	74	3	6	1051
2. Priority for Service		9	12	28	30	22	26	27	28	38	27	39	39	26	20	1	2	374
3. Continuation of Service		0	2	0	1	4	0	1	1	1	2	0	2	2	4	0	0	20
4. Any Instructional Service	0	5	33	73	63	55	57	41	27	43	28	88	84	52	74	3	0	726
5. Reading Instruction	0	3	18	39	35	34	32	25	14	24	15	19	10	5	10	1	0	284
6. Mathematics Instruction	0	2	15	34	28	21	25	16	13	19	13	18	14	12	16	1	0	247
7. High School Credit Accrual														51	60	35	48	195
8. Any Support Service	15	65	47	72	77	79	79	61	74	72	63	59	67	42	57	1	6	936
9. Counseling Service	0	15	25	38	29	45	39	32	33	39	33	41	35	31	25	0	0	460
10. Any Referred Service	0	4	2	5	1	3	1	3	0	4	4	2	1	0	2	0	0	32

2.3.1.3.2 MEP Participation -Summer/Intersession Term

Instructions Table 2.3.1.3.2 (on the next page) asks for the statewide unduplicated number of children who were served by the MEP in a summer or intersession term by age/grade according to several descriptive categories. Include children who changed ages, e.g., from 2 years to 3 years of age in only in the higher age cell. Count summer/intersession students in the appropriate grade based on the promotion date definition used in your state. Within each row, count a child only once statewide (*unduplicated* count). In all cases, the Total is the sum of the cells in a row.

Participation information is required for children who received instructional or support services funded in whole or in part with MEP funds.

Count only those children who were actually served; do not count unserved children. Include in this table all children who received a MEP funded service, even children continuing to receive services in the year after their eligibility ended, and those children previously eligible in secondary school and receiving credit-accrual services.

Served in a Summer or Intersession Project. Enter the number of *children who* participated in MEP-funded instructional or supportive service only. DO NOT include children who were served only by a "referred" service. Count a child only once statewide by age/grade in row 1 if he/she received any type of MEP-funded instructional or supportive service. Do not count the number of times an individual child received an instructional intervention.

Continuation of Services . In row 3, report only the numbers of children served under Sections 1304 (e) (2) - (3). Do not report in row 3 the children served in Sections 1304 (e) (1), children whose eligibility expired during the summer term.

Instructional Services. For each listed instructional service, enter the number of *children who* participated in MEP-funded services. Count a child only once statewide by age/grade in row 4 if he/she received any type of MEP-funded instructional service (regardless whether provided by a teacher or paraprofessional). Count each child only once statewide in row 5, once in row 6, and once in row 7 if he/she received the MEP-funded instruction (and provided by a teacher) in the subject area noted. Do not count the number of times an individual child received an instructional intervention.

Support Services . For each listed support service, enter the number of children who participated in MEP-funded services. Count a child only once statewide by age/grade in row 8 if he/she received any type of MEP-funded supportive service. Count a child only once statewide in row 9 if he/she received the specific MEP supportive service noted (*i.e.*, do not count the number of service interventions per child).

Referred Services . Count a child only once statewide by age/grade in row 10 if he/she received a referred service. This is NOT a count of the referrals themselves, but instead represents the number of children who are placed in an educational or educationally-related service funded by another non-MEP program/organization that they would not have otherwise obtained without the efforts of MEP funds (*i.e.*, do not count the number of service interventions per child).

2.3.1.3.2 MEP Participation-Summer/Intersession Term

		Ages																	Un-grad-ed	Out-of-school	Total
		0-2	3-5	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12					
PARTICIPATION-SUMMER TERM OR INTERSESSION																					
1.	Served in MEP Summer or Intersession Project (with an Instructional or Supportive Service Only)	0	12	36	43	70	46	63	62	46	44	28	36	31	15	5	0	0			537
2.	Priority for Service		1	2	12	19	26	20	22	23	14	19	14	17	8	8	0	0			206
3.	Continuation of Service		0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0			0
4.	Any Instructional Service	0	2	36	43	70	46	63	62	46	44	28	36	31	15	5	0	0			473
5.	Reading Instruction	0	1	18	23	36	23	32	30	21	20	10	6	9	3	0	0	0			232
6.	Mathematics Instruction	0	1	18	20	34	23	31	32	25	24	8	9	7	2	1	0	0			235
7.	High School Credit Accrual													21	15	10	4	0	0		50
8.	Any Support Service	0	12	20	31	44	29	37	33	25	30	17	22	14	10	4	0	0			333
9.	Counseling Service	0	4	13	18	24	15	18	21	13	23	15	20	10	6	4	0	0			204
10.	Any Referred Service	0	0	5	11	9	2	5	5	1	3	6	4	0	0	0	0	0			51

2.3.1.4 SCHOOL DATA

Table 2.3.1.4 asks for information on the number of schools and number of *eligible* migrant children who were enrolled in those schools.

In the first column of Table 2.3.1.4, enter the number of schools that enroll *eligible* migrant children during the regular school year. Schools include public schools, alternative schools, and private schools (that serve school-age children, i.e., grades K-12). In the second column, enter the number of *eligible* migrant children who were enrolled in these schools. In the second column, since more than one school in a State may enroll the same migrant child, the count of eligible children enrolled will be duplicated statewide

2.3.1.4. STUDENT ENROLLMENT	NUMBER OF SCHOOLS	NUMBER OF MIGRANT CHILDREN ENROLLED
1. Schools Enrolling Migrant Children	a. 197	b. 2043
2. Schools in Which MEP Funds are Combined in SWP	a. 19	b. 393

A code 1 was given to a number of elements of this report. No changes have been made. There are great fluctuations from one year to the next for many factors, so it is not unusual to have the numbers vary from 2003-04 + or minus can be due to many factors.

2.3.1.5 MEP Project Data

2.3.1.5.1 Type Of MEP Project

Enter the number of projects that are funded in whole or in part with MEP funds. A MEP project is the entity that receives MEP funds (by a subgrant from the State or through an intermediate entity that receives the subgrant) and provides services directly to the migrant child. DO NOT include *schoolwide* programs in which MEP were combined in any row of this table.

2.3.1.5.1. TYPE OF MEP PROJECT	NUMBER OF MEP PROJECTS	NUMBER OF MIGRANT CHILDREN ENROLLED
1. MEP Projects: Regular School Year (All MEP Services Provided During the School Day Only)	a. 0	b. 0
2. MEP Projects: Regular School Year (Some or All MEP Services Provided During an Extended Day/Week)	a. 1	b. 21
3. MEP Projects: Summer/Intersession Only	a. 3	b. 214
4. MEP Projects: Year Round (All MEP Services Provided throughout the Regular School Year and Summer/Intersession Terms)	a. 19	b. 1195

The state has verified that the cells are mutually exclusive (or that a "project" is counted only once in this table).

2.3.1.5.2 KEY MEP PERSONNEL

For each school term, enter both the actual number and *full-time-equivalent* number of staff that are paid by the MEP. Report both the actual number and FTE number by job classification. For actual numbers, enter the total number of individuals who were employed in the appropriate job classification, regardless of the percentage of time the person was employed. For the FTE number, define how many full-time days constitute one *FTE* for each term in your state. (For example, one regular term FTE may equal 180 full-time (8 hour) work days, one summer term FTE may equal 30 full-time work days, and one *intersession* FTE may equal 45 full-time work days split between three 15-day non-contiguous blocks throughout the year .) **Use only the percentage of an FTE paid by the MEP in calculating the total FTE numbers to be reported below for each job classification.**

DO NOT include staff employed in *schoolwide* programs where MEP funds are combined with those of other programs.

	NUMBER OF MEP FUNDED STAFF IN REGULAR SCHOOL YEAR (a)	FTE IN REGULAR SCHOOL YEAR 1 FTE = $\frac{120}{\text{Days}}$ (b)	NUMBER OF MEP FUNDED STAFF IN SUMMER-TERM/ INTERSESSION (c)	FTE IN SUMMER-TERM/ INTERSESSION 1 FTE = $\frac{30}{\text{Days}}$ (d)
2.3.1.5.2. KEY MEP PERSONNEL				
1. State Director	0	0	0	0
2. Teachers	16	5	18	20
3. Counselors	0	0	0	0
4. All Paraprofessionals	10	6	14	9
5. "Qualified" Paraprofessionals	10	6	14	9
6. Recruiters	8	3	11	5
7. Records Transfer Staff	16	3	10	4

The state has verified that the "Numbers of MEP-Funded staff" are actual people counts and has also verified the number of FTE counts reported.

2.4 PREVENTION AND INTERVENTION PROGRAMS FOR CHILDREN AND YOUTH WHO ARE NEGLECTED, DELINQUENT, OR AT RISK (TITLE I, PART D, SUBPARTS 1 AND 2)**2.4.1 General Data Reporting Form - Subpart 1**

The tables in this section contain annual performance report requirements for the Title I, Part D, Subpart 1, N or D Education Program for school year 2004-2005, defined as July 1, 2004, through June 30, 2005.

General Instructions for Title I, Part D, Subpart 1 Tables:

Specific instructions are provided before each table.

For items that request information on the **number of facilities/programs**, report **only** on facilities or programs that received Title I, Part D, Subpart 1 funding during the reporting year.

For items that request information on the **number of students**, report **only** on, neglected or delinquent students who received Title I, Part D, Subpart 1 services during the reporting year.

Instructions: State Agency Title I, Part D, Facilities and Students

Include the aggregate number of facilities/programs and/or students for all State Agencies that received Title I, Part D, Subpart 1 funds.

In the first column, report the number of facilities/programs that received Title I, Part D, Subpart 1 funding. Indicate the total number of facilities/programs by type, including neglected programs, detention facilities, juvenile correction facilities, and adult correction centers.

In the second column, indicate the duplicated number of neglected or delinquent students who were admitted to each type of facility/program. A duplicated count is one that counts students *more than once* if they were admitted to a facility or program multiple times in the reporting year.

In the third column, enter the average length of stay (in days) for students in each type of facility/program. The average should include multiple visits for students who entered a facility or program more than once during the reporting year.

In the fourth column, indicate the unduplicated number of students who were admitted to each type of facility/program. An unduplicated count is one that counts students *only once*, even if they were admitted to a facility or program multiple times within the reporting year.

Note: Throughout Table I, count facilities based on how the facility/program was classified for funding purposes. If a facility served as a multipurpose institution (e.g., a facility that served as both a corrections and a neglected facility) and received funding for both areas, then count the facility under both categories in Table I and enter how many facilities were double-counted in item 3. If a facility was multipurpose, but received Title I, Part D, Subpart 1 funds for only one area, count it only once.

2.4.1.1 State Agency Title I, Part D, Facilities

Facility/Program type	Number of facilities/ programs	Number of N or D students (Duplicated)	Average length of stay (days)	Number of N or D students (Unduplicated)
1. Neglected Programs	0	0	0	0
2. Delinquent (Total)	9	0	NA	2042
2.1. Juvenile Detention	0	0	0	0
2.2. Juvenile Corrections	3	0	135	761
2.3. Adult Corrections	6	0	225	1281
3. Number of facilities that served more than one purpose: <u> 0 </u>				

0 is reported because there are no duplications. Note: WI does not serve neglected under Subpart 1, only Subpart 2.

2.4.1.2 Student Demographics

Report demographic data on neglected or delinquent students who were served under Title I, Part D, Subpart 1. Report the number of students by race/ethnicity, gender, and age.

	Number in neglected programs	Number in juvenile detention	Number in juvenile correction	Number in adult correction
All Students	0	0	761	1281
Race/ethnicity				
American Indian or Native Alaskan	0	0	69	42
Asian or Pacific Islander	0	0	59	45
Black, non-Hispanic	0	0	468	665
Hispanic	0	0	77	189
White, non-Hispanic	0	0	93	340
Gender				
Male	0	0	526	1206
Female	0	0	235	75
Age				
5-10 years old	0	0	145	0
11-15 years old	0	0	275	0
16-18 years old	0	0	301	1031
19 years and older	0	0	0	250

Instructions: Academic/Vocational Outcomes

The number of facilities or programs with specific academic offerings, and the numbers of students who attained specific academic or vocational outcomes. The reported numbers should represent unduplicated counts of students; report only information on a student's most recent enrollment (e.g. do not double-count a student that earned credits on two separate enrollments). However, students may be counted in more than one outcome category within the same enrollment period (e.g., returned to school and earned high school credits). As the table indicates, combine reporting numbers for juvenile corrections and detention facilities.

For Section 1 of this table items 1-3, report the number of neglected programs, juvenile corrections and detention facilities, and adult correction facilities that received Title I, Part D, Subpart 1 funds and awarded at least one high school course credit, one high school diploma, and/or one GED within the reporting year.

For Section 2.1 of this table, items 1 and 2, enter the number of students who attained the following academic outcomes *during their time in the facility/program*: earned high school course credits and/or were enrolled in a GED program. Report the numbers by program type (e.g., Neglected, Juvenile Corrections and/or Detention, or Adult Corrections).

For Section 2.1 of this table, items 3-7, enter the number of students who attained the following academic outcomes *while in a facility/program OR within 30 days after exit*: enrolled in a district school, earned a GED, obtained a high school diploma, were accepted into postsecondary education, and/or enrolled in post-secondary education. Report the numbers by program type (e.g., Neglected, Juvenile Corrections and/or Detention, or Adult Corrections).

For Section 2.2 of this table, item 1, enter the number of students who attained the following vocational outcome *during their time in a facility/program*: enrolled in elective job training courses. Report the numbers by program type (e.g., Neglected, Juvenile Corrections and/or Detention, or Adult Corrections).

For Section 2.2 of this table, items 2 and 3, enter the number of students who attained the following vocational outcomes *while in a facility/program OR within 30 days after exit*: enrolled in external job training education, and/or obtained employment. Report the numbers by program type (e.g., Neglected, Juvenile Corrections and/or Detention, or Adult Corrections).

2.4.1.3 Academic/Vocational Outcomes

1. Facility Academic Offerings	Number of Facilities/Programs		
	Number of Neglected Programs (a)	Number of Juvenile Corrections and/or Detention Facilities (b)	Number of Adult Corrections Facilities (c)
1. Awarded high school course credit(s)	0	3	6
2. Awarded high school diploma(s)	0	3	6
3. Awarded GED(s)	0	3	6
2. Academic & Vocational Outcomes	Number of Students		
	Number in Neglected Programs	Number in Juvenile Corrections and/or Detention	Number in Adult Corrections
1. Academic			
<i>While in the facility, the number of students who...</i>			
1. Earned high school course credits	0	688	24
2. Were enrolled in a GED program	0	333	465
<i>While in the facility or within 30 calendar days after exit, the number of students who...</i>			
3. Enrolled in their local district school	0	130	105
4. Earned a GED	0	27	325
5. Obtained high school diploma	0	0	15
6. Were accepted into post-secondary education	0	0	0
7. Enrolled in post-secondary education	0	0	0
2. Vocational			
<i>While in the facility, the number of students who...</i>			
1. Enrolled in elective job training courses/programs	0	0	0
<i>While in the facility or within 30 calendar days after exit, the number of students who...</i>			
2. Enrolled in external job training education	0	0	0
3. Obtained employment	0	0	0

Instructions: Academic Performance Tables

Report the number of long-term Title I, Part D, Subpart 1 students in neglected programs, juvenile corrections/detention, or adult corrections who participated in pre- and post-testing in reading and math. Long-term refers to students who were incarcerated for at least 90 consecutive calendar days from July 1, 2004 , to June 30, 2005

The reported numbers should represent unduplicated counts of students; report only information on a student's most recent testing data. Count each student in only one length of stay category. For each length of stay category, report the data by the following facility or program type: students in neglected programs **(N)**, students in juvenile corrections or detention **(JC)**, and students in adult corrections **(AC)**. As the table indicates, combine reporting numbers for juvenile corrections and detention facilities.

For item 1, enter the number of students who were in placement during the reporting year for either 90-179 days, 180-270 days, or more than 270 days, by type of facility/ program.

For item 2, enter the number of students reported in item 1 who tested below grade level when they entered the facility or program.

For item 3, enter the number of students reported in item 1 who have data available for both the pre and the post test exams.

For items 4-8, indicate the number of students reported in item 3 who showed either negative change, no change, up to 1/2 grade level change, up to one grade level change, or more than one grade level change on the pre-post test exam. Students reported in item 3 should not appear in more the one of these change categories

2.4.1.4 Academic Performance in Reading

Performance Data (Based on most recent pre/post-test data)	Number of long-term students								
	In placement for 90-179 consecutive calendar days			In placement for 180-270 consecutive calendar days			In placement for more than 270 consecutive calendar days		
	N	JC	AC	N	JC	AC	N	JC	AC
1. # students who were in placement from July 1, 2004, to June 30, 2005 (in each length-of-stay category)	0	761	0	0	0	1281	0	0	0
2. # students from row 1 who tested below grade level upon entry.	0	761	0	0	0	1281	0	0	0
3. # students from row 1 who took both the pre- and post-test reading exams	0	664	0	0	0	928	0	0	0
4. # students from row 3 who showed <u>negative</u> grade level change from the pre- to post-test reading exams	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
5. # students from row 3 who showed <u>no change</u> in grade level from the pre- to post-test reading exams	0	152	0	0	0	315	0	0	0
6. # students from row 3 who showed improvement of <u>up to 1/2 grade level</u> from the pre- to post-test reading exams	0	250	0	0	0	320	0	0	0
7. # students from row 3 who showed improvement of <u>up to one full grade level</u> from the pre- to post-test reading exams	0	232	0	0	0	255	0	0	0
8. # students from row 3 who showed improvement of <u>more than one full grade level</u> from the pre- to post-test reading exams	0	0	0	0	30	38	0	0	0

WI has only two categories under state corrections - Please leave as reported for respective time ranges for Juvenile and Adult Corrections.

2.4.1.5 Academic Performance in Math

Performance Data (Based on most recent pre/post-test data)	Number of long-term students								
	In placement for 90-179 consecutive calendar days			In placement for 180-270 consecutive calendar days			In placement for more than 270 consecutive calendar days		
	N	JC	AC	N	JC	AC	N	JC	AC
1. # students who were in placement from July 1, 2004, to June 30, 2005 (in each length-of-stay category)	0	761	0	0	0	1281	0	0	0
2. # students from row 1 who tested below grade level upon entry.	0	761	0	0	0	1281	0	0	0
3. # students from row 1 who took both the pre- and post-test math exams	0	471	1180	0	0	1180	0	0	0
4. # students from row 3 who showed <u>negative</u> grade level change from the pre- to post-test math exams	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
5. # students from row 3 who showed <u>no change</u> in grade level from the pre- to post-test math exams	0	260	0	0	0	385	0	0	0
6. # students from row 3 who showed improvement of <u>up to 1/2 grade level</u> from the pre- to post-test math exams	0	150	0	0	0	410	0	0	0
7. # students from row 3 who showed improvement of <u>up to one full grade level</u> from the pre- to post-test math exams	0	61	0	0	0	395	0	0	0
8. # students from row 3 who showed improvement of <u>more than one full grade level</u> from the pre- to post-test math exams	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0

This time range is correct for the Detention Centers under Subpart 2 - and there are no duplications.

End Subpart 1 Reporting Form

2.4.2 General Data Reporting Form - Subpart 2

The tables in this section contain annual performance report requirements for the Title I, Part D, Subpart 2, N or D Education Program for school year 2004-2005, **defined as July 1, 2004, through June 30, 2005.**

General Instructions For Title I, Part D, Subpart 2 Tables:

Specific instructions are provided before each table.

For items that request information on the **number of facilities/programs**, report **only** on facilities or programs that received Title I, Part D, Subpart 2 funding during the reporting year.

For items that request information on the **number of students**, report **only** on at-risk, neglected or delinquent students who received Title I, Part D, Subpart 2 services during the reporting year.

At-risk students are reported only in the facility/program and demographic counts. They are **not** reported in the outcome or academic performance tables.

Instructions: Local Education Agency Title I, Part D, Facilities And Students

Include the aggregate number of facilities/programs and/or students for all Local Education Agencies that received Title I, Part D, Subpart 2 funds.

In the first column, report the number of facilities/programs that received Title I, Part D, Subpart 2 funding. Indicate the total number of facilities/programs by type, including at-risk programs, neglected programs, detention facilities, and juvenile correction facilities.

In the second column, indicate the duplicated number of at-risk, neglected, or delinquent students who were admitted to each type of facility/program. A duplicated count is one that counts students more than once if they were admitted to a facility or program multiple times in the reporting year.

In the third column, enter the average length of stay (in days) for students in each type of facility/program. The average should include multiple visits for students who entered a facility or program *more than once* during the reporting year.

In the fourth column, indicate the unduplicated number of students who were admitted to each type of facility/program. An unduplicated count is one that counts students *only once*, even if they were admitted to a facility or program multiple times within the reporting year.

Note: Throughout this table, count facilities based on how the facility/program was classified for funding purposes. If a facility served as a multipurpose institution (e.g., a facility that served as both a corrections and a neglected facility) and received funding for both areas, then count the facility under both categories in Table I and enter how many facilities were double-counted in item 4. If a facility was multipurpose, but received Title I, Part D, Subpart 2 funds for only one area, count it only once.

2.4.2.1 Local Education Agency Title I, Part D, Facilities and Students

Facility/Program type	Number of facilities/ programs	Number of at-risk or N or D Students (Duplicated)	Average length of stay (days)	Number of at-risk or N or D students (Unduplicated)
1. At-Risk Programs	0	0	NA	0
2. Neglected Programs	6	0	60	550
3. Delinquent (Total)	19	0	NA	5586
4. Juvenile Detention	0	0	0	0
5. Juvenile Corrections	0	0	0	0
6. Number of facilities that served more than one purpose: <u>0</u>				

Instructions: Student Demographics

Report demographic data on at-risk, neglected or delinquent students who were served under Title I, Part D, Subpart 2. Report the number of students by race/ethnicity, gender, and age.

2.4.2.2 STUDENT DEMOGRAPHICS

	Number in at-risk programs	Number in neglected programs	Number in juvenile detention	Number in juvenile correction
All Students	0	550	5586	0
Race/ethnicity				
American Indian or Native Alaskan	0	10	64	0
Asian or Pacific Islander	0	0	24	0
Black, non-Hispanic	0	335	2492	0
Hispanic	0	0	1661	0
<i>White, non-Hispanic</i>	0	205	1345	0
Gender				
<i>Male</i>	0	385	3352	0
<i>Female</i>	0	165	2234	0
Age				
5-10 years old	0	50	145	0
11-15 years old	0	365	2965	0
16-18 years old	125	125	2421	0
19 years and older	0	10	55	0

Instructions: Academic/Vocational Outcomes

The number of facilities or programs with specific academic offerings, and the numbers of students who attained specific academic or vocational outcomes. The reported numbers should represent unduplicated counts of students; report only information on a student's most recent enrollment (e.g. do not double-count a student that earned credits on two separate enrollments). However, students may be counted in more than one outcome category within the same enrollment period (e.g., returned to school and earned high school credits). As the table indicates, combine reporting numbers for juvenile corrections and detention facilities.

For Section 1 of this table, items 1-3, report the number of neglected programs, and juvenile corrections and detention facilities that received Title I, Part D, Subpart 2 funds and awarded at least one high school course credit, one high school diploma, and/or one GED within the reporting year.

For Section 2.1 of this table, items 1 and 2, enter the number of students who attained the following academic outcomes *during their time in the facility/program*: earned high school course credits and/or were enrolled in a GED program. Report the numbers by program type (e.g., Neglected Programs or Juvenile Corrections and/or Detention).

For Section 2.1 of this table, items 3-7, enter the number of students who attained the following academic outcomes *while in a facility/program OR within 30 days after exit*: enrolled in a district school, earned a GED, obtained a high school diploma, were accepted into postsecondary education, and/or enrolled in post-secondary education. Report the numbers by program type (e.g., Neglected Programs or Juvenile Corrections and/or Detention).

For Section 2.2 of this table, item 1, enter the number of students who attained the following vocational outcome *during their time in a facility/program*: enrolled in elective job training courses. Report the numbers by program type (e.g., Neglected Programs or Juvenile Corrections and/or Detention).

For Section 2.2 of this table, items 2 and 3, enter the number of students who attained the following vocational outcomes *while in a facility/program OR within 30 days after exit*: enrolled in external job training education, and/or obtained employment. Report the numbers by program type (e.g., Neglected Programs or Juvenile Corrections and/or Detention).

2.4.2.3 Academic/Vocational Outcomes

1. Facility Academic Offerings	Number of Facilities	
	Number of Neglected Programs	Number of Juvenile Corrections and/or Detention Facilities
1. Awarded high school course credit(s)	5	20
2. Awarded high school diploma(s)	3	6
3. Awarded GED(s)	2	2
2. Academic & Vocational Outcomes	Number of Students	
	Number in Neglected Programs	Number in Juvenile Corrections and/or Detention
1. Academic		
<i>While in the facility, the number of students who...</i>		
1. Earned high school course credits	125	227
2. Were enrolled in a GED program	0	78
<i>While in the facility or within 30 calendar days after exit, the number of students who...</i>		
3. Enrolled in their local district school	395	1845
4. Earned a GED	0	156
5. Obtained high school diploma	0	0
6. Were accepted into post-secondary education	0	0
7. Enrolled in post-secondary education	0	0
2. Vocational		
<i>While in the facility, the number of students who...</i>		
1. Enrolled in elective job training courses/programs	0	0
<i>While in the facility or within 30 calendar days after exit, the number of students who...</i>		
2. Enrolled in external job training education	0	0
3. Obtained employment	0	0

The outcome data reported represents what is available. The "0" indicates when there were no students reported. Note: Data is available on high school courses completed at the institution, but most students return to school districts. The local N & D institutions do not have data on # graduating from high school once they return to the district. The questions about work and post secondary would be more appropriate under Subpart 1.

Instructions: Academic Performance Tables

Report the number of long-term Title I, Part D, Subpart 2 students in neglected programs or juvenile corrections/detention who participated in pre- and post-testing in reading and math. Long-term refers to students who were incarcerated for at least 90 consecutive calendar days from July 1, 2004, to June 30, 2005.

The reported numbers should represent unduplicated counts of students; report only information on a student's most recent testing data. Count each student in only one length of stay category. For each length of stay category, report the data by the following facility or program type: students in neglected programs **(N)** and students in juvenile corrections or detention **(JC)**. As the table indicates, combine reporting numbers for juvenile corrections and detention facilities.

For item 1, enter the number of students who were in placement during the reporting year for either 90-179 days, 180-270 days, or more than 270 days, by type of facility/ program.

For item 2, enter the number of students reported in item 1 who tested below grade level when they entered the facility or program.

For item 3, enter the number of students reported in item 1 who have data available for both the pre and the post test exams.

For items 4-8, indicate the number of students reported in item 3 who showed either negative change, no change, up to 1/2 grade level change, up to one grade level change, or more than one grade level change on the pre-post test exam. Students reported in item 3 should not appear in more than one of these change categories.

2.4.2.4 Academic Performance In Reading

Performance Data (Based on most recent pre/post-test data)	Number of long-term students					
	In placement for 90-179 consecutive calendar days		In placement for 180-270 consecutive calendar days		In placement for more than 270 consecutive calendar days	
	N	JC	N	JC	N	JC
1. # students who were in placement from July 1, 2004, to June 30, 2005 (in each length-of-stay category)	79	1656	471	3900	0	0
2. # students from row 1 who tested below grade level upon entry.	550	1656	65	3900	0	0
3. # students from row 1 who took both the pre- and post-test reading exams	375	1125	62	1300	0	0
4. # students from row 3 who showed <u>negative</u> grade level change from the pre- to post-test reading exams	0	0	0	0	0	0
5. # students from row 3 who showed <u>no change</u> in grade level from the pre- to post-test reading exams	90	150	3	321	0	0
6. # students from row 3 who showed improvement of <u>up to 1/2 grade level</u> from the pre- to post-test reading exams	150	202	43	529	0	0
7. # students from row 3 who showed improvement of <u>up to one full grade level</u> from the pre- to post-test reading exams	92	326	13	440	0	0
8. # students from row 3 who showed improvement of <u>more than one full grade level</u> from the pre- to post-test reading exams	43	447	3	10	0	0

2.4.2.5 Academic Performance In Math

Performance Data (Based on most recent pre/post-test data)	Number of long-term students					
	In placement for 90-179 consecutive calendar days		In placement for 180-270 consecutive calendar days		In placement for more than 270 consecutive calendar days	
	N	JC	N	JC	N	JC
1. # students who were in placement from July 1, 2004, to June 30, 2005 (in each length-of-stay category)	79	1656	471	3900	0	0
2. # students from row 1 who tested below grade level upon entry.	79	4124	471	1425	0	0
3. # students from row 1 who took both the pre- and post-test math exams	51	2180	385	1350	0	0
4. # students from row 3 who showed <u>negative</u> grade level change from the pre- to post-test math exams	0	0	0	0	0	0
5. # students from row 3 who showed <u>no change</u> in grade level from the pre- to post-test math exams	18	150	125	250	0	0
6. # students from row 3 who showed improvement of <u>up to 1/2 grade level</u> from the pre- to post-test math exams	20	1525	165	950	0	0
7. # students from row 3 who showed improvement of <u>up to one full grade level</u> from the pre- to post-test math exams	10	496	90	148	0	0
8. # students from row 3 who showed improvement of <u>more than one full grade level</u> from the pre- to post-test math exams	3	9	5	2	0	0

END Subpart 2 Reporting Form

2.5 COMPREHENSIVE SCHOOL REFORM (TITLE I, PART F)

2.5.1 Please provide the percentage of Comprehensive School Reform (CSR) schools that have or have had a CSR grant and made AYP in reading/language arts based on data from the 2004-2005 school year. 97.4

2.5.2 Please provide the percentage of CSR schools that have or have had a CSR grant and made AYP in mathematics based on data from the 2004-2005 school year. 92.2

2.5.3 How many schools in the State have or have been awarded a CSR grant since 1998? 115

2.6 ENHANCING EDUCATION THROUGH TECHNOLOGY (TITLE II, PART D)

Funding Year: FY 2003

School Years: 2003-2004 AND 2004-2005

2.6.1 FY 2003 Program Information

State (Approved) Technology Plan (YES/NO)	Yes <u>X</u> No ___ (circle one)
Year last updated:	<u>2003</u> (year)
Date of State Approval:	MM/DD/YY
Web Site Location/URL: <u>http://dpi.wi.gov/pubsales/tchlgly_7.html</u>	

State Program Goals, Objectives and Performance Indicators

Using the format of the table below, describe the State's progress in meeting its EETT performance indicators based on data sources that the State established for its use in assessing the effectiveness of the program in improving access to and use of educational technology by students and teachers in support of academic achievement, as submitted in the Consolidated State Application. Indicate which of the three or combination of the three Title II, Part D goals relates to your State goals.

Title II, Part D -- Enhanced Education Through Technology Goals:

1. Improve student academic achievement through the use of technology in elementary schools and secondary schools.
2. To assist every student in crossing the digital divide by ensuring that every student is technologically literate by the time the student finishes the eighth grade, regardless of the student's race, ethnicity, gender, family income, geographic location, or disability.
3. To encourage the effective integration of technology resources and systems with teacher training and curriculum development to establish research-based instructional methods that can be widely implemented as best practices by State educational agencies and local educational agencies.

Provide results for each indicator, as well as an assessment and explanation of progress. For targets with no set targets, provide a descriptive assessment of progress. Please indicate where data are not yet available.

For the purpose of completing the table below, please explain how your State defines the following:

2.6.2.1.1 Curriculum Integration

Technology integration occurs when educators use a variety of technology-supported strategies and tools for teaching and learning experiences for all students across all curricular areas at all grade levels.

2.6.2.1.2 Technology literacy

Technology literacy is the ability to responsibly use appropriate technology to communicate, solve problems, and access, manage, integrate, evaluate, and create information to improve learning in all subject areas and to acquire lifelong knowledge and skills in the 21st century.

2.6.2.2 Goals, Objectives, Targets

Goals, Objectives, Targets	Narrative
<p>Program Goal (Indicate page number and item label as designated in the State Consolidated Application or restate goal.)</p>	<p>LEAs will implement comprehensive curricula that integrate technology in all schools.</p>
<p>Statutory Goal Indicate Statutory Goal number 1, 2, and/or 3. This Statutory Goal(s) relates to the Goal(s) submitted in your State Consolidated Application.</p>	<p>Goal 3: To encourage the effective integration of technology resources and systems with teacher training and curriculum development to establish research-based instructional methods that can be widely implemented as best practices by State educational agencies and local educational agencies. Goal 2: To assist every student in crossing the digital divide by ensuring that every student is technologically literate by the time the student finishes the eighth grade, regardless of the student's race, ethnicity, gender, family income, geographic location, or disability.</p>
<p>Program Objective (Indicate page number and item label as designated in the State Consolidated Application or restate objective.)</p>	<p>The percentage of school districts that have finished incorporating the Wisconsin Information and Technology Literacy Standards into their district subject area curricula will increase to 70% by 2007-8.</p>
<p>Indicator (Indicate page number and item label as designated in the State Consolidated Application or restate indicator.)</p>	<p>Survey question on the DPI District Technology Survey asks "Has your district incorporated the Information and Technology Literacy Standards (ITLS) into your district curricula?" (Note: we will have another data source starting next year as data becomes available from Wisconsin's Evaluating State Technology Programs will provide teacher data for two models of instruction developed with Title II Part D funding.)</p>
<p>Target <i>Indicate status of data in 2002-03 school year (SY).</i> BASELINE DATA</p>	<p>In 2002-03, 32% of school districts had incorporated the Wisconsin ITLS standards into their curricula, 64% were "In progress," and 4% had not.</p>
<p>Target <i>Indicate status of data in 2003-04 school year</i></p>	<p>No data available</p>
<p>Target <i>Indicate status of data in 2004-05 school year.</i></p>	<p>Preliminary data indicates that 48% of school districts had incorporated the Wisconsin ITLS standards into their curricula. 48% were "In progress" and 4% had not.</p>
<p>Target <i>Target for 2005-06 school year</i></p>	<p>Target: 56% of school districts will have incorporated the Wisconsin ITLS standards into their curricula.</p>
<p>Target <i>Target for 2006-07 school year.</i></p>	<p>Target: 64% of school districts will have incorporated the Wisconsin ITLS standards into their curricula.</p>
<p>Target <i>Target for 2007-08 school</i></p>	<p>Target: 70% of school districts will have incorporated the Wisconsin ITLS standards into their curricula.</p>
<p>Assessment of Progress <i>Status of progress on indicator</i></p> <p>(1) Target met (2) Target not met</p>	<p>Target met.</p>
<p>Measurement tool(s) used to assess progress of indicators.</p>	<p>Wisconsin School District Technology Survey</p>

Goals, Objectives, Targets	Narrative
Program Goal (Indicate page number and item label as designated in the State Consolidated Application or restate goal.)	Demonstrate improved student academic achievement in LEAs which receive a substantial amount of Title II D funds.
Statutory Goal Indicate Statutory Goal number 1, 2, and/or 3. This Statutory Goal(s) relates to the Goal(s) submitted in your State Consolidated Application.	Goal 1: Improve student academic achievement through the use of technology in elementary schools and secondary schools.
Program Objective (Indicate page number and item label as designated in the State Consolidated Application or restate objective.)	The Wisconsin Knowledge and Concept Exam (WKCE) will be used to provide data for those LEAs which receive a substantial amount of Title II D funds. (Note: we will have another data source starting next year as data becomes available from Wisconsin's Evaluating State Technology Programs. This will provide student achievement data for two models of instruction developed with Title II Part D funding.)
Indicator (Indicate page number and item label as designated in the State Consolidated Application or restate indicator.)	School districts which received over \$5000 and more than \$5 per student in the base year are considered to have received a substantial amount of Title II Part D funding. Because the money is based on indicators of poverty and poverty is correlated to test scores, these districts will be measured for progress instead of against more economically advantaged districts. The number of districts with an increase in their mean scale score (on the WKCE) in language arts, math, science and social studies in the 4 th , 8 th , and 10 th grade will be counted each year. The target is improvement in two thirds of the districts.
Target <i>Indicate status of data in 2002-03 school year (SY).</i> BASELINE DATA	In the 2002-2003 school year the average scale scores for the districts identified as receiving substantial Title II Part D funds were: 4 th Grade Language Arts: 640.14 th Grade Math: 624.74 th Grade Science: 629.74 th Grade Social Science: 640.48 th Grade Language Arts: 674.38 th Grade Math: 699.68 th Grade Science: 696.28 th Grade Social Science: 681.510 th Grade Language Arts: 715.710 th Grade Math: 738.510 th Grade Science: 724.210 th Grade Social Science: 707.8
Target <i>Indicate status of data in 2003-04 school year</i>	The percent of districts increasing in each of the categories was: 4 th Grade Language Arts: 674 th Grade Math: 594 th Grade Science: 824 th Grade Social Science: 718 th Grade Language Arts: 768 th Grade Math: 98 th Grade Science: 278 th Grade Social Science: 6610 th Grade Language Arts: 710 th Grade Math: 3610 th Grade Science: 2910 th Grade Social Science: 18
Target <i>Indicate status of data in 2004-05 school year.</i>	The percent of districts increasing in each of the categories was: 4 th Grade Language Arts: 314 th Grade Math: 384 th Grade Science: 364 th Grade Social Science: 368 th Grade Language Arts: 298 th Grade Math: 738 th Grade Science: 768 th Grade Social Science: 3810 th Grade Language Arts: 8410 th Grade Math: 6510 th Grade Science: 6210 th Grade Social Science: 73
Target <i>Target for 2005-06 school year</i>	The target is improvement in two thirds of the districts.
Target <i>Target for 2006-07 school year.</i>	The target is improvement in two thirds of the districts.
Target <i>Target for 2007-08 school</i>	The target is improvement in two thirds of the districts.
Assessment of Progress <i>Status of progress on indicator</i> (1) Target met (2) Target not met	Targets were not met.
Measurement tool(s) used to assess progress of indicators.	Wisconsin Knowledge and Concepts Examination

Goals, Objectives, Targets	Narrative
Program Goal (Indicate page number and item label as designated in the State Consolidated Application or restate goal.)	Work with other state agencies, and elementary and secondary schools to assist in the statewide and local acquisition, development, interconnection, implementation, improvement, and maintenance of an effective educational technology infrastructure in a manner that expands access of technology to students (particularly disadvantaged students) and teachers.
Statutory Goal Indicate Statutory Goal number 1, 2, and/or 3. This Statutory Goal(s) relates to the Goal(s) submitted in your State Consolidated Application.	Goal 3: To encourage the effective integration of technology resources and systems with teacher training and curriculum development to establish research-based instructional methods that can be widely implemented as best practices by State educational agencies and local educational agencies.
Program Objective (Indicate page number and item label as designated in the State Consolidated Application or restate objective.)	The goal is to have sufficient Internet access for all teachers and students by 2008. By 2008, 98% of classroom should have at least one Internet computer. The ratio of students to instructional Internet computers should be 2:1.
Indicator (Indicate page number and item label as designated in the State Consolidated Application or restate indicator.)	The indicators are the percentage of classrooms with at least one Internet computer and the number of students per Instructional Internet Computer. (Note: an additional source of data will become available when we gain access to Learning Point Associates' database of enGauge data in which one of the indicators is "access.")
Target <i>Indicate status of data in 2002-03 school year (SY).</i> BASELINE DATA	In 2002-03, 93% of classrooms had instructional Internet computers. There were 3.62 students per instructional Internet computers.
Target <i>Indicate status of data in 2003-04 school year</i>	No data available
Target <i>Indicate status of data in 2004-05 school year.</i>	Preliminary data show that 97% of classrooms had instructional Internet computers. There were 2.95 students per instructional Internet computer.
Target <i>Target for 2005-06 school year</i>	2.6 Student per Internet computer
Target <i>Target for 2006-07 school year.</i>	2.3 Students per Internet computer
Target <i>Target for 2007-08 school</i>	2 Students per Internet computer with 98% of classroom having Internet computers.
Assessment of Progress <i>Status of progress on indicator</i> (1) Target met (2) Target not met	On track for meeting this goal.
Measurement tool(s) used to assess progress of indicators.	Wisconsin School District Technology Survey

If for any reason you have modified or added Goal(s), objectives, indicators, and/or targets since submitting the State Consolidated Application, please indicate in the chart below.

Original Goal(s), objectives, indicators, and/or targets (Indicate page number and item label as designated in the State Consolidated Application or restate goal.)	Modification or Additions

2.7 SAFE AND DRUG-FREE SCHOOLS AND COMMUNITIES ACT (TITLE IV, PART A)

2.7.1 Performance Measures

Instructions: In the following chart, please identify:

- o Each of your State indicators as submitted in the June 2002 Consolidated State Application;
- o The instrument or data source used to measure the indicator;
- o The frequency with which the data are collected (annually, semi-annually, biennially) and year of the most recent collection;
- o The baseline data and year the baseline was established; and
- o Targets for the years in which your State has established targets.

2.7.1 Performance Measures

Indicator	Instrument/ Data Source	Frequency of collection	Targets	Actual Performance
By 2007, the percentage of students who carried a weapon (for example, a gun, knife, or club) on school property in the 30 days prior to the survey will be no greater than 3%, as measured by the Wisconsin Youth Risk Behavior Survey.	The Wisconsin Youth Risk Behavior Survey	Frequency: <u>Collected</u> <u>biennially</u> Year of most recent collection: <u>Spring 2005</u>	2003-2004 <u>N/A</u> 2004-2005 <u>3% or less</u> 2005-2006 <u>N/A</u> 2006-2007 <u>3% or less</u> 2007-2008 <u>N/A</u>	2003-2004 <u>N/A</u> 2004-2005 <u>3.9%</u> Baseline: <u>3%</u> Year established: <u>2001</u>
By 2007, the percentage of students who engaged in a physical fight on school property in the 12 months preceding the survey will be no greater than 10%, as measured by the Wisconsin Youth Risk Behavior Survey.	The Wisconsin Youth Risk Behavior Survey	Frequency: <u>Collected</u> <u>biennially</u> Year of most recent collection: <u>Spring 2005</u>	2003-2004 <u>N/A</u> 2004-2005 <u>10% or less</u> 2005-2006 <u>N/A</u> 2006-2007 <u>10% or less</u> 2007-2008 <u>N/A</u>	2003-2004 <u>N/A</u> 2004-2005 <u>12.2%</u> Baseline: <u>11%</u> Year established: <u>2001</u>
By 2007, the percentage of students offered, sold, or given an illegal drug on school property in the 12 months preceding the survey will be no greater than 25%, as measured by the Wisconsin Youth Risk Behavior Survey.	The Wisconsin Youth Risk Behavior Survey	Frequency: <u>Collected</u> <u>biennially</u> Year of most recent collection: <u>Spring 2005</u>	2003-2004 <u>N/A</u> 2004-2005 <u>25% or less</u> 2005-2006 <u>N/A</u> 2006-2007 <u>25% or less</u> 2007-2008 <u>N/A</u>	2003-2004 <u>N/A</u> 2004-2005 <u>21.7%</u> Baseline: <u>27%</u> Year established: <u>2001</u>
By 2007, the number of persistently dangerous schools, as defined by the state, will be 0.	Data collected through the statewide School Performance Report system and through collateral data provided by schools, including, but not limited to, school safety	Frequency: <u>Collected annually</u> Year of most recent collection: <u>Summer 2005</u>	2003-2004 <u>0</u> 2004-2005 <u>0</u> 2005-2006 <u>0</u> 2006-2007 <u>0</u> 2007-2008 <u>0</u>	2003-2004 <u>0</u> 2004-2005 <u>0</u> Baseline: <u>0</u> Year established: <u>2001</u>

plans, and a description of current efforts to address the schools' safety concerns.			
--	--	--	--

2.7.2 Suspension and Expulsion Data

Instructions: In the following charts, indicate the number of out-of-school suspensions and expulsions for elementary, middle, and high school students for each of the underlined incidents.

Please also provide the State's definition of an elementary, middle, and high school, as well as the State's definition of each of the incidents underlined below.

(If your State does not collect data in the same format as requested by this form, the State may provide data from a similar question, provided the State includes a footnote explaining the differences between the data requested and the data the State is able to supply.)

School Type	State Definition
Elementary School	A school that generally offers undifferentiated instruction to a self-contained class, usually involving grades no higher than 8.
Middle School	A school with a program designed specifically for the early-adolescent learner, usually beginning with grade 5 or 6.
High School	A school offering separate classes in different subjects and usually covering grades 9, 10, 11, and 12.

Additional WI definitions: Junior high school-A school between the elem. and high school levels, usually offering at least some separate classes in different subjects and usually covering grades 7, 8, and 9. Elem./secondary combined school-A school that generally offers instruction at all grade levels thru grade 12 in one location due, in most cases, to the size of the district. Although offered at one location, instruction is differentiated as elem., middle/junior high school, and high school.

2.7.2.2 The number of out-of-school suspensions and expulsions for physical fighting.

State definition of physical fighting: __

Wisconsin's categories differ from the federal categories. For the purpose of this report, the numbers reflected in this section will represent Wisconsin's "School Rules Violations" category (see comments below). Also, Wisconsin has 2 additional school types: "junior high" and "elementary/secondary combined." Those data have been combined with the federal "middle school" and "elementary" categories, respectively.

—

SUSPENSIONS	Number for 2004-2005 school year	Number of LEAs reporting
Elementary	17636	
Middle	37110	
High School	55230	

EXPULSIONS	Number for 2004-2005 school year	Number of LEAs reporting
Elementary	64	
Middle	172	
High School	262	

Our reporting system collects the suspension/expulsion data in four categories that differ from the federal categories. The four categories are: 1) School Rules Violations; 2) Assault and Endangering Behavior; 3) Weapon Related; and 4) Drug Related. Physical fighting falls under School Rules Violations, which are left to the LEA to define. 440 LEAs reported.

2.7.2.3 The number of out-of-school suspensions and expulsions for weapons possession

State definition of weapons: According to the U.S. Department of Education's Office of Special Education Programs, a dangerous weapon is a weapon, device, instrument, material, or substance, animate or inanimate, used for or readily capable of causing death or serious bodily injury except such a term does not include a pocket knife with a blade less than 2.5 inches in length.

SUSPENSIONS	Number for 2004-2005 school year	Number of LEAs reporting
Elementary	747	
Middle	564	
High School	736	

EXPULSIONS	Number for 2004-2005 school year	Number of LEAs reporting
Elementary	26	
Middle	125	
High School	338	

Wisconsin has 2 additional school types: "junior high" and "elementary/secondary combined." Those data are combined with the federal "middle school" and "elementary" categories, respectively. 440 LEAs reported.

2.7.2.4 The number of alcohol-related out-of-school suspensions and expulsions.

State definition of alcohol-related: __

Wisconsin's categories differ from the federal categories. For the purpose of this report, the numbers reflected in this section will represent Wisconsin's "Drug Related" category (see comments below). Also, Wisconsin has 2 additional school types: "junior high" and "elementary/secondary combined." Those data are combined with the federal "middle school" and "elementary" categories, respectively.

—

SUSPENSIONS	Number for 2004-2005 school year	Number of LEAs reporting
Elementary	162	
Middle	693	
High School	2851	

EXPULSIONS	Number for 2004-2005 school year	Number of LEAs reporting
Elementary	181	
Middle	223	
High School	740	

Our reporting system collects the suspension/expulsion data in four categories that differ from the federal categories. The four categories are: 1) School Rules Violations; 2) Assault and Endangering Behavior; 3) Weapon Related; and 4) Drug Related. 440 LEAs reported.

2.7.2.5 The number of illicit drug-related out-of-school suspensions and expulsions.

State definition of illicit-drug related: __

Wisconsin's categories differ from the federal categories. For the purpose of this report, the numbers reflected in this section will represent Wisconsin's "Assault/Endangering Behavior" category (see comments below). Also, Wisconsin has 2 additional school types: "junior high" and "elementary/secondary combined." Those data are combined with the federal "middle school" and "elementary" categories, respectively.

—

SUSPENSIONS	Number for 2004-2005 school year	Number of LEAs reporting
Elementary	8571	
Middle	8149	
High School	7037	

EXPULSIONS	Number for 2004-2005 school year	Number of LEAs reporting
Elementary	17	
Middle	54	
High School	165	

Our reporting system collects the suspension/expulsion data in four categories that differ from the federal categories. The four categories are: 1) School Rules Violations; 2) Assault and Endangering Behavior; 3) Weapon Related; and 4) Drug Related. Assault/Endangering Behavior is left to the LEA to define. 440 LEAs reported.

2.7.3 Parent Involvement

Instructions: Section 4116 of ESEA requires that each State provide information pertaining to the State's efforts to inform parents of and include parents in drug and violence prevention efforts. Please describe your State's efforts to include parents in these activities.

Wisconsin has a long history of local control for school districts which provides parents with ready access to the workings of the school and promotes strong parental participation.

The Department of Public Instruction (DPI) encourages parent involvement in drug and violence prevention efforts in a wide variety of ways.

DPI has conducted a State Superintendent's AODA Advisory Council for the past 27 years. This group of parents and educators are directly involved in policy and funding decisions at the state level.

DPI publishes and distributes many publications to encourage schools to inform and involve parents in promoting safe and drug free schools. Among them are; Wisconsin's Comprehensive School Health Program Framework, The Wisconsin Youth Risk Behavior Survey Executive Summary, and Starting a School-Community Health and Safety Council.

We use several methods to disseminate current youth risk behavior statistics to educate parents and community members about the problems of drugs and violence in our schools. Our website www.dpi.wi.gov has a feature called the Wisconsin Information Network for Successful Schools (WINSS) which displays current and past data on all school districts related to school functioning, including information on drug and violence. Our statewide Youth Risk Behavior Survey is published on the web and widely used by schools and community agencies including parents groups. This information helps parents and the general public to understand current prevalence and trends in youth alcohol and other drug abuse and violence. The department also offers a free online instrument for use by any school district, The School ATODA Assessment Tool. This instrument uses an accessible computer survey to gather information about gaps in school ATODA programs by questioning parents along with staff and students.

The State Superintendent regularly disseminates press releases about educational issues including youth risk behavior statistics and

drug and violence prevention programs. These results are communicated by newspapers and electronic media across the state, raising the level of awareness for these issues.

DPI staff members conduct numerous high profile presentations annually that inform educators and parent organizations that then inform their local parents. We work closely with our state parent and teacher association (PTA) to support initiatives that encourage parent involvement. One example of this is the annual Family-School Community Partnerships Conference sponsored and organized by the Department of Public Instruction. This conference is specifically supports parent and family involvement in schools.

Our Cooperative Educational Service Agencies (CESA) have a Wisconsin Alcohol, Tobacco & Other Drug Education Network (WATODEN) that works as our partners in disseminating AODA and violence information and soliciting parent and community input through their regional offices.

Several times a year DPI reminds school districts of their legal requirement to involve parents in SDFSC guidance which they acknowledge in assurances given to us in relation to SDFSC entitlements and other AODA and violence grant programs.

2.8 INNOVATIVE PROGRAMS(TITLE V, PART A)

2.8.1 Please describe **major** results to date of State-level Title V, Part A funded activities to improve student achievement and the quality of education for students. Please use quantitative data if available (e.g., increases in the number of highly qualified teachers).

Wisconsin's Title V, Part A state-level funded activities to improve student achievement and the quality of education for students had the following major results:

- Planned and organized workshops to develop individual grade level descriptors for grades 3 through 8 testing to comply with the requirements of the NCLB Act – particularly in reading, math and science.
- Conducted a variety of workshops (approximately 150) at school, school district, regional, and statewide meetings and conferences on standards, curriculum, instruction, and classroom assessments in the core academic subject areas as defined in the NCLB Act.
- Responded to daily inquiries and requests for technical assistance from a variety of stakeholders regarding standards, curriculum, instruction, and student assessments in the core academic subjects as defined in the NCLB Act.
- Developed, organized and convened teacher professional development workshops related to alignment between standards, curriculum, teaching, and assessment of learning in science, math, and reading.
- Provided technical assistance to schools on Involving Parents in No Child Left Behind.
- Developed and distributed to all Wisconsin schools information to encourage healthy nutrition at home and at school, Improving the School Nutrition Environment: What's Right for Kids.
- Planned and conducted the annual Parent Leadership Conference, March 9, 2005, attended by more than 350 teachers, parents, school administrators and other staff.
- Consulted with and helped plan goals, materials, and training sessions to enable all Wisconsin AmeriCorps and VISTA members conduct family-community partnership projects in schools.
- Developed on-line tools, including surveys, school improvement plans, and articles to help schools identify and strengthen useful family-school-community partnership practices.
- Staffed and developed products for the State Superintendent's Parent Leadership Corps, including three meetings and on-line materials.
- Provided weekly assistance via telephone and email regarding family-school-community partnerships and early childhood/pre-kindergarten programming.
- Hosted video conferences to link state and regional early childhood networks, and planned and co-sponsored the Strongest Links Conference.
- With other state agencies, collaboratively developed and conducted training on the Wisconsin Model Early Learning Standards.
- Provided technical assistance on the definition of school readiness and school readiness indicators in collaboration with the Packard Foundation School Readiness Indicators Project.
- Disseminated and provided technical assistance on the contents of two publications on community approaches to promote 4 year old kindergarten.
- Provided technical assistance to districts to complete their local accountability reports which include assessment, staff, and student behavior data.
- Responded to inquiries regarding NCLB student and school performance data published on WINSS, (Wisconsin Information Network for Successful Schools), and provided technical assistance to school districts to publish local accountability reports.
- Provided videoconference and web-based meetings and workshops to assist local school districts with implementing assessment, standards, curriculum, and accountability reforms. Arranged training on Individual Student Enrollment System to over 800 LEA staff. Six live sessions and 3 distance education sessions were conducted.
- Provided GIS (Geographic Information Systems), mapping for decision making and dissemination of information on topics such as early childhood education, charter schools, and enGauge (a new professional development and school improvement tool designed to help districts and schools plan and evaluate the system-wide use of educational technology).

- Using electronic databases and interlibrary loan systems, conducted research and disseminated information on education reforms and scientifically-based research practices.

2.8.2 The table below requests data on student achievement outcomes of **Title V, Part A - funded** LEAs that use **20%** or more of Title V, Part A funds and funds transferred from other programs for **strategic priorities including: (1)** student achievement in reading and math, **(2)** teacher quality, **(3)** safe and drug free schools, **(4)** access for all students to a quality education. Complete the table below using aggregated data from all LEA evaluations of school year 2004-2005 activities funded in whole or in part from Title V, Part A - Innovative Programs funds.

Priority Activity/Area [1]	Number of LEAs that used 20% or more Title V, Part A, including funds transferred into Title V, Part A (see Note) for:	Number of these LEAs that met AYP	Total Number of Students Served
Area 1: Student Achievement in Reading and Math	240	234	392634
Area 2: Teacher Quality	176	172	67640
Area 3: Safe and Drug Free Schools	6	6	1975
Area 4: Increase Access for all Students	125	124	40962
Note: Funds from REAP and Local Flex (Section 6152) that are used for Title V, Part A purposes and funds transferred into Title V, Part A under the transferability option under section 6132(b).			

2.8.3 Indicate the number of Title V, Part A funded LEAs that did not use, in school year 2004-2005, 20% or more of Title V, Part A funds including funds transferred from other programs into Title V, Part A, for any of the priority activities/areas listed in the table under B above. 0

2.8.4 Indicate the number of LEAs shown in B.1 that met AYP in school year 2004-2005. 0

2.8.5 Indicate the percentage of Title V funds, including funds transferred from other programs into Title V that LEAs used for the four strategic priorities. 81.8

[1] In completing this table, States should include activities described in Section 5131 of the ESEA as follows: Area 1 (activities 3, 9,12,16,19,20,22,26,27), Area 2 (activity 1,2), Area 3 (activity 14,25), Area 4 (activities 4,5,7,8,15,17)

2.8.6 Indicate the percentage of LEAs that completed needs assessments that the State determined to be meaningful and credible. 100.0

2.8.7 Describe how decisions were made regarding the local uses of funds.

School districts are required to annually assess the needs of their schools as part of the consolidated application process. Based on the needs that are identified annually, a school district decides which needs will be supported with Title V-Part A funds and which targeted area(s) under the law that the funding will support. Determination on how funds will be used is also based on the evaluation that the district conducted on use of Title V-A funds the prior year. A school districts consolidated application workgroup oversees the annual needs assessment and Title V-A evaluation.

2.9 RURAL EDUCATION ACHIEVEMENT PROGRAM (REAP) (TITLE VI, PART B)

2.9.1 Small Rural School Achievement Program (Title VI, Part B, Subpart 1)

Please indicate the number of eligible LEAs that notified the State of the LEA's intention to use the Alternative Uses of Funding authority under section 6211 during the 2004-2005 school year. 13

2.9.2 Rural and Low-Income School Program (Title VI, Part B, Subpart 2)

2.9.2.1 LEAs that receive Rural and Low-Income School (RLIS) Program grants may use these funds for any of the purposes listed in the following table. Please indicate in the table the total number of eligible LEAs that used funds for each of the listed purposes during the 2004-2005 school year.

Purpose	Number of LEAs
Teacher recruitment and retention, including the use of signing bonuses and other financial incentives	1
Teacher professional development, including programs that train teachers to utilize technology to improve teaching and to train special needs teachers	2
Educational technology, including software and hardware as described in Title II, Part D	5
Parental involvement activities	1
Activities authorized under the Safe and Drug-Free Schools Program (Title IV, Part A)	1
Activities authorized under Title I, Part A	3
Activities authorized under Title III (Language instruction for LEP and immigrant students)	2

- 2.9.2.2** Describe the progress the State has made in meeting the goals and objectives for the Rural Low-Income Schools Program as described in its June 2002 Consolidated State application. Provide quantitative data where available.

Progress the State has made in meeting the goals and objectives for the Rural & Low-Income Schools Program:

In 2004-05, six school districts were eligible for the Title VI, Part B, subpart(2) Rural & Low-Income Schools Program: Augusta, Geneva J4, Hillsboro, Menominee Indian, Norwalk-Ontario-Wilton, and Royall.

Augusta used its funding primarily to acquire educational technology (including a wireless network for the school), train teachers to utilize technology to improve teaching, especially in math, and support parental involvement through after-school and evening events.

Geneva J4 has continued to use much of its funding for the PATHS program in grades K-5, which aims to reduce aggressive behavior among students. They are also training all teachers in the use of educational technology. As a result, they have seen a 32% reduction in teachers' reports of aggressive student behavior; a 36% increase in teachers' reports of student self-control; a 68% increase in students' vocabulary for expressing emotions; and a 20% increase in students' cognitive skills test scores. The Geneva district achieved 100 percent proficiency level for 4th grade math this last year, compared to 81 in 2002, but declined in its proficiency level for 8th grade math, from 86 percent to 70 percent; however, it had been in the upper 80s and low 90s previously years. With the small enrollment, this decline is not significant. Its reading scores were at 100 percent in 4th grade and 90 percent in 8th grade for November 2005; however, the previous three years, 8th graders scored at 100 percent.

Hillsboro used much of its grant for educational technology, including computers and software. They also purchased research-based reading and math materials for their remediation/enrichment summer school program. The district showed improvement in its math scores in 4th grade, from 71 percent proficient to advanced in November 2002 to 81 percent in 2005. It was fairly consistent for 8th grade math scores, achieving 72 percent in November 2005. Its 4th grade reading scores in November 2005 were at 98 percent, and its 8th grade scores were at 86 percent.

Menominee Indian has used its funding primarily for parent involvement activities, including outreach activities and district-wide parent conferences. The primary component driven by the grant project was the Parent Welcome Center in the alternative school. They report increased parental participation in all school activities. While its 3rd grade reading scores improved from 54 in 2003 to 80 percent proficiency in 2005, at the 8th grade level, the district shows a 56 percent proficiency/advanced level for reading. Its math scores have not improved. Intensive attention continues to be placed to help the district.

Norwalk-Ontario-Wilton used its funds to purchase computers and software to support Title I programs in grades 1-4, and to purchase materials for their LEP students. Eighty-seven percent of its 4th grade students achieved at proficient or advanced in reading, and 89 percent of its 8th graders performed similarly on the November 2005 reading tests. In math, the 8th graders were at 70 percent and the 4th graders were at 59 percent.

Royall used their funds to upgrade computers and software used for information literacy, digital literacy, and educational software. The Royall District showed 82 percent proficiency and advanced for 4th grade reading and 63 percent for math this past November 2005; at the 8th grade the November 2005 scores for proficient and advanced were 92 percent for reading and 79 percent for math.

2.10 FUNDING TRANSFERABILITY FOR STATE AND LOCAL EDUCATIONAL AGENCIES (TITLE VI, PART A, SUBPART 2)**2.10.1 State Transferability of Funds**

Did the State transfer funds under the State Transferability authority of section 6123(a) during the 2004-2005 school year? No

2.10.2 Local Educational Agency Transferability of Funds

2.10.2.1 Please indicate the total number of LEAs that notified the State that they were transferring funds under the LEA Transferability authority of section 6123(b) during the 2004-2005 school year. 75

The answer to 2.10.1 is "no" because the January 30, 2006 letter transfers federal funds appropriated in FY 2005, that first became available to states on July 1, 2005 or the 2005-06 school year.

2.10.2.2 In the charts below, please indicate below the total number of LEAs that transferred funds TO and FROM each eligible program and the total amount of funds transferred TO and FROM each eligible program.

Program	Total Number of LEAs transferring funds <u>TO</u> eligible program	Total amount of funds transferred <u>TO</u> eligible program
Improving Teacher Quality State Grants (section 2121)	3	9916
Educational Technology State Grants (section 2412(a)(2)(A))	8	94359
Safe and Drug-Free Schools and Communities (section 4112(b)(1))	4	8813
State Grants for Innovative Programs (section 5112(a))	25	307479
Title I, Part A, Improving Basic Programs Operated by LEAs	29	598712

Program	Total Number of LEAs transferring funds FROM eligible program	Total amount of funds transferred FROM eligible program
Improving Teacher Quality State Grants (section 2121)	45	669261
Educational Technology State Grants (section 2412(a)(2)(A))	4	9361
Safe and Drug-Free Schools and Communities (section 4112(b)(1))	19	312391
State Grants for Innovative Programs (section 5112(a))	7	28266

The Department plans to obtain information on the use of funds under both the State and LEA Transferability Authority through evaluation studies.

2.11 21ST CENTURY COMMUNITY LEARNING CENTERS(TITLE IV, PART B)

Performance data needed for this program will be available from another source. The Department will implement a national evaluation and data reporting system to provide essential data needed to measure program performance. States will be notified and are requested to participate in these activities once they are implemented.