

**CONSOLIDATED STATE PERFORMANCE REPORT:
Parts I and II**

for
STATE FORMULA GRANT PROGRAMS
under the
ELEMENTARY AND SECONDARY EDUCATION ACT
As amended in 2001

For reporting on
School Year 2010-11

WISCONSIN



PART I DUE FRIDAY, DECEMBER 16, 2011
PART II DUE FRIDAY, FEBRUARY 17, 2012

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
WASHINGTON, DC 20202

INTRODUCTION

Sections 9302 and 9303 of the *Elementary and Secondary Education Act (ESEA)*, as amended in 2001 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 *ESEA* Consolidated State Performance Report (CSPR) for school year (SY) 2010-11 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 2010-11 must respond to this Consolidated State Performance Report (CSPR). Part I of the Report is due to the Department by **Friday, December 16, 2011**. Part II of the Report is due to the Department by **Friday, February 17, 2012**. Both Part I and Part II should reflect data from the SY 2010-11, 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 2010-11 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 2010-11 CSPR will be found on the main CSPR page of the EDEN web site (<https://EDEN.ED.GOV/EDENPortal/>).

	OMB Number: 1810-0614
	Expiration Date: 11/30/2013
<p>Consolidated State Performance Report For State Formula Grant Programs under the Elementary And Secondary Education Act as amended in 2001</p>	
Check the one that indicates the report you are submitting: <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Part I, 2010-11 <input type="checkbox"/> Part II, 2010-11	
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	
_____ Signature	<u>Friday, March 9, 2012, 11:58:38 AM</u> Date

Version 1.1 - Includes responses to 2/6/12 ED data verification request, in the following sections: 1.2, 1.4, 1.5, 1.6, 1.10

**CONSOLIDATED STATE PERFORMANCE REPORT
PART I**

For reporting on
School Year 2010-11



**PART I DUE DECEMBER 16, 2011
5PM EST**

1.1 STANDARDS AND ASSESSMENT DEVELOPMENT

STANDARDS OF ASSESSMENT DEVELOPMENT

This section requests descriptions of the State's implementation of the *Elementary and Secondary Education Act, as amended (ESEA)* 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 made or planned."

The response is limited to 4,000 characters.

Reading/Language Arts and Mathematics: Wisconsin adopted the Common Core State Standards in 2010 and is continuing to work with districts on implementation.

Science: Wisconsin continues to participate in the CCSSO state collaborative on assessment and student standards (SCASS) for science assessment, which is participating in development of the NRC/Achieve Next Generation Science Standards, expected for fall 2012.

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

1.1.2 Assessments in Mathematics and Reading/Language Arts and Science

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, reading/language arts and/or 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 the most 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.

Wisconsin continues to participate in the SMARTER Balanced Assessment Consortium (SBAC) as it develops new assessments in reading/English language arts and mathematics. SBAC is on track to pilot its assessments in 2013-14 and fully implement them in 2014-15, at which time Wisconsin expects to move to the new assessment system.

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

1.1.3 Grants for State Assessments and Related Activities

1.1.3.1 Percentages of Funds Used for Standards and Assessment Development and Other Purposes

For funds your State had available under *ESEA* section 6111 (Grants for State Assessments and Related Activities) during SY 2010-11, estimate what percentage of the funds your State used for the following (round to the nearest ten percent).

Purpose	Percentage (rounded to the nearest ten percent)
To pay the costs of the development of the State assessments and standards required by section 1111(b)	10.0
To administer assessments required by section 1111(b) or to carry out other activities described in section 6111 and other activities related to ensuring that the State's schools and local educational agencies are held accountable for the results	90.0
Comments:	

1.1.3.2 Uses of Funds for Purposes Other than Standards and Assessment Development

For funds your State had available under *ESEA* section 6111 (Grants for State Assessments and Related Activities) during SY 2010-11 that were used for purposes other than the costs of the development of the State assessments and standards required by section 1111(b), for what purposes did your State use the funds? (Enter "yes" for all that apply and "no" for all that do not apply).

Purpose	Used for Purpose (yes/no)
Administering assessments required by section 1111(b)	<u>No</u>
Developing challenging State academic content and student academic achievement standards and aligned assessments in academic subjects for which standards and assessments are not required by section 1111 (b)	<u>No</u>
Developing or improving assessments of English language proficiency necessary to comply with section 1111(b)(7)	<u>No</u>
Ensuring the continued validity and reliability of State assessments, and/or refining State assessments to ensure their continued alignment with the State's academic content standards and to improve the alignment of curricula and instructional materials	<u>No</u>
Developing multiple measures to increase the reliability and validity of State assessment systems	<u>No</u>
Strengthening the capacity of local educational agencies and schools to provide all students the opportunity to increase educational achievement, including carrying out professional development activities aligned with State student academic achievement standards and assessments	<u>No</u>
Expanding the range of accommodations available to students with limited English proficiency and students with disabilities (<i>IDEA</i>) to improve the rates of inclusion of such students, including professional development activities aligned with State academic achievement standards and assessments	<u>No</u>
Improving the dissemination of information on student achievement and school performance to parents and the community, including the development of information and reporting systems designed to identify best educational practices based on scientifically based research or to assist in linking records of student achievement, length of enrollment, and graduation over time	<u>No</u>
Other	<u>No</u>
Comments:	

1.2 PARTICIPATION IN STATE ASSESSMENTS

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

Note: States are not required to report these data by the seven (7) racial/ethnic groups; instead, they are required to report these data by the major racial and ethnic groups that are identified in their Accountability Workbooks. The charts below display racial/ethnic data that has been mapped back from the major racial and ethnic groups identified in their workbooks, to the 7 racial/ethnic groups to allow for the examination of data across states.

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 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 ESEA. 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. Do not include former students with disabilities (IDEA). Do not include students only covered under Section 504 of the Rehabilitation Act of 1973.

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	432,664	431,190	99.7
American Indian or Alaskan Native	7,033	6,986	99.3
Asian	16,829	16,784	99.7
Black or African American	46,460	46,020	99.1
Hispanic or Latino	39,543	39,390	99.6
Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander			
White	322,774	321,989	99.8
Two or more races			
Children with disabilities (IDEA)	60,445	59,869	99.0
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	25,864	25,764	99.6
Economically disadvantaged students	175,811	174,968	99.5
Migratory students	297	294	99.0
Male	222,041	221,204	99.6
Female	210,610	209,977	99.7

Comments: Per 2/6/12 ED Verification Request:

Data was submitted for the 5 major racial ethnic categories that apply in WI. Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander is not one of those categories. These students would be counted in the Asian/Pacific Islander category.

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 (IDEA)*. Do not include former students with disabilities (*IDEA*). Do not include students only 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	18,255	30.5
Regular Assessment with Accommodations	36,298	60.6
Alternate Assessment Based on Grade-Level Achievement Standards		
Alternate Assessment Based on Modified Achievement Standards		
Alternate Assessment Based on Alternate Achievement Standards	5,316	8.9
Total	59,869	
Comments:		

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 reading/language arts assessment.

Student Group	# Students Enrolled	# Students Participating	Percentage of Students Participating
All students	432,664	430,176	99.4
American Indian or Alaskan Native	7,033	6,969	99.1
Asian	16,829	16,605	98.7
Black or African American	46,460	45,969	98.9
Hispanic or Latino	39,543	38,712	97.9
Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander			
White	322,774	321,901	99.7
Two or more races			
Children with disabilities (<i>IDEA</i>)	60,445	59,577	98.6
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	25,864	24,844	96.1
Economically disadvantaged students	175,811	174,112	99.0
Migratory students	297	271	91.2
Male	222,041	220,590	99.3
Female	210,610	209,578	99.5
Comments: Per 2/6/12 ED Verification Request:			
Data was submitted for the 5 major racial ethnic categories that apply in WI. Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander is not one of those categories. These students would be counted in the Asian/Pacific Islander category.			

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 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 (IDEA)*. Do not include former students with disabilities (*IDEA*). Do not include students only covered under Section 504 of the Rehabilitation Act of 1973.

Note: For this question only, report on students with disabilities (*IDEA*) who are also LEP students in the U.S. less than 12 months who took the ELP in lieu of the statewide reading/language arts assessment.

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	20,237	34.0
Regular Assessment with Accommodations	34,015	57.1
Alternate Assessment Based on Grade-Level Achievement Standards		
Alternate Assessment Based on Modified Achievement Standards		
Alternate Assessment Based on Alternate Achievement Standards	5,325	8.9
LEP < 12 months, took ELP		
Total	59,577	
Comments:		

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 science assessment.

Student Group	# Students Enrolled	# Students Participating	Percentage of Students Participating
All students	188,636	187,166	99.2
American Indian or Alaskan Native	3,033	2,976	98.1
Asian	7,370	7,330	99.5
Black or African American	19,714	19,214	97.5
Hispanic or Latino	16,319	16,062	98.4
Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander			
White	142,190	141,578	99.6
Two or more races			
Children with disabilities (<i>IDEA</i>)	25,937	25,406	98.0
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	10,373	10,177	98.1
Economically disadvantaged students	73,140	72,193	98.7
Migratory students	136	126	92.6
Male	96,777	95,916	99.1
Female	91,853	91,248	99.3
Comments: Per 2/6/12 ED Verification Request:			
Data was submitted for the 5 major racial ethnic categories that apply in WI. Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander is not one of those categories. These students would be counted in the Asian/Pacific Islander category.			

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

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 science assessment.

The data provided should include science participation results from all students with disabilities as defined under the *Individuals with Disabilities Education Act (IDEA)*. Do not include former students with disabilities (*IDEA*). Do not include students only 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	8,586	33.8
Regular Assessment with Accommodations	14,598	57.5
Alternate Assessment Based on Grade-Level Achievement Standards		
Alternate Assessment Based on Modified Achievement Standards		
Alternate Assessment Based on Alternate Achievement Standards	2,222	8.7
Total	25,406	
Comments:		

1.3 STUDENT ACADEMIC ACHIEVEMENT

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

Note: States are not required to report these data by the seven (7) racial/ethnic groups; instead, they are required to report these data by the major racial and ethnic groups that are identified in their Accountability Workbooks. The charts below display racial/ethnic data that has been mapped back from the major racial and ethnic groups identified in their workbooks, to the 7 racial/ethnic groups to allow for the examination of data across states.

1.3.1 Student Academic Achievement in Mathematics

In the format of the table below, provide the number of students who received a valid score on the State 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, and for whom a proficiency level was assigned in the regular assessments with or without accommodations and alternate assessments. Do not include former students with disabilities (*IDEA*). 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.

1.3.1.1 Student Academic Achievement in Mathematics - Grade 3

Grade 3	# Students Who Received a Valid Score and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned	# Students Scoring at or Above Proficient	Percentage of Students Scoring at or Above Proficient
All students	60,009	44,506	74.2
American Indian or Alaskan Native	1,009	632	62.6
Asian	2,417	1,881	77.8
Black or African American	6,674	3,028	45.4
Hispanic or Latino	6,404	3,885	60.7
Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander			
White	43,500	35,077	80.6
Two or more races			
Children with disabilities (<i>IDEA</i>)	8,297	4,396	53.0
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	4,817	2,957	61.4
Economically disadvantaged students	26,548	16,183	61.0
Migratory students	40	27	67.5
Male	30,741	22,857	74.4
Female	29,266	21,648	74.0
Comments:			

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

Grade 3	# Students Who Received a Valid Score and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned	# Students Scoring at or Above Proficient	Percentage of Students Scoring at or Above Proficient
All students	59,694	48,144	80.7
American Indian or Alaskan Native	1,006	739	73.5
Asian	2,373	1,908	80.4
Black or African American	6,665	3,915	58.7
Hispanic or Latino	6,170	4,176	67.7
Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander			
White	43,475	37,402	86.0
Two or more races			
Children with disabilities (<i>IDEA</i>)	8,231	4,105	49.9
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	4,517	2,829	62.6
Economically disadvantaged students	26,265	18,248	69.5
Migratory students	33	23	69.7
Male	30,556	23,610	77.3
Female	29,136	24,533	84.2
Comments:			

1.3.3.1 Student Academic Achievement in Science - Grade 3

Grade 3	# Students Who Received a Valid Score and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned	# Students Scoring at or Above Proficient	Percentage of Students Scoring at or Above Proficient
All students			
American Indian or Alaskan Native			
Asian			
Black or African American			
Hispanic or Latino			
Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander			
White			
Two or more races			
Children with disabilities (<i>IDEA</i>)			
Limited English proficient (LEP) students			
Economically disadvantaged students			
Migratory students			
Male			
Female			
Comments: WI does not test science in this grade.			

1.3.1.2 Student Academic Achievement in Mathematics - Grade 4

Grade 4	# Students Who Received a Valid Score and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned	# Students Scoring at or Above Proficient	Percentage of Students Scoring at or Above Proficient
All students	60,959	48,425	79.4
American Indian or Alaskan Native	1,000	714	71.4
Asian	2,505	1,999	79.8
Black or African American	6,566	3,364	51.2
Hispanic or Latino	6,305	4,251	67.4
Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander			
White	44,583	38,097	85.5
Two or more races			
Children with disabilities (<i>IDEA</i>)	8,865	4,744	53.5
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	4,667	2,944	63.1
Economically disadvantaged students	26,554	17,844	67.2
Migratory students	44	22	50.0
Male	31,378	25,195	80.3
Female	29,581	23,230	78.5
Comments:			

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

Grade 4	# Students Who Received a Valid Score and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned	# Students Scoring at or Above Proficient	Percentage of Students Scoring at or Above Proficient
All students	60,781	50,690	83.4
American Indian or Alaskan Native	998	779	78.1
Asian	2,478	2,023	81.6
Black or African American	6,563	3,970	60.5
Hispanic or Latino	6,171	4,396	71.2
Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander			
White	44,571	39,522	88.7
Two or more races			
Children with disabilities (<i>IDEA</i>)	8,815	4,499	51.0
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	4,502	2,877	63.9
Economically disadvantaged students	26,397	19,120	72.4
Migratory students	41	29	70.7
Male	31,275	25,380	81.2
Female	29,506	25,310	85.8
Comments:			

1.3.3.2 Student Academic Achievement in Science - Grade 4

Grade 4	# Students Who Received a Valid Score and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned	# Students Scoring at or Above Proficient	Percentage of Students Scoring at or Above Proficient
All students	60,879	47,393	77.8
American Indian or Alaskan Native	999	701	70.2
Asian	2,502	1,892	75.6
Black or African American	6,549	3,225	49.2
Hispanic or Latino	6,270	4,034	64.3
Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander			
White	44,559	37,541	84.3
Two or more races			
Children with disabilities (<i>IDEA</i>)	8,840	5,360	60.6
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	4,632	2,720	58.7
Economically disadvantaged students	26,487	17,285	65.3
Migratory students	43	21	48.8
Male	31,326	24,255	77.4
Female	29,553	23,138	78.3
Comments:			

1.3.1.3 Student Academic Achievement in Mathematics - Grade 5

Grade 5	# Students Who Received a Valid Score and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned	# Students Scoring at or Above Proficient	Percentage of Students Scoring at or Above Proficient
All students	61,403	48,837	79.5
American Indian or Alaskan Native	977	663	67.9
Asian	2,450	2,004	81.8
Black or African American	6,727	3,540	52.6
Hispanic or Latino	5,793	3,898	67.3
Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander			
White	45,453	38,731	85.2
Two or more races			
Children with disabilities (<i>IDEA</i>)	8,849	4,367	49.4
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	3,972	2,451	61.7
Economically disadvantaged students	26,078	17,518	67.2
Migratory students	42	24	57.1
Male	31,560	25,235	80.0
Female	29,840	23,601	79.1
Comments:			

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

Grade 5	# Students Who Received a Valid Score and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned	# Students Scoring at or Above Proficient	Percentage of Students Scoring at or Above Proficient
All students	61,271	51,978	84.8
American Indian or Alaskan Native	976	754	77.3
Asian	2,415	2,004	83.0
Black or African American	6,715	4,200	62.5
Hispanic or Latino	5,712	4,211	73.7
Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander			
White	45,450	40,808	89.8
Two or more races			
Children with disabilities (<i>IDEA</i>)	8,818	4,643	52.7
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	3,846	2,485	64.6
Economically disadvantaged students	25,962	19,360	74.6
Migratory students	40	33	82.5
Male	31,479	26,043	82.7
Female	29,789	25,934	87.1
Comments:			

1.3.3.3 Student Academic Achievement in Science - Grade 5

Grade 5	# Students Who Received a Valid Score and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned	# Students Scoring at or Above Proficient	Percentage of Students Scoring at or Above Proficient
All students			
American Indian or Alaskan Native			
Asian			
Black or African American			
Hispanic or Latino			
Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander			
White			
Two or more races			
Children with disabilities (<i>IDEA</i>)			
Limited English proficient (LEP) students			
Economically disadvantaged students			
Migratory students			
Male			
Female			
Comments: WI does not test science in this grade.			

1.3.1.4 Student Academic Achievement in Mathematics - Grade 6

Grade 6	# Students Who Received a Valid Score and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned	# Students Scoring at or Above Proficient	Percentage of Students Scoring at or Above Proficient
All students	60,945	48,784	80.0
American Indian or Alaskan Native	986	678	68.8
Asian	2,328	1,949	83.7
Black or African American	6,633	3,399	51.2
Hispanic or Latino	5,641	3,749	66.5
Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander			
White	45,355	39,008	86.0
Two or more races			
Children with disabilities (<i>IDEA</i>)	8,594	3,856	44.9
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	3,446	1,981	57.5
Economically disadvantaged students	25,117	16,724	66.6
Migratory students	40	26	65.0
Male	31,347	24,868	79.3
Female	29,597	23,916	80.8
Comments:			

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

Grade 6	# Students Who Received a Valid Score and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned	# Students Scoring at or Above Proficient	Percentage of Students Scoring at or Above Proficient
All students	60,800	52,629	86.6
American Indian or Alaskan Native	980	774	79.0
Asian	2,306	1,904	82.6
Black or African American	6,607	4,364	66.1
Hispanic or Latino	5,571	4,141	74.3
Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander			
White	45,334	41,444	91.4
Two or more races			
Children with disabilities (<i>IDEA</i>)	8,537	4,500	52.7
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	3,354	1,991	59.4
Economically disadvantaged students	25,010	19,044	76.1
Migratory students	35	27	77.1
Male	31,260	26,451	84.6
Female	29,539	26,177	88.6
Comments:			

1.3.3.4 Student Academic Achievement in Science - Grade 6

Grade 6	# Students Who Received a Valid Score and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned	# Students Scoring at or Above Proficient	Percentage of Students Scoring at or Above Proficient
All students			
American Indian or Alaskan Native			
Asian			
Black or African American			
Hispanic or Latino			
Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander			
White			
Two or more races			
Children with disabilities (<i>IDEA</i>)			
Limited English proficient (LEP) students			
Economically disadvantaged students			
Migratory students			
Male			
Female			
Comments: WI does not test science in this grade.			

1.3.1.5 Student Academic Achievement in Mathematics - Grade 7

Grade 7	# Students Who Received a Valid Score and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned	# Students Scoring at or Above Proficient	Percentage of Students Scoring at or Above Proficient
All students	61,199	48,593	79.4
American Indian or Alaskan Native	1,020	710	69.6
Asian	2,246	1,798	80.1
Black or African American	6,605	3,219	48.7
Hispanic or Latino	5,346	3,473	65.0
Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander			
White	45,978	39,390	85.7
Two or more races			
Children with disabilities (<i>IDEA</i>)	8,564	3,594	42.0
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	3,217	1,744	54.2
Economically disadvantaged students	24,679	16,179	65.6
Migratory students	39	17	43.6
Male	31,349	24,885	79.4
Female	29,850	23,708	79.4
Comments:			

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

Grade 7	# Students Who Received a Valid Score and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned	# Students Scoring at or Above Proficient	Percentage of Students Scoring at or Above Proficient
All students	61,092	53,124	87.0
American Indian or Alaskan Native	1,017	835	82.1
Asian	2,224	1,862	83.7
Black or African American	6,604	4,438	67.2
Hispanic or Latino	5,286	4,087	77.3
Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander			
White	45,957	41,900	91.2
Two or more races			
Children with disabilities (<i>IDEA</i>)	8,509	4,445	52.2
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	3,139	2,034	64.8
Economically disadvantaged students	24,589	19,020	77.4
Migratory students	38	29	76.3
Male	31,281	26,533	84.8
Female	29,811	26,591	89.2
Comments:			

1.3.3.5 Student Academic Achievement in Science - Grade 7

Grade 7	# Students Who Received a Valid Score and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned	# Students Scoring at or Above Proficient	Percentage of Students Scoring at or Above Proficient
All students			
American Indian or Alaskan Native			
Asian			
Black or African American			
Hispanic or Latino			
Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander			
White			
Two or more races			
Children with disabilities (<i>IDEA</i>)			
Limited English proficient (LEP) students			
Economically disadvantaged students			
Migratory students			
Male			
Female			
Comments: WI does not test science in this grade.			

1.3.1.6 Student Academic Achievement in Mathematics - Grade 8

Grade 8	# Students Who Received a Valid Score and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned	# Students Scoring at or Above Proficient	Percentage of Students Scoring at or Above Proficient
All students	61,204	48,099	78.6
American Indian or Alaskan Native	964	658	68.3
Asian	2,318	1,844	79.6
Black or African American	6,507	2,941	45.2
Hispanic or Latino	5,070	3,217	63.5
Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander			
White	46,343	39,439	85.1
Two or more races			
Children with disabilities (<i>IDEA</i>)	8,317	3,394	40.8
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	3,111	1,585	50.9
Economically disadvantaged students	23,634	15,054	63.7
Migratory students	39	22	56.4
Male	31,367	24,692	78.7
Female	29,836	23,407	78.5
Comments:			

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

Grade 8	# Students Who Received a Valid Score and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned	# Students Scoring at or Above Proficient	Percentage of Students Scoring at or Above Proficient
All students	61,088	53,106	86.9
American Indian or Alaskan Native	959	787	82.1
Asian	2,299	1,953	84.9
Black or African American	6,494	4,237	65.2
Hispanic or Latino	5,004	3,886	77.7
Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander			
White	46,331	42,243	91.2
Two or more races			
Children with disabilities (<i>IDEA</i>)	8,267	4,250	51.4
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	3,016	1,955	64.8
Economically disadvantaged students	23,545	18,136	77.0
Migratory students	35	28	80.0
Male	31,281	26,285	84.0
Female	29,807	26,821	90.0
Comments:			

1.3.3.6 Student Academic Achievement in Science - Grade 8

Grade 8	# Students Who Received a Valid Score and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned	# Students Scoring at or Above Proficient	Percentage of Students Scoring at or Above Proficient
All students	61,084	47,510	77.8
American Indian or Alaskan Native	958	665	69.4
Asian	2,314	1,722	74.4
Black or African American	6,464	2,937	45.4
Hispanic or Latino	5,031	3,096	61.5
Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander			
White	46,316	39,090	84.4
Two or more races			
Children with disabilities (<i>IDEA</i>)	8,272	3,962	47.9
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	3,071	1,402	45.7
Economically disadvantaged students	23,544	14,863	63.1
Migratory students	35	21	60.0
Male	31,286	24,226	77.4
Female	29,798	23,284	78.1
Comments:			

1.3.1.7 Student Academic Achievement in Mathematics - High School

High School	# Students Who Received a Valid Score and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned	# Students Scoring at or Above Proficient	Percentage of Students Scoring at or Above Proficient
All students	65,471	46,872	71.6
American Indian or Alaskan Native	1,030	580	56.3
Asian	2,520	1,712	67.9
Black or African American	6,308	1,988	31.5
Hispanic or Latino	4,831	2,293	47.5
Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander			
White	50,777	40,296	79.4
Two or more races			
Children with disabilities (<i>IDEA</i>)	8,383	2,481	29.6
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	2,534	716	28.3
Economically disadvantaged students	22,358	11,599	51.9
Migratory students	50	17	34.0
Male	33,462	24,170	72.2
Female	32,007	22,701	70.9
Comments:			

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

High School	# Students Who Received a Valid Score and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned	# Students Scoring at or Above Proficient	Percentage of Students Scoring at or Above Proficient
All students	65,450	49,390	75.5
American Indian or Alaskan Native	1,033	665	64.4
Asian	2,510	1,674	66.7
Black or African American	6,321	2,709	42.9
Hispanic or Latino	4,798	2,671	55.7
Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander			
White	50,783	41,668	82.1
Two or more races			
Children with disabilities (<i>IDEA</i>)	8,400	2,925	34.8
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	2,470	707	28.6
Economically disadvantaged students	22,344	13,097	58.6
Migratory students	49	17	34.7
Male	33,458	24,114	72.1
Female	31,990	25,274	79.0
Comments:			

1.3.3.7 Student Academic Achievement in Science - High School

High School	# Students Who Received a Valid Score and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned	# Students Scoring at or Above Proficient	Percentage of Students Scoring at or Above Proficient
All students	65,203	49,002	75.2
American Indian or Alaskan Native	1,019	645	63.3
Asian	2,514	1,696	67.5
Black or African American	6,201	2,252	36.3
Hispanic or Latino	4,761	2,471	51.9
Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander			
White	50,703	41,936	82.7
Two or more races			
Children with disabilities (<i>IDEA</i>)	8,294	3,382	40.8
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	2,474	705	28.5
Economically disadvantaged students	22,162	12,706	57.3
Migratory students	48	21	43.8
Male	33,304	25,354	76.1
Female	31,897	23,647	74.1
Comments:			

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 public elementary and secondary schools and districts in the State, including charters, and the total number of those schools and districts that made AYP based on data for SY 2010-11. The percentage that made AYP will be calculated automatically.

Entity	Total #	Total # that Made AYP in SY 2010-11	Percentage that Made AYP in SY 2010-11
Schools	2,107	1,884	89.4
Districts	424	418	98.6
Comments: No comments at this time.			

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 SY 2010-11 . 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 2010-11	Percentage of Title I Schools that Made AYP in SY 2010-11
All Title I schools	1,174	1,036	88.2
Schoolwide (SWP) Title I schools	540	432	80.0
Targeted assistance (TAS) Title I schools	634	604	95.3
Comments: No comments at this time.			

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 2010-11. The percentage that made AYP will be calculated automatically.

# Districts That Received Title I Funds in SY 2010-11	# Districts That Received Title I Funds and Made AYP in SY 2010-11	Percentage of Districts That Received Title I Funds and Made AYP in SY 2010-11
412	406	98.5
Comments: No comments at this time.		

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 2011-12 based on the data from SY 2010-11. For each school on the list, provide the following:

- District Name
- District NCES ID Code
- School Name
- School 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 2011-12 (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)¹)
- 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 \(Get MS Excel Viewer\)](#).

¹ 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 *ESEA* were implemented in SY 2010-11 (based on SY 2009-10 assessments under Section 1111 of *ESEA*).

Corrective Action	# of Title I Schools in Corrective Action in Which the Corrective Action was Implemented in SY 2010-11
Required implementation of a new research-based curriculum or instructional program	10
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	2
Replacement of the principal	4
Restructuring the internal organization of the school	2
Appointment of an outside expert to advise the school	2
Comments: No comments at this time.	

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 *ESEA* were implemented in SY 2010-11 (based on SY 2009-10 assessments under Section 1111 of *ESEA*).

Restructuring Action	# of Title I Schools in Restructuring in Which Restructuring Action Is Being Implemented
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
Takeover the school by the State	0
Other major restructuring of the school governance	3
Comments: No comments at this time.	

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.

Milwaukee Education Center was closed. Students and staff are involved in opening a new school called Phillips Secondary School to serve 6th through 12th grade.

Starting with the 2010-11 school year, Milwaukee Public Schools (MPS) will use 1003(g) funds to implement the transformation reform model in Pulaski and Bay View High Schools.

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 2011-12 based on the data from SY 2010-11. For each district on the list, provide the following:

- District Name
- District 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 2011-12 (Use one of the following improvement status designations: Improvement or Corrective Action²)
- 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 \(Get MS Excel Viewer\)](#).

² 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.

The Wisconsin Department of Public Instruction (WDPI) is required by the Elementary and Secondary Education Act (ESEA) to annually identify schools and districts that did not make adequate yearly progress (AYP) toward meeting the state's established objectives in four areas. These objectives include: testing 95 percent of their enrolled students in the statewide reading and mathematics assessments; meeting state established targets in reading, based on Wisconsin's statewide standardized test; meeting state established targets in mathematics, based on Wisconsin's statewide standardized test; and maintaining either a high school graduation rate of at least 85 percent or show growth of two percentage points each year and elementary and middle school attendance rates of at least 85 percent of the statewide average, or show growth.

Under the ESEA, WDPI has required Milwaukee Public Schools (MPS) to take corrective action designed to meet the goal of having all students achieve at the proficient and advanced student academic achievement levels. Previous corrective action requirements have created a strong foundation, and the district has made progress in achieving many of these requirements. However, further work is needed to successfully address the immediate needs of MPS' students. MPS is a district identified for improvement and subject to corrective action, therefore, all MPS schools, which include contracted sites (charter and partnership), are held accountable to the Corrective Action Requirements.

MPS continues to focus their efforts in three strategic areas: student success through academic achievement; high performing schools and classrooms; and district and community support. Like MPS, the WDPI remains committed to the goal of improving student achievement in MPS and has maintained that focus as the department developed the Corrective Action Requirements for Milwaukee Public Schools District in Need of Improvement 2011-2012 (CAR). The CAR promotes a consistent, well-designed set of classroom-focused structures that will encourage MPS students to be successful academically and will focus on the following three goals: ensuring highly qualified teachers and leaders are in every school; improving student performance; and ensuring accountability at the district, school, and student levels.

The 2011-2012 CAR builds on work the district has begun in recent years. In 2009-2010, MPS began developing a system of early intervening services (SEIS), which includes academic support through a Response to Intervention (RtI) system and behavior support through a Positive Behavior Intervention and Supports (PBIS) system.

The SEIS is designed to provide early academic and behavioral supports to struggling students rather than waiting for a child to fail before offering help. The essential elements of a SEIS include: 1) scientific, research-based instructional delivery; 2) differentiated instruction; 3) curricula and instructional materials aligned to state standards; 4) scientific, research-based classroom management; 5) system of behavioral support; 6) reliable and valid universal screening of literacy for all students; 7) reliable and valid universal screening of numeracy for all students; 8) universal screening for all students taking content area courses required for graduation; 9) reliable and valid universal screening for behavior; 10) effective school leadership that supports instructional decisions based on data; 11) system of instructional support (professional development); 12) system of classroom observations to determine integrity of implementation; 13) follow-up procedures for instructional staff who have not met minimal criteria; and 14) parental/family and community involvement.

RtI is a process for achieving higher levels of academic and behavioral success for all students. This systematic process will provide teachers with an organized framework for selection and implementation of interventions, and monitoring of student interventions. Also, the district has expanded PBIS, a RtI approach to behavior, to create a framework to support positive student behavior in all schools.

Finally, the district has developed structures to address specific areas of concern under former corrective action requirements, such as adopting an action team for partnership model, which engages families and communities with the schools to focus on student achievement. The district has developed a 2010-2011 action plan for partnerships and a district action team that will work with the Regional Home-School staff to support the school governance councils and the action teams for partnerships.

MPS and the WDPI will work throughout the 2011-2012 school year in successfully achieving the School Year goals of the CAR. To better ensure the district meets these School Year goals, the CAR goals have been divided into quarterly indicators with the stated evidence submitted to the department by the date specified. These quarters are divided into the following time periods:

Quarter 1 : July 1, 2011—September 30, 2011

Quarter 2 : October 1, 2011—December 31, 2011

Quarter 3 : January 1, 2012—March 31, 2012

Quarter 4 : April 1, 2012—June 15, 2012.

The CAR was developed with a multiyear perspective, which recognizes that improving learning for MPS students is an ongoing effort. The WDPI will work collaboratively with MPS as it implements these corrective action requirements.

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 *ESEA* were implemented in SY 2010-11 (based on SY 2009-10 assessments under Section 1111 of *ESEA*).

Corrective Action	# of Districts receiving Title I funds in Corrective Action in Which Corrective Action was Implemented in SY 2010-11
Implemented a new curriculum based on State standards	1
Authorized students to transfer from district schools to higher performing schools in a neighboring district	0
Deferred programmatic funds or reduced administrative funds	1
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 2009-10 and beginning of SY 2010-11 as a corrective action)	0
Comments: No comments at this time.	

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 SY 2010-11 data and the results of those appeals.

	# Appealed Their AYP Designations	# Appeals Resulted in a Change in the AYP Designation
Districts	6	5
Schools	6	5
Comments: No comments at this time.		

Date (MM/DD/YY) that processing appeals based on SY 2010-11 data was complete	07/08/11
---	----------

1.4.8 Sections 1003(a) and (g) School Improvement Funds

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 2010-11.

1.4.8.5.1 Section 1003(a) State Reservations

In the space provided, enter the percentage of the FY 2010 (SY 2010-11) 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*: 2.1 %

Comments: No comments at this time.

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

For SY 2010-11 there is no need to upload a spreadsheet to answer this question in the CSPR.

1.4.8.5.2 will be answered automatically using data submitted to ED Facts in Data Group 694, School improvement funds allocation table, from File Specification N/X132. You may review data submitted to ED Facts using the report named "Section 1003(a) and 1003(g) Allocations to LEAs and Schools - CSPR 1.4.8.5.2 (EDEN012)" from the ED Facts Reporting System.

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 2010-11.

This response is limited to 8,000 characters.

The Wisconsin Department of Public Instruction (WDPI) provided assistance to the LEA and schools that received School Improvement Grants (SIG Grants) to effectively use these funds. The support included a wide range of activities related to administration, evaluation, and technical assistance. The director and assistant director of the Title I and School Support Team along with other WDPI staff with expertise in working with low-achieving schools provided technical assistance related to current research on best practices related to the intervention models; implementation of the intervention models; evaluation of the models; and required data reporting.

WDPI evaluated progress and provided technical assistance by meeting with district and school personnel (in-person, on the telephone, and via email) and reviewing student achievement targets; annual goals; and leading indicators.

Furthermore, WDPI facilitated two meetings to assess the degree to which each school was on target with implementation of the School Improvement Grant (SIG) grant. Early on in the grant year, WDPI met with all the principals of SIG schools to review the federal requirements; identify the difference between Schools Identified for Improvement (SIFI) vs. persistently low-performing schools; explain the process to identify schools; define and discuss the requirements for the intervention models. In March of 2011, WDPI staff held a second meeting for SIG school principals to reflect on mid-year report data, learn from other principals working in SIG schools, and identify practices that may result in more effective implementation of the SIG grant during the 2011-12 school year.

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 2010-11 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.

The Wisconsin Department of Public Instruction did not have any other funds available to support schools identified for improvement, corrective action, or restructuring.

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 to transfer, and the number who transferred under the provisions for public school choice under Section 1116 of *ESEA*. The number of students who were eligible for public school choice should include:

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

The number of students who applied to transfer should include:

1. All students who applied to transfer in the current school year but did not or were unable to transfer.
2. All students who transferred in the current school year under the public school choice provisions of Section 1116; and
3. All students who previously transferred under the public school choice provisions of Section 1116 and are continuing to transfer for the current school year under Section 1116.

For any of the respective student counts, States should indicate in the Comment section if the count does not include any of the categories of students discussed above.

	# Students
Eligible for public school choice	35,855
Applied to transfer	237
Transferred to another school under the Title I public school choice provisions	124
Comments:	

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 under Section 1116 of *ESEA*.

	Amount
Dollars spent by LEAs on transportation for public school choice	\$ 58,447

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 to eligible students due to any of the following reasons:

1. All schools at a grade level in the LEA 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.

	# LEAs
LEAs Unable to Provide Public School Choice	2

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? For those LEAs that implement open enrollment or other school choice programs in addition to public school choice under Section 1116 of *ESEA*, the State may consider a student as having applied to transfer if the student meets the following:
- Has a "home" or "neighborhood" school (to which the student would have been assigned, in the absence of a school 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.

In addition, the State may consider costs for transporting a student meeting the above conditions towards the funds spent by an LEA on transportation for public school choice if the student is using district transportation services to attend the non-identified school.

- b. How should States report on public school choice for those LEAs that are not able to offer public school choice? In the count of LEAs that are not able to offer public school choice (for any of the reasons specified in 1.4.9.1.4), States should include those LEAs that are unable to offer public school choice at one or more grade levels. For instance, if an LEA is able to provide public school choice to eligible students at the elementary level but not at the secondary level, the State should include the LEA in the count. States should also include LEAs that are not able to provide public school choice at all (i.e., at any grade level). States should provide the reason(s) why public school choice was not possible in these LEAs at the grade level(s) in the Comment section. In addition, States may also include in the Comment section a separate count just of LEAs that are not able to offer public school choice at any grade level.

For LEAs that are not able to offer public school choice at one or more grade levels, States should count as eligible for public school choice (in 1.4.9.1.2) all students who attend identified Title I schools regardless of whether the LEA is able to offer the students public school choice.

Comments: No comments at this time.

³ 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*.

	# Students
Eligible for supplemental educational services	16,162
Applied for supplemental educational services	3,148
Received supplemental educational services	2,540
Comments: No comments at this time.	

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*.

	Amount
Dollars spent by LEAs on supplemental educational services	\$ 5,349,343
Comments: No comments at this time.	

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 the grade levels listed, the number of those core academic classes taught by teachers who are highly qualified, 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.

	Number of Core Academic Classes (Total)	Number of Core Academic Classes Taught by Teachers Who Are Highly Qualified	Percentage of Core Academic Classes Taught by Teachers Who Are Highly Qualified	Number 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 classes	221,591	218,352	98.5	3,239	1.5
All elementary classes	68,301	67,052	98.2	1,249	1.8
All secondary classes	153,290	151,300	98.7	1,990	1.3

Per 2/6/12 ED Verification Request:
 The number of core academic classes reported is correct. Our calculations indicate only a 6% increase not a 25.1% increase as stated. 2009-2010 was the first year of mandatory reporting of the number of classes in our staff data collection. We believe some of the change is due to better data quality and better adherence to our reporting guidelines.

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.

Our guidance to LEAs is to report self-contained elementary classes as one class. In past years, we reported based on FTE and 2009-2010 was the first time we specifically asked districts to report the number of classes per assignment, so the data is not comparable to prior years.
--

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 is 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 the reporting period?* The reporting period is the school year. The count of classes must include all semesters, quarters, or terms of the school year. For example, if core academic classes are held in summer sessions, those classes should be included in the count of core academic classes. A state determines into which school year classes fall.

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

In the tables 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	31.5
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	14.0
Elementary school classes taught by teachers who are not fully certified (and are not in an approved alternative route program)	54.5
Other (please explain in comment box below)	
Total	100.0

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

	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)	31.2
Secondary school classes taught by certified special education teachers who have not demonstrated subject-matter competency in those subjects	20.3
Secondary school classes taught by teachers who are not fully certified (and are not in an approved alternative route program)	48.5
Other (please explain in comment box below)	
Total	100.0

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

1.5.3 Poverty Quartiles and Metrics Used

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. The percentage of core academic classes taught by teachers who are highly qualified will be calculated automatically. The percentages used for high- and low-poverty schools and the poverty metric used to determine those percentages are reported in the second table. Below the tables are FAQs about these data.

NOTE: No source of classroom-level poverty data exists, so States may look at school-level data when figuring poverty quartiles. Because not all schools have traditional grade configurations, and because a school may not be counted as both an elementary and as a secondary school, 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).

This means that for the purpose of establishing poverty quartiles, some classes in schools where both elementary and secondary classes are taught would be counted as classes in an elementary school rather than as classes in a secondary school in 1.5.3. This also means that such a 12th grade class would be in a different category in 1.5.3 than it would be in 1.5.1.

School Type	Number of Core Academic Classes (Total)	Number of Core Academic Classes Taught by Teachers Who Are Highly Qualified	Percentage of Core Academic Classes Taught by Teachers Who Are Highly Qualified
Elementary Schools			
High Poverty Elementary Schools	31,305	30,384	97.1
Low-poverty Elementary Schools	11,223	11,103	98.9
Secondary Schools			
High Poverty secondary Schools	30,839	29,966	97.2
Low-Poverty secondary Schools	44,430	44,197	99.5

1.5.3.1 Poverty Quartile Breaks

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.

	High-Poverty Schools (more than what %)	Low-Poverty Schools (less than what %)
Elementary schools	58.7	25.2
Poverty metric used	Eligible for subsidized lunch. They are either schools that had no enrollment or they are a DOC/DHFS school or a County Disability Board school. For those agencies, the data the teacher quality data (N063 and N064) is reported at the district level and not at the school level, so the fact that they were not assigned a quartile should not affect the counts in section 1.5.2.	
Secondary schools	51.1	24.8
Poverty metric used	Eligible for subsidized lunch. They are either schools that had no enrollment or they are a DOC/DHFS school or a County Disability Board school. For those agencies, the data the teacher quality data (N063 and N064) is reported at the district level and not at the school level, so the fact that they were not assigned a quartile should not affect the counts in section 1.5.2.	

FAQs on poverty quartiles and metrics used to determine poverty

- a. *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.
- b. *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.
- c. *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.
- d. *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/files/uploads/5/Language_Instruction_Educational_Programs.pdf.
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
Yes <input type="checkbox"/>	Dual language	Spanish
Yes <input type="checkbox"/>	Two-way immersion	Spanish
Yes <input type="checkbox"/>	Transitional bilingual programs	Spanish
Yes <input type="checkbox"/>	Developmental bilingual	Spanish
Yes <input type="checkbox"/>	Heritage language	Spanish
Yes <input type="checkbox"/>	Sheltered English instruction	
Yes <input type="checkbox"/>	Structured English immersion	
Yes <input type="checkbox"/>	Specially designed academic instruction delivered in English (SDAIE)	
Yes <input type="checkbox"/>	Content-based ESL	
Yes <input type="checkbox"/>	Pull-out ESL	
Yes <input type="checkbox"/>	Other (explain in comment box below)	

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

Content Area Tutoring, Self-Contained.

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 who meet the LEP definition under 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 under Section 3121(a)(4) of Title III) in the ALL LEP student count in this table.

Number of ALL LEP students in the State	48,205
Comments:	

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 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.	47,910
Comments:	

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; Castilian	29,825
Hmong	9,355
Chinese	582
Arabic	492
Russian	440

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

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

--

1.6.3 Student Performance Data

This section collects data on LEP students' English language proficiency, as required by Sections 1111(h)(4)(D) and 3121(a)(2).

1.6.3.1.1 All LEP Students Tested on the State Annual English Language Proficiency Assessment

In the table below, please provide the number of ALL LEP students tested and not tested on annual State English language proficiency (ELP) assessment (as defined in 1.6.2.1).

	#
Number tested on State annual ELP assessment	46,772
Number not tested on State annual ELP assessment	372
Total	47,144
Comments:	

1.6.3.1.2 ALL LEP Student English Language Proficiency Results

	#
Number attained proficiency on State annual ELP assessment	10,549
Percent attained proficiency on State annual ELP assessment	22.6
Comments:	

1.6.3.2.1 Title III LEP Students Tested on the State Annual English Language Proficiency Assessment

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

	#
Number tested on State annual ELP assessment	46,465
Number not tested on State annual ELP assessment	372
Total	46,837
Comments: Per 2/6/12 ED Verification Request: The correct N not tested was 372. Updated EDEN files resubmitted. See table next page 1.6.3.2.1 in workbook.	
In the table below, provide the number of Title III students who took the State annual ELP assessment for the first time and whose progress cannot be determined and whose results were not included in the calculation for AMAO1. Report this number ONLY if the State did not include these students in establishing AMAO1/ making progress target and did not include them in the calculations for AMAO1/ making progress (# and % making progress).	
	#
Number of Title III students who took the State annual ELP assessment for the first time whose progress cannot be determined and whose results were not included in the calculation for AMAO 1.	7,967

1.6.3.2.2 Title III LEP English Language Proficiency Results

This section collects information on Title III LEP students' development of English and attainment of English proficiency.

Table 1.6.3.2.2 Definitions:

- Annual Measureable Achievement Objectives (AMAOs)** = State targets for the number and percent of students making progress and attaining proficiency.
- Making Progress** = Number and percent of Title III LEP students that met the definition of "Making Progress" as defined by the State and submitted to ED in the Consolidated State Application (CSA), or as amended.
- Attained Proficiency** = Number and percent of Title III LEP students that met the State definition of "Attainment" of English language proficiency submitted to ED in the Consolidated State Application (CSA), or as amended.
- Results** = Number and percent of Title III LEP students that met the State definition of "Making Progress" and the number and percent that met the State definition of "Attainment" of English language proficiency.

In the table below, provide the State targets for the number and percent of students making progress and attaining English proficiency for this reporting period. Additionally, 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. If your State uses cohorts, provide us with the range of targets, (i.e., indicate the lowest target among the cohorts, e.g., 10% and the highest target among a cohort, e.g., 70%).

	Results		Targets	
	#	%	#	%
Making progress	13,502	35.1	10,307	35.00
Attained proficiency	9,665	20.8	1,914	6.50
Comments:				

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).	No
State offers the State mathematics content tests in the students' native language(s).	No
State offers the State science content tests in the students' native language(s).	No
Comments:	

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 *ESEA* accountability determinations for mathematics.

Language(s)
N/A
Comments:

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 *ESEA* accountability determinations for reading/language arts.

Language(s)
N/A
Comments:

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 *ESEA* accountability determinations for science.

Language(s)
N/A
Comments:

1.6.3.6 Title III Served Monitored Former LEP (MFLEP) 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 students include:

- Students who have transitioned out of a language instruction educational program.
- 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
1,530	1,073	2,603
Comments:		

1.6.3.6.2 In the table below, report the number of MFLEP students who took the annual mathematics assessment. Please provide data only for those students who transitioned out of language instruction educational programs 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 of 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
2,603	2,453	94.2	150
Comments:			

1.6.3.6.3 MFLEP Students Results for Reading/Language Arts

In the table below, report results for MFLEP students who took the annual reading/language arts assessment. Please provide data only for those students who transitioned out of language instruction educational programs 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
2,603	2,524	97.0	79
Comments:			

1.6.3.6.4 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 out of language instruction educational programs 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 total 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
981	902	91.9	79
Comments:			

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	79
# - Number of subgrantees that met all three Title III AMAOs	78
# - Number of subgrantees who met AMAO 1	79
# - Number of subgrantees who met AMAO 2	79
# - Number of subgrantees who met AMAO 3	78
# - 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 2009-10 and 2010-11)	1
# - Number of subgrantees implementing an improvement plan in SY 2010-11 for not meeting Title III AMAOs for two consecutive years	1
# - Number of subgrantees that have not met Title III AMAOs for four consecutive years (SYs 2007-08, 2008-09, 2009-10, and 2010-11)	0

Provide information on how the State counted consortia members in the total number of subgrantees and in each of the numbers in table 1.6.4.1.

The response is limited to 4,000 characters.

Comments: Each district within a Title III-A consortium was evaluated separately according to WI's approved Title III-A accountability plan. If a consortium had all its members meet an AMAO, then the consortium was itself counted as meeting that AMAO. The total number of subgrantees is the total number of consortia and non-consortium districts.

One WI subgrantee missed AMAOs in SY 2010-11, for the second consecutive year. WDPI is working with the subgrantee on developing and implementing an improvement plan.

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>
Comments: Per 2/6/12 ED Verification Request: Resubmitted EDEN data. 25% TIII-served LEP students Attained Proficiency	

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 or activities for immigrant children and youth terminated.

Comments:

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 schools 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 under 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 Language Instruction Educational Program (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
5,727	2,157	16

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.

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 under 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) v The term 'Language instruction educational program' means an instruction course v (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 as a second language.

	#
Number of all certified/licensed teachers currently working in Title III language instruction educational programs.	2,184
Estimate number of additional certified/licensed teachers that will be needed for Title III language instruction educational programs in the next 5 years*.	1,075

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.

Supply and demand data available at <http://dpi.wi.gov/tepd/supdem.html>.

* 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 Activities of Subgrantees Related to the Teaching and Learning of LEP Students

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

Table 1.6.6.2 Definitions:

1. **Professional Development Topics** = Subgrantee 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 activities reported.
4. **Total** = Number of all participants in professional development (PD) activities

Type of Professional Development Activity	# Subgrantees	
Instructional strategies for LEP students	217	
Understanding and implementation of assessment of LEP students	189	
Understanding and implementation of ELP standards and academic content standards for LEP students	139	
Alignment of the curriculum in language instruction educational programs to ELP standards	78	
Subject matter knowledge for teachers	95	
Other (Explain in comment box)	55	
Participant Information	# Subgrantees	# Participants
PD provided to content classroom teachers	171	11,949
PD provided to LEP classroom teachers	132	2,077
PD provided to principals	106	609
PD provided to administrators/other than principals	104	261
PD provided to other school personnel/non-administrative	113	908
PD provided to community based organization personnel	14	339
Total	247	16,143

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

Access testing | Somali language and culture | AMAOs for ELL | WIABE, WITESOL, Nancy Akhavan Workshop | Parent Outreach and Communication | ELL networking, reflective practices, common assessments | strategic planning, CESA 6, DPI conference, district-wide collaboration sessions | CESA 11 | Title III Network Meeting (09/23/10) and Differentiation Using the WIDA Resources | WIDA Training | Viewing of resources | Spanish literacy | Understanding and implementation of Title III along with knowledge of programs and assessments | SIOP training | Beginning-of-Year Training for new ELL teachers | DPI and WITESOL workshops | attendance at CESA 6 workshops | Intervention strategies | biliteracy training for bilingual staff | How to work with struggling ELP students | Intervention training | AYP mathematics Professional Development for all School that missed AYP in Math on the WKCE | All professional development activities listed above received through CESA 10 ELL network meetings | CESA1 ELL Network, IED Seminars on ELL | Training of Building staff in SIOP model and best practices for ELLs in elementary classrooms | ACCESS assessment training | Common Core State Standards | Coordinator / Area Cesa information training/resources | Rtl for ELL Workshop | State Workshop | At this time we have no ELL students. Teachers take individual classes and participate in workshops | Title III Network Meetings | Use of technology as a teaching tool & use of software to supplement instruction for ELL students | One-on-one support to classroom teachers & ELL kids | CESA 7 sponsored opportunities in to support classroom instruction and differentiation | Professional Workshops through CESA 1 | workshops through CESA #3 | Attended technology seminar. ELL and Special Education referral workshop. | ELP Resources available to teachers | SIOP Professional Development | Professional Development Activities Conducted by CESA 5 Consortium | Rtl and the English Language Learner | SIOP Training | Differentiated Instruction | Differentiation Using the WIDA Resources | Writing Instruction | Paraprofessional Series-bilingual aide training in core content areas

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 2010-11 funds July 1, 2010, and then made these funds available to subgrantees on August 1, 2010, for SY 2010-11 programs. Then the "# of days/\$\$ Distribution" is 30 days.

Date State Received Allocation	Date Funds Available to Subgrantees	# of Days/\$\$ Distribution
07/01/10	07/01/10	87
Comments: Prior to receiving allocations, WDPI gives districts/subgrantees an estimate based on the number of eligible ELLs in each. WI uses a consolidated online application for all ESEA Title funding and districts/subgrantees are allowed to complete their applications prior to the date WDPI receives allocations. Title III subgrants for each district/subgrantee are posted on WDPI's website and districts/subgrantees are immediately notified via email. Allocations are available the same date as the notice.		

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.

WDPI will continue to provide preliminary estimates of eligible ELLs in districts from which they build their budgets.

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
Comments:	

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 2009-10). Below the table are FAQs about the data collected in this table.

Student Group	Graduation Rate
All Students	89.9
American Indian or Alaska Native	78.5
Asian or Pacific Islander	91.3
Black, non-Hispanic	67.0
Hispanic	77.4
White, non-Hispanic	94.1
Children with disabilities (<i>IDEA</i>)	79.8
Limited English proficient	76.3
Economically disadvantaged	81.7
Migratory students	74.4
Male	88.2
Female	91.7
Comments: 2009-10 graduation rates for migratory students are based on incomplete cohort dropout data. Complete data will first be available with publication of 2011-12 rates.	

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 2009-10). Below the table is a FAQ about the data collected in this table.

Student Group	Dropout Rate
All Students	1.6
American Indian or Alaska Native	3.8
Asian or Pacific Islander	1.2
Black, non-Hispanic	5.5
Hispanic	3.3
White, non-Hispanic	0.9
Children with disabilities (<i>IDEA</i>)	2.7
Limited English proficient	3.0
Economically disadvantaged	2.5
Migratory students	4.7
Male	1.8
Female	1.4
Comments:	

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	427	427
LEAs with subgrants	16	16
Total	443	443
Comments: No comments at this time.		

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:

Age/Grade	# of Homeless Children/Youths Enrolled in Public School in LEAs <u>Without</u> Subgrants	# of Homeless Children/Youths Enrolled in Public School in LEAs <u>With</u> Subgrants
Age 3 through 5 (not Kindergarten)	310	419
K	473	696
1	485	749
2	453	680
3	411	677
4	394	619
5	339	555
6	334	596
7	286	550
8	295	504
9	254	507
10	272	418
11	341	481
12	624	648
Ungraded	0	0
Total	5,271	8,099
Comments: No comments at this time.		

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.

	# of Homeless Children/Youths - LEAs <u>Without</u> Subgrants	# of Homeless Children/Youths - LEAs <u>With</u> Subgrants
Shelters, transitional housing, awaiting foster care	691	1,497
Doubled-up (e.g., living with another family)	4,028	5,857
Unsheltered (e.g., cars, parks, campgrounds, temporary trailer, or abandoned buildings)	96	196
Hotels/Motels	456	549
Total	5,271	8,099
Comments: No comments at this time.		

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)	463
K	716
1	781
2	710
3	702
4	639
5	575
6	615
7	574
8	524
9	530
10	440
11	492
12	660
Ungraded	
Total	8,421

Comments: Wisconsin does not have ungraded classes.

1.9.2.2 Subgroups 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	1,127
Migratory children/youth	19
Children with disabilities (<i>IDEA</i>)	1,446
Limited English proficient students	603

Comments: No comments at this time.

1.9.3 Academic Achievement of Homeless Students

The following questions collect data on the academic achievement of enrolled homeless children and youths.

1.9.3.1 Reading Assessment

In the table below, provide the number of enrolled homeless children and youths who were tested on the State *ESEA* 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 *ESEA*.

Grade	# Homeless Children/Youth Who Received a Valid Score and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned	# Homeless Children/Youth Scoring at or above Proficient
3	543	266
4	511	287
5	468	285
6	485	276
7	444	272
8	407	262
High School	334	105
Comments: No comments at this time.		

1.9.3.2 Mathematics Assessment

This section is similar to 1.9.3.1. The only difference is that this section collects data on the State mathematics assessment.

Grade	# Homeless Children/Youth Who Received a Valid Score and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned	# Homeless Children/Youth Scoring at or above Proficient
3	559	227
4	525	251
5	474	235
6	499	212
7	451	197
8	417	182
High School	338	95
Comments: No comments at this time.		

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, 2010 through August 31, 2011. 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 under 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:

a. 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.

b. 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, 2010 through August 31, 2011. 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).

Age/Grade	12-Month Count of Eligible Migrant Children Who Can Be Counted for Funding Purposes
Age 3 through 5 (not Kindergarten)	111
K	59
1	74
2	65
3	56
4	56
5	62
6	56
7	51
8	49
9	61
10	62
11	50
12	42
Ungraded	0
Out-of-school	11
Total	865
Comments: No comments at this time.	

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 2010-11 Category 1 Count was 865. The 2009-10 Category 1 count was 947. This reflects a decrease of 82 students found eligible for the count. Wisconsin had a high number (94) of children below the age of 3, which were not eligible to be in the count provided for funding. This resulted in a decreased count for funding compared to last year. If one looks at the total migrant students for 2010-11, (959) that number surpassed the total eligible students for 2009-10 (947) . Thus, the decrease only occurred in the number of students eligible to be included in the count for funding when the counts for the two years were compared. The decrease is attributable to the high number of under age 3 children.

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, 2010 through August 31, 2011. 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).

Age/Grade	Summer/Intersession Count of Eligible Migrant Children Who Are Participants and Who Can Be Counted for Funding Purposes
Age 3 through 5 (not Kindergarten)	5
K	20
1	23
2	21
3	20
4	18
5	15
6	11
7	13
8	9
9	11
10	11
11	6
12	4
Ungraded	0
Out-of-school	0
Total	187
Comments: No comments at this time.	

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.

There was a decrease of (60) students in the 2011 Category 2 Count when compared to the 2010 Category 2 Count. Again, the high number of under age 3 children impacted the number served in the MEP program, creating a decrease in the number served, as these children were served in the UMOS Head Start programs. The MEP population had fewer secondary level students participating in the summer programs during Summer 2011 than was the case in Summer 2010 programs.

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.

Wisconsin's 2010-11 counts reported for Category 1 and Category 2 were determined through the New Generation System (NGS) generated reports from data entered into the system. These reports were subjected to multiple cross-checking procedures for validation by state and local staff. The same system and procedures were used for the 2009-10 child count data used for the 2009-10 and 2010-11 Category 1 and Category 2 counts.

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.

WI Response to 2/6/12 data verification request:

The State collects required Category 2 data for the summer term through the data elements completed by the state recruiter and local project personnel on the COE and data elements from Certificate of Eligibility (CER) and the Student Reporting Form (SRF). Data from these two forms are entered into the New Generation System data base. Data is collected during the summer term window. The SRF verifies students receiving supplemental services. The NGS system query has set programming to include only eligible children receiving a supplementary instructional or support service for the category 2 count. The system is programmed to count a student served only once for Category 2.

How was the child count collected?

The WI Certificate of Eligibility (COE) modeled from the national COE requirements, was used to collect a substantial amount of student demographic information necessary for determining migrant child eligibility. This data was entered into the New Generation System (NGS) and generates specially-designed reports on the eligible child counts for each category.

How was the data collected?

Trained recruiters from the local sites and the state program used the COE forms while completing face-to-face interviews with potential migrant families. The state recruiter does the recruitment in areas of the state without migrant projects. The state and local project sites have assigned staff for supervising the recruitment, reviewing the data and signing off as part of the quality control process. The array of information from the completed COE was used to make decisions on qualifying moves; qualifying arrival dates; residency dates; enrollment and withdrawal dates; student birth dates; and the end of eligibility, for the purpose of ensuring child count accuracy. The system has special built-in-flags that ensure appropriate counting for termination, including students who have obtained a GED, graduated from high school, or are deceased.

What data were collected?

The COE is designed to yield data on the required minimum data elements. The COE was designed to meet all national COE requirements, and undergoes revision when the regulations change to modify or add minimum data elements. In addition to a review of the NGS reports, the state staff reviews Local Accounting Sheets, Continuing Enrollment Reports, and Student Reporting Forms as a means of cross-checking district reporting on migrant students. The Student Reporting Form identifies the specific supplementary MEP funded instructional or support services. Residency and withdrawal dates are carefully monitored during the regular term and summer enrollment period. Follow up is carried out for any missing or questionable elements. Parental signatures are obtained on the COEs after they are well informed and they are provided a copy.

What activities were conducted to collect the data?

In summary, these activities were conducted to collect the data. Information obtained from state Workforce Development specifying new camps/growers location of migrant work and workers in the state; families alert recruiters that new families have arrived; school districts and UMOS share information with recruiters when new families arrive; employers provide information on new workers to the recruiters; school districts find new students during summer and regular year registration process; other states send notices via MSIX on new families coming to the state/ and follow up takes place; school Food Nutrition personnel contact recruiters when a new family arrives to check migrant status which leads to follow up; recruiters follow up on information leads on area work sites and make contacts, when migrant labor is involved; on-going re-interviewing checks are made and guidance provided; and a provision of relevant training for all recruiters and directors related to having accurate and complete NGS data and relationship to the quality of the MSIX data.

What activities were conducted to collect the data?

In summary, the major activities are as follows:

- * A COE was designed to be congruent with the required statues related to migrant child eligibility;
- * COEs are screened on an on-going basis, emails are sent noting program areas requesting clarification;
- * COEs 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 procedures by comparing data reported on the COE, the Local Accounting Sheet (LAS) and the Continuing Enrollment Report (CER) and the Student Reporting Form. The state recruiter and data manager is engaged in checking eligibility data for all enrolled eligible students and as necessary cross-checks accuracy of the date; and
- * local staff with responsibilities are kept abreast of data quality requirements and provided hands on training.

When were the data collected for the student information system?

The data collection activities gathered data between the appropriate window of September 1, 2010 and August 31, 2011.

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.

WI Response to 2/6/12 data verification request:

Yes, the NGS Specialist at the state and local level enter all data from the COE , The state NGS specialist enters the data from the Continuing Enrollment and Student Reporting Forms into the NGS data base. This includes course history, credits, and relevant summer service data. The state screens the NGS reports to identify any potential duplicates, and uses the MSIX duplicate report, making any adjustments as needed. When a duplicate is found, the data manager contacts the NGS Help Desk and ensures the duplication is removed. Updates to records are made e.g. when a secondary student did not finish all units in the summer and is able to finish in the fall. The data manager ensures partial credits are changed to final grade reported on the Student Reporting Form, and that updated course history is entered. State assessment data files for migrant students is transferred to NGS to be shared in MSIX.

The state NGS data entry specialist and some locally trained personnel with proper authorization enter data into the NGS. Wisconsin compiles a new COE for every student that arrives in the district from another district or state, or appropriate out of country locations. A Local Accounting Sheet (LAS) and a Continuing Enrollment Report (CER) were prepared for those students not moving out of state who were enrolled in school for the regular or summer term. NGS was updated regularly to reflect new demographic enrollment course history and assessment data.

Careful scrutiny by state staff affirmed that the NGS query included only students ages 3-21 and those eligible within the 36 month period, that residency had been verified, and that the unique student count for funding purposes included students of the appropriate age range. The type of each 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. However, Wisconsin does not have programming on the intercession basis. A "P" shows eligible migrants who are presently residing in the district but are not enrolled in a school or project.

The NGS has been programmed to set up a query to ensure a student is counted only once statewide for the count yielded in Category 1 and Category 2. The NGS creates a unique student identification number for each student. Extra checking is done by staff for potential duplications when names are the same or similar to rule out duplicity in the counts. The checks done on NGS data was tested in the MSIX preparation assisted with a strengthening of some problem areas. The analysis of snapshot data prior to authorizing data entry into EDEN also has been useful in validating the data accuracy.

Special NGS reports unique to districts were printed and shared with them to help eliminate problems with reported data and to ensure data accuracy and quality. Extra checking is done on the report that validates the 2 year olds turning 3 and other special reports on residency verification. The End of Eligibility Report is generated by NGS to flag students whose eligibility will end during the current term. This report helps to avoid inaccurate counts due to including students that no longer have eligible migrant status.

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.

The data for the State's Category 2 count were collected and maintained through NGS in the same manner as for the Category 1 count. The NGS system is programmed to report out the number of eligible students receiving supplemental services during the summer term.

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

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

WI Response to 2/6/12 data verification request:

The state does do extra checking with the report that validates 2 year olds turning 3. The report is shared with directors and recruiters. The projects file the Continuing Enrollment Report (CER) confirming all students still residing in the district with an indication of how residency was verified from one of three options: face to face, school records, records from other direct service providers who have some of the younger children in their programs. The NGS Query is set to count for Category 2 students only those who received a supplementary instruction or support system. The Query counts a student only once in the Category 2 child count for age/grade level. The data entered from the SRF identified the students with a supplementary instructional or support service and what that service was.

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.

The Category 1 count was obtained from the NGS data base, which was programmed to check data entered by the state for withdrawal date fields, enrollment date fields, and a residency verification date field which documented residency during the applicable reporting period and permits inclusion in the eligible student count. Substantial steps are taken by the state staff to build data quality prior to this step. Snapshot data is reviewed for accuracy prior to requesting the final run that generates the counts.

Children who met the program eligibility criteria were within 3 years of a last qualifying move and had a qualifying activity. 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 parents' signature on that same date.

Questionable situations discovered regarding 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 regulations and guidelines to local project recruiters and program directors prior to final determination of eligibility status. Communications were carried out through email, phone calls, and at times, at on-site meetings for local staff.

Children who were resident in your State for at least 1 day during the eligibility period (September 1 through August 31). The NGS data management system employs a query which counts a student only once. 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 this procedure also produces the Category 2 count.

- While the data management system employs a query which counts a student only once, the state staff 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.

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

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. Staff does careful additional cross-checking and reviews of the reporting on supplementary services that take place during the official summer program period.

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

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, there is a system of built-in checks with screening for potential duplications by similarity or same names. This checking System explores 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 Continuing Enrollment Report (CER) and Student Reporting Forms (SRFs). COEs are completed for summer and regular terms, and a CER is completed by district for children not leaving the state between summer and the regular term. A SRF is submitted for every student verifying school enrollment and dates. The state MEP data management team works on a continuous basis to analyze and improve data quality.

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.

The count is generated from the NGS in the same manner as the Category 1 count. Information from the Certificate of Eligibility and the Student Reporting Forms are entered into the system to capture unduplicated supplementary services per child served during the summer.

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.

WI Response to 2/6/12 data verification request:

Yes, the SEA has a handbook with written eligibility guidance and also uses the Identification and Recruitment modules developed by OME. Instructions for all Forms are provided. Eligibility is a part of summer term and regular term monitoring. Attendance is reviewed for the summer term and is filed on the Student Reporting Form (SRF) to show total days of enrollment and attendance prior to withdrawal. The MEP state team reviews input from local staff on needs, issues, and effectiveness of training; revisions are completed periodically to update forms, directions, and recruitment training on eligibility. Summer and regular term staff receive written guidance on how to collect, and report pupil enrollment and attendance data. Training is provided annually to directors, recruiters, and records clerks aimed at accuracy of identifying and reporting child eligibility data.

Only trained personnel may enter data into the NGS. Additionally,

- 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; and
- 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.

Discrepancies found are resolved by the State through these approaches:

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

The state's Migrant program manager attends meetings or phone conferences annually to participate in the Consortium sponsored by the NGS system. The NGS data management specialist participates in Advisory Council meetings with data entry specialists from the other states to focus on data quality issues, and to recommend improvements of the reports available to the states. The meetings engage the participants in reviewing needed new developments or enhancements in NGS along with opportunities to address national data requests relevant to child count and performance reporting. Consortium members are given the opportunity to make recommendations for improving services through the use of NGS.

The state staff design and provide quality training to local project personnel. During state sponsored training meetings substantial time is spent on the federal migrant education guidance and policy documents emphasizing legal requirements pertaining to data collection and reporting. Participants include project directors, recruiters, and records clerks. Sessions related to the improvement of identification and recruitment practices, collection of data to verify eligibility, procedures for reporting correctly, and acceptable me the key responsibilities for identification and recruitment practices and reporting of accurate data. The training was designed to ensure these individuals are kept abreast of the legal considerations to be considered when identifying eligible migrant students.

Data was carefully screened during the program year from multiple data sources which helped to verify withdrawal and enrollment and residency dates on the Certificates of Eligibility (COE). The state team comprised of the state program manager, the NGS data entry management specialist, the MEP consultant, the statewide recruiter, and MEP program assistant worked collaboratively to strengthen data collection and to analyze and modify procedures as needed to impact

the quality of the data that yields the Category 1 unique student count and the Category 2 summer program enrolled participants. Local project personnel provide training to others at the local site after receiving specialized training on determining and reporting eligibility.

COE's were obtained for all new families and families traveling out of state. Districts reported on the Local Accounting Sheet (LAS) and submitted a Continuing Enrollment Report (CER) for all other enrolled eligible students. The statewide recruiter engaged in checking eligibility data and in re-interviewing families to assist local recruiters that had problems with determination of eligibility.

The increased use of many of the NGS management reports has improved Wisconsin's data quality and accuracy when carrying out the data collection on migrant students. These included the District Report, the End of Eligibility Report, the COE Family Report, the Continuation of Services Report, and the Priority for Services Report, and other special reports available from NGS unique to the state.

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.

WI Response to 2/6/12 data verification request:

Yes, the state was engaged in reinterviewing during the 2010-11 program year. The activity during this year and 2011-12 is referred to as the Identification and Recruitment Quality Control Initiative, rather than reinterviewing. The activity is almost the same as the 2009-10 reinterviewing process, with the exception that external recruiters were used in the comprehensive review, and during the on-going two additional years we are using the state recruitment staff to audit COES. Sixty-five families of the selected 100 with participating children in the MEP were reinterviewed during 2010-11 and data analyzed for accuracy and eligibility of students. Two cases with eligibility problems were found where eligibility had ended for the students a month earlier. These two students were removed from the NGS system prior to the count. Other problems found were missed enrollments, and not including babies or young children on the COE. Appropriate adjustments were made and training was provided to staff at the projects with the problems identified.

Wisconsin completed a comprehensive prospective re-interviewing process in 2009-10, which was conducted with external out of state individuals knowledgeable about migrant education. The process involved every project. A continuous re-interviewing plan has been developed for the state which will have the eligibility of a number of students from each project reviewed on an on-going basis with prospective re-interviewing scheduled within a three year period.

The 2009-10 prospective re-interviewing process involved 129 families and reviewed the eligibility of 315 children. External out of state consultants were employed to conduct interviews with 129 families to verify the eligibility of 315 migrant children within those families. Out of the 315 children, four were not confirmed as eligible which is a 1.2 % error rate. In the continuous re-interviewing activities the suggestions or improvement of recruitment practices offered by the external evaluators have been incorporated into site visits and state training and other professional development offerings for workshops specifically focused on the improvement of the recruitment plan and practices, as well as the quality control process.

The three external re-interviewers provided specific suggestions for recruiters to improve their preparation of the COEs and for improvement of their identification and recruitment practices. These suggestions were focused on in the 2010-11 training for recruiters and directors who supervise their work. Additional opportunities will be provided to ensure recruiters are fully informed about the definitions of what constitutes temporary and seasonal agricultural work. Non-eligible children are removed from the program services and data base as appropriate. Plans are to continue related intensive training during the 2011-12 program years.

Re-interviews also take place when questions arise in the completion of the COE at the local level and the statewide recruiter re-contacts the family for clarification of information relevant to their move. Questions are thus resolved prior to entering the data into NGS. In the rare case a child is found to be ineligible, the parents are informed and the recommended procedures are again followed for removing that child from the migrant child count. The thorough examination of COE's by multiple trained staff is contributing to the goal of improving recruitment efforts, and contributes to having accurate data prior to submission of records to the NGS.

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.

WI Response to 2/6/12 data verification request:

The SEA has written procedures focused on correct procedures for inputting and updating child count data. Additionally MEP staff follow-up with direct contact when problems are noted with submitted data. Hands on Training also helps to keep local project staff updated and aware of the need to ensure data accuracy.

The state NGS Data Entry Management Specialist runs periodic reports for the staff and district personnel to use 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.

Special reports available from the NGS database were periodically 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. Monitoring of the migrant programs during the consolidated plan on site visits also provides an opportunity for the state migrant consultant to review data collection and reporting procedures.

There is an ongoing process which utilizes reports from NGS data collection 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. This includes the legal parameters that define eligibility This has 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 and eligibility determinations and reporting.

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.

WI Response to 2/6/12 data verification request:

The state director reviews the child counts and follows the guidance provided by OME. Careful reviews are completed before any official counts are submitted.

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. Snapshot data is carefully screened to ensure any issues with duplication are resolved. Any questionable data is reexamined.

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 works with EDEN staff to ensure proper reporting.

Multiple staff personnel are involved in review of data and issue resolving prior to the final submission of data into the system. Strict follow through guidelines are followed when problem areas are found.

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.

WI Response to 2/6/12 data verification request:

Yes it did, and technical assistance was provided to local projects in the areas of problems identified. Two eligibility errors were found and corrected. Some COEs were messy in some cases and there was evidence of some missed enrollments. One project failed to include babies/young children on the COE. Technical assistance was provided to appropriate personnel, and was included in plans for training. Follow up reviews will be made in this year to be sure the training was successful for personnel at these projects. Lessons learned are incorporated into the broader training held annually with all projects' staff.

The state has made a strong effort during 2009-10 and 2010-11 to strengthen training to improve the quality of its data collections and local and state determinations of child eligibility. State staff continued to engage district migrant project personnel in study of definitions, statutory requirements and related 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. New and continuing project staff is trained on the proper completion of the COE, and other necessary reports.

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. It will continue to pursue this goal during 2011-12. Recruiter training will focus on the new regulations and guidance issued by the federal government and practical case problems encountered by recruiters. Recruiters and records clerks new to their position will receive intensive induction and follow up hands on training. The new minimum data elements will be included in the training exercises.

The state engaged in comprehensive prospective re-interviewing during 2009-10. Suggestions received from the external Re-interviewers were integrated into the improvements of the recruitment process and these suggestions have been included in the professional development offerings for recruiters and directors, and records clerks in the annual recruiters' workshop and in on-going individualized sessions with new recruiters and records clerks. The three external re-interviewers provided suggestions for recruiters to improve their preparation of the COEs and for improvement of their identification and recruitment efforts to ensure all students were recruited. These suggestions are being incorporated into the ongoing 2010-11 training for recruiters and directors who supervise their work. Additional opportunities will be provided to ensure recruiters are fully informed about the definitions of what constitutes temporary and seasonal agricultural work. Non-eligible children are removed from the program services and data base as appropriate when cases of non-eligibility are determined. Any adjustments to the original COE must be initialized by the one making the change.

The new national COE was developed and implemented during the 2009-10 program year and this will help with obtaining sufficient data for eligibility determinations. 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. A major part of the 2010-11 recruiter training agenda will need to continue to be reserved for training on the changes in the new regulations, and what constitutes seasonal and temporary work. The results of the re-interviewing process at each site will be used to provide feedback to project personnel on strengths and areas needing improvement in the data collection and reporting.

COEs will not be entered into the NGS database system until complete and satisfactory information is gathered to verify temporary status. Based on the external re-interview team members' suggestions, and 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.

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.

The data submitted has been thoroughly reviewed and as there are many checks and balances built into the process to review the data, train personnel at the project level and to resolve issues prior to reporting. The state has made a thorough effort and believes it has submitted accurate data due to the intensity of the process.