

**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 2013-14



PART I DUE THURSDAY, DECEMBER 18, 2014
PART II DUE FRIDAY, FEBRUARY 13, 2015

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) 2013-14 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 2013-14 must respond to this Consolidated State Performance Report (CSPR). Part I of the Report is due to the Department by **Thursday, December 18, 2014**. Part II of the Report is due to the Department by **Friday, February 13, 2015**. Both Part I and Part II should reflect data from the SY 2013-14, 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 2013-14 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 2013-14 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: 7/31/2015
Consolidated State Performance Report For State Formula Grant Programs under the Elementary And Secondary Education Act as amended in 2001		
Check the one that indicates the report you are submitting: <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Part I, 2013-14 <input type="checkbox"/> Part II, 2013-14		
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 Christiansen		
Telephone: 608-266-2158		
Fax: 608-266-5188		
e-mail: maryjo.christiansen@dpi.wi.gov		
Name of Authorizing State Official: (Print or Type): Michael J. Thompson		
		Friday, March 6, 2015, 12:10:52 PM
Signature		Date

**CONSOLIDATED STATE PERFORMANCE REPORT
PART I**

For reporting on
School Year 2013-14



**PART I DUE DECEMBER 18, 2014
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

Indicate below whether your state has made or is planning to make revisions to or change the State's academic content standards in mathematics, reading/language arts or science since the State's content standards were most recently approved through ED's peer review process for State assessment systems. If yes, indicate specifically in what school year your State implemented or will implement the revisions or changes.

Response	Options
<p><u>No Revisions or changes</u></p>	<p>No revisions or changes to academic content standards in mathematics, reading/language arts or science made or planned.</p>
	<p>State has revised or changed its academic content standards in mathematics, reading/language arts or science or is planning to make revisions to or change its academic content standards in mathematics, reading/language arts or science. Indicate below the year these changes were or will be implemented or "Not Applicable" to indicate that changes were not made or will not be made in the subject area.</p>

Acceptable responses are a school year (e.g., 2013-14) or Not Applicable.

	Mathematics	Reading/Language Arts	Science
Academic Content Standards	June 2010	June 2010	Not Applicable

If the responses above do not fully describe revisions or changes to your State's academic content standards, describe the revisions or changes below.

The response is limited to 1,000 characters.

<p>No revisions or changes have been made to the academic content standards since June 2010.</p>

1.1.1.1 Academic Achievement Standards in Mathematics, Reading/Language Arts and Science

Indicate below whether your state has changed or is planning to change the State's academic achievement standards in mathematics, reading/language arts or science since the State's academic achievement standards were most recently approved through ED's peer review process for State assessment systems. If yes, indicate specifically in what school year your State implemented or will implement the changes.

As applicable, include changes to academic achievement standards based on any assessments (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.

Response	Options
<u>No Revisions or changes</u>	No revisions or changes to academic achievement standards in mathematics, reading/language arts or science made or planned.
	State has changed its academic achievement standards or is planning to change its academic achievement standards in mathematics, reading/language arts or science. Indicate below either the school year in which these changes were or will be implemented or "Not Applicable" to indicate that changes were not made or will not be made in the subject area.

Acceptable responses are a school year (e.g., 2013-14) or Not Applicable.

Academic Achievement Standards for	Mathematics	Reading/Language Arts	Science
Regular Assessments in Grades 3-8	2011-12	2011-12	Not Applicable
Regular Assessments in High School	2011-12	2011-12	Not Applicable
Alternate Assessments Based on Grade-Level Achievement Standards (if applicable)	Not Applicable	Not Applicable	Not Applicable
Alternate Assessments Based on Modified Achievement Standards (if applicable)	Not Applicable	Not Applicable	Not Applicable
Alternate Assessments Based on Alternate Achievement Standards	Not Applicable	Not Applicable	Not Applicable

If the responses above do not fully describe revisions or changes to your State's academic achievement standards, describe the revisions or changes below.

The response is limited to 1,000 characters.

No revisions or changes have been made since Wisconsin implemented new College & Career Ready Cut Scores for reading and mathematics in 2011-12.

1.1.2 Assessments in Mathematics and Reading/Language Arts and Science

Indicate below whether your state has changed or is planning to change the State's academic assessments in mathematics, reading/language arts or science since the State's academic assessments were most recently approved through ED's peer review process for State assessment systems. If yes, indicate specifically in what school year your State implemented or will implement the changes.

As applicable, include any assessments (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.

Response	Options
<u>State has revised or changed</u>	No changes to assessments in mathematics, reading/language arts or science made or planned.
	State has changed or is planning to change its assessments in mathematics, reading/language arts or science. Indicate below the year these changes were implemented or "Not Applicable" to indicate that changes were not made or will not be made in the subject area.

Acceptable responses are a school year (e.g., 2013-14) or Not Applicable.

Academic Assessments	Mathematics	Reading/Language Arts	Science
Regular Assessments in Grades 3-8	2014-15	2014-15	Not Applicable
Regular Assessments in High School	2014-15	2014-15	Not Applicable
Alternate Assessments Based on Grade-Level Achievement Standards (if applicable)	Not Applicable	Not Applicable	Not Applicable
Alternate Assessments Based on Modified Achievement Standards (if applicable)	Not Applicable	Not Applicable	Not Applicable
Alternate Assessments Based on Alternate Achievement Standards	2014-15	2014-15	Not Applicable

If the responses above do not fully describe revisions or changes to your State's academic achievement standards, describe the revisions or changes below.

The response is limited to 1,000 characters.

Wisconsin is implementing a new balanced assessment system during the 2014-15 school year. The Badger Exam is the new assessment developed by the multi-state Smarter Balanced Assessment Consortium. The Dynamic Learning Maps (DLM) Exam is the new assessment for students with significant cognitive disabilities developed by the DLM Consortium.

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 2013-14, 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)	0.00
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	100.00
Comments: The response is limited to 4,000 characters.	

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 2013-14 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>Yes</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>Yes</u>
Developing or improving assessments of English language proficiency necessary to comply with Section 1111(b)(7)	<u>Yes</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>Yes</u>
Developing multiple measures to increase the reliability and validity of State assessment systems	<u>Yes</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>Yes</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>Yes</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>Yes</u>
Other	<u>Yes</u>
Comments: The response is limited to 4,000 characters.	

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 racial/ethnic groups shown in the table below; 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 have been mapped from the major racial and ethnic groups identified in their workbooks to the racial/ethnic groups shown.

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	432,580	431,046	99.65
American Indian or Alaska Native	7,212	7,174	99.47
Asian or Pacific Islander	18,066	18,005	99.66
<i>Asian</i>			
<i>Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander</i>			
Black or African American	46,573	46,219	99.24
Hispanic or Latino	44,956	44,781	99.61
White	315,689	314,784	99.71
Two or more races			
Children with disabilities (<i>IDEA</i>)	59,896	59,281	98.97
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	23,523	23,440	99.65
Economically disadvantaged students	183,263	182,445	99.55
Migratory students	255	255	100.00
Male	222,211	221,331	99.60
Female	210,329	209,676	99.69

Comments: The response is limited to 4,000 characters.

1.2.2 Participation of Students with Disabilities (IDEA) 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 (IDEA) Participating	Percentage of Children with Disabilities (IDEA) Participating, Who Took the Specified Assessment
Regular Assessment without Accommodations	15,973	26.94
Regular Assessment with Accommodations	37,499	63.26
Alternate Assessment Based on Grade-Level Achievement Standards		
Alternate Assessment Based on Modified Achievement Standards		
Alternate Assessment Based on Alternate Achievement Standards	5,809	9.80
Total	59,281	////////////////////////////////////
Comments: The response is limited to 4,000 characters.		

The "Asian/Pacific Islander" row in the tables below represent either the value reported by the state to the Department of Education for the major racial and ethnic group "Asian/Pacific Islander" or an aggregation of values reported by the state for the major racial and ethnic groups "Asian" and "Native Hawaiian/Other Pacific Islander or Pacific Islander" (and "Filipino" in the case of California). When the values reported in the Asian/Pacific Islander row represent the U. S. Department of Education aggregation of other values reported by the state, the detail for "Asian" and Native Hawaiian or Other Pacific Islander" are also included in the following rows. Disaggregated reporting for assessment participation data is done according to the provisions outlined within each state's Accountability Workbook. Accordingly, not every state uses major racial and ethnic groups which enable detail of Asian American/Pacific Islander (AAPI) populations.

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	432,580	431,003	99.64
American Indian or Alaska Native	7,212	7,172	99.45
Asian or Pacific Islander	18,066	17,987	99.56
Asian			
Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander			
Black or African American	46,573	46,257	99.32
Hispanic or Latino	44,956	44,733	99.50
White	315,689	314,771	99.71
Two or more races			
Children with disabilities (<i>IDEA</i>)	59,896	59,312	99.02
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	23,523	23,351	99.27
Economically disadvantaged students	183,263	182,427	99.54
Migratory students	255	254	99.61
Male	222,211	221,304	99.59
Female	210,329	209,660	99.68
Comments: The response is limited to 4,000 characters.			

1.2.3.1 Recently Arrived LEP Students Taking ELP Assessments in Lieu of Reading/Language Arts Assessments

In the table below, provide the number of recently arrived LEP students (as defined in 34 C.F.R. Part 200.6(b)(4)) included in the participation counts in 1.2.3 who took an assessment of English language proficiency in lieu of the State's reading/language arts assessment, as permitted under 34 C.F.R. Part 200.20.

Recently Arrived LEP Students	#
Recently arrived LEP students who took an assessment of English language proficiency in lieu of the State's reading/language arts assessment	417

1.2.4 Participation of Students with Disabilities (IDEA) 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 (IDEA) Participating	Percentage of Children with Disabilities (IDEA) Participating, Who Took the Specified Assessment
Regular Assessment without Accommodations	17,931	30.23
Regular Assessment with Accommodations	35,531	59.91
Alternate Assessment Based on Grade-Level Achievement Standards		
Alternate Assessment Based on Modified Achievement Standards		
Alternate Assessment Based on Alternate Achievement Standards	5,827	9.82
LEP < 12 months, took ELP	23	0.04
Total	59,312	////////////////////////////////////
Comments: The response is limited to 4,000 characters.		

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	188,675	187,384	99.32
American Indian or Alaska Native	3,109	3,070	98.75
Asian or Pacific Islander	7,662	7,615	99.39
Asian			
Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander			
Black or African American	20,081	19,714	98.17
Hispanic or Latino	18,562	18,402	99.14
White	139,231	138,553	99.51
Two or more races			
Children with disabilities (IDEA)	25,830	25,365	98.20
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	9,289	9,201	99.05
Economically disadvantaged students	76,744	75,967	98.99
Migratory students	112	112	100.00
Male	96,849	96,130	99.26
Female	91,815	91,243	99.38
Comments: The response is limited to 4,000 characters.			

1.2.6 Participation of Students with Disabilities (IDEA) 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 (IDEA) Participating	Percentage of Children with Disabilities (IDEA) Participating, Who Took the Specified Assessment
Regular Assessment without Accommodations	7,218	28.46
Regular Assessment with Accommodations	15,666	61.76
Alternate Assessment Based on Grade-Level Achievement Standards		
Alternate Assessment Based on Modified Achievement Standards		
Alternate Assessment Based on Alternate Achievement Standards	2,481	9.78
Total	25,365	////////////////////////////////////
Comments: The response is limited to 4,000 characters.		

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 racial/ethnic groups shown in the table below; 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 have been mapped from the major racial and ethnic groups identified in their workbooks to the racial/ethnic groups shown.

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.

1.3.2 Student Academic Achievement in Reading/Language Arts

This section is similar to 1.3.1. The only difference is that this section collects data on the State's reading/language arts assessment, and the difference noted in the paragraph below.

The student group "limited English proficient (LEP) students" does not include recently arrived students who have attended schools in the United States for fewer than 12 months and who took an assessment of English language proficiency in lieu of the State's reading/language arts assessment. Do not include former LEP students.

1.3.3 Student Academic Achievement in Science

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

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

The "Asian/Pacific Islander" row in the tables below represent either the value reported by the state to the Department of Education for the major racial and ethnic group "Asian/Pacific Islander" or an aggregation of values reported by the state for the major racial and ethnic groups "Asian" and "Native Hawaiian/Other Pacific Islander or Pacific Islander" (and "Filipino" in the case of California). When the values reported in the Asian/Pacific Islander row represent the U. S. Department of Education aggregation of other values reported by the state, the detail for "Asian" and Native Hawaiian or Other Pacific Islander" are also included in the following rows. Disaggregated reporting for assessment participation data is done according to the provisions outlined within each state's Accountability Workbook. Accordingly, not every state uses major racial and ethnic groups which enable detail of Asian American/Pacific Islander (AAPI) populations.

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	60,579	30,511	50.37
American Indian or Alaska Native	1,020	345	33.82
Asian or Pacific Islander	2,757	1,420	51.51
<i>Asian</i>			
<i>Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander</i>			
Black or African American	6,787	1,380	20.33
Hispanic or Latino	6,948	2,120	30.51
White	43,040	25,244	58.65
Two or more races			
Children with disabilities (<i>IDEA</i>)	8,083	2,462	30.46
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	5,134	1,399	27.25
Economically disadvantaged students	27,482	9,161	33.33
Migratory students	34	5	14.71
Male	31,115	16,118	51.80
Female	29,460	14,393	48.86

Comments: The response is limited to 4,000 characters. Note - the proficient and advanced counts and percents reported above do not match the Wisconsin EdFacts files submitted.

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	60,432	21,032	34.80
American Indian or Alaska Native	1,019	222	21.79
Asian or Pacific Islander	2,726	932	34.19
<i>Asian</i>			
<i>Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander</i>			
Black or African American	6,783	966	14.24
Hispanic or Latino	6,887	1,209	17.55
White	42,990	17,702	41.18
Two or more races			
Children with disabilities (<i>IDEA</i>)	8,077	1,452	17.98
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	5,020	557	11.10
Economically disadvantaged students	27,391	5,772	21.07
Migratory students	32	1	3.12
Male	31,028	10,105	32.57
Female	29,400	10,927	37.17

Comments: The response is limited to 4,000 characters. Note - the proficient and advanced counts and percents reported above do not match the Wisconsin EdFacts files submitted.

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 Alaska Native			
Asian or Pacific Islander			
<i>Asian</i>			
<i>Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander</i>			
Black or African American			
Hispanic or Latino			
White			
Two or more races			
Children with disabilities (<i>IDEA</i>)			
Limited English proficient (LEP) students			
Economically disadvantaged students			
Migratory students			
Male			
Female			
Comments: The response is limited to 4,000 characters. Wisconsin does not test 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	61,276	31,929	52.11
American Indian or Alaska Native	1,028	353	34.34
Asian or Pacific Islander	2,677	1,423	53.16
<i>Asian</i>			
<i>Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander</i>			
Black or African American	6,775	1,487	21.95
Hispanic or Latino	6,866	2,216	32.27
White	43,903	26,449	60.24
Two or more races			
Children with disabilities (<i>IDEA</i>)	8,475	2,437	28.76
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	4,479	1,056	23.58
Economically disadvantaged students	27,263	9,546	35.01
Migratory students	33	9	27.27
Male	31,567	16,931	53.64
Female	29,704	14,998	50.49

Comments: The response is limited to 4,000 characters. Note - the proficient and advanced counts and percents reported above do not match the Wisconsin EdFacts filed submitted.

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	61,178	22,316	36.48
American Indian or Alaska Native	1,028	231	22.47
Asian or Pacific Islander	2,655	926	34.88
<i>Asian</i>			
<i>Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander</i>			
Black or African American	6,768	948	14.01
Hispanic or Latino	6,813	1,172	17.20
White	43,887	19,036	43.38
Two or more races			
Children with disabilities (<i>IDEA</i>)	8,471	1,418	16.74
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	4,390	290	6.61
Economically disadvantaged students	27,193	5,860	21.55
Migratory students	33	4	12.12
Male	31,509	10,986	34.87
Female	29,664	11,330	38.19

Comments: The response is limited to 4,000 characters. Note - the proficient and advanced counts and percents reported above do not match the Wisconsin EdFacts filed submitted.

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	61,213	46,728	76.34
American Indian or Alaska Native	1,027	670	65.24
Asian or Pacific Islander	2,672	2,066	77.32
<i>Asian</i>			
<i>Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander</i>			
Black or African American	6,759	3,098	45.84
Hispanic or Latino	6,853	4,161	60.72
White	43,875	36,724	83.70
Two or more races			
Children with disabilities (<i>IDEA</i>)	8,462	4,584	54.17
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	4,464	2,334	52.28
Economically disadvantaged students	27,224	17,105	62.83
Migratory students	33	15	45.45
Male	31,533	23,971	76.02
Female	29,675	22,756	76.68

Comments: The response is limited to 4,000 characters. Note - the proficient and advanced counts and percents reported above do not match the Wisconsin EdFacts filed submitted.

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	60,690	30,880	50.88
American Indian or Alaska Native	1,018	350	34.38
Asian or Pacific Islander	2,575	1,382	53.67
<i>Asian</i>			
<i>Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander</i>			
Black or African American	6,622	1,419	21.43
Hispanic or Latino	6,613	1,978	29.91
White	43,839	25,750	58.74
Two or more races			
Children with disabilities (<i>IDEA</i>)	8,549	2,153	25.18
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	3,248	553	17.03
Economically disadvantaged students	26,559	8,827	33.24
Migratory students	32	5	15.62
Male	31,262	15,771	50.45
Female	29,405	15,108	51.38

Comments: The response is limited to 4,000 characters. Note - the proficient and advanced counts and percents reported above do not match the Wisconsin EdFacts filed submitted.

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	60,629	20,540	33.88
American Indian or Alaska Native	1,018	225	22.10
Asian or Pacific Islander	2,557	851	33.28
<i>Asian</i>			
<i>Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander</i>			
Black or African American	6,621	897	13.55
Hispanic or Latino	6,576	1,122	17.06
White	43,834	17,443	39.79
Two or more races			
Children with disabilities (<i>IDEA</i>)	8,549	1,250	14.62
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	3,183	189	5.94
Economically disadvantaged students	26,513	5,032	18.98
Migratory students	32	2	6.25
Male	31,238	9,534	30.52
Female	29,368	11,004	37.47

Comments: The response is limited to 4,000 characters. Note - the proficient and advanced counts and percents reported above do not match the Wisconsin EdFacts filed submitted.

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 Alaska Native			
Asian or Pacific Islander			
<i>Asian</i>			
<i>Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander</i>			
Black or African American			
Hispanic or Latino			
White			
Two or more races			
Children with disabilities (<i>IDEA</i>)			
Limited English proficient (LEP) students			
Economically disadvantaged students			
Migratory students			
Male			
Female			
Comments: The response is limited to 4,000 characters. Wisconsin does not test 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	60,367	28,562	47.31
American Indian or Alaska Native	1,047	306	29.23
Asian or Pacific Islander	2,494	1,272	51.00
<i>Asian</i>			
<i>Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander</i>			
Black or African American	6,514	1,210	18.58
Hispanic or Latino	6,352	1,705	26.84
White	43,959	24,069	54.75
Two or more races			
Children with disabilities (<i>IDEA</i>)	8,456	1,721	20.35
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	2,714	300	11.05
Economically disadvantaged students	26,121	7,698	29.47
Migratory students	34	9	26.47
Male	30,881	14,836	48.04
Female	29,485	13,726	46.55

Comments: The response is limited to 4,000 characters. Note - the proficient and advanced counts and percents reported above do not match the Wisconsin EdFacts filed submitted.

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	60,291	22,101	36.66
American Indian or Alaska Native	1,046	217	20.75
Asian or Pacific Islander	2,464	850	34.50
<i>Asian</i>			
<i>Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander</i>			
Black or African American	6,515	943	14.47
Hispanic or Latino	6,312	1,147	18.17
White	43,953	18,944	43.10
Two or more races			
Children with disabilities (<i>IDEA</i>)	8,455	1,114	13.18
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	2,641	104	3.94
Economically disadvantaged students	26,071	5,498	21.09
Migratory students	33	2	6.06
Male	30,834	10,067	32.65
Female	29,456	12,034	40.85

Comments: The response is limited to 4,000 characters. Note - the proficient and advanced counts and percents reported above do not match the Wisconsin EdFacts filed submitted.

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 Alaska Native			
Asian or Pacific Islander			
<i>Asian</i>			
<i>Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander</i>			
Black or African American			
Hispanic or Latino			
White			
Two or more races			
Children with disabilities (<i>IDEA</i>)			
Limited English proficient (LEP) students			
Economically disadvantaged students			
Migratory students			
Male			
Female			
Comments: The response is limited to 4,000 characters. Wisconsin does not test 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	61,702	29,837	48.36
American Indian or Alaska Native	1,006	327	32.50
Asian or Pacific Islander	2,555	1,344	52.60
<i>Asian</i>			
<i>Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander</i>			
Black or African American	6,454	1,093	16.94
Hispanic or Latino	6,415	1,757	27.39
White	45,270	25,315	55.92
Two or more races			
Children with disabilities (<i>IDEA</i>)	8,718	1,641	18.82
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	3,105	355	11.43
Economically disadvantaged students	26,070	7,788	29.87
Migratory students	43	11	25.58
Male	31,778	15,207	47.85
Female	29,924	14,630	48.89

Comments: The response is limited to 4,000 characters. Note - the proficient and advanced counts and percents reported above do not match the Wisconsin EdFacts filed submitted.

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	61,644	23,635	38.34
American Indian or Alaska Native	1,007	277	27.51
Asian or Pacific Islander	2,542	880	34.62
<i>Asian</i>			
<i>Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander</i>			
Black or African American	6,452	907	14.06
Hispanic or Latino	6,381	1,175	18.41
White	45,260	20,395	45.06
Two or more races			
Children with disabilities (<i>IDEA</i>)	8,718	1,211	13.89
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	3,044	115	3.78
Economically disadvantaged students	26,028	5,832	22.41
Migratory students	41	5	12.20
Male	31,744	11,296	35.58
Female	29,900	12,339	41.27

Comments: The response is limited to 4,000 characters. Note - the proficient and advanced counts and percents reported above do not match the Wisconsin EdFacts filed submitted.

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 Alaska Native			
Asian or Pacific Islander			
<i>Asian</i>			
<i>Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander</i>			
Black or African American			
Hispanic or Latino			
White			
Two or more races			
Children with disabilities (<i>IDEA</i>)			
Limited English proficient (LEP) students			
Economically disadvantaged students			
Migratory students			
Male			
Female			
Comments: The response is limited to 4,000 characters. Wisconsin does not test 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	62,499	29,079	46.53
American Indian or Alaska Native	999	251	25.13
Asian or Pacific Islander	2,529	1,327	52.47
<i>Asian</i>			
<i>Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander</i>			
Black or African American	6,690	1,091	16.31
Hispanic or Latino	6,010	1,514	25.19
White	46,269	24,896	53.81
Two or more races			
Children with disabilities (<i>IDEA</i>)	8,727	1,442	16.52
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	3,033	342	11.28
Economically disadvantaged students	25,547	7,067	27.66
Migratory students	41	9	21.95
Male	32,110	15,220	47.40
Female	30,387	13,859	45.61

Comments: The response is limited to 4,000 characters. Note - the proficient and advanced counts and percents reported above do not match the Wisconsin EdFacts filed submitted.

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	62,455	21,286	34.08
American Indian or Alaska Native	997	227	22.77
Asian or Pacific Islander	2,514	852	33.89
<i>Asian</i>			
<i>Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander</i>			
Black or African American	6,696	946	14.13
Hispanic or Latino	5,982	1,087	18.17
White	46,264	18,174	39.28
Two or more races			
Children with disabilities (<i>IDEA</i>)	8,722	1,066	12.22
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	2,971	122	4.11
Economically disadvantaged students	25,510	4,951	19.41
Migratory students	41	3	7.32
Male	32,080	9,338	29.11
Female	30,373	11,948	39.34

Comments: The response is limited to 4,000 characters. Note - the proficient and advanced counts and percents reported above do not match the Wisconsin EdFacts filed submitted.

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	62,421	50,392	80.73
American Indian or Alaska Native	994	706	71.03
Asian or Pacific Islander	2,528	1,977	78.20
<i>Asian</i>			
<i>Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander</i>			
Black or African American	6,664	3,250	48.77
Hispanic or Latino	5,999	3,922	65.38
White	46,234	40,536	87.68
Two or more races			
Children with disabilities (<i>IDEA</i>)	8,694	4,220	48.54
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	3,022	1,313	43.45
Economically disadvantaged students	25,484	17,025	66.81
Migratory students	41	24	58.54
Male	32,067	25,765	80.35
Female	30,352	24,626	81.13
Comments: The response is limited to 4,000 characters. Note - the proficient and advanced counts and percents reported above do not match the Wisconsin EdFacts filed submitted.			

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	63,933	29,345	45.90
American Indian or Alaska Native	1,056	305	28.88
Asian or Pacific Islander	2,418	1,126	46.57
<i>Asian</i>			
<i>Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander</i>			
Black or African American	6,377	824	12.92
Hispanic or Latino	5,577	1,307	23.44
White	48,504	25,783	53.16
Two or more races			
Children with disabilities (<i>IDEA</i>)	8,273	1,103	13.33
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	1,727	128	7.41
Economically disadvantaged students	23,403	6,021	25.73
Migratory students	38	5	13.16
Male	32,618	15,305	46.92
Female	31,311	14,040	44.84

Comments: The response is limited to 4,000 characters. Note - the proficient and advanced counts and percents reported above do not match the Wisconsin EdFacts filed submitted.

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	63,957	27,306	42.69
American Indian or Alaska Native	1,057	298	28.19
Asian or Pacific Islander	2,412	933	38.68
<i>Asian</i>			
<i>Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander</i>			
Black or African American	6,389	1,064	16.65
Hispanic or Latino	5,567	1,364	24.50
White	48,531	23,647	48.73
Two or more races			
Children with disabilities (<i>IDEA</i>)	8,297	1,144	13.79
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	1,698	89	5.24
Economically disadvantaged students	23,412	6,036	25.78
Migratory students	38	7	18.42
Male	32,637	13,375	40.98
Female	31,316	13,931	44.49

Comments: The response is limited to 4,000 characters. Note - the proficient and advanced counts and percents reported above do not match the Wisconsin EdFacts filed submitted.

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	63,750	47,243	74.11
American Indian or Alaska Native	1,049	649	61.87
Asian or Pacific Islander	2,415	1,733	71.76
<i>Asian</i>			
<i>Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander</i>			
Black or African American	6,291	2,308	36.69
Hispanic or Latino	5,550	3,082	55.53
White	48,444	39,471	81.48
Two or more races			
Children with disabilities (<i>IDEA</i>)	8,209	3,041	37.04
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	1,715	407	23.73
Economically disadvantaged students	23,259	13,303	57.20
Migratory students	38	18	47.37
Male	32,530	24,385	74.96
Female	31,216	22,858	73.23

Comments: The response is limited to 4,000 characters. Note - the proficient and advanced counts and percents reported above do not match the Wisconsin EdFacts filed submitted.

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

For an SEA that has not received ESEA flexibility, or an SEA that received ESEA flexibility without the optional waiver to not make AYP determinations for LEAs and schools:

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 2013-14. The percentage that made AYP will be calculated automatically.

Entity	Total #	Total # that Made AYP in SY 2013-14	Percentage that Made AYP in SY 2013-14
Schools			
Districts			

Comments: The response is limited to 4,000 characters.

For an SEA with an approved ESEA flexibility request that includes the optional waiver to not make AYP determinations for LEAs and schools:

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 all of their AMOs, the 95 percent participation rate, and other academic indicator ³ based on data for SY 2013-14. The percentage will be calculated automatically.

Entity	Total #	Total # that Met All AMOs, 95 Percent Participation Rate, and Other Academic Indicator in SY 2013-14	Percentage that Met All AMOs, 95 Percent Participation Rate and Other Academic Indicator in SY 2013-14
Schools	2,044	603	29.50
Districts	422	47	11.14

Comments: The response is limited to 4,000 characters.

³ For a high school, the other academic indicator is always graduation rate.

1.4.2 Title I School Accountability

For an SEA that has not received ESEA flexibility, or an SEA that received ESEA flexibility without the optional waiver to not make AYP determinations for LEAs and schools:

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 2013-14. 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 2013-14	Percentage of Title I Schools that Made AYP in SY 2013-14
All Title I schools			
Schoolwide (SWP) Title I schools			
Targeted assistance (TAS) Title I schools			

Comments: The response is limited to 4,000 characters.

For an SEA with an approved ESEA flexibility request that includes the optional waiver to not make AYP determinations for LEAs and schools:

In the table below, provide the total number of public Title I schools by type and the total number of those schools that made all of their AMOs, the 95 percent participation rate, and the other academic indicator ⁴ based on data for SY 2013-14. Include only public Title I schools. Do not include Title I programs operated by LEAs in private schools. The percentage will be calculated automatically.

Title I School	# Title I Schools	# Title I Schools that Met All AMOs, 95 Percent Participation Rate, and Other Academic Indicator in SY 2013-14	Percentage of Title I Schools that Met All AMOs, 95 Percent Participation Rate, and Other Academic Indicator in SY 2013-14
All Title I schools	1,157	266	22.99
Schoolwide (SWP) Title I schools	694	107	15.42
Targeted assistance (TAS) Title I schools	463	159	34.34

Comments: The response is limited to 4,000 characters.

⁴ For a high school, the other academic indicator is always graduation rate.

1.4.3 Accountability of Districts That Received Title I Funds

For an SEA that has not received ESEA flexibility, or an SEA that received ESEA flexibility without the optional waiver to not make AYP determinations for LEAs and schools:

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 2013-14. The percentage that made AYP will be calculated automatically.

# Districts That Received Title I Funds in SY 2013-14	# Districts That Received Title I Funds and Made AYP in SY 2013-14	Percentage of Districts That Received Title I Funds and Made AYP in SY 2013-14

Comments: The response is limited to 4,000 characters.

For an SEA with an approved ESEA flexibility request that includes the optional waiver to not make AYP determinations for LEAs and schools:

In the table below, provide the total number of districts that received Title I funds and the total number of those districts that met all of their AMOs, the 95 percent participation rate, and other academic indicator⁵ based on data for SY 2013-14. The percentage will be calculated automatically.

# Districts That Received Title I Funds in SY 2013-14	# Districts That Received Title I Funds and Met All AMOs, 95 percent Participation Rate, and Other Academic Indicator in SY 2013-14	Percentage of Districts That Received Title I Funds and Met All AMOs, 95 percent Participation Rate, and Other Academic Indicator in SY 2013-14
417	43	10.31

Comments: The response is limited to 4,000 characters.

⁵ For a high school, the other academic indicator is always graduation rate.

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 2013-14 (based on SY 2012-13 assessments under Section 1111 of *ESEA*).

Corrective Action	# of Title I Schools in Corrective Action in Which the Corrective Action was Implemented in SY 2013-14
Required implementation of a new research-based curriculum or instructional program	
Extension of the school year or school day	
Replacement of staff members, not including the principal, relevant to the school's low performance	
Significant decrease in management authority at the school level	
Replacement of the principal	
Restructuring the internal organization of the school	
Appointment of an outside expert to advise the school	
Comments: The response is limited to 4,000 characters.	

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 2013-14 (based on SY 2012-13 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)	
Reopening the school as a public charter school	
Entering into a contract with a private entity to operate the school	
Takeover the school by the State	
Other major restructuring of the school governance	
Comments: The response is limited to 4,000 characters.	

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

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

--

1.4.5.2 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.

Wisconsin has one school district, Milwaukee Public Schools (MPS), as a district identified for improvement. The 2013-2014 Corrective Action Requirements (CAR) are included in the District Improvement Plan. All MPS schools, which include contracted sites (charter and partnership), are held accountable to the District Improvement Plan.

The District Improvement Plan's overall objective is to have all MPS students achieve at the proficient and advanced levels academically. The District Improvement Plan includes the following three steps that will focus the district's work toward meeting this objective:

1. A comprehensive needs assessment conducted by an external entity;
2. A district improvement plan created in collaboration with MPS and the Wisconsin Department of Public Instruction (WDPI); and
3. A monitoring system to ensure accountability at the district, school, and student levels.

The District Improvement Plan was developed with a multiyear perspective that recognizes improving learning for MPS students is an ongoing effort. Each goal has strategies, action steps, and tasks identified for the 2013-2014 school year. The WDPI worked collaboratively with MPS as it implements the District Improvement Plan.

The District Improvement Plan continues to emphasize the district and school improvement efforts that have been put in place under previous corrective action requirements and focuses on the impact that these improvement efforts are having on student achievement at the district and school levels. As required under previous Corrective Action Requirements, the district has developed key documents, i.e., Comprehensive Literacy Plan, Comprehensive Math and Science Plan, and the Response to Intervention Handbook. These documents provide MPS educators with the guidance they need to move forward in improving instruction in classrooms and positively impacting student achievement.

The 2013-2014 District Improvement Plan incorporated the use of district, region, and school level data to determine areas of success and areas in which the district needs to focus attention and resources. WDPI worked collaboratively with MPS staff using a problem solving approach to clearly understand the student and program data, and identify strategies to move forward.

MPS progress on the CAR was assessed monthly in order to ensure a timely and faithful execution of the plan. Evidence was submitted monthly to show progress the district was making towards the goals.

Technical Assistance

Technical assistance has been provided to the district during the duration of the Corrective Action Requirements, starting in 2005 when the district was first identified for improvement. Assistance and support was provided as the district started to develop the district's Comprehensive Literacy Plan (CLP), Comprehensive Mathematics and Science Plan (CMSP), and Response to Intervention (RtI) frameworks, with implementation beginning during the 2009-2010 school year. The RtI framework incorporates the Positive Behavior Interventions and Supports (PBIS) structure. Assistance and support provided during the development of these documents included on-site consultation, review and feedback on content and structure provided by state and national level experts. During the 2013-2014 school year, all three frameworks were to be implemented at all grade levels.

Monthly meetings were held with the district to discuss progress and concerns the district had, and to provide ongoing support. WDPI worked collaboratively with MPS staff using a problem solving approach to clearly understand the student and program data, and identify strategies to move forward.

A System of Support structure was required and funded by the state and included a district wide Manager of District and School Improvement and Regional Supervisors of District and School Support. These staff members supported the district and schools in the implementation of the District Improvement Plan, including the implements and monitoring of core components. The district received funding to help support the implementation of the CAR. In addition, WDPI contracted with West Ed on behalf of MPS to provide technical support regarding implementation of the District Improvement Plan. West Ed staff provided support and training for MPS throughout the course of the 2013-14 school year.

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 2013-14 (based on SY 2012-13 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 2013-14
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	0
Replaced district personnel who are relevant to the failure to make AYP	0
Removed one or more schools from the jurisdiction of the district	0
Appointed a receiver or trustee to administer the affairs of the district	0
Restructured the district	1
Abolished the district (list the number of districts abolished between the end of SY 2012-13 and beginning of SY 2013-14 as a corrective action)	0
Comments: The response is limited to 4,000 characters.	

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 2013-14 data and the results of those appeals.

Entity	# Appealed Their AYP Designations	# Appeals Resulted in a Change in the AYP Designation
Districts		
Schools		
Comments: The response is limited to 4,000 characters.		

In the table below, provide the data by which processing appeals based on SY 2013-14 data was complete.

Processing Appeals completion	Date
Date (MM/DD/YY) that processing appeals based on SY 2013-14 data was complete	

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

In the section below, "schools in improvement" refers to Title I schools identified for improvement, corrective action, or restructuring under Section 1116 of *ESEA*.

1.4.8.5 Use of Sections 1003(a) and (g) School Improvement Funds.**1.4.8.5.1 Section 1003(a) State Reservations**

In the space provided, enter the percentage of the FY 2013 (SY 2013-14) 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*: 1.70 %

Comments: The response is limited to 4,000 characters. We reserved 1.669% of Title I, Part A funds for 2013-14.

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

The data for this question are reported through *EDFacts* files and compiled in the EDEN012 "Section 1003(a) and 1003(g) Allocations to LEAs and Schools" report in the *EDFacts* Reporting System (ERS). The *EDFacts* files and data groups used in this report are listed in the CSPR Crosswalk. The CSPR Data Key contains more detailed information on how the data are populated into the report.

Before certifying Part I of the CSPR, a state user must run the EDEN012 report in ERS and verify that the state's data are correct. The final, certified data from this report will be made publicly available alongside the state's certified CSPR PDF.

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 2013-14.

This response is limited to 8,000 characters.

The Wisconsin Department of Public Instruction (WDPI) used Section 1003(g) funds to provide a variety of supports, including administration, evaluation, and technical assistance for the 1003(g) School Improvement Grant program.

WDPI assigned each of the lowest-achieving schools to a WDPI intervention implementation consultant. These consultants met regularly with school and district representatives to assess the degree to which each school is on target with implementation of the selected intervention model. Implementation consultants also examined achievement data. The progress of each school is shared regularly with the Assistant State Superintendent for Student and School Success and WDPI Director of Title I and School Support who report to the State Superintendent.

WDPI also provided assistance to LEAs so they are able to effectively use these funds. This support covered a wide range of activities related to administration, evaluation, and technical assistance. This support is provided by both WDPI staff and, when necessary, external providers, particularly those with expertise in working with low-achieving schools.

In order to assist LEAs in effectively using these funds, WDPI provided the following support:

- Technical assistance related to:
 - oCurrent research on best practices related to the intervention models;
 - oSelection of the most appropriate intervention model;
 - oImplementation of the models;
 - oEvaluation of the models; and
 - oRequired data reporting.
- Site visits; and
- Evaluation of the following:
 - oStudent achievement targets;
 - oAnnual goals; and
 - oLeading indicators.

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 2013-14 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.

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 Title I school 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.

Public School Choice	# Students
Eligible for public school choice	
Applied to transfer	
Transferred to another school under the Title I public school choice provisions	
Comments: The response is limited to 4,000 characters.	

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*.

Transportation for Public School Choice	Dollars Spent
Dollars spent by LEAs on transportation for public school choice	\$

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.

Unable to Provide Public School Choice	# LEAs
LEAs Unable to Provide Public School Choice	0

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: The response is limited to 4,000 characters.

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*.

The number of students who received supplemental educational services should include all students who were enrolled with a provider and participated in some hours of services. States and LEAs have the discretion to determine the minimum number of hours of participation needed by a student to be considered as having received services.

Supplemental Educational Services	# Students
Eligible for supplemental educational services	
Applied for supplemental educational services	
Received supplemental educational services	
Comments: The response is limited to 4,000 characters. Not required for Wisconsin due to flexibility.	

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*.

Spending on Supplemental Educational Services	Dollars Spent
Dollars spent by LEAs on supplemental educational services	\$
Comments: The response is limited to 4,000 characters.	

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.

Classes	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 <u>NOT</u> Highly Qualified	Percentage of Core Academic Classes Taught by Teachers Who Are <u>NOT</u> Highly Qualified
All classes	232,491	227,291	97.76	5,200	2.24
All elementary classes	68,445	66,475	97.12	1,970	2.88
All secondary classes	164,046	160,816	98.03	3,230	1.97

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

Data table includes classes taught by special education teachers who provide direct instruction in 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.

LEAs are advised to report self-contained full day elementary classes as one class.

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.

1.5.2.1 Elementary School Classes	
Elementary School Classes	Percentage
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	22.10
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	11.20
Elementary school classes taught by teachers who are not fully certified (and are not in an approved alternative route program)	66.70
Other (please explain in comment box below)	0.00
Total	100.00

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

1.5.2.2 Secondary School Classes	
Secondary School Classes	Percentage
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)	27.20
Secondary school classes taught by certified special education teachers who have not demonstrated subject-matter competency in those subjects	18.10
Secondary school classes taught by teachers who are not fully certified (and are not in an approved alternative route program)	54.70
Other (please explain in comment box below)	0.00
Total	100.00

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	29,599	28,113	94.98
Low-poverty Elementary Schools	12,298	12,095	98.35
Secondary Schools			
High Poverty secondary Schools	40,901	39,256	95.98
Low-Poverty secondary Schools	44,407	44,031	99.15

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	61.00	27.00
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 (C063 and C064) 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. Schools without ISES data get set to neither high nor low poverty.	
Secondary schools	52.00	27.00
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. Schools without ISES data get set to neither high nor low poverty.	

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/rcd/BE021775/Glossary_of_Terms.pdf.
2. **Other Language** = Name of the language of instruction, other than English, used in the programs.

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

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

Other: 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).

- o 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.
- o 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	45,771
Comments: The response is limited to 4,000 characters.	

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 in the State who received services in Title III language instructional education programs.

LEP Students Receiving Services	#
LEP students who received services in a Title III language instruction educational program in grades K through 12 for this reporting year.	45,497
Comments: The response is limited to 4,000 characters.	

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	30,378
Hmong	7,447
Arabic	697
Chinese	620
Russian	369

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).

All LEP Testing	#
Number tested on State annual ELP assessment	45,324
Number not tested on State annual ELP assessment	340
Total	45,664
Comments: The response is limited to 4,000 characters. The total number of LEP in the state reported in section 1.6.2.1 is 45,771. This is the count of LEP students enrolled in the state on the count date. This number is different than the total reported in 1.6.3.1.1. The number reported in this section represents the number of LEP students enrolled during the LEP assessment testing window.	

1.6.3.1.2 ALL LEP Student English Language Proficiency Results

All LEP Results	#
Number attained proficiency on State annual ELP assessment	10,802
Percent attained proficiency on State annual ELP assessment	23.87
Comments: The response is limited to 4,000 characters.	

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 and not tested on annual State English language proficiency assessment.

Title III LEP Testing		#
Number tested on State annual ELP assessment		45,061
Number not tested on State annual ELP assessment		340
Total		45,401
Comments: The response is limited to 4,000 characters. The total number of Title III LEP students reported in section 1.6.2.2 is 45,497. This is the count of Title III students enrolled on the count date. The total number reported in 1.6.3.2.1 above is the number that were enrolled during the testing window.		

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 AMAO 1. Report this number ONLY if the State did not include these students in establishing AMAO 1/ making progress target and did not include them in the calculations for AMAO 1/ making progress (# and % making progress).

Title III First Time Tested		#
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.		8,537

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%).

Title III Results	Results #	Results %	Targets #	Targets %
Making progress	21,217	58.09	14,974	41.00
Attained proficiency	10,732	23.82	4,956	11.00
Comments: The response is limited to 4,000 characters.				

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: The response is limited to 4,000 characters. No assessments are given in native languages other than English. For the mathematics assessment, a side-by-side translation accommodation is available in Spanish.	

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)
Comments: The response is limited to 4,000 characters. No assessments are given in native languages other than English. For the mathematics assessment, a side-by-side translation accommodation is available in Spanish.

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 (MFLEP) 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
5,083	2,778	7,861
Comments: The response is limited to 4,000 characters.		

1.6.3.6.2 MFLEP Students Results for Mathematics

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
4,875	2,550	52.31	2,325
Comments: The response is limited to 4,000 characters.			

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. This will be automatically calculated.
4. **# Below proficient** = State-aggregated number MFLEP students who did not score proficient on the State annual reading/language arts assessment.

# Tested	# At or Above Proficient	% Results	# Below Proficient
4,875	1,641	33.66	3,234
Comments: The response is limited to 4,000 characters.			

1.6.3.6.4 MFLEP Students Results for Science

In the table below, report results for 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 MFLEP 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. This will be automatically calculated.
4. **# Below proficient** = State-aggregated number MFLEP students who did not score proficient on the State annual science assessment.

# Tested	# At or Above Proficient	% Results	# Below Proficient
1,368	1,189	86.92	179
Comments: The response is limited to 4,000 characters.			

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 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 (d)(1) subgrants in 1.6.5.1 ONLY.)

Title III Subgrantees	
Total number of subgrantees for the year	
////////////////////////////////////	
Number of subgrantees that met all three Title III AMAOs	
Number of subgrantees that met AMAO 1	
Number of subgrantees that met AMAO 2	
Number of subgrantees that met AMAO 3	
////////////////////////////////////	
Number of subgrantees that did not meet any Title III AMAOs	
////////////////////////////////////	
Number of subgrantees that did not meet Title III AMAOs for two consecutive years (SYs 2012-13 and 2013-14)	
Number of subgrantees implementing an improvement plan in SY 2013-14 for not meeting Title III AMAOs for two consecutive years	
Number of subgrantees that have not met Title III AMAOs for four consecutive years (SYs 2010-11, 2011-12, 2012-13, and 2013-14)	

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. If applicable, the same or different from the previous year.

The response is limited to 4,000 characters.

Comments: The response is limited to 4,000 characters. All districts that receive Title III services are included in the 1.6.4.1 counts. If a district had fewer than were grouped with other members of their consortium and their AMAO 1 and AMAO 2 determinations were based on consortium-level calculations. There were and AMAO 2 determinations based on either their district or consortium determination. All 311 districts met AMAO 1 and AMAO 2. AMAO 3 is the AMO determi the district level. Only those districts with 20 or more ELL students in tested grades received an AMAO 3 determination. There were 95 districts that had an AN 28 districts met AMAO 3.

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.

State met <u>all</u> three Title III AMAOs	<u>No</u>
Comments: The response is limited to 4,000 characters. State met AMAO 1 and AMAO 2, and missed AMAO 3 (AMOs for ELL subgroup).	

1.6.4.3 Termination of Title III Language Instruction Educational Programs

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

Were any Title III language instruction educational programs <u>or</u> activities terminated for failure to reach program goals?	<u>No</u>
If yes, provide the number of language instruction educational programs <u>or</u> activities for immigrant children and youth terminated.	
Comments: The response is limited to 4,000 characters.	

1.6.5 Education Programs and Activities for Immigrant Students

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

Note: All immigrant students are not LEP 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 only 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
7,399	1,159	7

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

Title III Teachers	#
Number of all certified/licensed teachers currently working in Title III language instruction educational programs.	1,936
Estimate number of additional certified/licensed teachers that will be needed for Title III language instruction educational programs in the next 5 years*.	281

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.

* 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 and 1.6.4.)
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.

Professional Development (PD) Topics	# Subgrantees
Instructional strategies for LEP students	0
Understanding and implementation of assessment of LEP students	0
Understanding and implementation of ELP standards and academic content standards for LEP students	0
Alignment of the curriculum in language instruction educational programs to ELP standards	0
Subject matter knowledge for teachers	0
Other (Explain in comment box)	1

PD Participant Information	# Subgrantees	# Participants
PD provided to content classroom teachers	3	199
PD provided to LEP classroom teachers	2	29
PD provided to principals	0	0
PD provided to administrators/other than principals	1	12
PD provided to other school personnel/non-administrative	1	11
PD provided to community based organization personnel	0	0
Total	//////////	251

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

The 'other' professional development topic referred to in table above is a Resource Library.

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 submitted using the MM/DD/YY format.

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 2013-14 funds July 1, 2013, and then made these funds available to subgrantees on August 1, 2013, for SY 2013-14 programs. Then the "# of days/\$\$ Distribution" is 30 days.

Date State Received Allocation	Date Funds Available to Subgrantees	# of Days/\$\$ Distribution
07/01/14	07/01/14	0
<p>Comments: The response is limited to 4,000 characters. Prior to receiving allocations under NCLB, the WDPI gives districts/sub-grantees an estimate based on the number of eligible ELLs in each district. There is a consolidated online application for all title funding, and districts are allowed to complete their applications prior to when the WDPI receives the final allocations. As soon as the final allocation is received, Title III sub-grants for each district are calculated and posted on the WDPI's web pages, and an email is sent immediately to each district. Once subgrants are posted and districts are notified, those allocations are available to the districts. Districts then may make any needed modifications and submit their application that same day. In this way, WI makes Title III funds available to sub-grantees in zero days.</p>		

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.

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/unsafechoice.pdf>.

Persistently Dangerous Schools	#
Persistently Dangerous Schools	0
Comments: The response is limited to 4,000 characters.	

1.9 EDUCATION FOR HOMELESS CHILDREN AND YOUTHS PROGRAM

This section collects data on homeless children and youth 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 youth and the McKinney-Vento program. The totals will be automatically calculated.

LEAs	#	# LEAs Reporting Data
LEAs without subgrants	399	394
LEAs with subgrants	25	25
Total	424	419

Comments: The response is limited to 4,000 characters. 5 LEAs did not submit their Homeless Children and Youth data in time for this report.

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

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

1.9.1.1 Homeless Children And Youth

In the table below, provide the number of homeless children and youth 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/Youth Enrolled in Public School in LEAs Without Subgrants	# of Homeless Children/Youth Enrolled in Public School in LEAs With Subgrants
Age 3 through 5 (not Kindergarten)	320	949
K	586	1,150
1	595	1,087
2	590	1,057
3	521	995
4	518	990
5	447	873
6	422	881
7	446	814
8	403	786
9	390	882
10	353	659
11	432	722
12	717	815
Ungraded		
Total	6,740	12,660

Comments: The response is limited to 4,000 characters.

1.9.1.2 Primary Nighttime Residence of Homeless Children and Youth

In the table below, provide the number of homeless children and youth 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.

Primary Nighttime Residence	# of Homeless Children/Youth - LEAs Without Subgrants	# of Homeless Children/Youth - LEAs With Subgrants
Shelters, transitional housing, awaiting foster care	801	1,721
Doubled-up (e.g., living with another family)	5,239	9,926
Unsheltered (e.g., cars, parks, campgrounds, temporary trailer, or abandoned buildings)	141	255
Hotels/Motels	559	758
Total	6,740	12,660

Comments: The response is limited to 4,000 characters.

1.9.1.3 Subgroups of Homeless Students Enrolled

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

Special Population	# Homeless Children/Youth - LEAs Without Subgrants	# of Homeless Children/Youth - LEAs With Subgrants
Unaccompanied homeless youth	562	1,319
Migratory children/youth	31	41
Children with disabilities (IDEA)	1,201	2,583
Limited English Proficient (LEP) students	284	1,097

Comments: The response is limited to 4,000 characters.

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 Youth Served by McKinney-Vento Subgrants

In the table below, provide the number of homeless children and youth 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/Youth Served by Subgrants
Age Birth Through 2	124
Age 3 through 5 (not Kindergarten)	1,082
K	1,227
1	1,163
2	1,151
3	1,086
4	1,066
5	950
6	952
7	883
8	845
9	952
10	715
11	785
12	866
Ungraded	0
Total	13,847

Comments: The response is limited to 4,000 characters.

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.

Subgroup	# Homeless Students Served
Unaccompanied homeless youth	1,363
Migratory children/youth	41
Children with disabilities (<i>IDEA</i>)	3,702
Limited English Proficient (LEP) students	1,437

Comments: The response is limited to 4,000 characters.

1.9.3 Academic Achievement of Homeless Students

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

1.9.3.1 Reading Assessment

In the table below, provide the number of enrolled homeless children and youth who were tested on the State 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	# of Homeless Children/Youth - LEAs Without Subgrants # Homeless Children/Youth Who Received a Valid Score and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned	# of Homeless Children/Youth - LEAs Without Subgrants # Homeless Children/Youth Scoring at or above Proficient	# of Homeless Children/Youth - LEAs With Subgrants # Homeless Children/Youth Who Received a Valid Score and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned	# of Homeless Children/Youth - LEAs With Subgrants # Homeless Children/Youth Scoring at or above Proficient
3	272	48	394	38
4	288	61	364	33
5	235	31	339	32
6	220	37	348	36
7	234	44	308	34
8	192	24	318	31
High School	197	44	243	29

Comments: The response is limited to 4,000 characters.

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	# of Homeless Children/Youth - LEAs Without Subgrants # Homeless Children/Youth Who Received a Valid Score and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned	# of Homeless Children/Youth - LEAs Without Subgrants # Homeless Children/Youth Scoring at or above Proficient	# of Homeless Children/Youth - LEAs With Subgrants # Homeless Children/Youth Who Received a Valid Score and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned	# of Homeless Children/Youth - LEAs With Subgrants # Homeless Children/Youth Scoring at or above Proficient
3	272	89	402	66
4	288	94	373	53
5	236	69	343	58
6	223	58	351	51
7	237	59	309	37
8	192	44	319	28
High School	196	38	239	23

Comments: The response is limited to 4,000 characters.

1.9.3.3 Science Assessment

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

Grade	# of Homeless Children/Youth - LEAs Without Subgrants # Homeless Children/Youth Who Received a Valid Score and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned	# of Homeless Children/Youth - LEAs Without Subgrants # Homeless Children/Youth Scoring at or above Proficient	# of Homeless Children/Youth - LEAs With Subgrants # Homeless Children/Youth Who Received a Valid Score and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned	# of Homeless Children/Youth - LEAs With Subgrants # Homeless Children/Youth Scoring at or above Proficient
3				
4	285	190	370	155
5				
6				
7				
8	191	128	316	130
High School	195	101	235	66

Comments: The response is limited to 4,000 characters.