

**CONSOLIDATED STATE PERFORMANCE REPORT:
Part II**

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

For reporting on
School Year 2018-19

Wisconsin



PART II DUE THURSDAY, MAY 28, 2020

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

INTRODUCTION

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 8303¹ of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act (ESEA), as amended by the Every Student Succeeds Act of 2015(ESSA)².

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.

¹ SEC.8303. Consolidated Reporting – (a) In general: In order to simplify reporting requirements and reduce reporting burdens, the Secretary shall establish procedures and criteria under which a State educational agency, in consultation with the Governor of the State, may submit a consolidated State annual report. (b) Contents: The report shall contain information about the programs included in the report, including the performance of the State under those programs, and other matters as the Secretary determines are necessary, such as monitoring activities. (c) Replacement: The report shall replace separate individual annual reports for the programs included in the consolidated State annual report.

² All citations to the ESEA in this document are to the ESEA, as amended by the ESSA.

| |
|-----------------------------|
| OMB Number: 1810-0724 |
| Expiration Date: 10/31/2022 |

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:

Part I, 2018-19 Part II, 2018-19

Name of State Educational Agency (SEA) Submitting This Report:

Wisconsin Dept of Public Instruction

Address:

Person to contact about this report:

Name:

Mike Thompson

Telephone:

608-266-3584

Fax:

608-266-5188

e-mail:

michael.thompson@dpi.wi.gov

Name of Authorizing State Official: (Print or Type):

Mike Thompson

Submitted Date and Time:

05/28/20 3:27:08 PM

2.1 ACCOUNTABILITY

2.1.1 School Performance on Accountability Indicators

The following indicators are collected through ESS and compiled in the EDEN036 report via the *EDFacts* Reporting System (ERS) and will be posted as an accompanying report for every State:

- LEA Name
- NCES LEA ID
- State LEA ID
- School Name
- NCES School ID
- State School ID
- Title I School Status - DG 22 (FS129)
- Academic achievement indicator status – DG 835 (FS200)
- Other academic indicator status DG 836 (FS201)
- Graduation rate indicator status – DG 834 (FS199)
- Progress achieving English language proficiency indicator status - DG 837 (FS205)
- School quality or student success indicator status – DG 838 (FS202)

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 II of the CSPR, a state user must run the 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 DOCX.

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

2.1.2 Schools Identified for Comprehensive Support and Improvement

In the table below, provide the number of schools identified for comprehensive support and improvement, overall and by reason identified.

| | Number of Schools | Number of Title I Schools | Number of non-Title I Schools |
|--|-------------------|---------------------------|-------------------------------|
| Lowest performing five percent of Title I schools | 60 | | |
| High schools failing to graduate one third or more of their students | 15 | 9 | 6 |
| Title I schools that have received additional targeted support under Section 1111(d)(2)(C) of the ESEA and that have not exited that status after a State-determined number of years | | | |
| Total Identified | 75 | | |

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

When referencing SY2019-20 school directory data, the above data are correct. It is worth noting that within FS212 submitted by Wisconsin DPI, 61 schools were identified as CSI: Lowest Performance. One school identified as such closed for the SY2019-20.

2.1.3 Schools Implementing Targeted Support and Improvement Plans

In the table below, provide the number of schools implementing targeted support and improvement plans.

| | Number of Schools | Number of Title I Schools | Number of non- Title I Schools |
|--|-------------------|---------------------------|--------------------------------|
| Schools with One or More Consistently Underperforming Subgroups of Students | 160 | 113 | 45 |
| Schools in which any Subgroup of Students, on its own, would lead to Identification Under ESEA Section 1111(c)(4)(D)(i)(I) (i.e., Schools Receiving Additional Targeted Support) | 60 | 48 | 11 |

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

The Number of Schools identified for TSI (160) and ATSI (60) match the data submitted by Wisconsin DPI in FS206.

However, it is worth noting that the sum of the parts (Number of Title I and non-Title I Schools) within each row does not equal the whole (Number of Schools) in each row.

Based on identification year data (SY2018-19), the breakdown is as follows:

- TSI Title I: 116 schools
- TSI non-Title I: 44 schools
- ATSI Title I: 49 schools
- ATSI non-Title I: 11 schools

Based on SY2019-20 school data:

- TSI Title I: 113 schools (one school closed SY2019-20)
- TSI non-Title I: 45 schools (one school with "MISSING" Title I status in FS129)
- ATSI Title I: 48 schools (one school closed SY2019-20)
- ATSI non-Title I: 11 schools

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. The data for this question are reported through *EDFacts* files and compiled in the EDEN012 "Section 1003 Allocations to LEAs and Schools" report in the *EDFacts* Reporting System (ERS).

- Name of LEA with One or More Schools Provided Assistance through Section 1003(a) of the *ESEA* Funds in SY 2018-19
- NCES LEA ID
- Amount of LEA's Section 1003(a) of the *ESEA* Allocation

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 II 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 DOCX.

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

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. The data for this question are reported through *EDFacts* files and compiled in the EDEN012 "Section 1003 Allocations to LEAs and Schools" report in the *EDFacts* Reporting System (ERS).

- Name of School Provided Assistance through Section 1003(a) of the *ESEA* Funds in SY 2018-19
- NCES School ID
- Amount of School's Section1003(a) of the *ESEA* Allocation

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 II 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 DOCX.

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

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.

| Student Group | # Students in Cohort | # of Graduates | Graduation Rate |
|--|----------------------|----------------|-----------------|
| All students | 66,024 | 59,457 | 90.05% |
| American Indian or Alaska Native | 748 | 589 | 78.74% |
| Asian or Pacific Islander | 2,577 | 2,366 | 91.81% |
| <i>Asian</i> | 2,523 | 2,321 | 91.99% |
| <i>Native Hawaiian or Other Pacific Islander</i> | 54 | 45 | 83.33% |
| Black or African American | 6,065 | 4,330 | 71.39% |
| Hispanic or Latino | 7,227 | 5,983 | 82.79% |
| White | 47,515 | 44,560 | 93.78% |
| Two or more races | 1,891 | 1,629 | 86.14% |
| Children with disabilities (<i>IDEA</i>) | 7,649 | 5,336 | 69.76% |
| English Learners | 2,283 | 1,703 | 74.59% |
| Economically disadvantaged students | 22,496 | 18,118 | 80.54% |
| Children in foster care | 349 | 186 | 53.30% |
| Children who are homeless | 1,532 | 1,045 | 68.21% |

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.

Comments: The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

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. If data are missing or incomplete, please explain in the comments.

| | # Enrolled in an IHE | # Not enrolled in an IHE | # for which data are unavailable | Total |
|--|----------------------|--------------------------|----------------------------------|--------|
| All students | 41,747 | | 19,974 | 61,721 |
| American Indian or Alaska Native | 301 | | 304 | 605 |
| Asian or Pacific Islander | 1,656 | | 625 | 2,281 |
| <i>Asian</i> | | | | |
| <i>Native Hawaiian or Other Pacific Islander</i> | 30 | | 20 | 50 |
| Black or African American | 2,217 | | 2,642 | 4,859 |
| Hispanic or Latino | 3,088 | | 2,802 | 5,890 |
| White | 33,493 | | 13,010 | 46,503 |
| Two or more races | 962 | | 571 | 1,533 |
| Children with disabilities (IDEA) | 2,047 | | 3,868 | 5,915 |
| English Learners | 552 | | 906 | 1,458 |
| Economically disadvantaged students | 9,561 | | 9,531 | 19,092 |

Comments: The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

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

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.

| Special Services or Programs | # Students Served |
|--|--------------------------|
| Children with disabilities (<i>IDEA</i>) | 68,334 |
| English learners | 34,733 |
| Homeless students | 14,136 |
| Migrant students | 241 |

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

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.

| Race/Ethnicity | # Students Served |
|---|--------------------------|
| American Indian or Alaska Native | 6,509 |
| Asian | 15,736 |
| Black or African American | 69,426 |
| Hispanic or Latino | 69,961 |
| Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander | 379 |
| White | 214,185 |
| Two or more races | 18,439 |
| Total | 394,675 |

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

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). The totals column by type of program will be automatically calculated.

| Age /Grade | Public TAS | Public SWP | Private | Local Neglected | Total |
|------------------------------------|-------------------|-------------------|----------------|------------------------|----------------|
| Age Birth through 2 | 2 | 49 | 0 | 0 | 51 |
| Age 3 through 5 (not Kindergarten) | 734 | 34,478 | 324 | 0 | 35,536 |
| K | 2,378 | 34,821 | 1,202 | 0 | 38,401 |
| 1 | 2,735 | 35,291 | 1,606 | 0 | 39,632 |
| 2 | 2,691 | 35,178 | 1,498 | 0 | 39,367 |
| 3 | 2,287 | 35,931 | 1,379 | 0 | 39,597 |
| 4 | 2,074 | 37,318 | 1,274 | 0 | 40,666 |
| 5 | 2,061 | 35,412 | 1,144 | 0 | 38,617 |
| 6 | 2,171 | 25,191 | 935 | 0 | 28,297 |
| 7 | 2,068 | 21,945 | 838 | 0 | 24,851 |
| 8 | 1,926 | 21,826 | 700 | 0 | 24,452 |
| 9 | 1,239 | 13,994 | 417 | 0 | 15,650 |
| 10 | 1,129 | 12,477 | 215 | 0 | 13,821 |
| 11 | 1,020 | 11,866 | 120 | 0 | 13,006 |
| 12 | 1,061 | 13,319 | 62 | 0 | 14,442 |
| Ungraded | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| TOTALS | 25,576 | 369,096 | 11,714 | 0 | 406,389 |

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

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, 2018 through August 31, 2019. 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 2.4.1.1 *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: The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

Concerns that have been addressed include a vendor services change for data reporting and submission to MSIX, moving from NGS, Longhorn Tech Services, Inc. software to MIS2000, MS/EdD software. After performing initial data checks and additional data checks prior to EdFacts submission, Wisconsin is satisfied with migrant data quality for reporting and submissions through our new vendor MS/EdD. Wisconsin also moved to a tablet Certificate of Eligibility (COE) with MIS2000, MS/EdD which has proved to be a significant improvement for the accuracy, reliability, and timeliness, of COE processing.

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, 2018 through August 31, 2019. 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.

| Age/Grade | Eligible Migratory Children |
|------------------------------------|------------------------------------|
| Age 3 through 5 (not Kindergarten) | 80 |
| K | 55 |
| 1 | 43 |
| 2 | 47 |
| 3 | 52 |
| 4 | 56 |
| 5 | 56 |
| 6 | 55 |
| 7 | 53 |
| 8 | 46 |
| 9 | 63 |
| 10 | 51 |
| 11 | 47 |
| 12 | 27 |
| Ungraded | 0 |
| Out-of-school | 2 |
| Total | 733 |

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

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: The response is limited to 8,000 characters.
No comment needed within parameter.

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, 2018 through August 31, 2019.

| Age/Grade | Eligible Migratory Children |
|---------------------|------------------------------------|
| Age Birth through 2 | 43 |

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

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, 2018 through August 31, 2019. 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).

| Age/Grade | Eligible Migratory Children Served by the MEP During the Summer/Intersession Term |
|------------------------------------|---|
| Age 3 through 5 (not Kindergarten) | 8 |
| K | 14 |
| 1 | 9 |
| 2 | 12 |
| 3 | 12 |
| 4 | 14 |
| 5 | 11 |
| 6 | 7 |
| 7 | 5 |
| 8 | 3 |
| 9 | 1 |
| 10 | 4 |
| 11 | 2 |
| 12 | 0 |
| Ungraded | 0 |
| Out-of-school | 0 |
| Total | 102 |

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

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: The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

2018-19 is the first performance period during which Wisconsin has exclusively operated under a new regional summer only service delivery model. We are encouraged that we were able to find and serve over 100 migratory children during the summer intersession. We will increase the number served in summer through strategies to improve family outreach and adjust programming to increase program participation. These strategies include designating specific family liaison staff for each region to encourage program participation in the spring before summer programming begins; adjusting program site coordination to be accessible to more areas; and formalizing partnerships with organizations serving preschool students and offering other services to migratory families.

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, 2018 through August 31, 2019. 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).

| Age/Grade | Eligible Migratory Children Served by the MEP During the Summer/Intersession Term |
|---------------------|---|
| Age Birth through 2 | 0 |

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

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: The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

Wisconsin's migratory children are recorded and managed using a centralized database, Wisconsin's MIS2000 software, beginning with an electronic tablet COE. 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 2018-2019 Performance Period (September 1, 2018 – August 31, 2019) by checking one or more of the following dates: enrollment date, residency date, recertification/residency verification date, or withdrawal date between 9/1/2018 and 8/31/2019.
- 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 9/2/2015) of his/her residency date which occurs between 9/1/2018 and 8/31/2019
- 4) If a Graduation/High School Equivalency Diploma (HSED) date is on the system for a previous reporting period or entered during the 2018-2019 performance period that the child's residency is checked against the Graduation/HSED date.
- 5) If a Continuation of Services (COS) date is on the system for during the 2018-2019 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. Wisconsin has 1 full time, and 2 part time recruiters. DPI MEP also utilized an MEP Education Consultant and former recruiter to conduct interviews for eligibility during our busy season. All recruiters have more than five years of experience in 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 your State for at least 1 day during the performance period (September 1 through August 31):

In addition to ID&R, and summer program reporting, 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 only 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 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 a statewide 100% review of local data entry into the Wisconsin MIS2000 software, as well as 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 EDFacts 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. 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 records match process a part of the 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? See the Office of Migrant Education's CSPR Rating Instrument for the criteria needed to address this question. Please respond in the table below.

| Accuracy of EDFacts Data Files | Yes/No |
|--|--------|
| The State deployed a process that ensured that it transmits accurate migrant data to the Department in every required EDFacts data file. | YES |

| Use of MSIX to Verify Data Quality | Yes/No |
|---|--------|
| 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: The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

For data quality purposes the state migrant data administrator, in partnership with our MIS2000 vendor, uses MSIX Data Quality and Child Count Reconciliation reports to monitor data accuracy for system uploads. Recruiters, Wisconsin DPI MEP staff, school districts, and summer migrant program staff, utilize MSIX to verify eligibility and accuracy of student information.

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

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. | 120 |
| The number of eligibility determinations sampled for which a re-interview was completed. | 79 |
| The number of eligibility determinations sampled for which a re-interview was completed and the child was found eligible. | 79 |

| Procedures | SY |
|---|-----------|
| 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. | 2018-2019 |

Comments: The response is limited to 8,000 characters.
N/A

FAQ on independent prospective re-interviews:

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 | Re-interview Method |
|--|-------------------------|
| Select how the re-interviews were conducted: Face-to-face re-interviews Phone Interviews Both | Face-to-face interviews |

| Obtaining Data from Families | Yes/No |
|---|--------|
| 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 SY 2018-19.

Comments: The response is limited to 8,000 characters.
The State of Wisconsin contracted with an external, out-of-state, independent reviewer with detailed knowledge of the Migrant Education Program (MEP) and many years of experience as a migrant educator, migrant program administrator, and independent consultant, who has conducted independent re-interviews for several states.

The independent reviewer who conducted the re-interviews was a different person than the person(s) who completed the original Certificates of Eligibility (COEs).

MIS2000 technical support staff generated a random sample for the Wisconsin MEP. The sample consisted of a list of randomly selected children found to be eligible during the school year 2018-2019. The State provided this sample, along with a copy of the COEs completed for all children generated through the random sampling process, to the re-interviewer.

State MEP staff provided logistical support and assisted the independent re-interviewer in locating the families to be interviewed. State MEP staff did not interfere in the re-interviewing process and allowed the re-interviewer to independently make his determinations.

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: The response is limited to 8,000 characters.
N/A

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

| | Yes/No |
|---|--------|
| Does the state collect all the required data elements and data sections on the National Certificate of Eligibility (COE)? | YES |

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

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.

| Age/Grade | Priority for Services During the Performance Period |
|------------------------------------|---|
| Age 3 through 5 (not Kindergarten) | 3 |
| K | 9 |
| 1 | 3 |
| 2 | 4 |
| 3 | 4 |
| 4 | 4 |
| 5 | 6 |
| 6 | 1 |
| 7 | |
| 8 | |
| 9 | |
| 10 | 1 |
| 11 | |
| 12 | |
| Ungraded | |
| Out-of-school | |
| Total | 35 |

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

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.

| Age/Grade | ELs During the Performance Period |
|------------------------------------|--|
| Age 3 through 5 (not Kindergarten) | 14 |
| K | 30 |
| 1 | 28 |
| 2 | 33 |
| 3 | 31 |
| 4 | 42 |
| 5 | 29 |
| 6 | 33 |
| 7 | 26 |
| 8 | 18 |
| 9 | 25 |
| 10 | 21 |
| 11 | 22 |
| 12 | 12 |
| Ungraded | |
| Out-of-school | |
| Total | 364 |

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

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.

| Age/Grade | Children with Disabilities (<i>IDEA</i>) During the Performance Period |
|------------------------------------|---|
| Age Birth through 2 | |
| Age 3 through 5 (not Kindergarten) | 3 |
| K | 2 |
| 1 | 1 |
| 2 | 1 |
| 3 | 6 |
| 4 | 6 |
| 5 | |
| 6 | 2 |
| 7 | 2 |
| 8 | 4 |
| 9 | 3 |
| 10 | |
| 11 | 1 |
| 12 | 1 |
| Ungraded | |
| Out-of-school | |
| Total | 32 |

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

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, 2019 (i.e., QAD during the performance period). The total is calculated automatically.

| Age/Grade | QAD During the Performance Period |
|------------------------------------|-----------------------------------|
| Age Birth through 2 | 41 |
| Age 3 through 5 (not Kindergarten) | 62 |
| K | 29 |
| 1 | 20 |
| 2 | 22 |
| 3 | 23 |
| 4 | 31 |
| 5 | 27 |
| 6 | 26 |
| 7 | 33 |
| 8 | 22 |
| 9 | 36 |
| 10 | 34 |
| 11 | 25 |
| 12 | 7 |
| Ungraded | |
| Out-of-school | 2 |
| Total | 440 |

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

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.

| Grade | Dropouts During the Performance Period |
|----------|--|
| 7 | 1 |
| 8 | 0 |
| 9 | 0 |
| 10 | 0 |
| 11 | 1 |
| 12 | 0 |
| Ungraded | |
| Total | 2 |

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

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 2018-19 performance period, (2) were not enrolled at the beginning of the current (2018-19) 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 2018-19 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).

| Obtain HSED | # |
|---|----------|
| Obtained a HSED in your State During the Performance Period | 0 |

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

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.

| Age/Grade | Served During the Performance Period |
|------------------------------------|--------------------------------------|
| Age Birth through 2 | 0 |
| Age 3 through 5 (not Kindergarten) | 8 |
| K | 14 |
| 1 | 9 |
| 2 | 12 |
| 3 | 12 |
| 4 | 14 |
| 5 | 11 |
| 6 | 7 |
| 7 | 5 |
| 8 | 3 |
| 9 | 1 |
| 10 | 4 |
| 11 | 2 |
| 12 | 0 |
| Ungraded | 0 |
| Out-of-school | 0 |
| Total | 102 |

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

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.

| Age/Grade | Priority for Services During the Performance Period |
|------------------------------------|---|
| Age 3 through 5 (not Kindergarten) | 3 |
| K | 9 |
| 1 | 3 |
| 2 | 4 |
| 3 | 4 |
| 4 | 4 |
| 5 | 6 |
| 6 | |
| 7 | |
| 8 | |
| 9 | |
| 10 | |
| 11 | |
| 12 | |
| Ungraded | |
| Out-of-school | |
| Total | 33 |

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

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.

| Age/Grade | Continuation of Services During the Performance Period |
|------------------------------------|--|
| Age 3 through 5 (not Kindergarten) | |
| K | |
| 1 | |
| 2 | |
| 3 | |
| 4 | |
| 5 | |
| 6 | |
| 7 | |
| 8 | |
| 9 | |
| 10 | |
| 11 | |
| 12 | |
| Ungraded | |
| Out-of-school | |
| Total | |

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

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.

| Age/Grade | Instructional Service During the Performance Period |
|------------------------------------|---|
| Age Birth through 2 | |
| Age 3 through 5 (not Kindergarten) | 8 |
| K | 14 |
| 1 | 9 |
| 2 | 12 |
| 3 | 12 |
| 4 | 13 |
| 5 | 11 |
| 6 | 7 |
| 7 | 5 |
| 8 | 3 |
| 9 | 1 |
| 10 | 4 |
| 11 | 2 |
| 12 | |
| Ungraded | |
| Out-of-school | |
| Total | 101 |

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

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.

| Age/Grade | Reading Instruction During the Performance Period | Mathematics Instruction During the Performance Period | High School Credit Accrual During the Performance Period |
|------------------------------------|--|--|---|
| Age Birth through 2 | | | |
| Age 3 through 5 (not Kindergarten) | 8 | 8 | |
| K | 14 | 14 | |
| 1 | 9 | 9 | |
| 2 | 12 | 12 | |
| 3 | 12 | 12 | |
| 4 | 12 | 13 | |
| 5 | 11 | 10 | |
| 6 | 7 | 7 | |
| 7 | 5 | 5 | |
| 8 | 3 | 3 | |
| 9 | 1 | | 1 |
| 10 | 4 | 3 | 1 |
| 11 | 2 | 1 | 1 |
| 12 | | | |
| Ungraded | | | |
| Out-of-school | | | |
| Total | 100 | 97 | 3 |

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

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.

| Age/Grade | Support Services During the Performance Period | Breakout of Counseling Services During the Performance Period |
|------------------------------------|---|--|
| Age Birth through 2 | | |
| Age 3 through 5 (not Kindergarten) | 5 | |
| K | 7 | |
| 1 | 7 | |
| 2 | 8 | |
| 3 | 9 | |
| 4 | 11 | |
| 5 | 8 | |
| 6 | 7 | |
| 7 | 5 | |
| 8 | 2 | |
| 9 | 1 | |
| 10 | 3 | |
| 11 | 1 | |
| 12 | | |
| Ungraded | | |
| Out-of-school | | |
| Total | 74 | |

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

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 counselees, 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.

| Schools | # |
|---|-----|
| Number of schools that enrolled eligible migratory children | 100 |
| Number of eligible migratory children enrolled in those schools | 487 |

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

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.

| Schools | # |
|---|----------|
| Number of schools where MEP funds were consolidated in a schoolwide program | |
| Number of eligible migratory children enrolled in those schools | |

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

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, 2018 through June 30, 2019.
- 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:
 - **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.
 - **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.
 - **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.
 - **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.
 - **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.
 - **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/Facility Type | # Programs/Facilities | Average Length of Stay in Days |
|-----------------------------|-----------------------|--------------------------------|
| Neglected programs | 0 | 0 |
| Juvenile detention | 0 | 0 |
| Juvenile corrections | 3 | 92 |
| Adult corrections | 10 | 146 |
| Other | 0 | 0 |
| Total | 13 | |

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

FAQ on Programs and Facilities - Subpart I:

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.

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 |
|------------------------------------|-------------------------|
| Neglected programs | 0 |
| Juvenile detention | 0 |
| Juvenile corrections | 3 |
| Adult corrections | 10 |
| Other | 0 |
| Total | 13 |

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

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.

| # of Students Served | Neglected Programs | Juvenile Detention | Juvenile Corrections | Adult Corrections | Other Programs |
|------------------------------------|--------------------|--------------------|----------------------|-------------------|----------------|
| Total Unduplicated Students Served | | | 371 | 513 | |
| Total Long Term Students Served | | | 160 | 344 | |

Provide the number of students served by special populations

| Student Subgroups | Neglected Programs | Juvenile Detention | Juvenile Corrections | Adult Corrections | Other Programs |
|--|--------------------|--------------------|----------------------|-------------------|----------------|
| Children with disabilities (<i>IDEA</i>) | | | 117 | 193 | |
| English Learners (ELs) | | | 0 | 0 | |

Provide the number of students served by race/ethnicity.

| Race/Ethnicity | Neglected Programs | Juvenile Detention | Juvenile Corrections | Adult Corrections | Other Programs |
|---|--------------------|--------------------|----------------------|-------------------|----------------|
| American Indian or Alaska Native | | | 13 | 13 | |
| Asian | | | 3 | 2 | |
| Black or African American | | | 242 | 355 | |
| Hispanic or Latino | | | 34 | 24 | |
| Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander | | | 0 | 0 | |
| White | | | 74 | 91 | |
| Two or more races | | | 5 | 28 | |
| Total | | | 371 | 513 | |

Provide the number of students served by gender.

| Sex | Neglected Programs | Juvenile Detention | Juvenile Corrections | Adult Corrections | Other Programs |
|--------|--------------------|--------------------|----------------------|-------------------|----------------|
| Male | | | 340 | 502 | |
| Female | | | 31 | 11 | |
| Total | | | 371 | 513 | |

Provide the number of students served by age.

| Age | Neglected Programs | Juvenile Detention | Juvenile Corrections | Adult Corrections | Other Programs |
|-------------|--------------------|--------------------|----------------------|-------------------|----------------|
| 3 through 5 | | | 0 | 0 | |
| 6 | | | 0 | 0 | |
| 7 | | | 0 | 0 | |
| 8 | | | 0 | 0 | |
| 9 | | | 0 | 0 | |
| 10 | | | 0 | 0 | |
| 11 | | | 0 | 0 | |
| 12 | | | 1 | 0 | |
| 13 | | | 0 | 0 | |
| 14 | | | 6 | 0 | |
| 15 | | | 36 | 0 | |
| 16 | | | 64 | 0 | |
| 17 | | | 111 | 1 | |
| 18 | | | 98 | 29 | |

| Age | Neglected Programs | Juvenile Detention | Juvenile Corrections | Adult Corrections | Other Programs |
|-------|--------------------|--------------------|----------------------|-------------------|----------------|
| 19 | | | 27 | 117 | |
| 20 | | | 22 | 193 | |
| 21 | | | 6 | 173 | |
| Total | | | 371 | 513 | |

If the total number of students differs by demographics, please explain in comment box below.

Comments: The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

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

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, 2018 through June 30, 2018.

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.

| Outcomes (once per student, only after exit) | Neglected Programs | Juvenile Detention | Juvenile Corrections | Adult Corrections | Other Programs |
|--|--------------------|--------------------|----------------------|-------------------|----------------|
| # of Students Who Enrolled in their local district school 90 days after exit | | | 0 | 0 | |

| Outcomes (once per student) - # of Students Who | Neglected Programs - In fac. | Neglected Programs - 90 days after exit | Juvenile Detention - In fac. | Juvenile Detention - 90 days after exit | Juvenile Corrections - In fac. | 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 |
|---|------------------------------|---|------------------------------|---|--------------------------------|---|-----------------------------|--|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|
| Earned a GED | | | | | 25 | 0 | 42 | 0 | | |
| Obtained high school diploma | | | | | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | | |

| Outcomes (once per student per time period) - # of Students Who | Neglected Programs - In fac. | Neglected Programs - 90 days after exit | Juvenile Detention - In fac. | Juvenile Detention - 90 days after exit | Juvenile Corrections - In fac. | 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 |
|---|------------------------------|---|------------------------------|---|--------------------------------|---|-----------------------------|--|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|
| Earned high school course credits | | | | | 267 | 0 | 0 | 0 | | |
| Enrolled in a GED program | | | | | 50 | 0 | 513 | 0 | | |
| Accepted and/or enrolled into post-secondary education | | | | | 0 | 0 | 34 | 0 | | |
| Enrolled in job training courses/programs | | | | | 362 | 0 | 52 | 0 | | |
| Obtained employment | | | | | 15 | 0 | 0 | 0 | | |

In the text box below, please account for any missing or incomplete data after exit.

Comments: The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

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

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, 2018, 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.

| Performance Data (Based on most recent pre/post-test data) | Neglected Programs | Juvenile Detention | Juvenile Corrections | Adult Corrections | Other Programs |
|--|---------------------------|---------------------------|-----------------------------|--------------------------|-----------------------|
| Long-term students with negative grade level change from the pre- to post-test exams | | | 9 | 34 | |
| Long-term students with no change in grade level from the pre- to post-test exams | | | 33 | 28 | |
| Long-term students with improvement up to one full grade level from the pre- to post-test exams | | | 38 | 74 | |
| Long-term students with improvement of more than one full grade level from the pre- to post-test exams | | | 32 | 27 | |
| Total students pre/post- tested | | | 112 | 163 | |

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

FAQ on long-term students:

What is long-term? Long-term refers to students who were enrolled for at least 90 consecutive calendar days from July 1, 2018 through June 30, 2019.

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, 2018, 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.

| Performance Data (Based on most recent pre/post-test data) | Neglected Programs | Juvenile Detention | Juvenile Corrections | Adult Corrections | Other Programs |
|--|---------------------------|---------------------------|-----------------------------|--------------------------|-----------------------|
| Long-term students with negative grade level change from the pre- to post-test exams | | | 12 | 27 | |
| Long-term students with no change in grade level from the pre- to post-test exams | | | 48 | 46 | |
| Long-term students with improvement up to one full grade level from the pre- to post-test exams | | | 19 | 57 | |
| Long-term students with improvement of more than one full grade level from the pre- to post-test exams | | | 22 | 26 | |
| Total students pre/post- tested | | | 101 | 156 | |

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

FAQ on long-term students:

What is long-term? Long-term refers to students who were enrolled for at least 90 consecutive calendar days from July 1, 2018 through June 30, 2019.

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/Facility Type | # Programs/Facilities | Average Length of Stay in Days |
|---------------------------|-----------------------|--------------------------------|
| At-risk programs | 0 | 0 |
| Neglected programs | 4 | 203 |
| Juvenile detention | 11 | 33 |
| Juvenile corrections | 13 | 176 |
| Other | 1 | 104 |
| Total | 29 | |

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

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.

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/Facility Type | # Reporting Data |
|----------------------------------|-------------------------|
| At-risk programs | 0 |
| Neglected programs | 4 |
| Juvenile detention | 11 |
| Juvenile corrections | 13 |
| Other | 1 |
| Total | 29 |

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

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.

| # of Students Served | At-Risk Programs | Neglected Programs | Juvenile Detention | Juvenile Corrections | Other Programs |
|------------------------------------|------------------|--------------------|--------------------|----------------------|----------------|
| Total Unduplicated Students Served | | 291 | 1,688 | 1,164 | 24 |
| Total Long Term Students Served | | 191 | 234 | 840 | 15 |

Provide the number of students served by special populations.

| Student Subgroups | At-Risk Programs | Neglected Programs | Juvenile Detention | Juvenile Corrections | Other Programs |
|--|------------------|--------------------|--------------------|----------------------|----------------|
| Children with disabilities (<i>IDEA</i>) | | 224 | 757 | 729 | 20 |
| ELs | | 4 | 28 | 13 | 0 |

Provide the number of students served by race/ethnicity.

| Race/Ethnicity | At-Risk Programs | Neglected Programs | Juvenile Detention | Juvenile Corrections | Other Programs |
|---|------------------|--------------------|--------------------|----------------------|----------------|
| American Indian or Alaska Native | | 12 | 50 | 32 | 0 |
| Asian | | 9 | 14 | 4 | 0 |
| Black or African American | | 42 | 837 | 499 | 12 |
| Hispanic or Latino | | 7 | 162 | 92 | 1 |
| Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander | | 0 | 3 | 1 | 0 |
| White | | 200 | 545 | 450 | 11 |
| Two or more races | | 21 | 77 | 86 | 0 |
| Total | | 291 | 1,688 | 1,164 | 24 |

Provide the number of students served by sex.

| Sex | At-Risk Programs | Neglected Programs | Juvenile Detention | Juvenile Corrections | Other Programs |
|--------|------------------|--------------------|--------------------|----------------------|----------------|
| Male | | 190 | 1,233 | 905 | 24 |
| Female | | 101 | 455 | 259 | 0 |
| Total | | 291 | 1,688 | 1,164 | 24 |

Provide the number of students served by age.

| Age | At-Risk Programs | Neglected Programs | Juvenile Detention | Juvenile Corrections | Other Programs |
|-------------|------------------|--------------------|--------------------|----------------------|----------------|
| 3 through 5 | | 3 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 6 | | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 7 | | 7 | 1 | 0 | 0 |
| 8 | | 8 | 2 | 0 | 0 |
| 9 | | 17 | 0 | 5 | 0 |
| 10 | | 13 | 5 | 12 | 2 |
| 11 | | 17 | 20 | 25 | 1 |
| 12 | | 19 | 36 | 41 | 3 |
| 13 | | 17 | 110 | 79 | 6 |
| 14 | | 19 | 212 | 162 | 4 |
| 15 | | 43 | 360 | 243 | 5 |
| 16 | | 44 | 441 | 245 | 1 |
| 17 | | 43 | 333 | 234 | 2 |
| 18 | | 19 | 83 | 65 | 0 |
| 19 | | 7 | 41 | 32 | 0 |

| Age | At-Risk Programs | Neglected Programs | Juvenile Detention | Juvenile Corrections | Other Programs |
|-------|------------------|--------------------|--------------------|----------------------|----------------|
| 20 | | 7 | 30 | 18 | 0 |
| 21 | | 7 | 14 | 3 | 0 |
| Total | | 291 | 1,688 | 1,164 | 24 |

If the total number of students differs by demographics, please explain in comment box below.

Comments: The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

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

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, 2018 through June 30, 2019.

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 technical 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 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.

| Outcomes (once per student, only after exit) | At-Risk Programs | Neglected Programs | Juvenile Detention | Juvenile Corrections | Other Programs |
|--|------------------|--------------------|--------------------|----------------------|----------------|
| # of Students Who Enrolled in their local district school 90 days after exit | | 53 | 414 | 666 | 3 |

| Outcomes (once per student) - # of Students Who | 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. | 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 |
|---|----------------------------|---------------------------------------|------------------------------|---|------------------------------|---|--------------------------------|---|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|
| Earned a GED | | | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 3 | 1 | 0 | 0 |
| Obtained high school diploma | | | 7 | 1 | 46 | 22 | 13 | 3 | 0 | 0 |

| Outcomes (once per student per time period) - # of Students Who | 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. | 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 |
|---|----------------------------|---------------------------------------|------------------------------|---|------------------------------|---|--------------------------------|---|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|
| Earned high school course credits | | | 27 | 1 | 666 | 103 | 740 | 217 | 8 | 3 |
| Enrolled in a GED program | | | 0 | 1 | 5 | 9 | 5 | 2 | 0 | 0 |
| Accepted and/or enrolled into post- secondary education | | | 8 | 6 | 1 | 5 | 0 | 4 | 0 | 0 |
| Enrolled in job training courses/programs | | | 47 | 0 | 4 | 15 | 52 | 7 | 1 | 1 |
| Obtained employment | | | 25 | 1 | 13 | 44 | 44 | 61 | 1 | 1 |

In the text box below, please account for any missing or incomplete data after exit.

Comments: The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

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

2.5.4 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.

2.5.4.1 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, 2018, 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.

| Performance Data (Based on most recent pre/post-test data) | At-Risk Programs | Neglected Programs | Juvenile Detention | Juvenile Corrections | Other Programs |
|--|------------------|--------------------|--------------------|----------------------|----------------|
| Long-term students with negative grade level change from the pre- to post-test exams | | 3 | 4 | 63 | 0 |
| Long-term students with no change in grade level from the pre- to post-test exams | | 65 | 25 | 60 | 1 |
| Long-term students with improvement up to one full grade level from the pre- to post-test exams | | 60 | 41 | 283 | 8 |
| Long-term students with improvement of more than one full grade level from the pre- to post-test exams | | 33 | 45 | 280 | 6 |
| Total students pre/post- tested | | 161 | 115 | 686 | 15 |

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

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, 2018, through June 30, 2019.

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.

2.5.4.2 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, 2018, 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.

| Performance Data (Based on most recent pre/post-test data) | At-Risk Programs | Neglected Programs | Juvenile Detention | Juvenile Corrections | Other Programs |
|--|-------------------------|---------------------------|---------------------------|-----------------------------|-----------------------|
| Long-term students with negative grade level change from the pre- to post-test exams | | 11 | 12 | 60 | 0 |
| Long-term students with no change in grade level from the pre- to post-test exams | | 77 | 28 | 72 | 2 |
| Long-term students with improvement up to one full grade level from the pre- to post-test exams | | 44 | 31 | 365 | 6 |
| Long-term students with improvement of more than one full grade level from the pre- to post-test exams | | 30 | 30 | 196 | 7 |
| Total students pre/post- tested | | 162 | 101 | 693 | 15 |

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

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, 2018, through June 30, 2019.

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.

2.6 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*. The data are reported through the Annual Performance Reporting Tool.

| Content Area | Amount of Funds Spent |
|-----------------------------|------------------------------|
| Well-Rounded | 6,982,486.64 |
| Safe and Healthy Students | 5,120,702.74 |
| Effective Use of Technology | 747,250.94 |

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

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 18-19. The State has updated 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). The data are reported through the Annual Performance Reporting Tool.

| Content Area | Number of LEAs Spending Funds |
|-----------------------------|--------------------------------------|
| Well-Rounded | 367 |
| Safe and Healthy Students | 275 |
| Effective Use of Technology | 139 |
| Any Content Area | 429 |

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

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 18-19. The State has updated the claiming process for Title IV-A so that it will be able to track expenditures by Content Area in upcoming years.

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.

| State Transferability of Funds | Yes/No |
|--|---------------|
| Did the State transfer funds under the State Transferability authority of Section 5103(a) during SY 2018-19? | NO |

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

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.

| LEA Transferability of Funds | # |
|--|---|
| LEAs that notified the State that they were transferring funds under the LEA Transferability authority of Section 5103(b). | 6 |

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

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 |
|---|--|--|
| Supporting Effective Instruction (Title II, Part A) | 0 | 2 |
| Student Support and Enrichment Grants (Title IV, Part A) | 6 | 0 |
| Improving Basic Programs Operated by LEAs (Title I, Part A) | | 4 |
| Education of Migratory Children (Title I, Part C) | | 0 |
| Prevention and Intervention Programs for Children and Youth Who Are Neglected, Delinquent, or At-Risk (Title I, Part D) | | 0 |
| English Language Acquisition, Language Enhancement, and Academic Achievement Act (Title III, Part A) | | 0 |
| Rural Education Initiative (Title V, Part B) | | 0 |

In the table below provide the total amount of FY 2018 appropriated funds transferred from and to each eligible program.

| Program | Total Amount of Funds Transferred FROM Eligible Program | Total Amount of Funds Transferred TO Eligible Program |
|---|--|--|
| Supporting Effective Instruction (Title II, Part A) | 0.00 | 62,820.00 |
| Student Support and Enrichment Grants (Title IV, Part A) | 722,693.00 | 0.00 |
| Improving Basic Programs Operated by LEAs (Title I, Part A) | | 659,870.00 |
| Education of Migratory Children (Title I, Part C) | | 0.00 |
| Prevention and Intervention Programs for Children and Youth Who Are Neglected, Delinquent, or At-Risk (Title I, Part D) | | 0.00 |
| English Language Acquisition, Language Enhancement, and Academic Achievement Act (Title III, Part A) | | 0.00 |
| Rural Education Initiative (Title V, Part B) | | 0.00 |

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

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 SY2018-19 for each of the listed purposes.

| Purpose | # LEAs |
|--|---------------|
| Activities authorized under Part A of Title I | 4 |
| Activities authorized under Part A of Title II | 6 |
| Activities authorized under Title III | 1 |
| Activities authorized under Part A of Title IV | 13 |
| Parental involvement activities | 1 |

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

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: The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

Seventeen school districts in Wisconsin were eligible for RLIS for the 2018-19 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 2018-19 funds, as reported in their application budgets and subsequent claims: (Note: many districts used their grants in more than one area.)

- Seven districts used the funds to purchase iPads, laptops, or educational software.
- Eight districts used the funds for teacher or administrator professional development.
- Three districts used the funds for after-school tutors, programming, or supplies.
- Two districts used the funds to purchase textbooks.
- One district used the funds for teacher hiring bonuses.
- One district used the funds to increase teacher salaries.
- One district used the funds for a driver education course, in order that students could learn to drive (for no or low cost) and thus be able to access courses at community colleges that the district does not offer.
- One district used the funds for academic coach signing bonuses.
- One district used the funds to hire a full-time elementary school teacher, with the goal of reducing class sizes.
- One district used the funds to hire a reading coach.
- Eleven districts specifically mentioned a focus on reading and/or math instruction in their use of the funds (whether for professional development, purchase of equipment or software, or other purchases).

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.

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 response is limited to 8,000 characters.

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 immediately and questions were 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: The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

Seventeen school districts in Wisconsin were eligible for RLIS for the 2018-19 school year. DPI contacted all eligible districts letting them know they could apply in WISEgrants. All 17 districts that qualified* submitted applications and were awarded grants. The funding formula is based on the number of students in each district. The application 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 2018-19 was \$334,575.

*1) All schools within the district must be designated with an NCES locale code of 32, 33, 41, 42, or 43, and 2) The district must have a poverty rate of 20% or more, as defined by the number of children ages 5-17 from families with incomes below the poverty level.

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? | 5.00% |
| What percentage of those funds retained for State-level administration were used specifically for technical assistance? | 20.00% |

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

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. This information will be collected from SEAs outside of the CSPR collection tool.

- NCES LEA ID
- LEA Name
- RLIS Award Amount

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

NCES LEA ID LEA Name RLIS Award Amount

5500060 Adams-Friendship Area School District \$32,069

5500510 Ashland School District \$40,790

5500630 Augusta School District \$11,947

5500900 Bayfield School District \$7,880

5502340 Cashton School District \$11,380

5502910 Crandon School District \$18,107

5505640 Granton Area School District \$4,888

5505670 Grantsburg School District \$16,484

5506270 Hayward Community School District \$35,216

5508760 Markesan School District \$16,406

5509070 Menominee Indian School District \$17,677

5509870 Montello School District \$14,313

5510230 Necedah Area School District \$13,609

5510770 Norwalk-Ontario-Wilton School District \$13,609

5511820 Tri-County Area School District \$13,003

5515360 Viroqua Area School District \$22,839

5515960 Wautoma Area School District \$27,629

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

| | Number | Percentage |
|--|---------------|-------------------|
| What number and percentage of SRSA- and Dual-eligible LEAs informed their SEA of an intent to utilize SRSA's AFUA, under Section 5211 of the <i>ESEA</i> . | | |

Comments: The response is limited to 4,000 characters.
The State of Wisconsin confirms that no LEAs used the SRSA's AUFA in 2018-2019.