

# CONSOLIDATED STATE PERFORMANCE REPORT

## PART II

SCHOOL YEAR 2019-2020

WISCONSIN



The Consolidated State Performance Report (CSPR) is the required annual reporting tool for each State, the Bureau of Indian Education, District of Columbia, and Puerto Rico as authorized under Section 8303 of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act (ESEA), as amended by the Every Student Succeeds Act of 2015 (ESSA).

### Paperwork Burden Statement

According to the Paperwork Reduction Act of 1995, no persons are required to respond to a collection of information unless such collection displays a valid OMB control number. The valid OMB control number for this information collection is 1810-0724. The time required to complete this information collection is estimated to average 35.00 hours per response, including the time to review instructions, search existing data resources, gather the data needed, and complete and review the information collection. The obligation to respond to this collection is required to obtain or retain a benefit under the Elementary and Secondary Education Act (ESEA), as amended by the Every Student Succeeds Act (ESSA). If you have any comments concerning the accuracy of the time estimate(s) or suggestions for improving this form, please write to: U.S. Department of Education, Washington, D.C. 20202-4537. If you have comments or concerns regarding the status of your individual submission of this form, write directly to: Office of Elementary and Secondary Education, U.S. Department of Education, 400 Maryland Avenue, S.W., Washington, D.C. 20202.

## **2.1 ACCOUNTABILITY**

### **2.1.4 Section 1003 of the ESEA School Improvement Funds**

In the tables below, provide the amount of Section 1003 funds of the ESEA allocated to each district and school.

#### **2.1.4.1 Section 1003 of the ESEA Allocations to LEAs**

For each LEA receiving a 1003(a) allocation, list the amount of the allocation.

Populated with SCH-LEVEL FS132/DG794

Data published outside of report

#### **2.1.4.2 Section 1003 of the ESEA Allocations to Schools**

For each school receiving a Section 1003(a) allocation of the ESEA, list the amount of the allocation.

Populated with SCH-LEVEL FS132/DG794

Data published outside of report

## 2.2 GRADUATION RATES AND POSTSECONDARY ENROLLMENT

This section collects data on graduation rates and rates of postsecondary enrollment.

### 2.2.1 Four Year Adjusted Cohort Graduation Rates

In the table below, provide the state's four year adjusted cohort graduation rates for the current reporting period.

Populated with SEA-LEVEL FS150/DG695 and FS151/DG696

State	Student Group	# of Graduates	# of Students in Cohort	Graduation Rate
WISCONSIN	All students	58752	64983	90.41
WISCONSIN	American Indian or Alaska Native	637	750	84.93
WISCONSIN	Asian	2211	2388	92.59
WISCONSIN	Native Hawaiian or Other Pacific Islander	34	40	85
WISCONSIN	Black or African American	4243	5988	70.86
WISCONSIN	Hispanic or Latino	6223	7438	83.66
WISCONSIN	White	43634	46340	94.16
WISCONSIN	Two or more races	1770	2037	86.89
WISCONSIN	Children with Disabilities (IDEA)	5166	7407	69.74
WISCONSIN	English Learners	1956	2542	76.95
WISCONSIN	Economically disadvantaged students	18544	22740	81.55
WISCONSIN	Children in foster care	213	354	60.17
WISCONSIN	Children who are homeless	913	1358	67.23

#### Frequently Asked Questions (FAQs) on graduation rates:

What is the adjusted cohort graduation rate? The adjusted cohort graduation rate is described in sections 8101(23) and 8101(25) of the ESEA.

## 2.2.2 Postsecondary Enrollment

In the table below, provide counts of students who enrolled in programs of postsecondary education during the current reporting period.

Populated with SEA-LEVEL FS160/DG739

State	Student Group	# Enrolled in an IHE	# Not Enrolled in an IHE	# for which data are unavailable	Total
WISCONSIN	All students	42001	.	19413	61414
WISCONSIN	American Indian or Alaska Native	302	.	325	627
WISCONSIN	Asian or Pacific Islander	1742	.	653	2395
WISCONSIN	Native Hawaiian or Other Pacific Islander	32	.	19	51
WISCONSIN	Black or African American	2243	.	2511	4754
WISCONSIN	Hispanic or Latino	3505	.	2754	6259
WISCONSIN	White	33080	.	12550	45630
WISCONSIN	Two or more races	1097	.	601	1698
WISCONSIN	Female	22588	.	7826	30414
WISCONSIN	Male	19413	.	11587	31000
WISCONSIN	Children with Disabilities (IDEA)	2368	.	3905	6273
WISCONSIN	English Learners	808	.	1013	1821
WISCONSIN	Economically disadvantaged students	9895	.	9058	18953

## 2.3 TITLE I, PART A PROGRAM PARTICIPATION

The following sections collect data on students participating in Title I, Part A by various student characteristics.

### 2.3.1 Student Participation in Public Title I, Part A by Special Services or Programs

In the table below, provide the number of public school students served by either Public Title I Schoolwide Programs (SWPs) or Targeted Assistance programs (TAS) at any time during the regular school year for each category listed. Count each student only once in each category even if the student participated during more than one term or in more than one school or district in the State. Count each student in as many of the categories that are applicable to the student. Include pre-kindergarten through grade 12. Do not include the following individuals: (1) adult participants of adult literacy programs funded by Title I, (2) private school students participating in Title I programs operated by local educational agencies, or (3) students served in Part A local neglected programs.

Populated with SEA-LEVEL FS037/DG548

State	Special Services or Programs	# Students Served
WISCONSIN	Children with disabilities (IDEA)	66279
WISCONSIN	English learners	31664
WISCONSIN	Homeless students	13147
WISCONSIN	Migrant students	198

### 2.3.2 Student Participation in Public Title I, Part A by Racial/Ethnic Group

In the table below, provide the unduplicated number of public school students served by either Title I SWP or TAS at any time during the regular school year. Each student should be reported in only one racial/ethnic category. Include pre-kindergarten through grade 12. The total number of students served will be calculated automatically.

Do not include: (1) adult participants of adult literacy programs funded by Title I, (2) private school students participating in Title I programs operated by local educational agencies, or (3) students served in Part A local neglected programs.

Populated with SEA-LEVEL FS037/DG548

State	Race Ethnicity	# Students Served
WISCONSIN	American Indian or Alaska Native	6301
WISCONSIN	Asian	15855
WISCONSIN	Black or African American	67756
WISCONSIN	Hispanic or Latino	70338
WISCONSIN	Native Hawaiian or Other Pacific Islander	341
WISCONSIN	Total	395789
WISCONSIN	Two or more races	19692
WISCONSIN	White	215505

### 2.3.3 Student Participation in Title I, Part A by Grade Level

In the table below, provide the unduplicated number of students participating in Title I, Part A programs by grade level and by type of program: Title I public TAS, Title I SWP, private school students participating in Title I programs (private), and Part A local neglected programs (local neglected).

Populated with SEA-LEVEL FS134/DG670

State	Age Grade	Public SWP	Public TAS	Local Neglected	Private	Total
WISCONSIN	Age 3 through 5 (Not Kindergarte	34381	784	0	398	35563
WISCONSIN	Age Birth through 2	189	8	0	24	221
WISCONSIN	Grade 1	35320	2331	0	1597	39248
WISCONSIN	Grade 10	12616	1031	0	225	13872
WISCONSIN	Grade 11	11793	995	0	93	12881
WISCONSIN	Grade 12	12952	1093	0	69	14114
WISCONSIN	Grade 2	35387	2350	0	1574	39311
WISCONSIN	Grade 3	35340	2234	0	1398	38972
WISCONSIN	Grade 4	35901	2283	0	1255	39439
WISCONSIN	Grade 5	35730	2054	0	1138	38922
WISCONSIN	Grade 6	26286	2641	0	883	29810
WISCONSIN	Grade 7	23236	1871	0	771	25878
WISCONSIN	Grade 8	22595	2212	0	672	25479
WISCONSIN	Grade 9	13629	1214	0	293	15136
WISCONSIN	Kindergarten	35183	2064	0	1122	38369
WISCONSIN	Total	370538	25165	0	11512	407315
WISCONSIN	Ungraded	0	0	0	0	0

## 2.4 EDUCATION OF MIGRATORY CHILDREN

This section collects data on the Migrant Education Program (MEP) (Title I, Part C) for the performance period of September 1, 2018 through August 31, 2019. This section is composed of the following subsections:

- Population data of eligible migratory children
- Academic data of eligible migratory students
- Data of migratory children served during the performance period
- School data
- Project data
- Personnel data

Report a child in the age/grade category in which the child spent the majority of their time while residing in the State during the performance period.

There are two exceptions to this rule:

1. A child who turns 3 during the performance period is reported as “Age 3 through 5 (not Kindergarten),” only if the child’s residency in the state was verified after the child turned 3.
2. A child who turns 22 years of age during the performance is reported at the appropriate age/grade category for the performance period.

### 2.4.1 Migratory Child Counts

This section collects the Title I, Part C, MEP child counts which States are required to provide and may be used to determine the annual State allocations under Title I, Part C. The child counts should reflect the performance period of September 1, 2019 through August 31, 2020. This section also collects a report on the procedures used by States to produce true, reliable, and valid child counts.

To provide the child counts, each State Education Agency (SEA) should have implemented sufficient procedures and internal controls to ensure that it is counting only those children who are eligible for the MEP. Such procedures are important to protecting the integrity of the State's MEP because they permit the early discovery and correction of eligibility problems and thus help to ensure that only eligible migratory children are counted for funding purposes and are served. If an SEA has reservations about the accuracy of its child counts, it must disclose known data limitations to the Department, and explain how and when it will resolve data quality issues through corrective actions in the box below, which precedes Section 2.3.1.1 Category 1 Child Count.

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



**FAQs on Child Count:**

- a. How is “out-of-school” defined? Out-of-school means children up through age 21 who are entitled to a free public education in the State but are not currently enrolled in a K-12 institution. This term could include students who have dropped out of school, youth who are working on a high school equivalency diploma (HSED) outside of a K-12 institution, and youth who are “here-to-work” only. It would not include children in preschool, nor does it include temporary absences (e.g., summer/intersession, suspension or illness). Enrollment in school is not a condition affecting eligibility for the MEP. Therefore, out-of-school youth who meet the definition of a “migratory child” are eligible for the MEP.
- b. How is “ungraded” defined? Ungraded means the children are served in an educational unit that has no separate grades. For example, some schools have primary grade groupings that are not traditionally graded or ungraded groupings for children with learning disabilities (IDEA). In some cases, ungraded students may also include special education children (IDEA), transitional bilingual students, students working on a HSED through a K-12 institution, or those in a correctional setting. (Do not count students working on a HSED outside of a K-12 institution as ungraded; these students are counted as out-of-school youth.)
- c. How is reporting a child “in the age/grade category in which s/he spent the majority of his/her time while residing in the State” defined? A State must report a child in only one age/grade category in which the child spent the majority of his/her time while residing in the State. For example, a migratory child resided in State A for three months and in State B for nine months in SY2018-19. While in State A, the child enrolled in ninth grade for two months and in tenth grade for one month. Therefore, State A will report the child in the age/grade category of ninth grade, because the child spent the majority of his/her time in ninth grade in State A. In State B, the child enrolled in eighth grade for one month and in ninth grade for eight months. Therefore, State B will report the child in the age/grade category of ninth grade, because the child spent the majority of his/her time in ninth grade in State B.

In the space below, discuss any concerns about the accuracy of the reported child counts or the underlying eligibility determinations on which the counts are based and how and when these concerns will be resolved.

Comments
<p>Wisconsin continues to update and upgrade data processes to ensure data accuracy. For this performance period, September 1, 2019 through August 31, 2020, all year-end reporting student data was shared electronically from the state database, WISEdata, to the migrant vendor database, MIS2000, where in the past manual key entry was utilized for most of the state academic progress student data. Prior to this recent upgrade, some minor data cleanup was indicated in data reports but did not indicate concerns for overall data accuracy. Past data discrepancies are attributed to manual entry human error. Going forward, minor differences in data reports are due to timing of state data snapshots versus the continued daily updates in MSIX and can be verified as accurate based on time of data generation and report date. In the previous performance period, of September 1, 2018 through August 31, 2019, Wisconsin moved to electronic COE on tablet application to ensure accuracy of child eligibility reporting. Next steps; Wisconsin state IT has developed, and is currently in the process of implementing, an electronic daily data share of currently migrant eligible from the migrant vendor database, MIS2000, to the state database, WISEdata. This will allow the state to match any state school enrollment directly to a Wisconsin certified and currently eligible migrant child in a timely and reliable manner. The state database will then provide electronic notification to the current district of enrollment of migrant student status and service responsibilities. This process includes a required acknowledgement from the district receiving the notification. State IT staff will develop a report that notifies state MEP data staff of districts that do not acknowledge notification for purpose of follow up with the district. Expected launch is fall 2021.</p>

### 2.4.1.1 Category 1 Child Count (Eligible Migratory Children)

In the table below, enter the unduplicated statewide number by age/grade of eligible migratory children age 3 through 21 who, within 3 years of making a qualifying move, resided in your State for one or more days during the performance period of September 1, 2019 through August 31, 2020. This figure includes all eligible migratory children who may or may not have received MEP services. Count a child who moved from one age/grade level to another during the performance period only once in the age/grade category in which s/he spent the majority of his/her time while residing in the State, during the performance period. The unduplicated statewide total count is calculated automatically.

Do not include children age birth through 2 years.

Populated with SEA-LEVEL FS121/DG634

State	Age Grade	Eligible Migratory Children
WISCONSIN	Age 3 through 5 (Not Kindergarten)	58
WISCONSIN	Kindergarten	16
WISCONSIN	Grade 1	34
WISCONSIN	Grade 2	46
WISCONSIN	Grade 3	41
WISCONSIN	Grade 4	44
WISCONSIN	Grade 5	46
WISCONSIN	Grade 6	44
WISCONSIN	Grade 7	38
WISCONSIN	Grade 8	39
WISCONSIN	Grade 9	40
WISCONSIN	Grade 10	37
WISCONSIN	Grade 11	29
WISCONSIN	Grade 12	23
WISCONSIN	Ungraded	0
WISCONSIN	Out of school	0
WISCONSIN	Total	535

### 2.4.1.2 Category 1 Child Count Increases/Decreases

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

Comments
<p>Wisconsin experienced a decrease greater than 10% for the performance period of September 1, 2019 through August 31, 2020. ID&amp;R efforts were profoundly affected by the Novel Coronavirus Pandemic. The majority of new COEs for Wisconsin are written in the spring and summer months. All state agency face-to-face meetings were suspended in March of 2020. Wisconsin ID&amp;R responded with educating recruiters on conducting remote interviews. Our recruiters reported families were reluctant to trust an unknown phone call so multiple attempts were almost always necessary. The delays caused by stunted communications sometimes resulted in families leaving an area before contact could be established. The mandate for state agency employees not to travel and not to conduct face to face meetings has been extended through April of 2021. Partner agencies and agricultural employers reported decreases in families traveling with workers as well as a decline in workers themselves traveling to Wisconsin. Reports also indicated that workers had to stop work or were not able to start work, due to virus outbreaks and, as a result, some decided to seek work elsewhere. Many schools closed with intermittent opening for in-person classes. Contact with schools in the spring was hindered due to closings. All of these factors affected the ability of recruiters to remotely contact families and to conduct ID&amp;R interviews. Due to these unprecedented circumstances, and the small sampling of data collected, Wisconsin is not able to accurately discern any lesser factors of impact for this performance period.</p>

### 2.4.1.3 Birth through Two Child Count

In the table below, enter the unduplicated statewide number of eligible migratory children from birth through age 2 who, within 3 years of making a qualifying move, resided in your State for one or more days during the performance period of September 1, 2019 through August 31, 2020.

Populated with SEA-LEVEL FS121/DG634

State	Age Grade	Eligible Migratory Children
WISCONSIN	Age Birth through 2	11

## 2.4.2 Category 2 Child Count (Eligible Migratory Children Served by the MEP During the Summer/ Intersession Term)

In the table below, enter by age/grade the unduplicated statewide number of eligible migratory children age 3 through 21 who, within 3 years of making a qualifying move, were served for one or more days in a MEP-funded project conducted during either the summer term or during intersession periods that occurred within the performance period of September 1, 2019 through August 31, 2020. Count a child who moved from one age/grade level to another during the performance period only once in the age/grade category in which s/he spent the majority of his/her time while residing in the State, during the performance period. Count a child who moved to different schools within the State and who was served in both traditional summer and year-round school intersession programs only once. The unduplicated statewide total count is calculated automatically.

Do not include:

- Children age birth through 2 years
- Children who received only referred services (non-MEP funded).

Populated with SEA-LEVEL FS122/DG635

State	Age Grade	Eligible Migratory Children Served by the MEP During the Summer Intersession Term
WISCONSIN	Age 3 through 5 (Not Kindergarten)	9
WISCONSIN	Kindergarten	2
WISCONSIN	Grade 1	10
WISCONSIN	Grade 2	7
WISCONSIN	Grade 3	4
WISCONSIN	Grade 4	4
WISCONSIN	Grade 5	4
WISCONSIN	Grade 6	5
WISCONSIN	Grade 7	3
WISCONSIN	Grade 8	3
WISCONSIN	Grade 9	1
WISCONSIN	Grade 10	1
WISCONSIN	Grade 11	1
WISCONSIN	Grade 12	0
WISCONSIN	Out of school	0
WISCONSIN	Ungraded	0
WISCONSIN	Total	54

### 2.4.2.1 Category 2 Child Count Increases/Decreases

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

Comments
<p>Summer only MEP service delivery was exceptionally challenging during the summer surge of the Novel Coronavirus Pandemic. Most regions chose to provide instruction remotely outside of a classroom setting for the safety of staff, students, and families. Outreach efforts to families to encourage program participation was severely limited. Much of this work is usually done either with students attending school in the Spring (during which time all school buildings were closed in Wisconsin this year), or in person at sites of work or residential sites (and such contact was limited for the safety of all staff and families). In response to the needed flexibility due to the Pandemic, four all-regional coordinator virtual meetings were facilitated by the DPI MEP team throughout the summer program period as a space for coordinators to share ideas, problem solve, and offer support to one another in finding innovative ways to reach students despite limitations on in-person interactions. The DPI MEP team as well as regional programs made concerted efforts to continue to build the regional summer-only service delivery model introduced in 2018-19. These efforts included several new resources and technical assistance tools developed for regional programs. The DPI MEP program staff joined the Wisconsin Farmworkers Coalition COVID Response Steering Committee, a comprehensive collaboration of more than twelve community partners and state agencies that came together to respond to the health, safety, and other challenges presented by the COVID-19 Pandemic. The WI MEP also joined with other Midwestern states to meet on a regular basis to strategize service delivery and build relationships for future collaboration. Through both of these partnerships we learned that the number of students entering Wisconsin for the 2020 agricultural season had significantly decreased due to the Pandemic. Beyond the long-term benefits of the relationship building that occurred, another positive outcome of this challenging program period is the development of some enhanced family engagement strategies. Multiple regions reported that by having no choice but to bring instruction directly to students and families where they lived, regions learned lessons regarding how direct family engagement can happen in practice, and how instruction can be more effective when done at residential sites where families live.</p>

### 2.4.2.2 Birth through Two Eligible Migratory Children Served by the MEP During the Summer/Intersession Term

In the table below, enter the unduplicated statewide number of eligible migratory children from age birth through 2 who, within 3 years of making a qualifying move, were served for one or more days in a MEP-funded project conducted during either the summer term or during intersession periods that occurred within the performance period of September 1, 2019 through August 31, 2020. Count a child who moved to different schools within the State and who was served in both traditional summer and year-round school intersession programs only once.

Do not include:

- Children who received only referred services (non-MEP funded).

Populated with SEA-LEVEL FS122/DG635

State	Age Grade	Eligible Migratory Children Served by the MEP During the Summer Intersession Term
WISCONSIN	Age Birth through 2	1

## 2.4.3 Child Count Calculation and Validation Procedures

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

### 2.4.3.1 Methods Used to Count Children

In the space below, please describe the procedures and processes at the State level used to ensure all eligible children, ages 3-21 are reported. In particular, describe how the State includes and counts only:

- The unduplicated count of eligible migratory children, ages 3-21. Only include children two years of age whose residency in the state has been verified after turning three.
- Children who met the program eligibility criteria (e.g., were within 3 years of a qualifying move, engaged or had parents engage in migratory agricultural or fishing work, and were entitled to a free public education through grade 12 in the State, or preschool children below the age and grade level at which the agency provides free public education). Children who were resident in your State for at least 1 day during the performance period (September 1 through August 31).
- Children who graduated from high school or attained a High School Equivalency Diploma (HSED) during the performance period and ensures that these children are not counted in the subsequent performance period's child count.
- Children who—in the case of Category 2—were served for one or more days in a MEP-funded project conducted during either the summer term or during intersession periods.
- Children once per age/grade level for each child count category.
- Children who had an SEA approved Certificate of Eligibility (COE) and were entered in the State's migratory student database.

## Comments

Wisconsin's migratory children are recorded and managed using a centralized database, Wisconsin's version of MIS2000 software supported by Management Services for Education Data (MSEdD). When producing data for the Consolidated State Performance Report (CSPR) and for EdFacts files, the programming logic follows the MSIX logic and includes data checks in the following Hierarchical order: 1) That the child resided in the State during the 2019-2020 Performance Period (September 1, 2019 – August 31, 2020) by checking one or more of the following dates: enrollment date, residency date, recertification/residency verification date, or withdrawal date between 9/1/2019 and 8/31/2020. 2) That the child is only included if he/she is between the ages of 3 through 21 years of age based on the child's birthdate. MIS2000 calculates the child's age using the child's Birth Date. 3) That the qualifying arrival date (QAD) of the child is within 36 months (QAD must be on or after 9/2/2016) of his/her residency date which occurs between 9/1/2019 and 8/31/2020. Residency for at least one day of a child turning 3 years of age is verified by a school district staff or summer regional MEP staff in contact with a family, most often in connection with older siblings in attendance in school or the summer MEP program. Family contact by a migrant recruiter after the child has turned 3 years of age, or certification interview by a migrant recruiter after the child has turned 3 years of age in the specified performance period. In some cases, state MEP staff may contact a family to verify younger siblings or children, including a child turning 3 years of age, who resided in the state, after turning 3 years of age for at least one day during a specified performance period. 4) If a Graduation/High School Equivalency Diploma (HSED) date is in the system for a previous reporting period or entered during the 2019- 2020 performance period that the child's residency is checked against the Graduation/HSED date. 5) If a Continuation of Services (COS) date is in the system during the 2019-2020 Performance Period, that the child must have been eligible and residing in the State for at least one day during the Performance Period. Children who met the program eligibility criteria (e.g., were within 3 years of a qualifying move; engaged or had parents engage in migratory agricultural or fishing work; and were entitled to a free public education through grade 12 in the State or preschool children below the age and grade level at which the agency provides free public education): Eligibility determination is the responsibility of the recruiter and COE reviewer. During this performance period, Wisconsin had 2 full time, and 2 part time recruiters. All recruiters have participated in extensive training for migrant recruitment, and have demonstrated an excellent working knowledge of the tablet COE. As our recruitment staff is small, we use one-on-one continuous training and guidance headed up by our ID&R Coordinator, and state COE reviewer. Children who were residents in our State for at least 1 day during the performance period (September 1 through August 31): In addition to writing Certificates of Eligibility, and summer program reporting by regional program coordinators, Wisconsin's migrant data administrator uses Wisconsin's state database regular school year enrollment reports to verify migrant eligible students residing in the state during a performance period. Regular year school (non- MEP funded) enrollments of migrant eligible students are entered into the migrant database, MIS2000, verifying residence. Children who graduated from high school or attained a High School Equivalency Diploma (HSED) during the performance period and ensures that these children are not counted in the subsequent performance period's child count: Graduation dates are recorded into MIS2000 and the software filters and reports graduation dates occurring in the specific performance period. Children who—in the case of Category 2—were served for one or more days in a MEP-funded project conducted during either the summer term or during intersession periods: Wisconsin operates summer only regional MEP-funded projects. Children must be eligible as determined under Category 1, as well as enrolled in the State migrant database with Enrollment Type 03 - Summer/Intersession MEP-Funded Project and be included in the Category 2 count. The State migrant database (MIS2000) has an edit check to ensure that children are between the ages of 3 through 21 at the time of enrollment into the MEP-funded summer/intersession project. The child must be aged 3 through 21 (i.e., the child has turned 3 years of age, but has not yet turned 22 years of age) on or before the Enrollment Date in the Summer/Intersession term. Wisconsin MIS2000 software calculates the child's age using the child's Birth Date. As part of its quality control process, State MEP staff verify that children included in Category 2 actually received a summer service by performing a 100% review of local data entry into the Wisconsin MIS2000 software, as well as at least one regional site visit by state MEP staff for review of local summer project records including, but not limited to, enrollment lists, attendance rosters, and teacher logs, to confirm that districts and/or regions actually served all the children included in the State's Category 2 count. Finally, State MEP staff run the MSIX Child Count Reconciliation report to check the State Category 2 child counts against MSIX Category 2 child counts. All discrepancies are resolved before the State's ED Facts file submission. Children once per age/grade level for each child count category: Wisconsin MIS2000 filters each child by their unique ID for age/grade count using the longest period of time the child spent in a given grade during the reported performance period. If a child is enrolled in multiple grades during the year, the system calculates a single grade using CSPR Guidelines ensuring that a child is only counted once per grade level. In addition, grade levels are totaled and compared to overall counts to ensure they match, as part of a report-quality check. Children who had an SEA approved Certificate of Eligibility (COE) and were entered in the State's migratory student database: The MIS2000 software tracks eligibility using the child's unique ID and by the most recent Qualifying Arrival Date (QAD) for each child. MIS2000 software calculates eligibility expiration and does not report children whose eligibility has expired in accordance with MEP parameters. All new Wisconsin COEs are collected and submitted through MIS2000 Tablet COE. This allows for continuous oversight of each COE. Submitted COEs push from the recruiter's tablet to the state reviewer who is auto-notified of COEs requiring review. MIS2000 software provides a child record match process as part of a new COE approval process. In the case of tablet malfunction for new COEs, a recruiter may use Wisconsin's paper COE but then must enter the COE into MIS2000 as soon as possible, and also submit the signed paper COE to DPI MEP staff for signature retention, prior to COE approval.

Does the State ensure that the system that transmits migrant data to the Department accurately accounts for all the migratory children in every EDFacts data file? Please respond in the table below.

**The State deployed a process that ensured that it transmits accurate migrant data to the Department in every required EDFacts data file.**

Yes

**Does the State use data in the Migrant Student Information Exchange (MSIX) to verify the quality of migrant data?**

Yes



If MSIX is utilized, please explain how.

### Comments

Wisconsin's migrant database, MIS2000, supported by Management Services for Education Data (MSEdD) uses daily data checks to insure data reporting uploaded to MSIX is functioning correctly and accurately per all MSIX regulations. State MEP staff use reports at various times to compare and verify reports generated in the state MIS2000 database. Enrollments reported in MIS2000 are compared with MSIX Enrollments (MDE Type) for Enrollment Type 03-Summer Intersession. WISEdata enrollment for the Regular school year is compared to Enrollment Type 01-Regular school program enrollment. Districts and summer programs have access to MSIX for student eligibility and academic information in order to better plan and serve migratory students. State MEP staff run the MSIX Child Count Reconciliation report to check the State Category 2 child counts against MSIX Category 2 child counts as a verification step for summer intersession reporting. Recruiters use the MSIX or MSIX mobile application in the field to assist with eligibility and move history while in the field, or in this particular year to obtain information prior to a family interview conducted by phone. Information from MSIX move notices to coming our state are transferred to an ID&R tracking tool for recruiter follow-up and resolution. The state data administrator compares MSIX move notices from the state with school withdraw records. The state MEP staff does random checks and end of the year comparisons of MIS2000 data using MSIX Student Information reports drilling down to the student lists if needed for the purpose of finding and correcting any errors. Wisconsin uses MSIX in multiple ways to ensure data quality. Users are encouraged to explore the MSIX application and use the Help, Training, and Resource pages found within the application as needed to support their service and reporting responsibilities for the Migrant students. MSIX users also have the option to contact the MSIX state administrator for support.

Data  
Quality  
Comments

### 2.4.3.2 Quality Control Processes

In the space below, describe the results of any re-interview processes used by the SEA during the performance period to test the accuracy of the State's MEP eligibility determinations.

Results	#
The number of eligibility determinations sampled.	83
The number of eligibility determinations sampled for which a re-interview was completed.	33
The number of eligibility determinations sampled for which a re-interview was completed and the child was found eligible.	33

**What was the most recent year that the MEP conducted independent prospective re-interviews (i.e., interviewers were neither SEA or LEA staff members responsible for administering or operating the MEP, nor any other persons who worked on the initial eligibility determinations being tested)? If independent prospective re-interviews were not administered in any of the three performance periods, please provide an explanation in the "Comment" row at the end of this table.**

2018-19

#### Comments

Wisconsin did conduct independent prospective re-interviews for SY 2018-19. Wisconsin conducted in-state prospective re-interviews for SY 2019-20.

**FAQ on independent prospective re-interviews:**

a. What are independent prospective re-interviews? Independent prospective re-interviews allow confirmation of your State's eligibility determinations and the accuracy of the numbers of migratory children in your State reports. Independent prospective interviews should be conducted at least once every three years by an independent interviewer, performed on the current year's identified migratory children.

Obtaining Data from Families	Response
How were the re-interviews conducted	Phone interviews
Was there a protocol for verifying all information used in making the original eligibility determination?	Yes
Were re-interviewers independent from the original interviewers?	Yes

If you did conduct independent re-interviews in this reporting period, describe how you ensured that the process was independent. Only enter a response if your State completed independent re-interviews in SY2018-19.

Comments
N/A Wisconsin did not conduct independent prospective re-interviews for SY 2019-20.

In the space below, refer to the results of any re-interview processes used by the SEA, and if any of the migratory children were found ineligible, describe those corrective actions or improvements that will be made by the SEA to improve the accuracy of its MEP eligibility determinations.

Comments
<p>Wisconsin used in-state, re-interviewing for the performance period 2019-20. For the safety of families and staff, the re-interviewing process was conducted remotely. The results were very positive. For a third consecutive year, completed re-interview results indicate all children sampled were confirmed as eligible. Due mainly to the Novel Coronavirus pandemic, the number of migratory children and families identified for the performance period 2019-20 is significantly less than the previous year. This year's reduced population size and the existing defect rate of near zero for the past two years allowed Wisconsin to re-interview a smaller sampling of 33 interviews out of 39 attempted contacts. The random sample was developed in collaboration with Migrant Services for Education Data, produced in Wisconsin's MIS2000 software. The sample consisted of a list of randomly selected children found to be eligible during interviews conducted in the performance period 2019-20. The random sample list as well as the fillable electronic Re-Interview form was made available in the Wisconsin MIS2000 resources folder for ID&amp;R. Original COEs were accessed in the MIS2000 software for review. The state MEP data administrator was available for technical support for the re-interviewing process. Wisconsin's two full time recruiters completed the re-interviews by phone. Re-interviews were conducted by a different recruiter than the recruiter who completed the original COE. Completed re-interview forms were saved to the MIS2000 resources in a folder for completed forms. State MEP staff reviewed the forms to ensure all forms submitted were complete and tabulated the results.</p>

In the space below, please respond to the following question:

Does the state collect all the required data elements and data sections on the National Certificate of Eligibility (COE)?
Yes

Data Quality Comments

## 2.4.4 Eligible Migratory Children

### 2.4.4.1 Priority for Services

In the table below, provide the unduplicated number of eligible migratory children who have been classified as having "Priority for Services." The total is calculated automatically.

Populated with SEA-LEVEL FS121/DG634

**FAQ on priority for services:**

Who is classified as having “priority for service?” Migratory children who have made a qualifying move within the previous 1-year period and who 1) are failing, or most at risk of failing to meet challenging State academic standards, or 2) have dropped out of school.

**2.4.4.2 English Learners (ELs)**

In the table below, provide the unduplicated number of eligible migratory children who are also ELs. The total is calculated automatically.

Populated with SEA-LEVEL FS121/DG634

<b>State</b>	<b>Age Grade</b>	<b>ELs During the Performance Period</b>
WISCONSIN	Age 3 through 5 (Not Kindergarten)	10
WISCONSIN	Kindergarten	7
WISCONSIN	Grade 1	20
WISCONSIN	Grade 2	34
WISCONSIN	Grade 3	26
WISCONSIN	Grade 4	28
WISCONSIN	Grade 5	32
WISCONSIN	Grade 6	19
WISCONSIN	Grade 7	22
WISCONSIN	Grade 8	19
WISCONSIN	Grade 9	19
WISCONSIN	Grade 10	21
WISCONSIN	Grade 11	21
WISCONSIN	Grade 12	8
WISCONSIN	Out of school	.
WISCONSIN	Ungraded	.
WISCONSIN	Total	286

### 2.4.4.3 Children with Disabilities (IDEA)

In the table below, provide the unduplicated number of eligible migratory children who are also children with disabilities (IDEA) under Part B or Part C of the IDEA. The total is calculated automatically.

Populated with SEA-LEVEL FS121/DG634

<b>State</b>	<b>Age Grade</b>	<b>Children with Disabilities (IDEA) During the Performance Period</b>
WISCONSIN	Age Birth through 2	.
WISCONSIN	Age 3 through 5 (Not Kindergarte	6
WISCONSIN	Kindergarten	.
WISCONSIN	Grade 1	2
WISCONSIN	Grade 2	5
WISCONSIN	Grade 3	1
WISCONSIN	Grade 4	3
WISCONSIN	Grade 5	6
WISCONSIN	Grade 6	4
WISCONSIN	Grade 7	3
WISCONSIN	Grade 8	4
WISCONSIN	Grade 9	4
WISCONSIN	Grade 10	3
WISCONSIN	Grade 11	1
WISCONSIN	Grade 12	2
WISCONSIN	Out of school	.
WISCONSIN	Ungraded	.
WISCONSIN	Total	44

#### 2.4.4.4 Qualifying Arrival Date (QAD)

In the table below, provide the unduplicated number of eligible migratory children whose QAD occurred within 12 months from the last day of the performance period, August 31, 2020 (i.e., QAD during the performance period). The total is calculated automatically.

Populated with SEA-LEVEL FS121/DG634

State	Age Grade	QAD During the Performance Period
WISCONSIN	Age Birth through 2	8
WISCONSIN	Age 3 through 5 (Not Kindergarten)	27
WISCONSIN	Kindergarten	5
WISCONSIN	Grade 1	10
WISCONSIN	Grade 2	15
WISCONSIN	Grade 3	10
WISCONSIN	Grade 4	13
WISCONSIN	Grade 5	15
WISCONSIN	Grade 6	16
WISCONSIN	Grade 7	12
WISCONSIN	Grade 8	14
WISCONSIN	Grade 9	12
WISCONSIN	Grade 10	17
WISCONSIN	Grade 11	6
WISCONSIN	Grade 12	6
WISCONSIN	Out of school	.
WISCONSIN	Ungraded	.
WISCONSIN	Total	186

## 2.4.5 Academic Status

The following questions collect data about the academic status of eligible migratory students.

### 2.4.5.1 Dropouts

In the table below, provide the unduplicated number of eligible migratory students who dropped out of school. The total is calculated automatically.

Populated with SEA-LEVEL FS032/DG326

State	Grade	Dropouts During the Performance Period
WISCONSIN	Grade 7	0
WISCONSIN	Grade 8	0
WISCONSIN	Grade 9	0
WISCONSIN	Grade 10	2
WISCONSIN	Grade 11	0
WISCONSIN	Grade 12	4
WISCONSIN	Ungraded	.
WISCONSIN	Total	6

#### FAQ on Dropouts:

How is “dropouts” defined? The term used for students, who, (1) were enrolled in a school for at least one day during the 2019-20 performance period, (2) were not enrolled at the beginning of the current (2020-21) performance period, (3) who have not graduated from high school or completed a State- or district-approved educational program, and (4) who do not meet any of the following exclusionary conditions: (a) transfer to another school district, private school or State- or district-approved educational program (including correctional or health facility programs), (b) temporary absence due to suspension or school-excused illness or (c) death. Students who dropped out-of-school prior to the 2019-20 performance period should not be reported in this item.

### 2.4.5.2 HSED (High School Equivalency Diploma)

In the table below, provide the total unduplicated number of eligible migratory students who obtained a High School Equivalency Diploma (HSED) by passing a high school equivalency test that your state accepts (e.g. GED, HiSET, TASC).

Obtained a HSED in your State During the Performance Period
0



Data Quality Comments

## 2.4.6 MEP Services - During the Performance Period

The following questions collect data about MEP services provided to migratory children during the performance period.

### FAQ on Services:

What are services? Services are a subset of all allowable activities that the MEP can provide through its programs and projects. “Services” are those educational or educationally related activities that: (1) directly benefit a migratory child; (2) address a need of a migratory child consistent with the SEA’s comprehensive needs assessment and service delivery plan; (3) are grounded in scientifically based research or, in the case of support services, are a generally accepted practice; and (4) are designed to enable the program to meet its measurable outcomes and contribute to the achievement of the State’s performance targets/annual measurable objectives. Activities related to identification and recruitment activities, parental involvement, program evaluation, professional development, or administration of the program are examples of allowable activities that are not considered services. Other examples of an allowable activity that would not be considered a service would be the one-time act of providing instructional packets to a child or family, and handing out leaflets to migratory families on available reading programs as part of an effort to increase the reading skills of migratory children. Although these are allowable activities, they are not services because they do not meet all of the criteria above.

In the table below, provide the unduplicated number of eligible migratory children who received MEP-funded instructional or support services at any time during the performance period. Do not count the number of times an individual child received a service intervention. The total number of students served is calculated automatically.

Populated with SEA-LEVEL FS054/DG102

<b>State</b>	<b>Age Grade</b>	<b>Served During the Performance Period</b>
WISCONSIN	Age Birth through 2	1
WISCONSIN	Age 3 through 5 (Not Kindergarte	9
WISCONSIN	Kindergarten	2
WISCONSIN	Grade 1	10
WISCONSIN	Grade 2	7
WISCONSIN	Grade 3	4
WISCONSIN	Grade 4	4
WISCONSIN	Grade 5	4
WISCONSIN	Grade 6	5
WISCONSIN	Grade 7	3
WISCONSIN	Grade 8	3
WISCONSIN	Grade 9	1
WISCONSIN	Grade 10	1
WISCONSIN	Grade 11	1
WISCONSIN	Grade 12	0
WISCONSIN	Ungraded	0
WISCONSIN	Out of school	0
WISCONSIN	Total	55

### 2.4.6.1 Priority for Services – During the Performance Period

In the table below, provide the unduplicated number of eligible migratory children who have been classified as having “priority for services” and who received MEP-funded instructional or support services during the performance period. The total is calculated automatically.

Populated with SEA-LEVEL FS054/DG102

<b>State</b>	<b>Age Grade</b>	<b>Priority for Services During the Performance Period</b>
WISCONSIN	Age 3 through 5 (Not Kindergarte	4
WISCONSIN	Kindergarten	2
WISCONSIN	Grade 1	6
WISCONSIN	Grade 2	3
WISCONSIN	Grade 3	2
WISCONSIN	Grade 4	2
WISCONSIN	Grade 5	3
WISCONSIN	Grade 6	3
WISCONSIN	Grade 7	2
WISCONSIN	Grade 8	1
WISCONSIN	Grade 9	1
WISCONSIN	Grade 10	1
WISCONSIN	Grade 11	1
WISCONSIN	Grade 12	0
WISCONSIN	Ungraded	0
WISCONSIN	Out of school	0
WISCONSIN	Total	31

## 2.4.6.2 Continuation of Services – During the Performance Period

In the table below, provide the unduplicated number of migratory children who received MEP-funded instructional or support services during the performance period under the continuation of services authority Section 1304(e)(2–3). Do not include children served under Section 1304(e)(1), which are children whose eligibility expired during the school term. The total is calculated automatically.

Populated with SEA-LEVEL FS054/DG102

State	Age Grade	Continuation of Services During the Performance Period
WISCONSIN	Age 3 through 5 (Not Kindergarten)	0
WISCONSIN	Kindergarten	0
WISCONSIN	Grade 1	0
WISCONSIN	Grade 2	0
WISCONSIN	Grade 3	0
WISCONSIN	Grade 4	0
WISCONSIN	Grade 5	0
WISCONSIN	Grade 6	0
WISCONSIN	Grade 7	0
WISCONSIN	Grade 8	0
WISCONSIN	Grade 9	0
WISCONSIN	Grade 10	0
WISCONSIN	Grade 11	0
WISCONSIN	Grade 12	0
WISCONSIN	Ungraded	0
WISCONSIN	Out of school	0
WISCONSIN	Total	0

### FAQ on Continuation of Services:

What is Continuation of Services? The “continuation of services” provision found in Section 1304(e) of the ESEA provides that: (1) a child who ceases to be a migratory child during a school term shall be eligible for services until the end of such term; (2) a child who is no longer a migratory child may continue to receive services for one additional school year, but only if comparable services are not available through other programs; and (3) secondary school students who were eligible for services in secondary school may continue to be served through credit accrual programs until graduation.

### 2.4.6.3 Instructional Service – During the Performance Period

In the table below, provide the unduplicated number of eligible migratory children who received any type of MEP-funded instructional service during the performance period. Include children who received instructional services provided by either a teacher or a paraprofessional. Children should be reported only once regardless of the frequency with which they received a service intervention. The total is calculated automatically.

Populated with SEA-LEVEL FS145/DG684

State	Age Grade	Instructional Service During the Performance Period
WISCONSIN	Age Birth through 2	1
WISCONSIN	Age 3 through 5 (Not Kindergarten)	9
WISCONSIN	Kindergarten	2
WISCONSIN	Grade 1	10
WISCONSIN	Grade 2	7
WISCONSIN	Grade 3	4
WISCONSIN	Grade 4	4
WISCONSIN	Grade 5	4
WISCONSIN	Grade 6	5
WISCONSIN	Grade 7	3
WISCONSIN	Grade 8	3
WISCONSIN	Grade 9	1
WISCONSIN	Grade 10	1
WISCONSIN	Grade 11	1
WISCONSIN	Grade 12	.
WISCONSIN	Ungraded	.
WISCONSIN	Out of school	.
WISCONSIN	Total	55

## 2.4.6.4 Type of Instructional Service – During the Performance Period

In the table below, provide the number of eligible migratory children reported in the table above who received MEP-funded reading instruction, mathematics instruction, or high school credit accrual during the performance period. Include children who received such instructional services provided by a teacher only. Children may be reported as having received more than one type of instructional service in the table. However, children should be reported only once within each type of instructional service that they received regardless of the frequency with which they received the instructional service. The totals are calculated automatically.

Populated with SEA-LEVEL FS145/DG684

State	Age Grade	Reading Instruction During the Performance Period	Mathematics Instruction During the Performance Period	High School Credit Accrual During the Performance Period
WISCONSIN	Age 3 through 5 (Not Kindergarten)	7	7	.
WISCONSIN	Age Birth through 2	.	.	.
WISCONSIN	Grade 1	7	7	.
WISCONSIN	Grade 10	1	.	1
WISCONSIN	Grade 11	1	.	1
WISCONSIN	Grade 12	.	.	.
WISCONSIN	Grade 2	6	4	.
WISCONSIN	Grade 3	4	3	.
WISCONSIN	Grade 4	2	3	.
WISCONSIN	Grade 5	1	3	.
WISCONSIN	Grade 6	3	5	.
WISCONSIN	Grade 7	2	1	.
WISCONSIN	Grade 8	2	2	.
WISCONSIN	Grade 9	1	.	.
WISCONSIN	Kindergarten	.	1	.
WISCONSIN	Out of school	.	.	.
WISCONSIN	Total	37	36	2
WISCONSIN	Ungraded	.	.	.

### FAQ on Types of Instructional Services:

What is “high school credit accrual”? MEP-funded instruction, funded in whole or in part by MEP funds, in courses that accrue credits needed for high school graduation provided by a teacher for students on a regular or systematic basis, usually for a predetermined period of time. High school credit accrual includes correspondence courses taken by a student under the supervision of a teacher. High school credit accrual may include the age/grade categories of Grade 8 through Grade 12. NOTE: Children receiving a MEP-funded high school credit accrual service should be reported only once, regardless of frequency.

## 2.4.6.5 Support Services with Breakout for Counseling Services – During the Performance Period

In the table below, in the column titled Support Services, provide the unduplicated number of eligible migratory children who received any MEP-funded support service during the performance period. In the column titled Breakout of Counseling Services During the Performance Period, provide the unduplicated number of eligible migratory children who received a counseling service during the performance period. Children should be reported only once in each column regardless of the frequency with which they received a support service intervention. The totals are calculated automatically.

Populated with SEA-LEVEL FS145/DG684

State	Age Grade	Support Services During the Performance Period	Breakout of Counseling Services During the Performance Period
WISCONSIN	Age 3 through 5 (Not Kindergarte	7	.
WISCONSIN	Age Birth through 2	1	.
WISCONSIN	Grade 1	8	.
WISCONSIN	Grade 10	1	.
WISCONSIN	Grade 11	1	.
WISCONSIN	Grade 12	.	.
WISCONSIN	Grade 2	6	.
WISCONSIN	Grade 3	3	.
WISCONSIN	Grade 4	2	.
WISCONSIN	Grade 5	3	.
WISCONSIN	Grade 6	5	.
WISCONSIN	Grade 7	2	.
WISCONSIN	Grade 8	3	.
WISCONSIN	Grade 9	.	.
WISCONSIN	Kindergarten	.	.
WISCONSIN	Out of school	.	.
WISCONSIN	Total	42	.
WISCONSIN	Ungraded	.	.

### FAQs on Support Services:

a. What are support services? These MEP-funded educationally-related services are provided to students. These services include, but are not limited to, health, nutrition, counseling, and social services for migratory children; necessary educational supplies, and transportation. Activities related to identification and recruitment, parental involvement, professional development, program evaluation, and the one-time act of providing instructional or informational packets to a child or family does not constitute a support service.

b. What are counseling services? Services to help a student to better identify and enhance his or her educational, personal, or occupational potential; relate his or her abilities, emotions, and aptitudes to educational and career opportunities; utilize his or her abilities in formulating realistic plans; and achieve satisfying personal and social development. These activities take place between one or more counselors and one or more students as counsees, or between students and students in MEP peer-to-peer counseling activities, or between students and MEP-funded staff members. The services can also help the child address life problems or personal crisis that result from the culture of migrancy. NOTE: Children who receive a MEP-funded counseling service should be reported only once, regardless of frequency.

## 2.4.7 School Data during the Regular School Year

The following questions are about the enrollment of eligible migratory children in schools during the regular school year.

### 2.4.7.1 Schools and Enrollment – During the Regular School Year

In the table below, provide the number of public schools that enrolled eligible migratory children at any time during the regular school year. Schools include public schools that serve school age (e.g., grades K through 12) children. Also, provide the number of eligible migratory children who were enrolled in those schools. Since more than one school in a State may enroll the same migratory child at some time during the regular school year, the number of children may include duplicates.

Populated with SCH-LEVEL FS165/DG110

State	Number of schools that enrolled eligible migratory children	Number of eligible migratory children enrolled in those schools
WISCONSIN	124	441

### 2.4.7.2 Schools Where MEP Funds Were Consolidated in SWPs – During the Regular School Year

In the table below, provide the number of schools where MEP funds were consolidated in an SWP. Also, provide the number of eligible migratory children who were enrolled in those schools at any time during the regular school year. Since more than one school in a State may enroll the same migratory child at some time during the regular school year, the number of children may include duplicates.

Populated with SCH-LEVEL FS165/DG110 and FS165/DG514



## **2.5 PREVENTION AND INTERVENTION PROGRAMS FOR CHILDREN AND YOUTH WHO ARE NEGLECTED, DELINQUENT, OR AT RISK**

This section collects data on programs and facilities that serve students who are neglected, delinquent, or at risk under Title I, Part D, and characteristics about and services provided to these students.

Throughout this section:

- Report data for the program year of July 1, 2019 through June 30, 2020.
- Count programs/facilities based on how the program was classified to ED for funding purposes.
- Do not include programs funded solely through Title I, Part A.
- Use the definitions listed below:
  - o Adult Corrections: An adult correctional institution is a facility in which persons, including persons 21 or under, are confined as a result of conviction for a criminal offense.
  - o At-Risk Programs: Programs operated (through LEAs) that target students who are at risk of academic failure, dependency adjudication, or delinquency adjudication, have a drug or alcohol problem, are pregnant or parenting, have been in contact with the juvenile justice or child welfare system in the past, are at least 1 year behind the expected age/grade level, are English learners, are gang members, have dropped out of school in the past, or have a high absenteeism rate at school.
  - o Juvenile Corrections: An institution for delinquent children and youth that is a public or private residential facility other than a foster home that is operated for the care of children and youth who have been adjudicated delinquent or in need of supervision. Include any programs serving adjudicated youth (including non-secure facilities and group homes) in this category.
  - o Juvenile Detention Facilities: Detention facilities are shorter-term institutions that provide care to children who require secure custody pending court adjudication, court disposition, or execution of a court order, or care to children after commitment.
  - o Neglected Programs: An institution for neglected children and youth is a public or private residential facility, other than a foster home, that is operated primarily for the care of children who have been committed to the institution or voluntarily placed under applicable State law due to abandonment, neglect, or death of their parents or guardians.
  - o Other: Any other programs, not defined above, that receive Title I, Part D funds and serve non-adjudicated children and youth.

### **2.5.1 State Agency Title I, Part D Programs and Facilities – Subpart 1**

The following questions collect data on Title I, Part D, Subpart 1 programs and facilities.

#### **2.5.1.1 Programs and Facilities - Subpart 1**

In the table below, provide the number of State agency Title I, Part D, Subpart 1 programs and facilities that serve neglected and delinquent students and the average length of stay by program/facility type, for these students. Report only programs and facilities that received Title I, Part D, Subpart 1 funding during the reporting year. Count a facility once if it offers only one type of program. If a facility offers more than one type of program (i.e., it is a multipurpose facility), then count each of the separate programs. The total number of programs/facilities will be automatically calculated. Below the table is a FAQ about the data collected in this table.

State Program or Facility Type	# Programs or Facilities	Average Length of Stay in Days
Adult corrections	8	143
Juvenile corrections	3	98
Juvenile detention	0	.
Neglected programs	0	.
Other programs	0	.
Total	11	.

### FAQ on Programs and Facilities - Subpart 1:

How is average length of stay calculated? The average length of stay should be weighted by number of students and should include the number of days, per visit, for each student enrolled during the reporting year, regardless of entry or exit date. Multiple visits for students who entered more than once during the reporting year can be included. The average length of stay in days should not exceed 365.

Data Quality Comments

### 2.5.1.2 Programs and Facilities That Reported - Subpart 1

In the table below, provide the number of State agency Title I, Part D, Subpart 1 programs/facilities that reported data on neglected and delinquent students. The total row will be automatically calculated.

State Program Facility Type	# Reporting Data
Adult corrections	8
Juvenile corrections	3
Juvenile detention	0
Neglected programs	0
Other programs	0
Total	11

Data Quality Comments

### 2.5.1.3 Students Served – Subpart 1

In the tables below, provide the number of neglected and delinquent students served in State agency Title I, Part D, Subpart 1 programs and facilities. Report only students who received Title I, Part D, Subpart 1 services during the reporting year. In the first table, provide in row 1 the unduplicated number of students served by each program, and in row 2, the total number of students in row 1 who are long-term. In the subsequent tables provide the number of students served by disability (IDEA) and EL status, by race/ethnicity, by sex, and by age. The total number of students by race/ethnicity, by sex and by age will be automatically calculated.

Populated with SEA-LEVEL FS119/DG656

State	# of Students Served	Neglected Programs	Juvenile Detention	Juvenile Corrections	Adult Corrections	Other Programs
WISCONSIN	Total Long-Term Students Served	.	.	151	276	.
WISCONSIN	Total Unduplicated Students Served	.	.	302	440	.

Provide the number of students served by special populations.

State	Student Subgroups	Neglected Programs	Juvenile Detention	Juvenile Corrections	Adult Corrections	Other Programs
WISCONSIN	Children with one or more disabilities (IDEA)	.	.	87	173	.
WISCONSIN	English learner	.	.	0	0	.

Provide the number of students served by race/ethnicity.

State	Race Ethnicity	Neglected Programs	Juvenile Detention	Juvenile Corrections	Adult Corrections	Other Programs
WISCONSIN	American Indian or Alaska Native	.	.	17	12	.
WISCONSIN	Asian	.	.	3	3	.
WISCONSIN	Black or African American	.	.	193	312	.
WISCONSIN	Hispanic or Latino	.	.	25	20	.
WISCONSIN	Native Hawaiian or Other Pacific	.	.	0	0	.
WISCONSIN	Total	.	.	302	440	.
WISCONSIN	Two or more races	.	.	1	13	.
WISCONSIN	White	.	.	63	80	.

Provide the number of students served by gender.

State	Sex	Neglected Programs	Juvenile Detention	Juvenile Corrections	Adult Corrections	Other Programs
WISCONSIN	Female	.	.	31	31	.
WISCONSIN	Male	.	.	271	409	.
WISCONSIN	Total	.	.	302	440	.

Provide the number of students served by age.

State	Age	Neglected Programs	Juvenile Detention	Juvenile Corrections	Adult Corrections	Other Programs
WISCONSIN	10 years old	.	.	0	0	.
WISCONSIN	11 years old	.	.	0	0	.
WISCONSIN	12 years old	.	.	0	0	.
WISCONSIN	13 years old	.	.	1	0	.
WISCONSIN	14 years old	.	.	4	0	.
WISCONSIN	15 years old	.	.	26	0	.
WISCONSIN	16 years old	.	.	48	0	.
WISCONSIN	17 years old	.	.	96	0	.
WISCONSIN	18 years old	.	.	79	16	.
WISCONSIN	19 years old	.	.	29	85	.
WISCONSIN	20 years old	.	.	12	164	.
WISCONSIN	21 years old	.	.	7	175	.
WISCONSIN	3 through 5	.	.	0	0	.
WISCONSIN	6 years old	.	.	0	0	.
WISCONSIN	7 years old	.	.	0	0	.
WISCONSIN	8 years old	.	.	0	0	.
WISCONSIN	9 years old	.	.	0	0	.
WISCONSIN	Total	.	.	302	440	.

**FAQ on Unduplicated Count:**

What is an unduplicated count? An unduplicated count is one that counts students only once, even if they were admitted to a facility or program multiple times within the reporting year.

**FAQ on long-term:**

What is long-term? Long-term refers to students who were enrolled for at least 90 consecutive calendar days from July 1, 2019 through June 30, 2020.

### 2.5.1.4 Academic, Career and Technical Outcomes While in the State Agency Program/Facility or Within 90 Calendar Days after Exit

In the tables below, for each program type, provide the number of students who attained academic, career, and technical outcomes.

The first table includes outcomes a student is able to achieve only after exit. In this table, provide the unduplicated number of students who enrolled, or planned to enroll, in their local district school within 90 calendar days after exiting. A student may be reported only once, per program type.

The second table includes outcomes a student is able to achieve only one time. In this table, provide the unduplicated number of students who attained the listed outcomes either in the while enrolled in the State agency program/facility column (“in fac.”) or in the within 90 calendar days after exiting column. A student may be reported only once across the two time periods, per program type.

The third table includes outcomes a student may achieve more than once. In the “in fac.” column, provide the unduplicated number of students who attained academic, career and technical outcomes while enrolled in the State agency program/facility. In the “90 days after exit” column provide the unduplicated number of students who attained academic, career, and technical outcomes within 90 calendar days after exiting. If a student attained an outcome once in the program/facility and once during the 90–day transition period, that student may be reported once in each column.

Populated with SEA-LEVEL FS180/DG783 and FS181/DG785

State	Outcomes (once per student, only after exit)	Neglected Programs	Juvenile Detention	Juvenile Corrections	Adult Corrections	Other Programs
WISCONSIN	Enrolled in local district school	.	.	16	0	.

State	Outcomes	Neglected Programs - In Fac	Neglected Programs - 90 Days After Exit	Juvenile Detention - In Fac	Juvenile Detention - 90 Days After Exit	Juvenile Corrections - In Fac
WISCONSIN	Earned a GED	.	.	.	.	17
WISCONSIN	Earned high school course credits	.	.	.	.	204
WISCONSIN	Enrolled in a GED program	.	.	.	.	32
WISCONSIN	Enrolled in job training courses/programs	.	.	.	.	0
WISCONSIN	Obtained employment	.	.	.	.	0
WISCONSIN	Obtained high school diploma	.	.	.	.	4
WISCONSIN	Were accepted and/or enrolled into post-secondary education	.	.	.	.	0

State	Outcomes	Juvenile Corrections - 90 Days After Exit	Adult Corrections - In Fac	Adult Corrections - 90 Days After Exit	Other Programs - In Fac	Other Programs - 90 Days After Exit
WISCONSIN	Earned a GED	0	49	0	.	.
WISCONSIN	Earned high school course credits	0	0	0	.	.
WISCONSIN	Enrolled in a GED program	0	431	0	.	.
WISCONSIN	Enrolled in job training courses/programs	0	132	0	.	.
WISCONSIN	Obtained employment	0	0	0	.	.
WISCONSIN	Obtained high school diploma	0	0	0	.	.
WISCONSIN	Were accepted and/or enrolled into post-secondary education	0	116	0	.	.

## 2.5.2 Academic Performance – Subpart 1

The following questions collect data on the academic performance of neglected and delinquent long-term students served by Title I, Part D, Subpart 1 in reading and mathematics.

### 2.5.2.1 Academic Performance in Reading – Subpart 1

In the table below, provide the unduplicated number of long-term students served by Title I, Part D, Subpart 1, who participated in reading pre-and post-testing. Students should be reported in only one of the four change categories.

Report only information on a student's most recent testing data. Students who were pre-tested prior to July 1, 2019, may be included if their post-test was administered during the reporting year. Students who were post-tested after the reporting year ended should be counted in the following year. Below the table is an FAQ about the data collected in this table.

Populated with SEA-LEVEL FS113/DG628

State	Performance Data (Based on most recent pre post-test data)	Neglected Programs	Juvenile Detention	Juvenile Corrections	Adult Corrections	Other Programs
WISCONSIN	More than one full grade	.	.	12	19	.
WISCONSIN	Negative change	.	.	9	2	.
WISCONSIN	No Change	.	.	28	32	.
WISCONSIN	Total	.	.	64	70	.
WISCONSIN	Up to one full grade	.	.	15	17	.

### 2.5.2.2 Academic Performance in Mathematics – Subpart 1

In the table below, provide the unduplicated number of long-term students served by Title I, Part D, Subpart 1, who participated in mathematics pre-and post-testing. Students should be reported in only one of the four change categories.

Report only information on a student's most recent testing data. Students who were pre-tested prior to July 1, 2019, may be included if their post-test was administered during the reporting year. Students who were post-tested after the reporting year ended should be counted in the following year.

Populated with SEA-LEVEL FS113/DG628

State	Performance Data (Based on most recent pre post-test data)	Neglected Programs	Juvenile Detention	Juvenile Corrections	Adult Corrections	Other Programs
WISCONSIN	More than one full grade	.	.	10	11	.
WISCONSIN	Negative change	.	.	4	3	.
WISCONSIN	No Change	.	.	21	49	.
WISCONSIN	Total	.	.	49	72	.
WISCONSIN	Up to one full grade	.	.	14	9	.



## 2.5.3 LEA Title I, Part D Programs and Facilities – Subpart 2

The following questions collect data on Title I, Part D, Subpart 2 programs and facilities.

### 2.5.3.1 Programs and Facilities – Subpart 2

In the table below, provide the number of LEA Title I, Part D, Subpart 2 programs and facilities that serve neglected and delinquent students and the yearly average length of stay by program/facility type for these students. Report only the programs and facilities that received Title I, Part D, Subpart 2 funding during the reporting year. Count a facility once if it offers only one type of program. If a facility offers more than one type of program (i.e., it is a multipurpose facility), then count each of the separate programs. The total number of programs/ facilities will be automatically calculated. Below the table is an FAQ about the data collected in this table.

LEA Program or Facility Type	# Programs or Facilities	Average Length of Stay (# days)
At-risk programs	0	.
Juvenile corrections	10	214
Juvenile detention	10	39
Neglected programs	3	277
Other programs	1	108
Total	24	.

#### FAQ on average length of stay:

How is average length of stay calculated? The average length of stay should be weighted by number of students and should include the number of days, per visit for each student enrolled during the reporting year, regardless of entry or exit date. Multiple visits for students who entered more than once during the reporting year can be included. The average length of stay in days should not exceed 365.

#### Data Quality Comments

Norris Adolescent Center has a delinquent residential facility but also operates as its own LEA and serves other students. Because of the unique situation, the Wisconsin Department of Public Instruction determined that the Norris Adolescent Center did not fit into any of the predetermined CSPR classifications and therefore classified it under ""Other"".

### 2.5.3.2 Programs and Facilities That Reported - Subpart 2

In the table below, provide the number of LEA Title I, Part D, Subpart 2 programs and facilities that reported data on neglected and delinquent students. The total row will be automatically calculated.

LEA Program or Facility Type	# Reporting Data
At-risk programs	0
Juvenile corrections	10
Juvenile detention	10
Neglected programs	3
Other programs	1
Total	24

Data Quality Comments

### 2.5.3.3 Students Served – Subpart 2

In the tables below, provide the number of neglected and delinquent students served in LEA Title I, Part D, Subpart 2 programs and facilities. Report only students who received Title I, Part D, Subpart 2 services during the reporting year. In the first table, provide in row 1 the unduplicated number of students served by each program, and in row 2, the total number of students in row 1 who are long-term. In the subsequent tables, provide the number of students served by disability (IDEA), and EL status, by race/ethnicity, by sex, and by age. The total number of students by race/ethnicity, by sex, and by age will be automatically calculated.

Populated with LEA-LEVEL FS127/DG657

State	# of students served	At-Risk Programs	Neglected Programs	Juvenile Detention	Juvenile Corrections	Other Programs
WISCONSIN	Total Long-Term Students Served	.	171	193	702	18
WISCONSIN	Total Unduplicated Students Served	.	262	1466	929	28

Provide the number of students served by special populations.

State	Student Subgroups	At-Risk Programs	Neglected Programs	Juvenile Detention	Juvenile Corrections	Other Programs
WISCONSIN	Children with one or more disabilities (IDEA)	.	214	618	554	19
WISCONSIN	English learner	.	2	108	8	0

Provide the number of students served by race/ethnicity.

State	Race Ethnicity	At-Risk Programs	Neglected Programs	Juvenile Detention	Juvenile Corrections	Other Programs
WISCONSIN	American Indian or Alaska Native	.	14	45	36	1
WISCONSIN	Asian	.	7	18	10	0
WISCONSIN	Black or African American	.	32	773	404	9
WISCONSIN	Hispanic or Latino	.	8	134	55	1
WISCONSIN	Native Hawaiian or Other Pacific	.	0	1	1	1
WISCONSIN	Total	.	262	1466	929	28
WISCONSIN	Two or more races	.	21	64	61	0
WISCONSIN	White	.	180	431	362	16

Provide the number of students served by sex.

State	Sex	At-Risk Programs	Neglected Programs	Juvenile Detention	Juvenile Corrections	Other Programs
WISCONSIN	Female	.	89	314	176	0
WISCONSIN	Male	.	173	1152	753	28
WISCONSIN	Total	.	262	1466	929	28

Provide the number of students served by age.

State	Age	At-Risk Programs	Neglected Programs	Juvenile Detention	Juvenile Corrections	Other Programs
WISCONSIN	10 years old	.	14	4	10	0
WISCONSIN	11 years old	.	11	9	13	0
WISCONSIN	12 years old	.	17	34	47	0
WISCONSIN	13 years old	.	20	98	67	1
WISCONSIN	14 years old	.	21	191	204	4
WISCONSIN	15 years old	.	39	305	172	9
WISCONSIN	16 years old	.	45	393	189	5
WISCONSIN	17 years old	.	29	327	170	9
WISCONSIN	18 years old	.	16	68	30	0
WISCONSIN	19 years old	.	8	20	17	0
WISCONSIN	20 years old	.	7	16	4	0
WISCONSIN	21 years old	.	8	1	3	0
WISCONSIN	3 through 5	.	0	0	0	0
WISCONSIN	6 years old	.	4	0	0	0
WISCONSIN	7 years old	.	3	0	0	0
WISCONSIN	8 years old	.	10	0	0	0
WISCONSIN	9 years old	.	10	0	3	0
WISCONSIN	Total	.	262	1466	929	28

**FAQ on Unduplicated Count:**

What is an unduplicated count? An unduplicated count is one that counts students only once, even if they were admitted to a facility or program multiple times within the reporting year.

**FAQ on long-term:**

What is long-term? Long-term refers to students who were enrolled for at least 90 consecutive calendar days from July 1, 2019 through June 30, 2020.

### 2.5.3.4 Academic, Career and Technical Outcomes While in the LEA Program/Facility or Within 90 Calendar Days After Exit

In the tables below, for each program type, provide the number of students who attained academic, career and technical outcomes.

The first table includes outcomes a student is able to achieve only after exit. In this table, provide the unduplicated number of students who enrolled, or planned to enroll, in their local district school within 90 calendar days after exiting. A student may be reported only once, per program type.

The second table includes outcomes a student is able to achieve only one time. In this table, provide the unduplicated number of students who attained the listed outcomes either in the while enrolled in the LEA program/facility column (“in fac.”) or in the within 90 calendar days after exiting column. A student may be reported only once across the two time periods, per program type.

The third table includes outcomes a student may achieve more than once. In the “in fac.” column, provide the unduplicated number of students who attained academic, career and vocational outcomes while enrolled in the LEA program/facility. In the “90 days after exit” column provide the unduplicated number of students who attained academic, career and vocational outcomes within 90 calendar days after exiting. If a student attained an outcome once in the program/facility and once during the 90 day transition period, that student may be reported once in each column.

Populated with LEA-LEVEL FS180/DG782 and FS181/DG784

State	Outcomes(once per student, only after exit)	At-Risk Programs	Neglected Programs	Juvenile Detention	Juvenile Corrections	Other Programs
WISCONSIN	Enrolled in local district school	.	57	345	516	9

State	Outcomes	At-Risk Programs - In Fac	At-Risk Programs - 90 Days After Exit	Neglected Programs - In Fac	Neglected Programs - 90 Days After Exit	Juvenile Detention - In Fac
WISCONSIN	Earned a GED	.	.	0	0	0
WISCONSIN	Earned high school course credits	.	.	45	18	739
WISCONSIN	Enrolled in a GED program	.	.	0	2	0
WISCONSIN	Enrolled in job training courses/programs	.	.	27	3	25
WISCONSIN	Obtained employment	.	.	16	3	9
WISCONSIN	Obtained high school diploma	.	.	10	0	35
WISCONSIN	Were accepted and/or enrolled into post-secondary education	.	.	23	6	4

State	Outcomes	Juvenile Detention - 90 Days After Exit	Juvenile Corrections - In Fac	Juvenile Corrections - 90 Days After Exit	Other Programs - In Fac	Other Programs - 90 Days After Exit
WISCONSIN	Earned a GED	1	2	0	0	0
WISCONSIN	Earned high school course credits	41	531	85	18	17
WISCONSIN	Enrolled in a GED program	5	5	2	0	0
WISCONSIN	Enrolled in job training courses/programs	5	53	1	0	0
WISCONSIN	Obtained employment	17	9	30	0	0
WISCONSIN	Obtained high school diploma	21	8	1	1	0
WISCONSIN	Were accepted and/or enrolled into post-secondary education	2	3	1	0	0

### 2.5.3.5 Academic Performance – Subpart 2

The following questions collect data on the academic performance of neglected and delinquent long-term students served by Title I, Part D, Subpart 2 in reading and mathematics.

#### 2.5.3.5.1 Academic Performance in Reading – Subpart 2

In the table below, provide the unduplicated number of long-term students served by Title I, Part D, Subpart 2, who participated in reading pre- and post-testing. Students should be reported in only one of the four change categories. Reporting pre- and post-test data for at-risk students in the table below is optional.

Report only information on a student's most recent testing data. Students who were pre-tested prior to July 1, 2019, may be included if their post-test was administered during the reporting year. Students who were post-tested after the reporting year ended should be counted in the following year. Below the table is an FAQ about the data collected in this table.

Populated with LEA-LEVEL FS125/DG629

State	Performance Data(Based on most recent pre post-test data)	At-Risk Programs	Neglected Programs	Juvenile Detention	Juvenile Corrections	Other Programs
WISCONSIN	More than one full grade	.	28	41	167	4
WISCONSIN	Negative change	.	7	11	30	2
WISCONSIN	No change	.	71	14	25	1
WISCONSIN	Total	.	144	98	377	17
WISCONSIN	Up to one full grade	.	38	32	155	10

#### FAQ on long-term:

What is long-term? Long-term refers to students who were enrolled for at least 90 consecutive calendar days from July 1, 2019, through June 30, 2020.

Is reporting pre/post-test data for at-risk programs required? No, reporting pre/post-test data for at-risk students is no longer required, but States have the option to continue to collect and report it within the CSPR.

### 2.5.3.5.2 Academic Performance in Mathematics – Subpart 2

In the table below, provide the unduplicated number of long-term students served by Title I, Part D, Subpart 2, who participated in mathematics pre- and post-testing. Students should be reported in only one of the four change categories. Reporting pre- and post-test data for at-risk students in the table below is optional.

Report only information on a student's most recent testing data. Students who were pre-tested prior to July 1, 2019, may be included if their post-test was administered during the reporting year. Students who were post-tested after the reporting year ended should be counted in the following year.

Populated with LEA-LEVEL FS125/DG629

State	Performance Data(Based on most recent pre post-test data)	At-Risk Programs	Neglected Programs	Juvenile Detention	Juvenile Corrections	Other Programs
WISCONSIN	More than one full grade	.	20	19	154	4
WISCONSIN	Negative change	.	5	11	24	0
WISCONSIN	No change	.	86	19	32	0
WISCONSIN	Total	.	144	97	388	15
WISCONSIN	Up to one full grade	.	33	48	178	11



## 2.6 STUDENT SUPPORT AND ACADEMIC ENRICHMENT GRANTS (TITLE IV, PART A)

### 2.6.1 Funds Spent Under Title IV, Part A

This section collects data on the amount of funds spent by LEAs on the three content areas under Title IV, Part A of the ESEA.

Content Area	Amount of Funds Spent
Well-Rounded	\$8,261,032
Safe and Healthy Students	\$6,635,647
Effective Use of Technology	\$761,148

#### Data Quality Comments

Please note that the above amounts represent budgeted amounts by Content Area, rather than amounts spent. The State of Wisconsin was not able to track expenditures by Content Area in 19-20. The State is working on updating the claiming process for Title IV-A so that it will be able to track expenditures by Content Area in upcoming years.

### 2.6.2 LEAs Who Spent Funds Under Title IV, Part A

This section collects data on the number of LEAs who spent funds by the content areas under Title IV, Part A of the ESEA. For the “Any” category, report the number of LEAs that spent funds in any of the three content areas. An LEA should be included in the count of each content area it spent funds on (i.e. an LEA may be represented in more than one content area in the table below).

Content Area	Number of LEAs Spending Funds
Well-Rounded	368
Safe and Healthy Students	272
Effective Use of Technology	127
Any Content Area	431

#### Data Quality Comments

--

## 2.7 FUNDING TRANSFERABILITY FOR STATE AND LOCAL EDUCATIONAL AGENCIES (TITLE V, PART A)

### 2.7.1 State Transferability of Funds

In the table below, indicate whether the State transferred funds under the state transferability authority.

<b>Did the State transfer funds under the State Transferability authority of Section 5103(a) during SY2019-20?</b>
No

<b>Data Quality Comments</b>

### 2.7.2 Local Educational Agency (LEA) Transferability of Funds

In the table below, indicate the number of LEAs that notified the State that they transferred funds under the LEA transferability authority.

<b>LEAs that notified the State that they were transferring funds under the LEA Transferability authority of Section 5103(b).</b>
5

<b>Data Quality Comments</b>

### 2.7.3 LEA Funds Transfers

In the table below, provide the total number of LEAs that transferred funds from an eligible program to another eligible program.

Program	# LEAs Transferring Funds FROM Eligible Program	# LEAs Transferring Funds TO Eligible Program
Education of Migratory Children (Title I, Part C)	.	0
English Language Acquisition, Language Enhancement, and Academic Achievement Act (Title III, Part A)	.	0
Improving Basic Programs Operated by LEAs (Title I, Part A)	.	5
Prevention and Intervention Programs for Children and Youth Who Are Neglected, Delinquent, or At-Risk (Title I, Part D)	.	0
Rural Education Initiative (Title V, Part B)	.	0
Student Support and Enrichment Grants (Title IV, Part A)	5	0
Supporting Effective Instruction (Title II, Part A)	0	0

Data Quality Comments

In the table below provide the total amount of FY 2019 appropriated funds transferred from and to each eligible program.

<b>Program</b>	<b>Total Amount of Funds Transferred FROM Eligible Program</b>	<b>Total Amount of Funds Transferred TO Eligible Program</b>
Education of Migratory Children (Title I, Part C)	.	\$0
English Language Acquisition, Language Enhancement, and Academic Achievement Act (Title III, Part A)	.	\$0
Improving Basic Programs Operated by LEAs (Title I, Part A)	.	\$247,528
Prevention and Intervention Programs for Children and Youth Who Are Neglected, Delinquent, or At-Risk (Title I, Part D)	.	\$0
Rural Education Initiative (Title V, Part B)	.	\$0
Student Support and Enrichment Grants (Title IV, Part A)	\$247,528	\$0
Supporting Effective Instruction (Title II, Part A)	\$0	\$0

<b>Data Quality Comments</b>

## 2.8 RURAL EDUCATION ACHIEVEMENT PROGRAM (REAP)

This section collects data on the Rural Education Achievement Program (REAP) Title V, Part B, Subparts 1 and 2.

### 2.8.1 LEA Use of Rural Low-Income Schools Program (RLIS) (Title V, Part B, Subpart 2) Grant Funds

In the table below, provide the number of eligible LEAs that used RLIS funds during SY2019-20 for each of the listed purposes.

Purpose	# LEAs
Activities authorized under Part A of Title I	7
Activities authorized under Part A of Title II	8
Activities authorized under Title III	2
Activities authorized under Part A of Title IV	17
Parental involvement activities	4

Data Quality Comments

## 2.8.2 RLIS Objectives and Outcomes

In the space below, describe the progress the State has made in meeting the objectives and outcomes for the Rural Low-Income School (RLIS) Program as described in the State's most current Consolidated State Application. If providing quantitative data along with your narrative, please ensure all data is converted to text format.

Comments
<p>Nineteen school districts in Wisconsin were eligible for RLIS for the 2019-20 school year. The goal of the RLIS program is to provide rural, high-poverty school districts with funds that can be used to meet a variety of objectives, giving the districts the flexibility to direct those funds where they decide they are most needed. Following is a summary of how districts used their 2019-20 funds, as reported in their application budgets and subsequent claims: (Note: many districts used their grants in more than one area.) Professional development for teachers: 10 Computers and related equipment: 3 Textbooks: 2 Salary bonuses for teachers: 1 Teacher salaries After-school coaches/tutors: 2 Summer reading program staff: 1 Professional development books: 1 Curriculum software for reading instruction: 1 Subscriptions to teaching software and other resources: 2 It is difficult to supply statistical data on the impact of this grant for several reasons. Districts use the funds for many different purposes, so there is not one set of expected outcomes. Further, only a few districts have received the grant for several consecutive years, so there is little longitudinal data. Finally, it would be questionable to try to attribute measurable improvements in academic areas to the impact of this small grant. Nevertheless, it is clear that the grant is highly valued by the districts that receive it, and that it does fulfill the purpose for which it was intended to provide rural, high-poverty districts with additional resources and flexibility. This is especially evident from the districts' consistent use of much of the funding to supplement educational technology and professional development. Many rural districts are in danger of falling behind in these rapidly evolving aspects of instructional methodology.</p>

### 2.8.3 RLIS Technical Assistance

In the space below, describe the progress the State has made in providing technical assistance for RLIS LEA sub-grantees as described in the State's most current Consolidated State Application. If providing quantitative data along with your narrative, please ensure all data is converted to text format.

Comments
The Department of Public Instruction provided ongoing technical assistance as needed for RLIS LEA sub-grantees. The grant recipient districts were provided ongoing email communication from the Department regarding status and next steps during the entire grant cycle and application process, which included information on budgeting, revisions, and claims. A website with direct links for RLIS grant information was also available as a resource for their review. The Department also provided contact information □ voice and email contacts - so that districts could directly contact the grant representative or grant accountant as needed for assistance and answers to their specific technical questions. It was the Department's practice that support was provided and questions answered in a timely fashion. Districts can also receive additional WISEgrants technical assistance from WISEgrants technical support staff.

### 2.8.4 RLIS Subgrant Award Determination

Please report the method the SEA used to award grants to eligible LEAs. If the SEA used a competitive process, please describe that process and include a description of the methods and criteria the SEA used to review applications, award funds to LEAs, and how the LEAs were notified of the process. If the SEA used a formula besides one based on the number of students in average daily attendance served by eligible LEAs in the State, please describe that formula, including an explanation of how this alternative formula enables the SEA to allot grant funds in a manner that serves equal or greater concentrations of children from families with incomes below the poverty line, relative to the concentration that would be served if the SEA used a formula based on the number of students in average daily attendance served by eligible LEAs in the State.

Comments
Nineteen school districts in Wisconsin were eligible for RLIS for the 2019-20 school year. DPI contacted all eligible districts letting them know they could apply in WISEgrants. All 19 districts that qualified submitted applications and were awarded grants. The funding formula is based on the number of students in each district. The application in WISEgrants consists of a "narrative" question and a budget. In Wisconsin, funding is expected to be targeted at improving student achievement in reading and/or mathematics. Once the review process was complete, districts received notification through WISEgrants that their applications and budgets had been approved. The total allocation for 2019-20 was \$355,681.

## 2.8.5 RLIS State Administrative Funds

In the table below, provide information on state administrative funds.

Question	Percentage
What percentage of the RLIS grant funds were retained for State-level administration?	5
What percentage of those funds retained for State-level administration were used specifically for technical assistance?	20

Data Quality Comments

## 2.8.6 RLIS LEAs Awarded Funds

Please list the NCES LEA ID and name of each LEA that received RLIS funds and the amount each received.

Data published outside of report

Data Quality Comments

## 2.8.7 Small, Rural School Achievement (SRSA) Program, Alternative Fund Use Authority (AFUA)

Populated with LEA-LEVEL FS131/DG614

State	Number of SRSA- and Dual-eligible LEAs informed their SEA of an intent to utilize SRSA's AFUA, under Section 5211 of the ESEA.	Percent of SRSA- and Dual-eligible LEAs informed their SEA of an intent to utilize SRSA's AFUA, under Section 5211 of the ESEA.
WISCONSIN	0	0