

**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 2007-08**

**WISCONSIN**



**PART I DUE FRIDAY, DECEMBER 19, 2008**  
**PART II DUE FRIDAY, FEBRUARY 27, 2009**

**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 are 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:

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

The *NCLB* Consolidated State Performance Report (CSPR) for school year (SY) 2007-08 consists of two Parts, Part I and Part II.

## **PART I**

Part I of the CSPR 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 the *ESEA*. The five *ESEA* Goals established in the June 2002 Consolidated State Application are:

- **Performance Goal 1:** By SY 2013-14, all students will reach high standards, at a minimum attaining proficiency or better in reading/language arts and mathematics.
- **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.
- **Performance Goal 3:** By SY 2005-06, all students will be taught by highly qualified teachers.
- **Performance Goal 4:** All students will be educated in learning environments that are safe, drug free, and conducive to learning.
- **Performance Goal 5:** All students will graduate from high school.

Beginning with the CSPR SY 2005-06 collection, the Education of Homeless Children and Youths was added. The Migrant Child count was added for the SY 2006-07 collection.

## **PART II**

Part II of the CSPR consists of information related to State activities and outcomes of specific *ESEA* programs. While the information requested varies from program to program, 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 pending full implementation of required ED Facts submission.
3. The information will provide valid evidence of program outcomes or results.

## GENERAL INSTRUCTIONS AND TIMELINES

All States that received funding on the basis of the Consolidated State Application for the SY 2007-08 must respond to this Consolidated State Performance Report (CSPR). Part I of the Report is due to the Department by **Friday, December 19, 2008**. Part II of the Report is due to the Department by **Friday, February 27, 2009**. Both Part I and Part II should reflect data from the SY 2007-08, unless otherwise noted.

The format states will use to submit the Consolidated State Performance Report has changed to an online submission starting with SY 2004-05. 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 "SY 2007-08 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 SY 2007-08 CSPR will be found on the main CSPR page of the EDEN web site (<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: 10/31/2010
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: <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Part I, 2007-08 <input type="checkbox"/> Part II, 2007-08		
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.wi.gov		
Name of Authorizing State Official: (Print or Type): Michael J. Thompson		
		Friday, March 13, 2009, 5:02:59 PM
Signature		Date

**CONSOLIDATED STATE PERFORMANCE REPORT  
PART I**

For reporting on  
**School Year 2007-08**



**PART I DUE DECEMBER 19, 2008  
5PM EST**

**1.1 STANDARDS AND ASSESSMENT DEVELOPMENT**

This section requests descriptions of the State's implementation of the *NCLB* academic content standards, academic achievement standards and assessments to meet the requirements of Section 1111(b)(1) of *ESEA*.

**1.1.1 Academic Content Standards**

In the space below, provide a description and timeline of any actions the State has taken or is planning to take to make revisions to or change the State's academic content standards in mathematics, reading/language arts or science. Responses should focus on actions taken or planned since the State's content standards were approved through ED's peer review process for State assessment systems. Indicate specifically in what school year your State expects the changes to be implemented.

If the State has not made or is not planning to make revisions or changes, respond "No revisions or changes to content standards taken or planned."

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

WI is in the process of reviewing academic standards in core areas as a part of the America Diploma Project and the Partnership for 21st Century Skills.

Wisconsin participated in the Cohort III Alignment Institute and has undergone a quality review in Mathematics and English Language Arts. Specific draft revisions of mathematics and ELA standards will be submitted in Spring 2009. Final adoption will occur by June 2009.

Work is being done to identify the core competencies ... Beginning with Business Summit on Education (March 2007) to identify the essential knowledge and skills high school graduates need for success for the workplace, postsecondary education, and citizenship. Continuing the conversation through postsecondary strategic planning event (Dec 2008) to identify key issues for high school preparation. Will include feedback from workforce development groups and regional economic development councils (Spring 2009).

No revisions or changes to Wisconsin Model Academic content standards in science was undertaken. The extended, alternate achievement standards in all content areas for students with disabilities was undertaken and approved on August 27, 2007.

March 13, 2009 - Additional comments per ED request for data verification:

The last sentence above is accurate. No revision needed.

Source – Manual input by the SEA using the online collection tool.

### 1.1.2 Assessments in Mathematics and Reading/Language Arts

In the space below, provide a description and timeline of any actions the State has taken or is planning to take to make revisions to or change the State's assessments and/or academic achievement standards in mathematics or reading/language arts required under Section 1111(b)(3) of ESEA. Responses should focus on actions taken or planned since the State's assessment system was approved through ED's peer review process. Responses also should indicate specifically in what school year your State expects the changes to be implemented.

As applicable, include any assessment (e.g., alternate assessments based on alternate achievement standards, alternate assessments based on modified achievement standards, native language assessments, or others) implemented to meet the assessment requirements under Section 1111(b)(3) of ESEA as well as alternate achievement standards for students with significant cognitive disabilities and modified academic achievement standards for certain students with disabilities implemented to meet the requirements of Section 1111(b)(3) of ESEA. Indicate specifically in what year your state expects the changes to be implemented.

If the State has not made or is not planning to make revisions or changes, respond "No revisions or changes to assessments and/or academic achievement standards taken or planned."

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

WDPI developed standardized accommodations for English language learners (ELL) to take the Wisconsin Knowledge and Concepts Examinations (WKCE) with side-by-side accommodations in Spanish or Hmong when needed. Beginning in 2006-07, all ELL students participated in the regular WKCE - there is no separate alternate assessment for ELL students.

WI has developed new alternate assessments for students with disabilities (WAA-SwD) based on based on alternate achievement standards. These standards-based instruments in Reading, Mathematics, and Science replace the portfolio assessments previously used. They were developed to increase the alignment, standardization, and technical quality of the WAA-SwD. The students with disabilities are administered the WAA-SwD are in an alternate curriculum through their Individual Education Program (IEP) and are taught the alternate standards extended from the WI Model Academic Standards.

March 13, 2009 - Additional comments per ED request for data verification:

The last sentence above is accurate. No revision needed.

Source – Manual input by the SEA using the online collection tool.

#### 1.1.4 Assessments in Science

If your State's assessments and academic achievement standards in science required under Section 1111(b)(3) of *ESEA* have been approved through ED's peer review process, provide in the space below a description and timeline of any actions the State has taken or is planning to take to make revisions to or change the State's assessments and/or academic achievement standards in science required under Section 1111(b)(3) of *ESEA*. Responses should focus on actions taken or planned since the State's assessment system was approved through ED's peer review process. Responses also should indicate specifically in what school year your State expects the changes to be implemented.

As applicable, include any assessment (e.g., alternate assessments based on alternate achievement standards, alternate assessments based on modified achievement standards, native language assessments, or others) implemented to meet the assessment requirements under Section 1111(b)(3) of *ESEA* as well as alternate achievement standards for students with significant cognitive disabilities and modified academic achievement standards for certain students with disabilities implemented to meet the requirements of Section 1111(b)(3) of *ESEA*.

If the State has not made or is not planning to make revisions or changes, respond "No revisions or changes to assessments and/or academic achievement standards taken or planned."

If the State's assessments in science required under Section 1111(b)(3) of *ESEA* have not been approved through ED's peer review process, respond "State's assessments and academic achievement standards in science not yet approved."

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

Wisconsin has received full approval on our Standards and Assessments under NCLB, including Science. No revisions or changes to Wisconsin Model Academic content standards was undertaken. The extended, alternate achievement standards for students with disabilities was undertaken and approved on August 27, 2007. This edition of the Science WKCE with these achievement standards have been administered since 2002-03. The WAA-SwD Science assessment was developed in 2007-08.

WI is in the process of reviewing academic standards in core areas as a part of the America Diploma Project and the Partnership for 21st Century Skills. Wisconsin's participation in the Partnership for 21st Century Skills, which builds on core subject expertise and emphasizes new 21st century competencies such as information and communication technology literacy; critical thinking; communication; collaboration; and other skills.

Source – Manual input by the SEA using the online collection tool.

## 1.2 PARTICIPATION IN STATE ASSESSMENTS

This section collects data on the participation of students in the State *NCLB* assessments.

### 1.2.1 Participation of All Students in Mathematics Assessment

In the table below, provide the number of students enrolled during the State's testing window for *NCLB* mathematics assessments required under Section 1111(b)(3) of *ESEA* (regardless of whether the students were present for a full academic year) and the number of students who participated in the mathematics assessment in accordance with *NCLB*. The percentage of students who were tested for mathematics will be calculated automatically.

The student group "children with disabilities (*IDEA*)" includes children who participated in the regular assessments with or without accommodations and alternate assessments.

The student group "limited English proficient (LEP) students" includes recently arrived students who have attended schools in the United States for fewer than 12 months. Do not include former LEP students.

Student Group	# Students Enrolled	# Students Participating	Percentage of Students Participating
All students	436,982	434,507	99.4
American Indian or Alaska Native	6,264	6,190	98.8
Asian or Pacific Islander	15,669	15,581	99.4
Black, non-Hispanic	46,032	45,157	98.1
Hispanic	32,488	32,240	99.2
White, non-Hispanic	336,466	335,296	99.6
Children with disabilities ( <i>IDEA</i> )	61,688	60,614	98.3
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	24,480	24,336	99.4
Economically disadvantaged students	143,822	142,549	99.1
Migratory students	305	297	97.4
Male	224,162	222,699	99.4
Female	212,789	211,791	99.5

**Comments:** These data match WI publicly reported WINSS data.

Source – The table above is produced through *EDFacts*. The SEA submits the data in file N/X081 that includes data group 588, category sets A, B, C, D, E, and F, and subtotal 1. If the SEA has additional racial/ethnic groups or combinations of racial/ethnic groups in its accountability plan under *NCLB*, the SEA will report the above data for those groups through the online collection tool.

### 1.2.2 Participation of Students with Disabilities in Mathematics Assessment

In the table below, provide the number of children with disabilities (*IDEA*) participating during the State's testing window in mathematics assessments required under Section 1111(b)(3) of *ESEA* (regardless of whether the children were present for a full academic year) by the type of assessment. The percentage of children with disabilities (*IDEA*) who participated in the mathematics assessment for each assessment option will be calculated automatically. The total number of children with disabilities (*IDEA*) participating will also be calculated automatically.

The data provided below should include mathematics participation data from all students with disabilities as defined under the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act. Do not include results from students covered under Section 504 of the Rehabilitation Act of 1973.

Type of Assessment	# Children with Disabilities ( <i>IDEA</i> ) Participating	Percentage of Children with Disabilities ( <i>IDEA</i> ) Participating, Who Took the Specified Assessment
Regular Assessment without Accommodations	17,939	29.6
Regular Assessment with Accommodations	37,228	61.4
Alternate Assessment Based on Grade-Level Achievement Standards	0	0.0
Alternate Assessment Based on Modified Achievement Standards	0	0.0
Alternate Assessment Based on Alternate Achievement Standards	5,447	9.0
Total	60,614	

**Comments:** Wisconsin does not administer Alternate Assessments based on grade-level or modified achievement standards.

Source – Manual input by the SEA using the online collection tool.

### 1.2.3 Participation of All Students in the Reading/Language Arts Assessment

This section is similar to 1.2.1 and collects data on the State's *NCLB* reading/language arts assessment.

Student Group	# Students Enrolled	# Students Participating	Percentage of Students Participating
All students	436,982	433,117	99.1
American Indian or Alaska Native	6,264	6,187	98.8
Asian or Pacific Islander	15,669	15,333	97.9
Black, non-Hispanic	46,032	45,188	98.2
Hispanic	32,488	31,145	95.9
White, non-Hispanic	336,466	335,218	99.6
Children with disabilities ( <i>IDEA</i> )	61,688	60,497	98.1
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	24,480	22,927	93.7
Economically disadvantaged students	143,822	141,338	98.3
Migratory students	305	280	91.8
Male	224,162	221,955	99.0
Female	212,789	211,145	99.2

**Comments:** Participation rates for LEP and Migratory student fluctuate widely to very small numbers of students in 425 districts and over 2200 schools in Wisconsin.

Source – The same file specification as 1.2.1 is used, but with data group 589 instead of 588.

### 1.2.4 Participation of Students with Disabilities in Reading/Language Arts Assessment

This section is similar to 1.2.2 and collects data on the State's *NCLB* reading/language arts assessment.

The data provided should include reading/language arts participation data from all students with disabilities as defined under the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act. Do not include results from students covered under Section 504 of the Rehabilitation Act of 1973.

Type of Assessment	# Children with Disabilities ( <i>IDEA</i> ) Participating	Percentage of Children with Disabilities ( <i>IDEA</i> ) Participating, Who Took the Specified Assessment
Regular Assessment without Accommodations	17,913	29.6
Regular Assessment with Accommodations	36,664	60.6
Alternate Assessment Based on Grade-Level Achievement Standards	0	0.0
Alternate Assessment Based on Modified Achievement Standards	0	0.0
Alternate Assessment Based on Alternate Achievement Standards	5,920	9.8
Total	60,497	

**Comments:** Wisconsin does not administer Alternate Assessments based on grade-level or modified achievement standards.

Source – Manual input by the SEA using the online collection tool.

### 1.2.5 Participation of All Students in the Science Assessment

This section is similar to 1.2.1 and collects data on the State's *NCLB* science assessment.

Student Group	# Students Enrolled	# Students Participating	Percentage of Students Participating
All students	194,428	191,889	98.7
American Indian or Alaska Native	2,863	2,798	97.7
Asian or Pacific Islander	6,769	6,592	97.4
Black, non-Hispanic	20,047	19,214	95.8
Hispanic	13,322	12,832	96.3
White, non-Hispanic	151,386	150,425	99.4
Children with disabilities ( <i>IDEA</i> )	27,473	26,584	96.8
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	9,554	9,040	94.6
Economically disadvantaged students	60,639	59,144	97.5
Migratory students	129	114	88.4
Male	99,587	98,136	98.5
Female	94,827	93,747	98.9

**Comments:** Matches publicly reported data on WINSS.  
Fluctuation and participation rates of LEP and Migratory students in 426 districts is due to small numbers.

Source – Manual input by the SEA using the online collection tool.

**Note:** New collection for the SY 2007-08 CSPR. Proposed under OMB 831.

### 1.2.6 Participation of Students with Disabilities in Science Assessment

This section is similar to 1.2.2 and collects data on the State's *NCLB* science assessment.

The data provided should include science participation data from all students with disabilities as defined under the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act. Do not include results from students covered under Section 504 of the Rehabilitation Act of 1973.

Type of Assessment	# Children with Disabilities (IDEA) Participating	Percentage of Children with Disabilities (IDEA) Participating, Who Took the Specified Assessment
Regular Assessment without Accommodations	8,058	30.3
Regular Assessment with Accommodations	16,432	61.8
Alternate Assessment Based on Grade-Level Achievement Standards	0	0.0
Alternate Assessment Based on Modified Achievement Standards	0	0.0
Alternate Assessment Based on Alternate Achievement Standards	2,094	7.9
Total	26,584	

**Comments:** Total # of SwD (IDEA) participating matches science table 1.2.5 above.  
Wisconsin does not administer Alternate Assessments based on grade-level or modified achievement standards.

Source – Manual input by the SEA using the online collection tool.

**Note:** New collection for the SY 2007-08 CSPR. Proposed under OMB 831.

### 1.3 STUDENT ACADEMIC ACHIEVEMENT

This section collects data on student academic achievement on the State *NCLB* assessments.

#### 1.3.1 Student Academic Achievement in Mathematics

In the format of the table below, provide the number of students who completed the State *NCLB* assessment(s) in mathematics implemented to meet the requirements of Section 1111(b)(3) of ESEA (regardless of whether the students were present for a full academic year) and for whom a proficiency level was assigned, and the number of these students who scored at or above proficient, in grades 3 through 8 and high school. The percentage of students who scored at or above proficient is calculated automatically.

The student group "children with disabilities (*IDEA*)" includes children who participated in the regular assessments with or without accommodations and alternate assessments.

The student group "limited English proficient (LEP) students" does include recently arrived students who have attended schools in the United States for fewer than 12 months. Do not include former LEP students.

#### 1.3.2 Student Academic Achievement in Reading/Language Arts

This section is similar to 1.3.1. The only difference is that this section collects data on the State's *NCLB* reading/language arts assessment.

The student group "limited English proficient (LEP) students" does not include recently arrived students who have attended schools in the United States for fewer than 12 months. Do not include former LEP students.

#### 1.3.3 Student Academic Achievement in Science

This section is similar to 1.3.1. The only difference is that this section collects data on the State's *NCLB* science assessment administered at least one in each of the following grade spans 3 through 5, 6 through 9, and 10 through 12.

Limited English Proficiency (LEP) students includes recently arrived students who have attended schools in the United States for fewer than 12 months. Do not include former LEP students.

**1.3.1.1 Student Academic Achievement in Mathematics - Grade 3**

<b>Grade 3</b>	<b># Students Who Completed the Assessment and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned</b>	<b># Students Scoring at or Above Proficient</b>	<b>Percentage of Students Scoring at or Above Proficient</b>
All students	59,822	44,335	74.1
American Indian or Alaska Native	880	548	62.3
Asian or Pacific Islander	2,170	1,625	74.9
Black, non-Hispanic	6,463	2,843	44.0
Hispanic	5,373	3,067	57.1
White, non-Hispanic	44,931	36,247	80.7
Children with disabilities ( <i>IDEA</i> )	8,344	4,536	54.4
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	4,388	2,523	57.5
Economically disadvantaged students	21,715	12,748	58.7
Migratory students	40	23	57.5
Male	30,779	22,867	74.3
Female	29,042	21,467	73.9

**Comments:** A very small number of migratory students are enrolled in Wisconsin schools at the time of testing. A relatively large year-to-year fluctuation in the grade level group size is be expected with group size N<99.

Source – Initially populated from ED*Facts*. See Attachment D: CSPR & ED*Facts* Data Crosswalk. If the SEA has additional racial/ethnic groups or combinations of racial/ethnic groups in its accountability plan under *NCLB*, the SEA will report the above data for those groups through the online collection tool.

**1.3.2.1 Student Academic Achievement in Reading/Language Arts - Grade 3**

<b>Grade 3</b>	<b># Students Who Completed the Assessment and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned</b>	<b># Students Scoring at or Above Proficient</b>	<b>Percentage of Students Scoring at or Above Proficient</b>
All students	59,454	47,705	80.2
American Indian or Alaska Native	878	634	72.2
Asian or Pacific Islander	2,135	1,621	75.9
Black, non-Hispanic	6,452	3,731	57.8
Hispanic	5,070	3,278	64.7
White, non-Hispanic	44,913	38,436	85.6
Children with disabilities ( <i>IDEA</i> )	8,273	4,332	52.4
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	4,032	2,421	60.0
Economically disadvantaged students	21,353	14,272	66.8
Migratory students	38	26	68.4
Male	30,579	23,571	77.1
Female	28,874	24,133	83.6

**Comments:** A very small number of migratory students are enrolled in Wisconsin schools at the time of testing. A relatively large year-to-year fluctuation in the grade level group size is be expected with group size N<99.

Source – Initially populated from ED*Facts*. See Attachment D: CSPR & ED*Facts* Data Crosswalk. If the SEA has additional racial/ethnic groups or combinations of racial/ethnic groups in its accountability plan under *NCLB*, the SEA will report the above data for those groups through the online collection tool.

**1.3.3.1 Student Academic Achievement in Science - Grade 3**

<b>Grade 3</b>	<b># Students Who Completed the Assessment and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned</b>	<b># Students Scoring at or Above Proficient</b>	<b>Percentage of Students Scoring at or Above Proficient</b>
All students	0	0	0.0
American Indian or Alaska Native	0	0	0.0
Asian or Pacific Islander	0	0	0.0
Black, non-Hispanic	0	0	0.0
Hispanic	0	0	0.0
White, non-Hispanic	0	0	0.0
Children with disabilities ( <i>IDEA</i> )	0	0	0.0
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	0	0	0.0
Economically disadvantaged students	0	0	0.0
Migratory students	0	0	0.0
Male	0	0	0.0
Female	0	0	0.0
<b>Comments:</b> Science is NOT tested at grade 3.			

Source – Manual input by the SEA using the online collection tool. If the SEA has additional racial/ethnic groups or combinations of racial/ethnic groups in its accountability plan under *NCLB*, the SEA will report the above data for those groups through the online CSPR collection tool.

**Note:** New collection for the SY 2007-08 CSPR. Proposed under OMB 83I.

**1.3.1.2 Student Academic Achievement in Mathematics - Grade 4**

<b>Grade 4</b>	<b># Students Who Completed the Assessment and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned</b>	<b># Students Scoring at or Above Proficient</b>	<b>Percentage of Students Scoring at or Above Proficient</b>
All students	59,872	46,010	76.8
American Indian or Alaska Native	862	558	64.7
Asian or Pacific Islander	2,098	1,599	76.2
Black, non-Hispanic	6,538	3,076	47.0
Hispanic	5,046	3,070	60.8
White, non-Hispanic	45,323	37,703	83.2
Children with disabilities ( <i>IDEA</i> )	8,500	4,455	52.4
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	3,958	2,318	58.6
Economically disadvantaged students	21,583	13,291	61.6
Migratory students	49	31	63.3
Male	30,687	23,888	77.8
Female	29,183	22,120	75.8
<b>Comments:</b>			

Source – Initially populated from *EDFacts*. See Attachment D: CSPR & *EDFacts* Data Crosswalk. If the SEA has additional racial/ethnic groups or combinations of racial/ethnic groups in its accountability plan under *NCLB*, the SEA will report the above data for those groups through the online collection tool.

**1.3.2.2 Student Academic Achievement in Reading/Language Arts - Grade 4**

<b>Grade 4</b>	<b># Students Who Completed the Assessment and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned</b>	<b># Students Scoring at or Above Proficient</b>	<b>Percentage of Students Scoring at or Above Proficient</b>
All students	59,620	48,917	82.0
American Indian or Alaska Native	861	633	73.5
Asian or Pacific Islander	2,059	1,570	76.3
Black, non-Hispanic	6,532	3,778	57.8
Hispanic	4,862	3,333	68.6
White, non-Hispanic	45,300	39,598	87.4
Children with disabilities ( <i>IDEA</i> )	8,458	4,324	51.1
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	3,722	2,261	60.7
Economically disadvantaged students	21,366	14,631	68.5
Migratory students	46	27	58.7
Male	30,558	24,397	79.8
Female	29,060	24,518	84.4
<b>Comments:</b> A very small number of migratory students are enrolled in Wisconsin schools at the time of testing. A relatively large year-to-year fluctuation in the grade level group size is expected with group size $N < 99$ .			

Source – Initially populated from *EDFacts*. See Attachment D: CSPR & *EDFacts* Data Crosswalk. If the SEA has additional racial/ethnic groups or combinations of racial/ethnic groups in its accountability plan under *NCLB*, the SEA will report the above data for those groups through the online collection tool.

**1.3.3.2 Student Academic Achievement in Science - Grade 4**

<b>Grade 4</b>	<b># Students Who Completed the Assessment and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned</b>	<b># Students Scoring at or Above Proficient</b>	<b>Percentage of Students Scoring at or Above Proficient</b>
All students	59,650	45,106	75.6
American Indian or Alaska Native	862	546	63.3
Asian or Pacific Islander	2,062	1,434	69.5
Black, non-Hispanic	6,510	2,960	45.5
Hispanic	4,932	2,894	58.7
White, non-Hispanic	45,284	37,269	82.3
Children with disabilities ( <i>IDEA</i> )	8,464	4,976	58.8
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	3,794	2,018	53.2
Economically disadvantaged students	21,390	12,799	59.8
Migratory students	45	22	48.9
Male	30,566	23,038	75.4
Female	29,084	22,066	75.9
<b>Comments:</b> P_LDS_WSAS_FACT 12/8/2008 All students participating in WSAS received a proficiency level.			

Source – Manual input by the SEA using the online collection tool. If the SEA has additional racial/ethnic groups or combinations of racial/ethnic groups in its accountability plan under *NCLB*, the SEA will report the above data for those groups through the online CSPR collection tool.

**Note:** New collection for the SY 2007-08 CSPR. Proposed under OMB 831.

**1.3.1.3 Student Academic Achievement in Mathematics - Grade 5**

<b>Grade 5</b>	<b># Students Who Completed the Assessment and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned</b>	<b># Students Scoring at or Above Proficient</b>	<b>Percentage of Students Scoring at or Above Proficient</b>
All students	59,455	45,374	76.3
American Indian or Alaska Native	809	559	69.1
Asian or Pacific Islander	2,168	1,688	77.9
Black, non-Hispanic	6,334	2,826	44.6
Hispanic	4,710	2,794	59.3
White, non-Hispanic	45,431	37,505	82.6
Children with disabilities ( <i>IDEA</i> )	8,424	3,972	47.2
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	3,733	2,079	55.7
Economically disadvantaged students	20,593	12,331	59.9
Migratory students	37	19	51.4
Male	30,419	23,370	76.8
Female	29,035	22,004	75.8

**Comments:** A very small number of migratory students are enrolled in Wisconsin schools at the time of testing. A relatively large year-to-year fluctuation in the grade level group size is be expected with group size N<99.

Source – Initially populated from ED*Facts*. See Attachment D: CSPR & ED*Facts* Data Crosswalk. If the SEA has additional racial/ethnic groups or combinations of racial/ethnic groups in its accountability plan under *NCLB*, the SEA will report the above data for those groups through the online collection tool.

**1.3.2.3 Student Academic Achievement in Reading/Language Arts - Grade 5**

<b>Grade 5</b>	<b># Students Who Completed the Assessment and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned</b>	<b># Students Scoring at or Above Proficient</b>	<b>Percentage of Students Scoring at or Above Proficient</b>
All students	59,266	50,316	84.9
American Indian or Alaska Native	809	655	81.0
Asian or Pacific Islander	2,128	1,699	79.8
Black, non-Hispanic	6,335	3,909	61.7
Hispanic	4,569	3,295	72.1
White, non-Hispanic	45,421	40,755	89.7
Children with disabilities ( <i>IDEA</i> )	8,411	4,477	53.2
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	3,547	2,291	64.6
Economically disadvantaged students	20,440	14,843	72.6
Migratory students	32	23	71.9
Male	30,322	25,099	82.8
Female	28,943	25,217	87.1

**Comments:** A very small number of migratory students are enrolled in Wisconsin schools at the time of testing. A relatively large year-to-year fluctuation in the grade level group size is be expected with group size N<99.

Source – Initially populated from ED*Facts*. See Attachment D: CSPR & ED*Facts* Data Crosswalk. If the SEA has additional racial/ethnic groups or combinations of racial/ethnic groups in its accountability plan under *NCLB*, the SEA will report the above data for those groups through the online collection tool.

**1.3.3.3 Student Academic Achievement in Science - Grade 5**

<b>Grade 5</b>	<b># Students Who Completed the Assessment and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned</b>	<b># Students Scoring at or Above Proficient</b>	<b>Percentage of Students Scoring at or Above Proficient</b>
All students	0	0	0.0
American Indian or Alaska Native	0	0	0.0
Asian or Pacific Islander	0	0	0.0
Black, non-Hispanic	0	0	0.0
Hispanic	0	0	0.0
White, non-Hispanic	0	0	0.0
Children with disabilities ( <i>IDEA</i> )	0	0	0.0
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	0	0	0.0
Economically disadvantaged students	0	0	0.0
Migratory students	0	0	0.0
Male	0	0	0.0
Female	0	0	0.0
<b>Comments:</b> Science is tested at grades 4, 8, 10 in Wisconsin.			

Source – Manual input by the SEA using the online collection tool. If the SEA has additional racial/ethnic groups or combinations of racial/ethnic groups in its accountability plan under *NCLB*, the SEA will report the above data for those groups through the online CSPR collection tool.

**Note:** New collection for the SY 2007-08 CSPR. Proposed under OMB 83I.

**1.3.1.4 Student Academic Achievement in Mathematics - Grade 6**

<b>Grade 6</b>	<b># Students Who Completed the Assessment and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned</b>	<b># Students Scoring at or Above Proficient</b>	<b>Percentage of Students Scoring at or Above Proficient</b>
All students	60,693	46,179	76.1
American Indian or Alaska Native	823	505	61.4
Asian or Pacific Islander	2,254	1,736	77.0
Black, non-Hispanic	6,381	2,611	40.9
Hispanic	4,511	2,625	58.2
White, non-Hispanic	46,720	38,698	82.8
Children with disabilities ( <i>IDEA</i> )	8,543	3,555	41.6
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	3,447	1,882	54.6
Economically disadvantaged students	20,297	11,698	57.6
Migratory students	44	27	61.4
Male	31,223	23,684	75.9
Female	29,469	22,494	76.3

**Comments:** A very small number of migratory students are enrolled in Wisconsin schools at the time of testing. A relatively large year-to-year fluctuation in the grade level group size is be expected with group size N<99.

Source – Initially populated from ED*Facts*. See Attachment D: CSPR & ED*Facts* Data Crosswalk. If the SEA has additional racial/ethnic groups or combinations of racial/ethnic groups in its accountability plan under *NCLB*, the SEA will report the above data for those groups through the online collection tool.

**1.3.2.4 Student Academic Achievement in Reading/Language Arts - Grade 6**

<b>Grade 6</b>	<b># Students Who Completed the Assessment and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned</b>	<b># Students Scoring at or Above Proficient</b>	<b>Percentage of Students Scoring at or Above Proficient</b>
All students	60,547	51,833	85.6
American Indian or Alaska Native	824	633	76.8
Asian or Pacific Islander	2,229	1,693	76.0
Black, non-Hispanic	6,384	3,944	61.8
Hispanic	4,397	3,174	72.2
White, non-Hispanic	46,709	42,385	90.7
Children with disabilities ( <i>IDEA</i> )	8,542	4,410	51.6
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	3,290	1,971	59.9
Economically disadvantaged students	20,163	14,458	71.7
Migratory students	44	29	65.9
Male	31,153	26,034	83.6
Female	29,393	25,798	87.8

**Comments:** A very small number of migratory students are enrolled in Wisconsin schools at the time of testing. A relatively large year-to-year fluctuation in the grade level group size is be expected with group size N<99.

Source – Initially populated from ED*Facts*. See Attachment D: CSPR & ED*Facts* Data Crosswalk. If the SEA has additional racial/ethnic groups or combinations of racial/ethnic groups in its accountability plan under *NCLB*, the SEA will report the above data for those groups through the online collection tool.

**1.3.3.4 Student Academic Achievement in Science - Grade 6**

<b>Grade 6</b>	<b># Students Who Completed the Assessment and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned</b>	<b># Students Scoring at or Above Proficient</b>	<b>Percentage of Students Scoring at or Above Proficient</b>
All students	0	0	0.0
American Indian or Alaska Native	0	0	0.0
Asian or Pacific Islander	0	0	0.0
Black, non-Hispanic	0	0	0.0
Hispanic	0	0	0.0
White, non-Hispanic	0	0	0.0
Children with disabilities ( <i>IDEA</i> )	0	0	0.0
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	0	0	0.0
Economically disadvantaged students	0	0	0.0
Migratory students	0	0	0.0
Male	0	0	0.0
Female	0	0	0.0
<b>Comments:</b> Science is tested at Grades 4, 8, 10 in Wisconsin.			

Source – Manual input by the SEA using the online collection tool. If the SEA has additional racial/ethnic groups or combinations of racial/ethnic groups in its accountability plan under *NCLB*, the SEA will report the above data for those groups through the online CSPR collection tool.

**Note:** New collection for the SY 2007-08 CSPR. Proposed under OMB 831.

**1.3.1.5 Student Academic Achievement in Mathematics - Grade 7**

<b>Grade 7</b>	<b># Students Who Completed the Assessment and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned</b>	<b># Students Scoring at or Above Proficient</b>	<b>Percentage of Students Scoring at or Above Proficient</b>
All students	61,776	47,686	77.2
American Indian or Alaska Native	862	562	65.2
Asian or Pacific Islander	2,273	1,717	75.5
Black, non-Hispanic	6,546	2,717	41.5
Hispanic	4,499	2,541	56.5
White, non-Hispanic	47,594	40,148	84.4
Children with disabilities ( <i>IDEA</i> )	8,508	3,506	41.2
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	3,302	1,668	50.5
Economically disadvantaged students	20,177	11,793	58.4
Migratory students	52	32	61.5
Male	31,672	24,574	77.6
Female	30,096	23,110	76.8

**Comments:** A very small number of migratory students are enrolled in Wisconsin schools at the time of testing. A relatively large year-to-year fluctuation in the grade level group size is be expected with group size N<99.

Source – Initially populated from ED*Facts*. See Attachment D: CSPR & ED*Facts* Data Crosswalk. If the SEA has additional racial/ethnic groups or combinations of racial/ethnic groups in its accountability plan under *NCLB*, the SEA will report the above data for those groups through the online collection tool.

**1.3.2.5 Student Academic Achievement in Reading/Language Arts - Grade 7**

<b>Grade 7</b>	<b># Students Who Completed the Assessment and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned</b>	<b># Students Scoring at or Above Proficient</b>	<b>Percentage of Students Scoring at or Above Proficient</b>
All students	61,618	52,637	85.4
American Indian or Alaska Native	865	676	78.2
Asian or Pacific Islander	2,237	1,776	79.4
Black, non-Hispanic	6,557	4,065	62.0
Hispanic	4,369	3,104	71.0
White, non-Hispanic	47,587	43,014	90.4
Children with disabilities ( <i>IDEA</i> )	8,506	4,275	50.3
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	3,137	1,907	60.8
Economically disadvantaged students	20,045	14,443	72.1
Migratory students	49	29	59.2
Male	31,574	26,224	83.1
Female	30,036	26,408	87.9

**Comments:** A very small number of migratory students are enrolled in Wisconsin schools at the time of testing. A relatively large year-to-year fluctuation in the grade level group size is be expected with group size N<99.

Source – Initially populated from ED*Facts*. See Attachment D: CSPR & ED*Facts* Data Crosswalk. If the SEA has additional racial/ethnic groups or combinations of racial/ethnic groups in its accountability plan under *NCLB*, the SEA will report the above data for those groups through the online collection tool.

**1.3.3.5 Student Academic Achievement in Science - Grade 7**

<b>Grade 7</b>	<b># Students Who Completed the Assessment and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned</b>	<b># Students Scoring at or Above Proficient</b>	<b>Percentage of Students Scoring at or Above Proficient</b>
All students	0	0	0.0
American Indian or Alaska Native	0	0	0.0
Asian or Pacific Islander	0	0	0.0
Black, non-Hispanic	0	0	0.0
Hispanic	0	0	0.0
White, non-Hispanic	0	0	0.0
Children with disabilities ( <i>IDEA</i> )	0	0	0.0
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	0	0	0.0
Economically disadvantaged students	0	0	0.0
Migratory students	0	0	0.0
Male	0	0	0.0
Female	0	0	0.0
<b>Comments:</b> Science is tested at grades 4, 8, 10 in Wisconsin.			

Source – Manual input by the SEA using the online collection tool. If the SEA has additional racial/ethnic groups or combinations of racial/ethnic groups in its accountability plan under *NCLB*, the SEA will report the above data for those groups through the online CSPR collection tool.

**Note:** New collection for the SY 2007-08 CSPR. Proposed under OMB 83I.

**1.3.1.6 Student Academic Achievement in Mathematics - Grade 8**

<b>Grade 8</b>	<b># Students Who Completed the Assessment and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned</b>	<b># Students Scoring at or Above Proficient</b>	<b>Percentage of Students Scoring at or Above Proficient</b>
All students	63,786	48,317	75.7
American Indian or Alaska Native	945	604	63.9
Asian or Pacific Islander	2,265	1,670	73.7
Black, non-Hispanic	6,777	2,556	37.7
Hispanic	4,219	2,356	55.8
White, non-Hispanic	49,574	41,131	83.0
Children with disabilities ( <i>IDEA</i> )	9,144	3,424	37.4
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	3,063	1,593	52.0
Economically disadvantaged students	20,217	11,327	56.0
Migratory students	34	12	35.3
Male	32,571	24,864	76.3
Female	31,214	23,452	75.1

**Comments:** A very small number of migratory students are enrolled in Wisconsin schools at the time of testing. A relatively large year-to-year fluctuation in the grade level group size is be expected with group size N<99.

Source – Initially populated from ED*Facts*. See Attachment D: CSPR & ED*Facts* Data Crosswalk. If the SEA has additional racial/ethnic groups or combinations of racial/ethnic groups in its accountability plan under *NCLB*, the SEA will report the above data for those groups through the online collection tool.

**1.3.2.6 Student Academic Achievement in Reading/Language Arts - Grade 8**

<b>Grade 8</b>	<b># Students Who Completed the Assessment and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned</b>	<b># Students Scoring at or Above Proficient</b>	<b>Percentage of Students Scoring at or Above Proficient</b>
All students	63,663	54,157	85.1
American Indian or Alaska Native	943	715	75.8
Asian or Pacific Islander	2,229	1,733	77.7
Black, non-Hispanic	6,809	4,086	60.0
Hispanic	4,105	2,891	70.4
White, non-Hispanic	49,571	44,730	90.2
Children with disabilities ( <i>IDEA</i> )	9,152	4,379	47.8
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	2,912	1,774	60.9
Economically disadvantaged students	20,119	14,303	71.1
Migratory students	32	18	56.3
Male	32,504	26,762	82.3
Female	31,158	27,394	87.9

**Comments:** A very small number of migratory students are enrolled in Wisconsin schools at the time of testing. A relatively large year-to-year fluctuation in the grade level group size is be expected with group size N<99.

Source – Initially populated from ED*Facts*. See Attachment D: CSPR & ED*Facts* Data Crosswalk. If the SEA has additional racial/ethnic groups or combinations of racial/ethnic groups in its accountability plan under *NCLB*, the SEA will report the above data for those groups through the online collection tool.

**1.3.3.6 Student Academic Achievement in Science - Grade 8**

<b>Grade 8</b>	<b># Students Who Completed the Assessment and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned</b>	<b># Students Scoring at or Above Proficient</b>	<b>Percentage of Students Scoring at or Above Proficient</b>
All students	63,487	47,782	75.3
American Indian or Alaska Native	935	588	62.9
Asian or Pacific Islander	2,233	1,469	65.8
Black, non-Hispanic	6,684	2,618	39.2
Hispanic	4,136	2,294	55.5
White, non-Hispanic	49,499	40,810	82.4
Children with disabilities ( <i>IDEA</i> )	9,066	3,952	43.6
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	2,963	1,365	46.1
Economically disadvantaged students	20,000	11,238	56.2
Migratory students	32	13	40.6
Male	32,409	24,431	75.4
Female	31,078	23,350	75.1
<b>Comments:</b> P_LDS_WSAS_FACT 12/8/2008 All students participating in WSAS received a proficiency level.			

Source – Manual input by the SEA using the online collection tool. If the SEA has additional racial/ethnic groups or combinations of racial/ethnic groups in its accountability plan under *NCLB*, the SEA will report the above data for those groups through the online CSPR collection tool.

**Note:** New collection for the SY 2007-08 CSPR. Proposed under OMB 831.

**1.3.1.7 Student Academic Achievement in Mathematics - High School**

High School	# Students Who Completed the Assessment and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned	# Students Scoring at or Above Proficient	Percentage of Students Scoring at or Above Proficient
All students	69,103	48,674	70.4
American Indian or Alaska Native	1,009	518	51.3
Asian or Pacific Islander	2,353	1,482	63.0
Black, non-Hispanic	6,118	1,626	26.6
Hispanic	3,882	1,638	42.2
White, non-Hispanic	55,723	43,401	77.9
Children with disabilities ( <i>IDEA</i> )	9,151	2,459	26.9
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	2,445	798	32.6
Economically disadvantaged students	17,967	8,501	47.3
Migratory students	41	17	41.5
Male	35,348	25,125	71.1
Female	33,752	23,549	69.8
<b>Comments:</b> A very small number of migratory students are enrolled in Wisconsin schools at the time of testing.			

Source – Initially populated from *EDFacts*. See Attachment D: CSPR & *EDFacts* Data Crosswalk. If the SEA has additional racial/ethnic groups or combinations of racial/ethnic groups in its accountability plan under *NCLB*, the SEA will report the above data for those groups through the online collection tool.

**1.3.2.7 Student Academic Achievement in Reading/Language Arts - High School**

High School	# Students Who Completed the Assessment and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned	# Students Scoring at or Above Proficient	Percentage of Students Scoring at or Above Proficient
All students	68,949	52,367	76.0
American Indian or Alaska Native	1,007	641	63.7
Asian or Pacific Islander	2,316	1,470	63.5
Black, non-Hispanic	6,119	2,477	40.5
Hispanic	3,773	1,952	51.7
White, non-Hispanic	55,717	45,817	82.2
Children with disabilities ( <i>IDEA</i> )	9,155	3,034	33.1
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	2,287	768	33.6
Economically disadvantaged students	17,852	9,881	55.3
Migratory students	39	18	46.2
Male	35,265	25,586	72.6
Female	33,681	26,780	79.5
<b>Comments:</b> A very small number of migratory students are enrolled in Wisconsin schools at the time of testing. A relatively large year-to-year fluctuation in the grade level group size is expected with group size $N < 99$ .			

Source – Initially populated from *EDFacts*. See Attachment D: CSPR & *EDFacts* Data Crosswalk. If the SEA has additional racial/ethnic groups or combinations of racial/ethnic groups in its accountability plan under *NCLB*, the SEA will report the above data for those groups through the online collection tool.

**1.3.3.7 Student Academic Achievement in Science - High School**

<b>High School</b>	<b># Students Who Completed the Assessment and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned</b>	<b># Students Scoring at or Above Proficient</b>	<b>Percentage of Students Scoring at or Above Proficient</b>
All students	68,679	50,833	74.0
American Indian or Alaska Native	1,001	572	57.1
Asian or Pacific Islander	2,296	1,462	63.7
Black, non-Hispanic	5,989	1,885	31.5
Hispanic	3,761	1,812	48.2
White, non-Hispanic	55,632	45,091	81.1
Children with disabilities ( <i>IDEA</i> )	9,054	3,388	37.4
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	2,277	791	34.7
Economically disadvantaged students	17,672	9,248	52.3
Migratory students	37	15	40.5
Male	35,108	26,351	75.1
Female	33,571	24,481	72.9
<b>Comments:</b> P_LDS_WSAS_FACT 12/8/2008			
All students participating in WSAS received a proficiency level - Grade 10			

Source – Manual input by the SEA using the online collection tool. If the SEA has additional racial/ethnic groups or combinations of racial/ethnic groups in its accountability plan under *NCLB*, the SEA will report the above data for those groups through the online CSPR collection tool.

**Note:** New collection for the SY 2007-08 CSPR. Proposed under OMB 83I.

**1.4 SCHOOL AND DISTRICT ACCOUNTABILITY**

This section collects data on the Adequate Yearly Progress (AYP) status of schools and districts.

**1.4.1 All Schools and Districts Accountability**

In the table below, provide the total number of schools and districts and the total number of those schools and districts that made AYP based on data for the SY 2007-08. The percentage that made AYP will be calculated automatically.

Entity	Total #	Total # that Made AYP in SY 2007-08	Percentage that Made AYP in SY 2007-08
Schools	2,153	2,000	92.9
Districts	426	422	99.1
<b>Comments:</b> Note + 2 multiDistrict charter schools = 2155 Total Schools			

Source – The table above is produced through ED*Facts*. The SEA submits the data in N/X103 for data group 32.

**1.4.2 Title I School Accountability**

In the table below, provide the total number of public Title I schools by type and the total number of those schools that made AYP based on data for the SY 2007-08 school year. Include only public Title I schools. Do not include Title I programs operated by local educational agencies in private schools. The percentage that made AYP will be calculated automatically.

Title I School	# Title I Schools	# Title I Schools that Made AYP in SY 2007-08	Percentage of Title I Schools that Made AYP in SY 2007-08
All Title I schools	1,125	1,018	90.5
Schoolwide (SWP) Title I schools	381	290	76.1
Targeted assistance (TAS) Title I schools	744	728	97.8
<b>Comments:</b> All Title I schools with K-12 enrollment = 1111; Met AYP = 1004 " SwP = 382; Met AYP = 291 " TAS = 729; Met AYP = 713			

Source – The table above is produced through ED*Facts*. The SEA submits the data in N/X129 for data group 22 and N/X103 for data group 32.

**1.4.3 Accountability of Districts That Received Title I Funds**

In the table below, provide the total number of districts that received Title I funds and the total number of those districts that made AYP based on data for SY 2007-08. The percentage that made AYP will be calculated automatically.

# Districts That Received Title I Funds	# Districts That Received Title I Funds and Made AYP in SY 2007-08	Percentage of Districts That Received Title I Funds and Made AYP in SY 2007-08
364	360	98.9
<b>Comments:</b> 364 LEAs rec'd T1 \$ and 360 are the #T1 LEAs that met AYP.		

Source – Initially populated from ED*Facts*. See Attachment D: CSPR & ED*Facts* Data Crosswalk.

**Note:** DG 582 is not collected from the SEA, rather it comes from the Title I funding data.

#### 1.4.4 Title I Schools Identified for Improvement

##### 1.4.4.1 List of Title I Schools Identified for Improvement

In the following table, provide a list of Title I schools identified for improvement, corrective action, or restructuring under Section 1116 for the SY 2008-09 based on the data from SY 2007-08. For each school on the list, provide the following:

- District Name and NCES ID Code
- School Name and NCES ID Code
- Whether the school met the proficiency target in reading/language arts as outlined in the State's Accountability Plan
- Whether the school met the participation rate target for the reading/language arts assessment
- Whether the school met the proficiency target in mathematics as outlined in the State's Accountability Plan
- Whether the school met the participation rate target for the mathematics assessment
- Whether the school met the other academic indicator for elementary/middle schools (if applicable) as outlined in the State's Accountability Plan
- Whether the school met the graduation rate for high schools (if applicable) as outlined in the State's Accountability Plan
- Improvement status for SY 2008-09 (Use one of the following improvement status designations: School Improvement – Year 1, School Improvement – Year 2, Corrective Action, Restructuring Year 1 (planning), or Restructuring Year 2 (implementing))<sup>1</sup>
- Whether (yes or no) the school is or is not a Title I school (*This column **must be completed** by States that choose to list all schools in improvement. Column is optional for States that list only Title I schools.*)
- Whether (yes or no) the school was provided assistance through 1003(a).
- Whether (yes or no) the school was provided assistance through 1003 (g).

See attached for blank template that can be used to enter school data.

Download template: [Question 1.4.4.1 \(Get MS Excel Viewer\)](#)

Source – Manual entry by SEA into the online collection tool.

<sup>1</sup> The school improvement statuses are defined in *LEA and School Improvement Non-Regulatory Guidance*. This document may be found on the Department's Web page at <http://www.ed.gov/policy/elsec/guid/schoolimprovementguid.doc>.

**1.4.4.3 Corrective Action**

In the table below, for schools in corrective action, provide the number of schools for which the listed corrective actions under *NCLB* were implemented in SY 2007-08 (based on SY 2006-07 assessments under Section 1111 of *ESEA*).

<b>Corrective Action</b>	<b># of Title I Schools in Corrective Action in Which the Corrective Action was Implemented in SY 2007-08</b>
Required implementation of a new research-based curriculum or instructional program	0
Extension of the school year or school day	0
Replacement of staff members relevant to the school's low performance	0
Significant decrease in management authority at the school level	0
Replacement of the principal	0
Restructuring the internal organization of the school	0
Appointment of an outside expert to advise the school	0
<b>Comments:</b> Data not collected for 2007-08	

Source – Manual entry by SEA into the online collection tool.

**1.4.4.4 Restructuring – Year 2**

In the table below, for schools in restructuring – year 2 (implementation year), provide the number of schools for which the listed restructuring actions under *NCLB* were implemented in SY 2007-08 (based on SY 2006-07 assessments under Section 1111 of *ESEA*).

<b>Restructuring Action</b>	<b># of Title I Schools in Restructuring in Which Restructuring Action Is Being Implemented</b>
Replacement of all or most of the school staff (which may include the principal)	0
Reopening the school as a public charter school	0
Entering into a contract with a private entity to operate the school	0
Take over the school by the State	0
Other major restructuring of the school governance	0
<b>Comments:</b> Data not collected for 2007-08	

Source – Manual entry by SEA into the online collection tool.

In the space below, list specifically the "other major restructuring of the school governance" action(s) that were implemented.

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

--

## 1.4.5 Districts That Received Title I Funds Identified for Improvement

### 1.4.5.1 List of Districts That Received Title I Funds and Were Identified for Improvement

In the following table, provide a list of districts that received Title I funds and were identified for improvement or corrective action under Section 1116 for the SY 2008-09 based on the data from SY 2007-08. For each district on the list, provide the following:

- District Name and NCES ID Code
- Whether the district met the proficiency target in reading/language arts as outlined in the State's Accountability Plan
- Whether the district met the participation rate target for the reading/language arts assessment
- Whether the district met the proficiency target in mathematics as outlined in the State's Accountability Plan
- Whether the school met the participation rate target for the mathematics assessment
- Whether the district met the other academic indicator for elementary/middle schools (if applicable) as outlined in the State's Accountability Plan
- Whether the district met the graduation rate for high schools (if applicable) as outlined in the State's Accountability Plan
- Improvement status for SY 2008-09 (Use one of the following improvement status designations: Improvement or Corrective Action<sup>2</sup>)
- Whether the district is a district that received Title I funds. Indicate "Yes" if the district received Title I funds and "No" if the district did not receive Title I funds. (**This column must be completed by States that choose to list all districts or all districts in improvement.** This column is optional for States that list only districts in improvement that receive Title I funds.)

See attached for blank template that can be used to enter district data.

Download template: [Question 1.4.5.1 \(Get MS Excel Viewer\)](#)

Source – Manual entry by SEA into the online collection tool.

<sup>2</sup> The district improvement statuses are defined in *LEA and School Improvement Non-Regulatory Guidance*. This document may be found on the Department's Web page at <http://www.ed.gov/policy/elsec/guid/schoolimprovementguid.doc>.

**1.4.5.2 Actions Taken for Districts That Received Title I Funds and Were Identified for Improvement**

In the space below, briefly describe the measures being taken to address the achievement problems of districts identified for improvement or corrective action. Include a discussion of the technical assistance provided by the State (e.g., the number of districts served, the nature and duration of assistance provided, etc.).

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

Requirements for Milwaukee Public Schools  
District in Need of Improvement: Year 2  
As Outlined By  
Wisconsin Department of Public Instruction  
August 29, 2007

**District/School Improvement**

MPS shall meet with state superintendent and her designees (dates to be determined) to outline requirements regarding program aspects of Title I district and school improvement strategies and use of supplemental federal school improvement funds.

By November 1, 2007, Milwaukee Public Schools (MPS) shall submit to the state superintendent its District in Need of Improvement Plan that incorporates the "MPS District and School Improvement Accountability Model Under NCLB."

By November 1, 2007, MPS shall hire MPS Director of District and School Improvement with the school improvement supervisors to be hired by December 31, 2007.

By December 1, 2007, MPS shall submit its 2007-2008 ESEA Consolidated Application Plan to the state superintendent and adhere to other state timelines for reporting.

**Teacher Quality**

MPS shall provide a qualified mentor and a system of support for each initial educator:

- Identify each initial educator and provide names to the state superintendent by October 1, 2007;
- Identify a qualified mentor for each initial educator, develop and begin implementation of a system of support for initial educators, and provide evidence of such to the state superintendent by October 19, 2007;
- Provide quarterly reports on the implementation of the initial educator system of support to the state superintendent by January 31, 2008; April 30, 2008; and July 31, 2008; and,
- Develop and implement a data-base system to identify annually initial educators and provide evidence to the state superintendent by February 29, 2008.

MPS staff, as designated by the district administrator shall attend a DPI-convened Title I Quality Educator Recruitment and Retention Grant meeting to be held in September, 2007.

MPS shall submit to the state superintendent by December 31, 2007 the individualized support plan to move each teacher identified as not highly qualified under NCLB to highly qualified.

**School Finance**

MPS shall identify one primary finance contact and provide name to the state superintendent by October 1, 2007.

MPS finance staff shall attend a DPI-convened federal and state finance workshop to be held in November, 2007.

MPS finance staff shall meet at least three times annually with DPI finance staff to review MPS finances.

Should MPS be unable to meet statutory or other deadlines identified by DPI, it will result in DPI withholding and/or reducing federal funds to Milwaukee.

Source – Manual entry by SEA into the online collection tool.

**1.4.5.3 Corrective Action**

In the table below, for districts in corrective action, provide the number of districts in corrective action in which the listed corrective actions under *NCLB* were implemented in SY 2007-08 (based on SY 2006-07 assessments under Section 1111 of *ESEA*).

<b>Corrective Action</b>	<b># of Districts receiving Title I funds in Corrective Action in Which Corrective Action was Implemented in SY 2007-08</b>
Implementing a new curriculum based on State standards	0
Authorized students to transfer from district schools to higher performing schools in a neighboring district	0
Deferred programmatic funds or reduced administrative funds	0
Replaced district personnel who are relevant to the failure to make AYP	0
Removed one or more schools from the jurisdiction of the district	0
Appointed a receiver or trustee to administer the affairs of the district	0
Restructured the district	1
Abolished the district (list the number of districts abolished between the end of SY 2006-07 and beginning of SY 2007-08 as a corrective action)	0
<b>Comments:</b>	

Source – Manual entry by SEA into the online collection tool.

**1.4.7 Appeal of AYP and Identification Determinations**

In the table below, provide the number of districts and schools that appealed their AYP designations based on 2007-08 data and the results of those appeals.

	<b># Appealed Their AYP Designations</b>	<b># Appeals Resulted in a Change in the AYP Designation</b>
Districts	0	0
Schools	4	4
<b>Comments:</b>		

Source – Manual entry by SEA into the online collection tool.

Date (MM/DD/YY) that processing appeals based on SY 2007-08 data was complete	07/18/08
---	----------

Source – Manual entry by SEA into the online collection tool.

### 1.4.8 School Improvement Status

In the section below, "Schools in Improvement" means Title I schools identified for improvement, corrective action, or restructuring under Section 1116 of *ESEA* for SY 2007-08.

#### 1.4.8.1 Student Proficiency for Schools Receiving Assistance Through Section 1003(a) and 1003(g) Funds

The table below pertains only to schools that received assistance through Section 1003(a) and/or 1003(g) funds during SY 2007-08.

- In the **SY 2007-08 column**, provide the total number and percentage of students in schools receiving School Improvement funds in SY 2007-08 who were:
  - Proficient in mathematics as measured by your State's assessments required under Section 1111(b)(3) of *ESEA* in SY 2007-08.
  - Proficient in reading/language arts as measured by your State's assessments required under Section 1111(b)(3) of *ESEA* in SY 2007-08.
  - Total number of schools for which the data in this table are reported. This should be the total number of schools that received assistance through Section 1003(a) and/or 1003(g) funds during SY 2007-08.
- In the **SY 2006-07 column**, provide the requested data for the same schools whose student proficiency data are reported for SY 2007-08. No total is requested for schools in SY 2006-07.

Category	SY 2007-08	SY 2006-07
Total number of students who were enrolled in schools that received assistance through Section 1003 (a) and/or 1003(g) funds in SY 2007-08	21,444	22,209
Total number of students who were proficient in <b>mathematics</b> in schools that received assistance through Section 1003(a) and/or 1003(g) funds in SY 2007-08	10,017	10,208
Percentage of students who were proficient in <b>mathematics</b> in schools that received assistance through Section 1003(a) and/or 1003(g) funds in SY 2007-08	46.7	46.0
Total number of students who were proficient in <b>reading/language arts</b> in schools that received assistance through Section 1003(a) and/or 1003(g) funds in SY 2007-08	12,596	12,928
Percentage of students who were proficient in <b>reading/language arts</b> in schools that received assistance through Section 1003(a) and/or 1003(g) funds in SY 2007-08	58.7	58.2
Number of schools that received assistance through Section 1003(a) and/or 1003(g) funds in SY 2007-08	98	
<b>Comments:</b> Enrollment data in row one include students in the tested grades of 3-8 and 10.		
Reading only (language arts not included)		
March 13, 2009 - Additional comments per ED request for data verification:		
Row one includes students enrolled in the tested grades 3-8 and 10.		
Total Enrollment for all grades in schools receiving assistance through S.1003(a)or(g) funds in SY 2007-08 were 44,626(2007-08) and 45,588 (2006-07).		

Source – Manual input by the SEA using the online collection tool.

**Note:** New collection for the SY 2007-08 CSPR. Proposed under OMB 831.

#### 1.4.8.2 School Improvement Status and School Improvement Assistance

In the table below, indicate the number of schools receiving assistance through Section 1003(a) and/or 1003(g) funds during SY 2007-08 that:

- Made adequate yearly progress;
- Exited improvement status;
- Did not make adequate yearly progress.

Category	# of Schools
Number of schools receiving assistance through Section 1003(a) and/or 1003(g) funds during SY 2007-08 that <b>made adequate yearly progress</b> based on testing in SY 2007-08	72
Number of schools receiving assistance through Section 1003(a) and/or 1003(g) funds during SY 2007-08 that <b>exited improvement status</b> based on testing in SY 2007-08	1
Number of schools receiving assistance through Section 1003(a) and/or 1003(g) funds during SY 2007-08 that <b>did not make adequate yearly progress</b> based on testing in SY 2007-08	25
<b>Comments:</b> March 13, 2009 - Additional comments per ED request for data verification:	
One additional school that did not make AYP in 2007-08 was closed at the end of the year (Maasi).	

Source – Manual input by the SEA using the online collection tool.

**Note:** New collection for the SY 2007-08 CSPR. Proposed under OMB 83I.

**1.4.8.3 Effective School Improvement Strategies**

In the table below, indicate the effective school improvement strategies used that were supported through Section 1003(a) and/or 1003(g) funds.

Column 1	Column 2	Column 3	Column 4	Column 5	Column 6	Column 7
<b>Effective Strategy or Combination of Strategies Used</b>  (See response options in "Column 1 Response Options Box" below.)  If your State's response includes a "5" (other strategies), identify the specific strategy(s) in Column 2.	<b>Description of "Other Strategies"</b>  This response is limited to 500 characters.	<b>Number of schools in which the strategy(s) was used</b>	<b>Number of schools that used the strategy(s), made AYP, and exited improvement status</b>	<b>Number of schools that used the strategy(s), made AYP, but did not exit improvement status</b>	<b>Most common other Positive Outcome from the Strategy</b>  (See response options in "Column 6 Response Options Box" below)	<b>Description of "Other Positive Outcome" if Response for Column 6 is "D"</b>  This response is limited to 500 characters.
1	Data not collected for 2007-08	0	0	0	D	Data not collected for 2007-08

**Comments:** Data not collected for 2007-08

March 13, 2009 - Additional comments per ED request for data verification:

Notification of this requirement was provided AFTER the grant applications were collected, therefore, WI was not able to collect this data for 2007-08.

Column 1 Response Options Box
1 = Provide customized technical assistance and/or professional development that is designed to build the capacity of LEA and school staff to improve schools and is informed by student achievement and other outcome-related measures.
2 = Utilize research-based strategies or practices to change instructional practice to address the academic achievement problems that caused the school to be identified for improvement, corrective action, or restructuring.
3 = Create partnerships among the SEA, LEAs and other entities for the purpose of delivering technical assistance, professional development, and management advice.
4 = Provide professional development to enhance the capacity of school support team members and other technical assistance providers who are part of the Statewide system of support and that is informed by student achievement and other outcome-related measures.
5 = Implement other strategies determined by the SEA or LEA, as appropriate, for which data indicate the strategy is likely to result in improved teaching and learning in schools identified for improvement, corrective action, or restructuring.
6 = Combination 1: Schools using a combination of strategies from above. Please use Column 2 to indicate which of the above strategies comprise this combination.
7 = Combination 2: Schools using a combination of strategies from above. Please use Column 2 to indicate which of the above strategies comprise this combination.
8 = Combination 3: Schools Using a combination of strategies from above. Please use Column 2 to indicate which of the above strategies comprise this combination.

Column 6 Response Options Box
A = Improvement by at least five percentage points in two or more AYP reporting cells
B = Increased teacher retention
C = Improved parental involvement

D = Other

Source – Manual input by the SEA using the online collection tool.

**Note:** New collection for the SY 2007-08 CSPR. Proposed under OMB 83I.

**1.4.8.4 Sharing of Effective Strategies**

In the space below, describe how your State shared the effective strategies identified in item 1.4.8.3 with its LEAs and schools. Please exclude newsletters and handouts in your description.

This response is limited to 8,000 characters.

LEAs that receive school improvement funds under 1003 (a) and 1003(g) are required to attend two District Network Meetings hosted by the Wisconsin Department of Public Instruction (DPI). The purpose of the District Network Meetings is to provide administrators and teacher leaders the opportunity to learn together and share effective district practices that positively impact student achievement. One meeting occurs in the fall and the second meeting takes place in the spring.

Source – Manual input by the SEA using the online collection tool.

**1.4.8.5 Use of Section 1003(a) and (g) School Improvement Funds**

Note: New section for the SY 2007-08 CSPR. Proposed under OMB 83I.

**1.4.8.5.1 Section 1003(a) State Reservations**

In the space provided, enter the percentage of the FY 2007 (SY 2007-08) Title I, Part A allocation that the SEA reserved in accordance with Section 1003(a) of *ESEA* and §200.100(a) of ED's regulations governing the reservation of funds for school improvement under Section 1003(a) of *ESEA*: 4.0 %

**Comments:**

Source – Manual input by the SEA using the online collection tool.

**Note:** New collection for the SY 2007-08 CSPR. Proposed under OMB 83I.

**1.4.8.5.2 Section 1003(a) and 1003(g) Allocations to LEAs and Schools**

In the tables below, provide the requested information for FY 2007 (SY 2007-08).

See attached for blank template that can be used to enter allocation data.  
Download template: [Question 1.4.8.5.2 \(Get MS Excel Viewer\)](#)

Source – Manual input by the SEA using the online collection tool.

**Note:** New collection for the SY 2007-08 CSPR. Proposed under OMB 831.

**1.4.8.5.3 Use of Section 1003(g)(8) Funds for Evaluation and Technical Assistance**

Section 1003(g)(8) of *ESEA* allows States to reserve up to five percent of Section 1003(g) funds for administration and to meet the evaluation and technical assistance requirements for this program. In the space below, identify and describe the specific Section 1003(g) evaluation and technical assistance activities that your State conducted during SY 2007-08.

This response is limited to 8,000 characters.

The Wisconsin Department of Public Instruction (DPI) required the LEA to provide documentation of a plan to implement high leverage school improvement strategies at each Title I SIFI during the 2007-08 school year and required the LEA to provide evidence that these strategies were met. Such evidence included, but was not limited to:

- revised school schedules demonstrating implementation of reading and mathematics blocks;
- enrollment and achievement rates in reading courses;
- consistent implementation of required high leverage strategies in each Title I SIFI;
- documentation of summer school courses and enrollment figures; and
- increased achievement rates.

The LEA reported evidence of success in meeting improvement goals in an end-of-year report. In addition, the DPI Title I staff met monthly with the LEA's school improvement staff. This provided an opportunity to monitor the implementation process and data collection and analysis in a timely manner.

The state superintendent appointed a Director of DIFI to ensure monitoring and evaluation of the efficacy of the improvement efforts required by the LEA. Additionally, a team from the finance department at the DPI met regularly with finance team members from the LEA. The specific goals of this joint team included:

- identification of one primary finance contact from the LEA for the Wisconsin state superintendent;
- attendance of the LEA finance staff at the DPI-convened federal and state finance workshop;
- review sessions between the LEA finance staff and DPI finance staff at least three times annually; and
- preparation for withholding or reducing funds should the LEA be unable to meet statutory or other deadlines identified by the DPI.

The DPI has several methods in place to disseminate information to LEAs about successful practices. The LEA was required attend two meetings annually to share improvement strategies and results with other LEAs. In addition, principals of Title I SIFI schools attended an annual Principals' Leadership Retreat in June. The retreat featured sessions led by participating principals concerning successful strategies that their schools are implementing to close the achievement gap. The DPI also hosted an annual statewide conference that focused on improving student achievement. The LEA was required to attend this conference where SIFI school staff and district office personnel that experienced success in raising student achievement were asked to present workshops on successful practices in their school or district.

Source – Manual input by the SEA using the online collection tool.

**Note:** New collection for the SY 2007-08 CSPR. Proposed under OMB 83I.

**1.4.8.6 Actions Taken for Title I Schools Identified for Improvement Supported by Funds Other than Those of Section 1003(a) and 1003(g).**

In the space below, describe actions (if any) taken by your State in SY 2007-08 that were supported by **funds other than Section 1003(a) and 1003(g) funds** to address the achievement problems of schools identified for improvement, corrective action, or restructuring under Section 1116 of *ESEA*.

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

No additional state or federal funds were allocated to address achievement problems in SIFI schools. However, the Wisconsin Department of Public Instruction utilized the knowledge and skills of the Title I staff to monitor progress and provide technical assistance to the LEA with Title I schools identified for improvement. The Title I staff monitored the LEA's progress and addressed achievement problems as well as corrective action for schools identified for improvement.

Source – Manual input by the SEA using the online collection tool.

**Note:** New collection for the SY 2007-08 CSPR. Proposed under OMB 83I.

### 1.4.9 Public School Choice and Supplemental Educational Services

This section collects data on public school choice and supplemental educational services.

#### 1.4.9.1 Public School Choice

This section collects data on public school choice. FAQs related to the public school choice provisions are at the end of this section.

##### 1.4.9.1.2 Public School Choice – Students

In the table below, provide the number of students who were eligible for public school choice, the number of eligible students who applied for public school choice, and the number who transferred under the provisions for public school choice in Section 1116 of *ESEA*.

Students who are eligible for public school choice includes:

- (1) Students currently enrolled in a school identified for improvement, corrective action or restructuring.
- (2) Students who transferred in the current school year under the public school choice provisions of Section 1116, and
- (3) Students who previously transferred under Section 1116 and are continuing to transfer for the current school year under Section 1116.

	# Students
Eligible for public school choice	16,200
Applied to transfer	290
Transferred to another school under the Title I public school choice provisions	270

Indicate in the table below the categories of students that are included in the count of eligible students.

	Yes/No
Enrolled in a school identified for improvement	<u>Yes</u>
Transferred in the current school year, only	<u>Yes</u>
Transferred in a prior year and in the current year	<u>Yes</u>
<b>Comments:</b>	

Source – Initially populated from *EDFacts*. See Attachment D: CSPR & *EDFacts* Data Crosswalk.

**1.4.9.1.3 Funds Spent on Public School Choice**

In the table below, provide the total dollar amount spent by LEAs on transportation for public school choice in Section 1116 of ESEA.

	<b>Amount</b>
Dollars spent by LEAs on transportation for public school choice	\$ 192,510
<b>Comments:</b>	

Source – Initially populated from ED Facts. See Attachment D: CSPR & ED Facts Data Crosswalk.

**1.4.9.1.4 Availability of Public School Choice Options**

In the table below provide the number of LEAs in your State that are unable to provide public school choice options to eligible students due to any of the following reasons:

1. All schools at a grade level are in school improvement, corrective action, or restructuring.
2. LEA only has a single school at the grade level of the school at which students are eligible for public school choice
3. LEA's schools are so remote from one another that choice is impracticable.

	<b># LEAs</b>
LEAs Unable to Provide Public School Choice	0
<b>Comments:</b>	

Source – Manual entry by SEA into the online collection tool.

**FAQs about public school choice:**

- a. *How should States report data on Title I public school choice for those LEAs that have open enrollment and other choice programs?* An LEA may consider a student as eligible for and participating in Title I public school choice, and may consider costs for transporting that student towards its funds spent on transportation for public school choice, if the student meets the following conditions:
  - Has a "home" or "neighborhood" school (to which the student would have been assigned, in the absence of a choice program) that receives Title I funds and has been identified, under the statute, as in need of improvement, corrective action, or restructuring; and
  - Has elected to enroll, at some point since July 1, 2002 (the effective date of the Title I choice provisions), and after the home school has been identified as in need of improvement, in a school that has not been so identified and is attending that school; and
  - Is using district transportation services to attend such a school.<sup>3</sup>
- b. *How do States report on public school choice for those LEAs that are not able to offer public school choice (e.g., LEAs in which all schools in a grade level are in school improvement, LEAs that have only a single school at that grade level, or LEAs whose schools are so remote from one another that choice is impracticable)?* For those LEAs, States should count as eligible all students who attend identified Title I schools. States should report that no eligible schools or students were provided the option to transfer and should provide an explanation why choice is not possible within the LEA in the Comment Section.

<sup>3</sup> Adapted from OESE/OII policy letter of August 2004. The policy letter may be found on the Department's Web page at <http://www.ed.gov/policy/elsec/guid/stateletters/choice/choice081804.html>.

**1.4.9.2 Supplemental Educational Services**

This section collects data on supplemental educational services.

**1.4.9.2.2 Supplemental Educational Services – Students**

In the table below, provide the number of students who were eligible for, who applied for, and who received supplemental educational services under Section 1116 of *ESEA*.

	<b># Students</b>
Eligible for supplemental educational services	8,103
Applied for supplemental educational services	3,704
Received supplemental educational services	2,195
<b>Comments:</b>	

Source – Initially populated from *EDFacts*. See Attachment D: CSPR & *EDFacts* Data Crosswalk.

**1.4.9.2.3 Funds Spent on Supplemental Educational Services**

In the table below, provide the total dollar amount spent by LEAs on supplemental educational services under Section 1116 of *ESEA*.

	<b>Amount</b>
Dollars spent by LEAs on supplemental educational services	\$ 3,445,654
<b>Comments:</b>	

Source – Initially populated from *EDFacts*. See Attachment D: CSPR & *EDFacts* Data Crosswalk.

**1.5 TEACHER QUALITY**

This section collects data on "highly qualified" teachers as the term is defined in Section 9101(23) of ESEA.

**1.5.1 Core Academic Classes Taught by Teachers Who Are Highly Qualified**

In the table below, provide the number of core academic classes for each of the school types listed and the number of those core academic classes taught by teachers who are highly qualified (as the term is defined in Section 9101(23) of ESEA) and the number taught by teachers who are not highly qualified. The percentage of core academic classes taught by teachers who are highly qualified and the percentage taught by teachers who are not highly qualified will be calculated automatically. Below the table are FAQs about these data. The percentages used for high- and low-poverty schools and the poverty metric used to determine those percentages are reported in 1.5.3.

School Type	# of Core Academic Classes (Total)	# of Core Academic Classes Taught by Teachers Who Are Highly Qualified	Percentage of Core Academic Classes Taught by Teachers Who Are Highly Qualified	# of Core Academic Classes Taught by Teachers Who Are NOT Highly Qualified	Percentage of Core Academic Classes Taught by Teachers Who Are NOT Highly Qualified
All schools	50,952	50,283	98.7	669	1.3
Elementary level					
High-poverty schools	7,062	6,863	97.2	199	2.8
Low-poverty schools	6,679	6,650	99.6	29	0.4
All elementary schools	27,082	26,796	98.9	286	1.1
Secondary level					
High-poverty schools	4,327	4,135	95.6	192	4.4
Low-poverty schools	7,109	7,067	99.4	42	0.6
All secondary schools	23,870	23,487	98.4	383	1.6
<b>Comments:</b>					

Do the data in Table 1.5.1 above include classes taught by special education teachers who provide direct instruction core academic subjects?

Data table includes classes taught by special education teachers who provide direct instruction core academic subjects.	<u>Yes</u>
---	------------

If the answer above is no, please explain below. The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

--

Does the State count elementary classes so that a full-day self-contained classroom equals one class, or does the State use a departmentalized approach where a classroom is counted multiple times, once for each subject taught?

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

Wisconsin is not able to supply class counts for highly qualified. Wisconsin uses teacher fte. March 13, 2009 - Additional comments per ED request for data verification: The data regarding class counts is not available. We are hopeful that we (the department) will be able to identify class counts next year.
--

Source – Manual entry by SEA into the online collection tool.

**FAQs about highly qualified teachers and core academic subjects:**

- a. *What are the core academic subjects?* English, reading/language arts, mathematics, science, foreign languages, civics and government, economics, arts, history, and geography [Title IX, Section 9101(11)]. While the statute includes the arts in the core academic subjects, it does not specify which of the arts are core academic subjects; therefore, States must make this determination.
- b. *How is a teacher defined?* An individual who provides instruction in the core academic areas to kindergarten, grades 1 through 12, or ungraded classes, or individuals who teach in an environment other than a classroom setting (and who maintain daily student attendance records) [from NCES, CCD, 2001-02]
- c. *How is a class defined?* A class is a setting in which organized instruction of core academic course content is provided to one or more students (including cross-age groupings) for a given period of time. (A course may be offered to more than one class.) Instruction, provided by one or more teachers or other staff members, may be delivered in person or via a different medium. Classes that share space should be considered as separate classes if they function as separate units for more than 50% of the time [from NCES Non-fiscal Data Handbook for Early Childhood, Elementary, and Secondary Education, 2003].
- d. *Should 6th-, 7th-, and 8th-grade classes be reported in the elementary or the secondary category?* States are responsible for determining whether the content taught at the middle school level meets the competency requirements for elementary or secondary instruction. Report classes in grade 6 through 8 consistent with how teachers have been classified to determine their highly qualified status, regardless of whether their schools are configured as elementary or middle schools.
- e. *How should States count teachers (including specialists or resource teachers) in elementary classes?* States that count self-contained classrooms as one class should, to avoid over-representation, also count subject-area specialists (e.g., mathematics or music teachers) or resource teachers as teaching one class. On the other hand, States using a departmentalized approach to instruction where a self-contained classroom is counted multiple times (once for each subject taught) should also count subject-area specialists or resource teachers as teaching multiple classes.
- f. *How should States count teachers in self-contained multiple-subject secondary classes?* Each core academic subject taught for which students are receiving credit toward graduation should be counted in the numerator and the denominator. For example, if the same teacher teaches English, calculus, history, and science in a self-contained classroom, count these as four classes in the denominator. If the teacher were Highly Qualified to teach English and history, he/she would be counted as Highly Qualified in two of the four subjects in the numerator.
- g. *What is a "high-poverty school"?* Section 1111(h)(1)(C)(viii) defines "high-poverty" schools as schools in the top quartile of poverty in the State. The poverty quartile breaks are reported later in this section.
- h. *What is a "low-poverty school"?* Section 1111(h)(1)(C)(viii) defines "low-poverty" schools as schools in the bottom quartile of poverty in the State. The poverty quartile breaks are reported later in this section.

### 1.5.2 Reasons Core Academic Classes Are Taught by Teachers Who Are Not Highly Qualified

In the table below, estimate the percentages for each of the reasons why teachers who are not highly qualified teach core academic classes. For example, if 900 elementary classes were taught by teachers who are not highly qualified, what percentage of those 900 classes falls into each of the categories listed below? If the three reasons provided at each grade level are not sufficient to explain why core academic classes at a particular grade level are taught by teachers who are not highly qualified, use the row labeled "other" and explain the additional reasons. The total of the reasons is calculated automatically for each grade level and must equal 100% at the elementary level and 100% at the secondary level.

**Note:** Use the numbers of core academic classes taught by teachers who are not highly qualified from 1.5.1 for both elementary school classes (1.5.2.1) and for secondary school classes (1.5.2.2) as your starting point.

	Percentage
Elementary School Classes	
Elementary school classes taught by certified general education teachers who did not pass a subject-knowledge test or (if eligible) have not demonstrated subject-matter competency through HOUSSE	17.0
Elementary school classes taught by certified special education teachers who did not pass a subject-knowledge test or have not demonstrated subject-matter competency through HOUSSE	28.0
Elementary school classes taught by teachers who are not fully certified (and are not in an approved alternative route program)	55.0
Other (please explain in comment box below)	0.0
Total	100.0

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

Source – Manual entry by SEA into the online collection tool.

	Percentage
Secondary School Classes	
Secondary school classes taught by certified general education teachers who have not demonstrated subject-matter knowledge in those subjects (e.g., out-of-field teachers)	15.0
Secondary school classes taught by certified special education teachers who have not demonstrated subject-matter competency in those subjects	31.0
Secondary school classes taught by teachers who are not fully certified (and are not in an approved alternative route program)	54.0
Other (please explain in comment box below)	0.0
Total	100.0

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

Source – Manual entry by SEA into the online collection tool.

### 1.5.3 Poverty Quartiles and Metrics Used

In the table below, provide the poverty quartiles breaks used in determining high- and low-poverty schools and the poverty metric used to determine the poverty quartiles. Below the table are FAQs about the data collected in this table.

	<b>High-Poverty Schools</b> (more than what %)	<b>Low-Poverty Schools</b> (less than what %)
Elementary schools	50.0	17.6
Poverty metric used	Eligible for subsidized lunch	
Secondary schools	41.8	16.2
Poverty metric used	Eligible for subsidized lunch	
<b>Comments:</b>		

Source – Manual entry by SEA into the online collection tool.

#### FAQs on poverty quartiles and metrics used to determine poverty

- a. *How are the poverty quartiles determined?* Separately rank order elementary and secondary schools from highest to lowest on your percentage poverty measure. Divide the list into four equal groups. Schools in the first (highest group) are high-poverty schools. Schools in the last group (lowest group) are the low-poverty schools. Generally, States use the percentage of students who qualify for the free or reduced-price lunch program for this calculation.
- b. *Since the poverty data are collected at the school and not classroom level, how do we classify schools as either elementary or secondary for this purpose?* States may include as elementary schools all schools that serve children in grades K through 5 (including K through 8 or K through 12 schools) and would therefore include as secondary schools those that exclusively serve children in grades 6 and higher.

**1.6 TITLE III AND LANGUAGE INSTRUCTIONAL PROGRAMS**

This section collects annual performance and accountability data on the implementation of Title III programs.

**1.6.1 Language Instruction Educational Programs**

In the table below, place a check next to each type of language instruction educational programs implemented in the State, as defined in Section 3301(8), as required by Sections 3121(a)(1), 3123(b)(1), and 3123(b)(2).

**Table 1.6.1 Definitions:**

1. **Types of Programs** = Types of programs described in the subgrantee's local plan (as submitted to the State or as implemented) that is closest to the descriptions in <http://www.ncela.gwu.edu/expert/glossary.html>.
2. **Other Language** = Name of the language of instruction, other than English, used in the program.

Check Types of Programs	Type of Program	Other Language
<u>Yes</u>	Dual language	Spanish
<u>Yes</u>	Two-way immersion	Spanish
<u>Yes</u>	Transitional bilingual	Spanish
<u>Yes</u>	Developmental bilingual	Spanish
<u>Yes</u>	Heritage language	Spanish
<u>Yes</u>	Sheltered English instruction	
<u>Yes</u>	Structured English immersion	
<u>Yes</u>	Specially designed academic instruction delivered in English (SDAIE)	
<u>Yes</u>	Content-based ESL	
<u>Yes</u>	Pull-out ESL	
<u>Yes</u>	Other (explain in comment box below)	

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

Content Area Tutoring (CAT) is one-on-one or small group tutoring/assistance to ELLs during school hours, in the content areas, including English language arts, mathematics, science, and social studies. Tutoring is generally provided by teachers other than bilingual or ESL teachers, and may be provided by an aide, under the direction of a teacher.

Self-Contained is usually with a dual-licensed content area and a bilingual or ESL teacher

Source – Manual entry by SEA into the online collection tool.

## 1.6.2 Student Demographic Data

### 1.6.2.1 Number of ALL LEP Students in the State

In the table below, provide the unduplicated number of ALL LEP students in the State. LEP students are defined as all students assessed for English language proficiency (ELP) using an annual State ELP assessment as required under Section 1111(b)(7) of *ESEA* in the reporting year and who meet the LEP definition in Section 9101(25).

- Include newly enrolled (recent arrivals to the U.S.) and continually enrolled LEP students, whether or not they receive services in a Title III language instruction educational program
- Do not include Former LEP students (as defined in Section 200.20(f)(2) of the Title I regulation) and monitored Former LEP students (as defined in Section 3121(a)(4) of Title III) in the ALL LEP student count in this table.

Number of ALL LEP students in the State	47,593
<b>Comments:</b>	

Source – Manual entry by SEA into the online collection tool.

**Note:** New or substantially revised question for the SY 2007-08 CSPR. Proposed under OMB 83I.

### 1.6.2.2 Number of LEP Students Who Received Title III Language Instruction Educational Program Services

In the table below, provide the unduplicated number of the number of LEP students who received services in Title III language instructional education programs.

	#
LEP students who received services in a Title III language instruction educational program in grades K through 12 for this reporting year.	42,838
<b>Comments:</b> 42,838 came from the ACCESS for ELLs file in the longitudinal data system.	

Source – The SEA submits the data in file N/X116 that contains data group ID 648, category set A.

### 1.6.2.3 Most Commonly Spoken Languages in the State

In the table below, provide the five most commonly spoken languages, other than English, in the State (for all LEP students, not just LEP students who received Title III Services). The top five languages should be determined by the highest number of students speaking each of the languages listed.

Language	# LEP Students
Spanish	27,678
Hmong	11,225
Russian	488
Chinese Mandarin	417
Arabic Standard	406

Report additional languages with significant numbers of LEP students in the comment box below.

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

--

Source – Manual entry by SEA into the online collection tool.

**1.6.3 Student Performance Data**

This section collects data on LEP student English language proficiency, as required by Sections 1111(h)(4)(D) and 3121(b)(1).

**1.6.3.1.1 ALL LEP Participation in State Annual English Language Proficiency Assessment**

In the table below, please provide the number of ALL LEP students tested on annual State English language proficiency assessment (as defined in 1.6.2.1).

	#
Number tested on State annual ELP assessment	46,845
Number not tested on State annual ELP assessment	822
Total	47,667
<b>Comments:</b>	

Source – Manual entry by SEA into the online collection tool.

**Note:** New or substantially revised question for the SY 2007-08 CSPR. Proposed under OMB 83I.

**1.6.3.1.2 ALL LEP Student English Language Proficiency Results**

	#
Number proficient or above on State annual ELP assessment	33,980
Percent proficient or above on State annual ELP assessment	71.3
<b>Comments:</b>	

Source – Manual entry by SEA into the online collection tool.

**Note:** New or substantially revised question for the SY 2007-08 CSPR. Proposed under OMB 83I.

**1.6.3.2.1 Title III LEP Participation in English Language Proficiency**

In the table below, provide the number of Title III LEP students participating in the annual State English language proficiency assessment.

	#
Number tested on State annual ELP assessment	42,064
Number not tested on State annual ELP assessment	774
Total	42,838
<b>Comments:</b>	

Source – Manual entry by SEA into the online collection tool.

**Note:** New or substantially revised question for the SY 2007-08 CSPR. Proposed under OMB 83I.

**1.6.3.2.2 Title III LEP English Language Proficiency Results**

In the table below, provide the results from the annual State English language proficiency assessment for Title III-served LEP students who participated in a Title III language instruction educational program in grades K through 12.

**Table 1.6.3.2.2 Definitions:**

- Making Progress** = Number of Title III LEP students who met the definition of "Making Progress" as defined by the State and submitted to OELA in the State Consolidated Application (CSA), or as amended.
- ELP Attainment** = Number of Title III LEP students who attained English language proficiency as defined by the State and submitted to OELA in the State Consolidated Application (CSA), or as amended.
- Results** = Number and percent of Title III LEP students who met the State definition of "Making Progress" and the number and percent that met the State definition of "Attainment" of English language proficiency.

	Results	
	#	%
Making progress	23,342	72.0
ELP attainment	4,359	40.0
<b>Comments:</b> March 13, 2009 - Additional comments per ED request for data verification:  AMAO 1 ELP 1-4: $23,342/32,381 = 72\%$ AMAO 2 ELP 5-6: $4,359/10,072 = 40\%$ Total T3 ELLs 43,353  Mutually exclusive groups (1 ELP 1-4 Making Progress & 2 ELP 5-6 Attainment) are currently used in Wisconsin's Accountability calculations.		

Source – Manual entry by SEA into the online collection tool.

**1.6.3.5 Native Language Assessments**

This section collects data on LEP students assessed in their native language (Section 1111(b)(6)) to be used for AYP determinations.

**1.6.3.5.1 LEP Students Assessed in Native Language**

In the table below, check "yes" if the specified assessment is used for AYP purposes.

State offers the State reading/language arts content tests in the students' native language(s).	<u>No</u>
State offers the State mathematics content tests in the students' native language(s).	<u>No</u>
State offers the State science content tests in the students' native language(s).	<u>No</u>
<b>Comments:</b>	

Source – Manual entry by SEA into the online collection tool.

**Note:** New or substantially revised question for the SY 2007-08 CSPR. Proposed under OMB 83I.

**1.6.3.5.2 Native Language of Mathematics Tests Given**

In the table below, report the language(s) in which native language assessments are given for *NCLB* accountability determinations for mathematics.

Language(s)
N/A
<b>Comments:</b>

Source – Manual entry by SEA into the online collection tool.

**1.6.3.5.3 Native Language of Reading/Language Arts Tests Given**

In the table below, report the language(s) in which native language assessments are given for *NCLB* accountability determinations for reading/language arts.

Language(s)
N/A
<b>Comments:</b>

Source – Manual entry by SEA into the online collection tool.

**1.6.3.5.4 Native Language of Science Tests Given**

In the table below, report the language(s) in which native language assessments are given for *NCLB* accountability determinations for science.

Language(s)
N/A
<b>Comments:</b>

Source – Manual entry by SEA into the online collection tool.

**Note:** New or substantially revised question for the SY 2007-08 CSPR. Proposed under OMB 83I.

**1.6.3.6 Title III Served Monitored Former LEP Students**

This section collects data on the performance of former LEP students as required by Sections 3121(a)(4) and 3123(b)(8).

**1.6.3.6.1 Title III Served MFLEP Students by Year Monitored**

In the table below, report the unduplicated count of monitored former LEP students during the two consecutive years of monitoring, which includes both MFLEP students in AYP grades and in non-AYP grades.

Monitored Former LEP (MFLEP) students include:

- Students who have transitioned out of a language instruction educational program funded by Title III into classrooms that are not tailored for LEP students.
- Students who are no longer receiving LEP services and who are being monitored for academic content achievement for 2 years after the transition.

**Table 1.6.3.6.1 Definitions:**

1. **# Year One** = Number of former LEP students in their first year of being monitored.
2. **# Year Two** = Number of former LEP students in their second year of being monitored.
3. **Total** = Number of monitored former LEP students in year one and year two. This is automatically calculated.

# Year One	# Year Two	Total
2,758	1,213	3,971
<b>Comments:</b>		

Source – Manual entry by SEA into the online collection tool.

**1.6.3.6.2 Monitored Former LEP (MFLEP) Students Results for Mathematics**

In the table below, report the number of monitored former LEP (MFLEP) students who took the annual mathematics assessment. Please provide data only for those students who transitioned into classrooms not designed for LEP students and who no longer received services under Title III in this reporting year. These students include both students who are monitored former LEP students in their first year of monitoring, and those in their second year of monitoring.

**Table 1.6.3.6.2 Definitions:**

1. **# Tested** = State-aggregated number of MFLEP students who were tested in mathematics in all AYP grades.
2. **# At or Above Proficient** = State-aggregated number of MFLEP students who scored at or above proficient on the State annual mathematics assessment.
3. **% Results** = Automatically calculated based on number who scored at or above proficient divided by the number tested.
4. **# Below proficient** = State-aggregated number MFLEP students who did not score proficient on the State annual mathematics assessment. This will be automatically calculated.

# Tested	# At or Above Proficient	% Results	# Below Proficient
2,371	2,080	87.7	291
<b>Comments:</b>			

Source – Manual entry by SEA into the online collection tool.

**1.6.3.6.3 Monitored Former LEP (MFLEP) Students Results for Reading/Language Arts**

In the table below, report results monitored former LEP (MFLEP) students who took the annual reading/language arts assessment. Please provide data only for those students who transitioned into classrooms not designed for LEP students and who no longer received services under Title III in this reporting year. These students include both students who are monitored former LEP students in their first year of monitoring, and those in their second year of monitoring.

**Table 1.6.3.6.3 Definitions:**

1. **# Tested** = State-aggregated number of MFLEP students who were tested in reading/language arts in all AYP grades.
2. **# At or Above Proficient** = State-aggregated number of MFLEP students who scored at or above proficient on the State annual reading/language arts assessment.
3. **% Results** = Automatically calculated based on number who scored at or above proficient divided by the total number tested.
4. **# Below proficient** = State-aggregated number MFLEP students who did not score proficient on the State annual reading/language arts assessment. This will be automatically calculated.

# Tested	# At or Above Proficient	% Results	# Below Proficient
2,371	2,177	91.8	194
<b>Comments:</b>			

Source – Manual entry by SEA into the online collection tool.

**1.6.3.6.4 Monitored Former LEP (MFLEP) Students Results for Science**

In the table below, report results for monitored former LEP (MFLEP) students who took the annual science assessment. Please provide data only for those students who transitioned into classrooms not designed for LEP students and who no longer received services under Title III in this reporting year. These students include both students who are monitored former LEP students in their first year of monitoring, and those in their second year of monitoring.

**Table 1.6.3.6.4 Definitions:**

1. **# Tested** = State-aggregated number of MFLEP students who were tested in science.
2. **# At or Above Proficient** = State-aggregated number of MFLEP students who scored at or above proficient on the State annual science assessment.
3. **% Results** = Automatically calculated based on number who scored at or above proficient divided by the number tested.
4. **# Below proficient** = State-aggregated number MFLEP students who did not score proficient on the State annual science assessment. This will be automatically calculated.

# Tested	# At or Above Proficient	% Results	# Below Proficient
1,151	960	83.4	191
<b>Comments:</b>			

Source – Manual entry by SEA into the online collection tool.

**Note:** New or substantially revised question for the SY 2007-08 CSPR. Proposed under OMB 83I.

#### 1.6.4 Title III Subgrantees

This section collects data on the performance of Title III subgrantees.

##### 1.6.4.1 Title III Subgrantee Performance

In the table below, report the number of Title III subgrantees meeting the criteria described in the table. Do not leave items blank. If there are zero subgrantees who met the condition described, put a zero in the number (#) column. Do not double count subgrantees by category.

**Note:** Do not include number of subgrants made under Section 3114(d)(1) from funds reserved for education programs and activities for immigrant children and youth. (Report Section 3114(d)(1) subgrants in 1.6.5.1 ONLY.)

	#
Total number of subgrantees for the year	74
Number of subgrantees that met all three Title III AMAOs	74
Number of subgrantees who met AMAO 1	74
Number of subgrantees who met AMAO 2	74
Number of subgrantees who met AMAO 3	74
Number of subgrantees that did not meet any Title III AMAOs	0
Number of subgrantees that did not meet Title III AMAOs for two consecutive years (SYs 2006-07 and 2007-08)	0
Number of subgrantees implementing an improvement plan in SY 2007-08 for not meeting Title III AMAOs	0
Number of subgrantees who have not met Title III AMAOs for four consecutive years (SYs 2004-05, 2005-06, 2006-07, and 2007-08)	0
<b>Comments:</b>	

Source – Manual entry by SEA into the online collection tool.

##### 1.6.4.2 State Accountability

In the table below, indicate whether the State met all three Title III AMAOs.

**Note:** Meeting all three Title III AMAOs means meeting each State-set target for each objective: Making Progress, Attaining Proficiency, and Making AYP for the LEP subgroup. This section collects data that will be used to determine State AYP, as required under Section 6161.

State met <u>all</u> three Title III AMAOs	<u>Yes</u>
<b>Comments:</b>	

Source – Manual entry by SEA into the online collection tool.

##### 1.6.4.3 Termination of Title III Language Instruction Educational Programs

This section collects data on the termination of Title III programs or activities as required by Section 3123(b)(7).

Were any Title III language instruction educational programs <u>or</u> activities terminated for failure to reach program goals?	<u>No</u>
If yes, provide the number of language instruction educational programs <u>or</u> activities for immigrant children and youth terminated.	
<b>Comments:</b>	

Source – Manual entry by SEA into the online collection tool.

### 1.6.5 Education Programs and Activities for Immigrant Students

This section collects data on education programs and activities for immigrant students.

#### 1.6.5.1 Immigrant Students

In the table below, report the unduplicated number of immigrant students enrolled in the State and who participated in qualifying educational programs under Section 3114(d)(1).

##### **Table 1.6.5.1 Definitions:**

1. **Immigrant Students Enrolled** = Number of students who meet the definition of immigrant children and youth in Section 3301(6) and enrolled in the elementary or secondary schools in the State.
2. **Students in 3114(d)(1) Program** = Number of immigrant students who participated in programs for immigrant children and youth funded under Section 3114(d)(1), using the funds reserved for immigrant education programs/activities. This number should not include immigrant students who receive services in Title III language instructional educational programs under Sections 3114(a) and 3115(a).
3. **3114(d)(1) Subgrants** = Number of subgrants made in the State under Section 3114(d)(1), with the funds reserved for immigrant education programs/activities. Do not include Title III LIEP subgrants made under Sections 3114(a) and 3115(a) that serve immigrant students enrolled in them.

# Immigrant Students Enrolled	# Students in 3114(d)(1) Program	# of 3114(d)(1) Subgrants
5,437	2,331	15

If state reports zero (0) students in programs or zero (0) subgrants, explain in comment box below.

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

Source – Initially populated from *EDFacts*. See Attachment D: CSPR & *EDFacts* Data Crosswalk.

**1.6.6 Teacher Information and Professional Development**

This section collects data on teachers in Title III language instruction education programs as required under Section 3123(b)(5).

**1.6.6.1 Teacher Information**

This section collects information about teachers as required under Section 3123 (b)(5).

In the table below, report the number of teachers who are working in the Title III language instruction educational programs as defined in Section 3301(8) and reported in 1.6.1 (Types of language instruction educational programs) even if they are not paid with Title III funds.

**Note:** Section 3301(8) – The term 'Language instruction educational program' means an instruction course – (A) in which a limited English proficient child is placed for the purpose of developing and attaining English proficiency, while meeting challenging State academic content and student academic achievement standards, as required by Section 1111(b)(1); and (B) that may make instructional use of both English and a child's native language to enable the child to develop and attain English proficiency and may include the participation of English proficient children if such course is designed to enable all participating children to become proficient in English and a second language.

	#
Number of all certified/licensed teachers currently working in Title III language instruction educational programs.	2,725
Estimate number of <b>additional</b> certified/licensed teachers that will be needed for Title III language instruction educational programs in the next 5 years*.	1,000

Explain in the comment box below if there is a zero for any item in the table above.

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

Source – Manual entry by SEA into the online collection tool.

\* This number should be the total additional teachers needed for the next 5 years, not the number needed for each year. Do not include the number of teachers currently working in Title III English language instruction educational programs.

**1.6.6.2 Professional Development (PD) Activities of Subgrantees Related to the Teaching and Learning of LEP Students**

In the table below, provide information about the subgrantee professional development activities that meets the requirements of Section 3115(c)(2).

**Table 1.6.6.2 Definitions:**

1. **Professional Development Topics** = Subgrantee activities for professional development topics required under Title III.
2. **# Subgrantees** = Number of subgrantees who conducted each type of professional development activity. A subgrantee may conduct more than one professional development activity. (Use the same method of counting subgrantees, including consortia, as in 1.6.1.1 and 1.6.4.1.)
3. **Total Number of Participants** = Number of teachers, administrators and other personnel who participated in each type of the professional development (PD) activities reported.
4. **Total** = Number of all participants in PD activities.

Type of Professional Development Activity	# Subgrantees	
Instructional strategies for LEP students	68	
Understanding and implementation of assessment of LEP students	62	
Understanding and implementation of ELP standards and academic content standards for LEP students	56	
Alignment of the curriculum in language instruction educational programs to ELP standards	0	
Subject matter knowledge for teachers	43	
Other (Explain in comment box)	29	
Participant Information	# Subgrantees	# Participants
PD provided to content classroom teachers	57	7,216
PD provided to LEP classroom teachers	65	1,403
PD provided to principals	49	484
PD provided to administrators/other than principals	47	302
PD provided to other school personnel/non-administrative	44	886
PD provided to community based organization personnel	11	155
Total	222	10,446

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

Note: The # reported under "Type of Professional Development Activity" and "Participant Information" is the total number of LEAs that responded to each. We are unable to provide subgrantee level data at this time, but will submit those in the near future.

2007-08 Title III EOY Professional Development Activities Statewide

Descriptions for "Other:" [note: some mentioned more than once]

- Modifying assignments
- Identifying gifted and talented ELL students
- Working with families; understanding cultural diversity
- Spanish immersion course for bilingual teachers
- ESL teacher mentoring for new ESL teacher
- Speaker for staff, parents, and families at a family/school event
- Training in SIOP
- Cultural competence
- Special education and ELLs
- Differentiation in instruction
- Latino cultural training "Walk a mile in my shoes..."

Source – Manual entry by SEA into the online collection tool.

**1.6.7 State Subgrant Activities**

This section collects data on State grant activities.

**1.6.7.1 State Subgrant Process**

In the table below, report the time between when the State receives the Title III allocation from ED, normally on July 1 of each year for the upcoming school year, and the time when the State distributes these funds to subgrantees for the intended school year. Dates must be in the format MM/DD/YY.

**Table 1.6.7.1 Definitions:**

1. **Date State Received Allocation** = Annual date the State receives the Title III allocation from US Department of Education (ED).
2. **Date Funds Available to Subgrantees** = Annual date that Title III funds are available to approved subgrantees.
3. **# of Days/\$\$ Distribution** = Average number of days for States receiving Title III funds to make subgrants to subgrantees beginning from July 1 of each year, except under conditions where funds are being withheld.

Example: State received SY 2007-08 funds July 1, 2007, and then made these funds available to subgrantees on August 1, 2007, for SY 2007-08 programs. Then the "# of days/\$\$ Distribution" is 30 days.

Date State Received Allocation	Date Funds Available to Subgrantees	# of Days/\$\$ Distribution
07/1/07	07/1/07	0
<p><b>Comments:</b> Prior to receiving allocations under NCLB, the WDPI gives districts/subgrantees an estimate based on the number of eligible ELLs in each district. There is a consolidated online application for all title funding, and districts are allowed to complete their applications prior to when the WDPI receives the final allocations. As soon as the final allocation is received, Title III subgrants for each district are calculated and posted on the WDPI's web pages, and an e-mail is sent immediately to each district. Once subgrants are posted and districts are notified, those allocations are available to the districts. Districts then may make any needed modifications and submit their application that same day. In this way, WI makes Title III funds available to subgrantees in zero days.</p>		

Source – Manual entry by SEA into the online collection tool.

**1.6.7.2 Steps To Shorten the Distribution of Title III Funds to Subgrantees**

In the comment box below, describe how your State can shorten the process of distributing Title III funds to subgrantees.

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

LEAs are given preliminary estimates to build their budgets with. As soon as the SEA receives its allocations, final LEA budgets are determined and are immediately available to LEAs. Budgets are then "fine tuned" once final funding is determined.

Source – Manual entry by SEA into the online collection tool.

**1.7 PERSISTENTLY DANGEROUS SCHOOLS**

In the table below, provide the number of schools identified as persistently dangerous, as determined by the State, by the start of the school year. For further guidance on persistently dangerous schools, refer to Section B "Identifying Persistently Dangerous Schools" in the Unsafe School Choice Option Non-Regulatory Guidance, available at: <http://www.ed.gov/policy/elsec/guid/unsafeschoolchoice.pdf>.

	#
Persistently Dangerous Schools	0
<b>Comments:</b>	

Source – Manual entry by SEA into the online collection tool.

**1.8 GRADUATION RATES AND DROPOUT RATES**

This section collects graduation and dropout rates.

**1.8.1 Graduation Rates**

In the table below, provide the graduation rates calculated using the methodology that was approved as part of the State's accountability plan for the **previous school year** (SY 2006-07). Below the table are FAQs about the data collected in this table.

Student Group	Graduation Rate
All Students	89.6
American Indian or Alaska Native	74.8
Asian or Pacific Islander	91.0
Black, non-Hispanic	68.0
Hispanic	75.4
White, non-Hispanic	93.0
Children with disabilities ( <i>IDEA</i> )	80.4
Limited English proficient	80.5
Economically disadvantaged	80.7
Migratory students	
Male	87.7
Female	91.6
<b>Comments:</b> Migrant data will be available 2009-10 at the earliest.	

Source – Initially populated from *EDFacts*. See Attachment D: CSPR & *EDFacts* Data Crosswalk. If the SEA has additional racial/ethnic groups or combinations of racial/ethnic groups in its accountability plan under *NCLB*, the SEA will report the above data for those groups through the online CSPR collection tool.

**FAQs on graduation rates:**

- a. *What is the graduation rate?* Section 200.19 of the Title I regulations issued under the *No Child Left Behind Act* on December 2, 2002, defines graduation rate to mean:
  - The percentage of students, measured from the beginning of high school, who graduate from public high school with a regular diploma (not including a GED or any other diploma not fully aligned with the State's academic standards) in the standard number of years; or,
  - Another more accurate definition developed by the State and approved by the Secretary in the State plan that more accurately measures the rate of students who graduate from high school with a regular diploma; and
  - Avoids counting a dropout as a transfer.
- b. *What if the data collection system is not in place for the collection of graduate rates?* For those States that are reporting transitional graduation rate data and are working to put into place data collection systems that will allow the State to calculate the graduation rate in accordance with Section 200.19 for all the required subgroups, please provide a detailed progress report on the status of those efforts.

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

--

**1.8.2 Dropout Rates**

In the table below, provide the dropout rates calculated using the annual event school dropout rate for students leaving a school in a single year determined in accordance with the National Center for Education Statistic's (NCES) Common Core of Data (CCD) for the **previous school year** (SY 2006-07). Below the table is a FAQ about the data collected in this table.

<b>Student Group</b>	<b>Dropout Rate</b>
All Students	1.6
American Indian or Alaska Native	3.6
Asian or Pacific Islander	1.4
Black, non-Hispanic	5.5
Hispanic	3.5
White, non-Hispanic	0.9
Children with disabilities ( <i>IDEA</i> )	2.6
Limited English proficient	2.3
Economically disadvantaged	2.3
Migratory students	
Male	1.9
Female	1.3
<b>Comments:</b> Migrant data will be available for 2007-08 at the earliest.	

Source – Manual entry by SEA into the online collection tool.

**FAQ on dropout rates:**

*What is a dropout?* A dropout is an individual who: 1) was enrolled in school at some time during the previous school year; and 2) was not enrolled at the beginning of the current school year; and 3) has not graduated from high school or completed a State- or district-approved educational program; and 4) does not meet any of the following exclusionary conditions: a) transfer to another public school district, private school, or State- or district-approved educational program (including correctional or health facility programs); b) temporary absence due to suspension or school-excused illness; or c) death.

**1.9 EDUCATION FOR HOMELESS CHILDREN AND YOUTHS PROGRAM**

This section collects data on homeless children and youths and the McKinney-Vento grant program.

In the table below, provide the following information about the number of LEAs in the State who reported data on homeless children and youths and the McKinney-Vento program. The totals will be will be automatically calculated.

	#	# LEAs Reporting Data
LEAs without subgrants	431	430
LEAs with subgrants	12	12
Total	443	442
<b>Comments:</b> The Wisconsin LEA count includes 17 independent charter schools.		
March 13, 2009 - Additional comments per ED request for data verification:		
The Maasai Institute Charter School closed in April 2008.		

Source – Manual entry by SEA into the online collection tool.

**1.9.1 All LEAs (with and without McKinney-Vento subgrants)**

The following questions collect data on homeless children and youths in the State.

**1.9.1.1 Homeless Children And Youths**

In the table below, provide the number of homeless children and youths by grade level enrolled in public school at any time during the regular school year. The totals will be automatically calculated:

<b>Age/Grade</b>	<b># of Homeless Children/Youths Enrolled in Public School in LEAs Without Subgrants</b>	<b># of Homeless Children/Youths Enrolled in Public School in LEAs With Subgrants</b>
Age 3 through 5 (not Kindergarten)	65	104
K	304	727
1	273	589
2	279	560
3	289	485
4	249	528
5	187	481
6	188	392
7	180	414
8	182	417
9	148	493
10	165	348
11	229	314
12	347	394
Ungraded	0	0
Total	3,085	6,246
<b>Comments:</b>		

Source – Manual entry by SEA into the online collection tool.

**1.9.1.2 Primary Nighttime Residence of Homeless Children and Youths**

In the table below, provide the number of homeless children and youths by primary nighttime residence enrolled in public school at any time during the regular school year. The primary nighttime residence should be the student's nighttime residence when he/she was identified as homeless. The totals will be automatically calculated.

	<b># of Homeless Children/Youths - LEAs Without Subgrants</b>	<b># of Homeless Children/Youths - LEAs With Subgrants</b>
Shelters, transitional housing, awaiting foster care	823	1,461
Doubled-up (e.g., living with another family)	1,727	4,479
Unsheltered (e.g., cars, parks, campgrounds, temporary trailer, or abandoned buildings)	90	55
Hotels/Motels	445	251
Total	3,085	6,246
<b>Comments:</b>		

Source – Manual entry by SEA into the online collection tool.

## 1.9.2 LEAs with McKinney-Vento Subgrants

The following sections collect data on LEAs with McKinney-Vento subgrants.

### 1.9.2.1 Homeless Children and Youths Served by McKinney-Vento Subgrants

In the table below, provide the number of homeless children and youths by grade level who were served by McKinney-Vento subgrants during the regular school year. The total will be automatically calculated.

Age/Grade	# Homeless Children/Youths Served by Subgrants
Age 3 through 5 (not Kindergarten)	104
K	727
1	589
2	560
3	485
4	528
5	481
6	392
7	414
8	417
9	493
10	348
11	314
12	394
Ungraded	0
Total	6,246
<b>Comments:</b> Wisconsin kindergarten data includes children in K4 and K5 programs. Wisconsin does not have "ungraded" schools.	

Source – Initially populated from *EDFacts*. See Attachment D: CSPR & *EDFacts* Data Crosswalk.

### 1.9.2.2 Subpopulations of Homeless Students Served

In the table below, please provide the following information about the homeless students served during the regular school year.

	# Homeless Students Served
Unaccompanied youth	742
Migratory children/youth	22
Children with disabilities ( <i>IDEA</i> )	1,328
Limited English proficient students	325
<b>Comments:</b>	

Source – Initially populated from *EDFacts*. See Attachment D: CSPR & *EDFacts* Data Crosswalk.

**1.9.2.3 Educational Support Services Provided by Subgrantees**

In the table below, provide the number of subgrantee programs that provided the following educational support services with McKinney-Vento funds.

	<b># McKinney-Vento Subgrantees That Offer</b>
Tutoring or other instructional support	12
Expedited evaluations	8
Staff professional development and awareness	12
Referrals for medical, dental, and other health services	12
Transportation	12
Early childhood programs	11
Assistance with participation in school programs	12
Before-, after-school, mentoring, summer programs	11
Obtaining or transferring records necessary for enrollment	12
Parent education related to rights and resources for children	12
Coordination between schools and agencies	12
Counseling	12
Addressing needs related to domestic violence	10
Clothing to meet a school requirement	12
School supplies	12
Referral to other programs and services	12
Emergency assistance related to school attendance	11
Other (optional – in comment box below)	
Other (optional – in comment box below)	
Other (optional – in comment box below)	

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

Other (optional)- Obtaining out-of-state school records

Source – Manual input by SEA into the online collection tool.

**1.9.2.4 Barriers To The Education Of Homeless Children And Youth**

In the table below, provide the number of subgrantees that reported the following barriers to the enrollment and success of homeless children and youths.

	<b># Subgrantees Reporting</b>
Eligibility for homeless services	0
School Selection	0
Transportation	0
School records	1
Immunizations	0
Other medical records	0
Other Barriers – in comment box below	0

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

Other barriers - obtaining out-of-state school records

Source – Manual entry by SEA into the online collection tool.

### 1.9.2.5 Academic Progress of Homeless Students

The following questions collect data on the academic achievement of homeless children and youths served by McKinney-Vento subgrants.

#### 1.9.2.5.1 Reading Assessment

In the table below, provide the number of homeless children and youths served who were tested on the State *NCLB* reading/language arts assessment and the number of those tested who scored at or above proficient. Provide data for grades 9 through 12 only for those grades tested for *NCLB*.

Grade	# Homeless Children/Youths Served by McKinney-Vento Taking Reading Assessment Test	# Homeless Children/Youths Served by McKinney-Vento Who Scored At or Above Proficient
3	322	160
4	380	195
5	366	211
6	289	166
7	307	157
8	315	176
High School	214	79

**Comments:** Wisconsin uses the categories of "Advanced" and "Proficient" for students "Who Scored At or Above Proficient" in reading.

Source – Initially populated from *EDFacts*. See Attachment D: CSPR & *EDFacts* Data Crosswalk.

#### 1.9.2.5.2 Mathematics Assessment

This section is similar to 1.9.2.5.1. The only difference is that this section collects data on the State *NCLB* mathematics assessment.

Grade	# Homeless Children/Youths Served by McKinney-Vento Taking Mathematics Assessment Test	# Homeless Children/Youths Served by McKinney-Vento Who Scored At or Above Proficient
3	332	147
4	395	163
5	378	154
6	290	105
7	316	111
8	320	107
High School	217	52

**Comments:** Wisconsin uses the categories of "Advanced" and "Proficient" for students "Who Scored At or Above Proficient" in mathematics.

Source – Initially populated from *EDFacts*. See Attachment D: CSPR & *EDFacts* Data Crosswalk.

## 1.10 MIGRANT CHILD COUNTS

This section collects the Title I, Part C, Migrant Education Program (MEP) child counts which States are required to provide and may be used to determine the annual State allocations under Title I, Part C. The child counts should reflect the reporting period of September 1, 2007 through August 31, 2008. This section also collects a report on the procedures used by States to produce true, accurate, and valid child counts.

To provide the child counts, each SEA should have sufficient procedures in place to ensure that it is counting only those children who are eligible for the MEP. Such procedures are important to protecting the integrity of the State's MEP because they permit the early discovery and correction of eligibility problems and thus help to ensure that only eligible migrant children are counted for funding purposes and are served. If an SEA has reservations about the accuracy of its child counts, it must inform the Department of its concerns and explain how and when it will resolve them in Section 1.10.3.4 *Quality Control Processes*.

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

### FAQs on Child Count:

*How is "out-of-school" defined?* Out-of-school means youth up through age 21 who are entitled to a free public education in the State but are not currently enrolled in a K-12 institution. This could include students who have dropped out of school, youth who are working on a GED outside of a K-12 institution, and youth who are "here-to-work" only. It does not include preschoolers, who are counted by age grouping.

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

**1.10.1 Category 1 Child Count**

In the table below, enter the unduplicated statewide number by age/grade of **eligible** migrant children age 3 through 21 who, within 3 years of making a qualifying move, resided in your State for one or more days during the reporting period of September 1, 2007 through August 31, 2008. This figure includes all eligible migrant children who may or may not have participated in MEP services. Count a child who moved from one age/grade level to another during the reporting period only once in the highest age/grade that he/she attained during the reporting period. The unduplicated statewide total count is calculated automatically.

Do not include:

- Children age birth through 2 years
- Children served by the MEP (under the continuation of services authority) after their period of eligibility has expired when other services are not available to meet their needs
- Previously eligible secondary-school children who are receiving credit accrual services (under the continuation of services authority).

<b>Age/Grade</b>	<b>12-Month Count of Eligible Migrant Children Who Can be Counted for Funding Purposes</b>
Age 3 through 5 (not Kindergarten)	140
K	60
1	67
2	79
3	65
4	77
5	58
6	67
7	69
8	64
9	78
10	71
11	50
12	50
Ungraded	1
Out-of-school	36
Total	1,032

**Comments:**

Source – Initially populated from ED*Facts*. See Attachment D: C*SPR* & ED*Facts* Data Crosswalk.

**1.10.1.1 Category 1 Child Count Increases/Decreases**

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

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

The reported migrant student counts for Category 1 were lower for 2007-08 than the count submitted for 2006-07. Contributing factors are stated below:

- A trend continues that growers and employers are increasingly recruiting and hiring single workers instead of families.
- There has been an increase in arrangements between employers and employment sites to share workers and bussing costs/expenses are then absorbed by the entities which This practice is reducing the overall number of workers as well.
- The continuous crackdown by the Department of Homeland Security and the negativity spewing from the raids and immigration debate has had an impact on agricultural workers. A fearful environment has emerged that influences some families decisions to not travel into the state or Midwest areas.
- During the summer peak season, the gasoline prices continued to soar creating a barrier to travel for some migrant families that had been coming to the state for agricultural work.
- Inadequate housing for families is still a reality in some parts of the state resulting in some migrant families opting to travel on to other states for work.
- Agricultural trends showed a continuing decline in the state as farmers opted to abandon their growing practices and the hiring of migrants.
- There is a continuing practice in this state of bringing in foreign worker under VISA programs. These individuals are mostly adult workers without families and in many cases already have college degrees.

Source – Manual entry by SEA into the online collection tool.

**1.10.2 Category 2 Child Count**

In the table below, enter by age/grade the unduplicated statewide number of **eligible** migrant children age 3 through 21 who, within 3 years of making a qualifying move, were served for one or more days in a MEP-funded project conducted during either the summer term or during intersession periods that occurred within the reporting period of September 1, 2007 through August 31, 2008. Count a child who moved from one age/grade level to another during the reporting period only once in the highest age/grade that he/she attained during the reporting period. Count a child who moved to different schools within the State and who was served in both traditional summer and year-round school intersession programs only once. The unduplicated statewide total count is calculated automatically.

Do not include:

- Children age birth through 2 years
- Children served by the MEP (under the continuation of services authority) after their period of eligibility has expired when other services are not available to meet their needs
- Previously eligible secondary-school children who are receiving credit accrual services (under the continuation of services authority).

<b>Age/Grade</b>	<b>Summer/Intersession Count of Eligible Migrant Children Who Are Participants and Who Can Be Counted for Funding Purposes</b>
Age 3 through 5 (not Kindergarten)	6
K	9
1	21
2	20
3	21
4	25
5	26
6	19
7	18
8	14
9	10
10	16
11	6
12	3
Ungraded	1
Out-of-school	1
Total	216
<b>Comments:</b>	

Source – Initially populated from ED*Facts*. See Attachment D: CSPR & ED*Facts* Data Crosswalk.

**1.10.2.1 Category 2 Child Count Increases/Decreases**

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

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

Additional, influencing factors included:

- During the summer 2008 program, the partnership agency that provides day care for migrant families reduced the number of centers available and there were areas with workers where no day care is available. Consequently, some parents opted to keep their school-aged students home to care for younger siblings so both parents could work while in the state. Migrant parents tend to be younger and have very young children.
- There has been a substantial increase in the hours migrant family members work on a daily basis and this had made it increasingly difficult to be successful in scheduling migrant youth into needed secondary classes during the summer to meet credit accrual needs.

Source – Manual entry by SEA into the online collection tool.

### 1.10.3 Child Count Calculation and Validation Procedures

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

#### 1.10.3.1 Student Information System

In the space below, respond to the following questions: What system(s) did your State use to compile and generate the Category 1 and Category 2 child count for this reporting period (e.g., NGS, MIS 2000, COEStar, manual system)? Were child counts for the last reporting period generated using the same system(s)? If the State's category 2 count was generated using a different system from the category 1 count, please identify each system.

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

1.10.3.1 Student information systems used for Category 1 and Category 2 counts.

Response:

Wisconsin's 2007-08 child counts reported for Category 1 and Category 2 were determined through reports generated from data inputted into the New Generation System (NGS), along with multiple cross-checking procedures and validation of data by state and local staff.

1.10.3.1 Were Child Counts for the last reporting period generated using the same systems?

Response:

Yes, the same system was used for the 2006-07 child count. Student count data used for the 2006-07 child counts was reported from the New Generation System (NGS) for the Category 1 and Category 2 counts.

Source – Manual entry by SEA into the online collection tool.

**1.10.3.2 Data Collection and Management Procedures**

In the space below, respond to the following questions: How was the child count data collected? What data were collected? What activities were conducted to collect the data? When were the data collected for use in the student information system? If the data for the State's category 2 count were collected and maintained differently from the category 1 count, please describe each set of procedures.

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

- Recruiters follow up information leads on area work sites and make contacts, when migrant labor is involved.
2. How does the State evaluate recruitment efforts and accuracy?
- COE's are carefully screened on an on-going basis; emails are sent noting problem areas; or asking for clarification. COE's are obtained for all new families. This checking focuses on verification of enrollment, withdrawal, and residency dates on the COE.
  - The state uses multiple checks and balances by comparing data reported on the COE, the Local Accounting Sheet (LAS) and the Continuing Enrollment Report (CER) for all other enrolled eligible students. The statewide recruiter is engaged in checking eligibility data and in re-interviewing families to cross-check accuracy of data.
  - The state and local personnel with responsibilities for inputting data are in-serviced and kept abreast of requirements, and provided hands on opportunities.
  - Following the retrospective re-interviewing special support and training was provided at all sites , and especially at those contributing to the error rate.
  - The new plan for prospective re-interviewing, and the plan to analyze the accuracy of the temporary designation for workers will assist with determining accuracy.
  - Provision of relevant training for all recruiters before they assume this role.

3. Where are students with a "P" designation included in the report?

- It is not clear what report is being referred to. In practice however, the students with a "P" designation are included in the total eligible population, but would not be in other reports such as school enrollment, or testing as they are not enrolled in school.

Box 2 Describe how the child count data was inputted, updated, and then organized by the student information system for child count purposes at the State level.

Box 3-Category 2 data was collected and maintained in the same manner as Category 1.

The state NGS data entry management specialist and some locally trained personnel with proper authorization enter data into the NGS system from edited COEs. Much review and corrections takes place before entry of data. A new COE is completed for every student that arrives from another district or state, or from Canada or Mexico. A Continuing Enrollment Report and Local Accounting Sheet are prepared for those not moving who were enrolled in school for the regular term or summer term. NGS is updated regularly to reflect new demographic enrollment course history and assessment data. A careful checking of residency verification is completed by the designated November date. Careful scrutiny is ongoing to ensure eligible students ages 3-21 and eligible with the 36 months, and residency is verified. The type of enrollment is included on every enrollment history line. An "R" identifies students as reenrolled in a school or project during the regular school year, while an "S" or "I" identifies summer or intercession enrollments. Wisconsin has no intercession programs. A "P" shows eligible migrant students residing in the district, but not enrolled in a school or project.

Source – Manual entry by SEA into the online collection tool.

In the space below, describe how the child count data are inputted, updated, and then organized by the student information system for child count purposes at the State level

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

March 13, 2009 - Additional comments per ED request for data verification:

Category 2 data was collected and maintained in the same manner as Category 1

If the data for the State's category 2 count were collected and maintained differently from the category 1 count, please describe each set of procedures.

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

March 13, 2009 - Additional comments per ED request for data verification:

The state NGS data entry management specialist and some locally trained personnel with proper authorization enter data into the NGS system from edited COEs. Much review and corrections takes place before entry of data. A new COE is completed for every student that arrives from another district or state, or from Canada or Mexico. A Continuing Enrollment Report and Local Accounting Sheet are prepared for those not moving who were enrolled in school for the regular term or summer term. NGS is updated regularly to reflect new demographic enrollment course history and assessment data. A careful checking of residency verification is completed by the designated November date. Careful scrutiny is ongoing to ensure eligible students ages 3-21 and eligible with the 36 months, and residency is verified. The type of enrollment is included on every enrollment history line. An "R" identifies students as reenrolled in a school or project during the regular school year, while an "S" or "I" identifies summer or intercession enrollments. Wisconsin has no intercession programs. A "P" shows eligible migrant students residing in the district, but not enrolled in a school or project.

Source – Manual entry by SEA into the online collection tool.

**1.10.3.3 Methods Used To Count Children**

In the space below, respond to the following question: How was each child count calculated? Please describe the compilation process and edit functions that are built into your student information system(s) specifically to produce an accurate child count. In particular, describe how your system includes and counts only:

- children who were between age 3 through 21;
- children who met the program eligibility criteria (e.g., were within 3 years of a last qualifying move, had a qualifying activity);
- children who were resident in your State for at least 1 day during the eligibility period (September 1 through August 31);
- children who—in the case of Category 2—received a MEP-funded service during the summer or intersession term; and
- children once per age/grade level for each child count category.

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

**1.10.3.3 Methods Used to Count Children**

•Children who met the program eligibility criteria (e.g.,) were between 3-21 years-of-age and were within 3 years of a last qualifying move with a qualifying activity.

Response:

The Category 1 count was obtained from the NGS data base, which was programmed to check data entered by states for withdrawal date fields, enrollment date fields, and residency verification date field which documented residency during the applicable reporting period and permits inclusion in the eligible student count.

•Children who met the program eligibility criteria were within 3 years of a last qualifying move and had a qualifying activity.

Response:

The NGS query has been set to include only children who were at least 3 and under 22 years of age. Local recruiters and the statewide recruiter verify residency by the face-to-face recruitment interviews with the family to obtain appropriate information to make necessary judgments on eligibility and by obtaining the parent's signature on that same date.

Questionable situations discovered regarding the Principal Means of Livelihood (PMOL), qualifying work, qualifying arrival, and withdrawal issues were scheduled for follow-up reviews. State MEP staff reviewed and offered guidance per federal definitions and relevant guidelines to local project recruiters and program directors seeking guidance prior to making a final determination on the family's eligibility status. Communications were carried out through email, phone calls, and at time, on-site meetings with local staff.

A special report available from NGS helps local personnel follow-up on 2 year olds that will turn 3 within the eligibility window. Recruiters then take action to ensure continuing residency verification is documented.

•Children who were resident in your State for at least 1 day during the eligibility period (September 1 through August 31.)

Response:

The NGS data management system employs a query which counts a student only once as described earlier. For all new or updated COEs, history lines were created for Category 1 count which permitted enrollment, withdrawal and residency verification dates to be entered for every student identified and reported for the reporting period, and also produces the Category 2 count.

•Children who—in the case of Category 2—received a MEP-funded service during the summer or intersession term;

Response:

The NGS system query has set programming to include only eligible children who received either MEP funded instruction and/or support services in the Category 2 count.

•Children once per age/grade level for each child count category.

Response:

The NGS system query has been programmed to count a student only once in the Category 1 and Category 2 counts. The unique student ID number for each new student is registered in the NGS centralized data base. Prior to a student record being created, a system of built in checks screened for potential duplications by similarity or same names. These checks explored other fields of data. Any problems discovered were resolved before the NGS snapshot was taken and any duplicity problems were cleared up as the fields of data elements were reviewed and issues clarified.

The state employs multiple systems of checking and verifying residency. Data from the COE is checked against the Certified Enrollment

Report (CER) and student reporting forms (SRF). COEs are completed for summer and regular terms, and a CER is completed by district for children not leaving the state. A SRF is submitted for every student verifying school enrollment and dates.

March 13, 2009 - Additional comments per ED request for data verification:

1. What efforts does the state make to confirm that children were residents in the state for at least one day?

The state has worked with NGS to ensure the data management system employs a query which counts a student only once. However, the state is active in reviewing enrollment and withdrawal dates and verifying residency dates are available for every student identified and reported for the reporting period.

Training of local project staff includes focusing on the importance of reporting accurate data for enrollment, withdrawal and residency verification dates.

2. What role does the State play in ensuring accurate data is entered into the NGS system?

Only trained personnel may enter data into the NGS system;

Attendance at training to personnel is required to stay abreast of changes in regulations, requirements, and NGS procedures.

Printing off of MGS Management Reports and having districts review data;

Accuracy of records is checked by review and monitoring on Local Accounting Sheets (LAS); Student Reporting Forms; and Continuing Enrollment Reports with NGS data such as withdrawal, residency, and enrollment dates, with immediate follow-up on problem areas.

State personnel assigned to review and enter data, spends extensive time reviewing COE data, clearing up any problems areas before proceeding with input of data.

The report from NGS that validates 2 year olds turning 3 and special reports on residency verification are used by the state when checking accuracy of data for the counts.

The End of Eligibility Report generated by NGS to flag students whose eligibility will end during the current term is used for establishing accurate counts of students with eligible migrant status.

3. What factors does NGS use to determine that records are not duplicated and that similar records are unique?

The NGS system has been programmed to set a query to ensure a student is counted only once statewide for the counts yielded in Category 1 and Category 2. The NGS system creates a unique student identification number for each student. However, there is extra checking for any potential duplication when names are the same or similar to rule out duplicity in the counts.

4. How are discrepancies in NGS records resolved by the State?

The state contacts local project personnel through email memos explaining problems found to determine reporting problem, and works to clarify data; or explains the lack of needed information and works to remedy the situation.

The state data MEP management personnel work with NGS help desk and programmers, technical assistance consultants when questions arrive if there are data problems to be resolved.

The state provides extensive review and cross-checking of data reports and takes appropriate action when needed.

The state provides input to the NGS contractor when issues arise and works to achieve a resolve. The state has been engaged with programmers at this entity to be sure NGS data will be compatible with the MSIX system.

The state MEP personnel run NGS reports on an on-going basis to monitor progress and to spot any problem areas.

If your State's category 2 count was generated using a different system from the category 1 count, please describe each system separately.

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

March 13, 2009 - Additional comments per ED request for data verification:

The data for the State's Category 2 count was collected and maintained through NGS in the same manner as described for the category 1 counts. The NGS system is set to report the number of students receiving supplemental services during the summer term.

Source – Manual entry by SEA into the online collection tool.

### 1.10.3.4 Quality Control Processes

In the space below, respond to the following question: What steps are taken to ensure your State properly determines and verifies the eligibility of each child included in the child counts for the reporting period of September 1 through August 31 before that child's data are included in the student information system(s)?

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

As stated in 1.10.2 the following practices contribute to determining and ensuring data is accurate:

- Only trained personnel may enter data into the NGS system;
  - Attendance at training to personnel is required to stay abreast of changes in regulations, requirements, and NGS procedures.; Reporting Forms/purpose/ correct entry procedures.
  - Printing off of MGS Management Reports and having districts review data;
  - Accuracy of records is checked by review and monitoring on Local Accounting Sheets (LAS); Student Reporting Forms: and Continuing Enrollment Reports with NGS data such as withdrawal, residency, and enrollment dates, with immediate follow-up on problem areas.
  - State personnel assigned to review and enter data, spends extensive time reviewing COE data, clearing up any problems areas before proceeding with input of data.
  - Re-interviewing of families by local and state personnel. Findings were built into discussions with project recruiters where errors were found and into state- sponsored training; MERCK materials trainers provided training on several modules of content that recruiters need .
  - Local supervisor checks quality/accuracy of recruiter's work; state data management /consultant checks and clarifies problems with incoming COE before entry.;
  - COEs are not accepted or entered into NGS until any needed corrections are made.
- How information on local eligibility determinations are communicated.
- Phone, fax, on-site visits, face to face in meetings. with requests for corrections.

What consequences the State considers for non-compliance?

- Data not accepted until corrected or clarified. Technical assistance first/ non-compliance notification to Board if no resolve. New recruiters may need more training and are helped; position description and time allotted to do work is examined with recommendations if needed.

Schedules followed::

- On-going efforts; special trainings annually during the year and summer inservice; at selected sites with new personnel.

Source – Manual entry by SEA into the online collection tool.

In the space below, describe specifically the procedures used and the results of any re-interview processes used by the SEA during the reporting period to test the accuracy of the State's MEP eligibility determinations. In this description, please include the number of eligibility determinations sampled, the number for which a test was completed, and the number found eligible.

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

Yes both Category 1 and 2; 14 summer; 22regular term. Response rate: 70% summer 60% early fall; 100 families; Retrospective: 100 families; Prospective:50 families; All problems from retrospective check were from urban areas so time was spent correcting problems at active sites. The prospective check is based on a sample of 50 families per sample recommendations of the University research lab. Accuracy =95.1% ; Error rate=4.9%; SOPs delivered at training meetings; regular mail;

Source – Manual entry by SEA into the online collection tool.

In the space below, respond to the following question: Throughout the year, what steps are taken by staff to check that child count data are inputted and updated accurately (and—for systems that merge data—consolidated accurately)?

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

The state NGS Data Entry Management Specialist runs periodic reports to monitor progress and to spot problem areas. These reports include the District Report, which shows residency verification, enrollment status, withdrawal of students, duplication in names or numbers for the same individual, and other details related to accurate reporting. The District Reports, along with others are used in working with LEAs needing guidance on procedures for correcting or completing data entries that impact accuracy of student counts. Extensive technical assistance is given by phone and in e-mail communications on an ongoing basis through this position as well as through the MEP education consultant position. Persistent problems are worked into professional development training agendas. Periodic NGS updates in the form of Quick Reference Sheets are also forwarded to all projects as needed throughout the year. In this manner open communication is maintained with all individuals whose responsibilities involve child count issues and both long standing, as well as new data collection requirements are met.

As mentioned above, special reports available from the NGS database were periodically this reviewed by state staff, and shared to assist districts in assessing the status of their identification and recruitment procedures that impact eligibility determination for the child counts and levels of accuracy when reporting progress. The MEP education consultant and the statewide recruiter also used the reports as an integral part of the review process in their formal ESEA monitoring visits. Duplicate records were resolved using the prescribed procedures. NGS Reports were also used to provide technical assistance sessions to districts to assist them in strengthening the quality of data and to emphasize the importance of meeting reporting timelines and the legal parameters that define eligibility. This included large group and one-on-one training and support to project directors, recruiters, data entry, and other records clerk personnel with responsibilities for the

migrant education program data collection eligibility determinations and reporting.

State develops samples and advises projects;

Source – Manual entry by SEA into the online collection tool.

In the space below, respond to the following question: What final steps are taken by State staff to verify the child counts produced by your student information system(s) are accurate counts of children in Category 1 and Category 2 prior to their submission to ED?

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

State staff members work closely with NGS technical assistance consultants at the Texas contractor's office to take every precaution in closely studying all relevant reports to ensure accuracy is maintained prior to submittal of the final count. State staff works closely with EDEN staff to exchange reports from the data base for submittal of verified counts to the national data base.

The state MEP staff takes a serious approach to the verification of the accuracy of the two child counts. These efforts are going on all year and contribute to the goal of meeting the legal eligibility criteria as set forth in 34 CFR 200.40. In the final steps strong efforts were made to have state and local project personnel fully aware of what constitutes accurate data for child count reporting, and the importance of maintaining clear documentation supporting eligibility of students entered into the migrant child counts.

State and local project personnel were engaged in the use of all available data for cross-checking on data displayed on district specific-related reports throughout the year, however this effort is intensified as preliminary counts become available and a thorough study of accuracy of the two counts is conducted before the final clearance for submittal to the education department. MEP staff work with EDEN staff to ensure proper reporting.

State staff continued to engage district migrant project personnel in study of definitions, statutory requirements and decision-making on Principal Means of Livelihood (PMOL), determinations of qualifying work, intent to see or obtain work, and acceptable means of documenting work histories for the migrant families moving into the state, or from one school district to another within the state. The comprehensive review of available paper documentation that supports the counts and/or spots problems to be solved in the final steps, contributes to accurate documentation of child counts.

Summer to summer; Fall to Fall comparisons

Source – Manual entry by SEA into the online collection tool.

In the space below, describe those corrective actions or improvements that will be made by the SEA to improve the accuracy of its MEP eligibility determinations in light of the prospective re-interviewing results.

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

The state will be engaging in an effort to include in its re-interviewing plan cases that were qualified by temporary status in accordance with the new regulations. Upon receipt of Certificates of Eligibility (COEs) from the local projects and statewide recruiter the data management specialist, and education consultant will review them for completeness, accuracy, and compliance with the new regulations. In cases of incomplete COEs, they will be referred to the assigned interviewer for completion or clarification, as needed. In cases when eligibility cannot be definitively determined based on the information provided on the COE, recruiters and possibly employers will be contacted to clarify qualifying agricultural activities. Temporary employment activities will require additional clarifying comments. A major part of the training agenda will be reserved for training on the changes in the new regulations, and what constitutes seasonal and temporary work.

COEs will not be entered into the NGS database system until complete and satisfactory information is gathered to verify temporary status. To further ensure accuracy, all updates after receipt of COEs will be documented and dated directly on the COE. Additional e-mail communications will be attached to the COE. Even after all of these precautions are taken, it is realized that it may be necessary at times to follow up on information elements in the data entry process where discrepancies in the items exist. In such cases, the appropriate individual or school person will be notified and worked with to rectify the problem.

Through effective training and technical assistance until problems are resolved

Source – Manual entry by SEA into the online collection tool.

In the space below, discuss any concerns about the accuracy of the reported child counts or the underlying eligibility determinations on which the counts are based.

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

There are no concerns with the accuracy of the reported child counts for 2007-08.

Source – Manual entry by SEA into the online collection tool.