

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

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

For reporting on
School Year 2015-16



PART I DUE THURSDAY, DECEMBER 15, 2016
PART II DUE THURSDAY, FEBRUARY 9, 2017

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
WASHINGTON, DC 20202

PRIVACY PROTECTED VERSION

SOME DATA IN THIS REPORT HAVE BEEN SUPPRESSED OR BLURRED TO PROTECT STUDENT PRIVACY.

INTRODUCTION

Sections 9302 and 9303 of the *Elementary and Secondary Education Act (ESEA)*, as amended in 2001 provide to States the option of applying for and reporting on multiple *ESEA* programs through a single consolidated application and report. Although a central, practical purpose of the Consolidated State Application and Report is to reduce "red tape" and burden on States, the Consolidated State Application and Report are also intended to have the important purpose of encouraging the integration of State, local, and *ESEA* programs in comprehensive planning and service delivery and enhancing the likelihood that the State will coordinate planning and service delivery across multiple State and local programs. The combined goal of all educational agencies—State, local, and Federal—is a more coherent, well-integrated educational plan that will result in improved teaching and learning. The Consolidated State Application and Report includes the following *ESEA* programs:

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

The *ESEA* Consolidated State Performance Report (CSPR) for school year (SY) 2015-16 consists of two Parts, Part I and Part II.

PART I

Part I of the CSPR requests information related to the five *ESEA* Goals, established in the June 2002 Consolidated State Application, and information required for the Annual State Report to the Secretary, as described in Section 1111(h)(4) of the *ESEA*. The five *ESEA* Goals established in the June 2002 Consolidated State Application are:

- | **Performance Goal 1:** By SY 2013-14, all students will reach high standards, at a minimum attaining proficiency or better in reading/language arts and mathematics.
- | **Performance Goal 2:** All limited English proficient students will become proficient in English and reach high academic standards, at a minimum attaining proficiency or better in reading/language arts and mathematics.
- | **Performance Goal 3:** By SY 2005-06, all students will be taught by highly qualified teachers.
- | **Performance Goal 4:** All students will be educated in learning environments that are safe, drug free, and conducive to learning.
- | **Performance Goal 5:** All students will graduate from high school.

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

PART II

Part II of the CSPR consists of information related to State activities and outcomes of specific *ESEA* programs. While the information requested varies from program to program, the specific information requested for this report meets the following criteria:

1. The information is needed for Department program performance plans or for other program needs.
2. The information is not available from another source, including program evaluations pending full implementation of required *EDFacts* submission.
3. The information will provide valid evidence of program outcomes or results.

GENERAL INSTRUCTIONS AND TIMELINES

All States that received funding on the basis of the Consolidated State Application for the SY 2015-16 must respond to this Consolidated State Performance Report (CSPR). Part I of the Report is due to the Department by **Thursday, December 15, 2016**. Part II of the Report is due to the Department by **Thursday, February 9, 2017**. Both Part I and Part II should reflect data from the SY 2015-16, unless otherwise noted.

The format states will use to submit the Consolidated State Performance Report has changed to an online submission starting with SY 2004-05. This online submission system is being developed through the Education Data Exchange Network (EDEN) and will make the submission process less burdensome. Please see the following section on transmittal instructions for more information on how to submit this year's Consolidated State Performance Report.

TRANSMITTAL INSTRUCTIONS

The Consolidated State Performance Report (CSPR) data will be collected online from the SEAs, using the EDEN web site. The EDEN web site will be modified to include a separate area (sub-domain) for CSPR data entry. This area will utilize EDEN formatting to the extent possible and the data will be entered in the order of the current CSPR forms. The data entry screens will include or provide access to all instructions and notes on the current CSPR forms; additionally, an effort will be made to design the screens to balance efficient data collection and reduction of visual clutter.

Initially, a state user will log onto EDEN and be provided with an option that takes him or her to the "SY 2015-16 CSPR". The main CSPR screen will allow the user to select the section of the CSPR that he or she needs to either view or enter data. After selecting a section of the CSPR, the user will be presented with a screen or set of screens where the user can input the data for that section of the CSPR. A user can only select one section of the CSPR at a time. After a state has included all available data in the designated sections of a particular CSPR Part, a lead state user will certify that Part and transmit it to the Department. Once a Part has been transmitted, ED will have access to the data. States may still make changes or additions to the transmitted data, by creating an updated version of the CSPR. Detailed instructions for transmitting the SY 2015-16 CSPR will be found on the main CSPR page of the EDEN web site (<https://EDEN.ED.GOV/EDENPortal/>).

		OMB Number: 1810-0724
		Expiration Date: 5/31/2018
Consolidated State Performance Report For State Formula Grant Programs under the Elementary And Secondary Education Act as amended in 2001		
Check the one that indicates the report you are submitting: <input type="checkbox"/> Part I, 2015-16 <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Part II, 2015-16		
Name of State Educational Agency (SEA) Submitting This Report: Wisconsin Department of Public Instruction		
Address: 125 South Webster Street, P.O. Box 7841 Madison, WI 53707-7841		
Person to contact about this report:		
Name: Mary Jo Christiansen		
Telephone: 608-266-2158		
Fax: 608-266-5188		
e-mail: maryjo.christiansen@dpi.wi.gov		
Name of Authorizing State Official: (Print or Type): Michael J. Thompson		
_____ Signature		Thursday, May 11, 2017, 4:50:29 PM Date

Recertified 5/11/17

**CONSOLIDATED STATE PERFORMANCE REPORT
PART II**

For reporting on
School Year 2015-16



**PART II DUE FEBRUARY 09, 2017
5PM EST**

2.1 IMPROVING BASIC PROGRAMS OPERATED BY LOCAL EDUCATIONAL AGENCIES (TITLE I, PART A)

This section collects data on Title I, Part A programs.

2.1.1 Student Achievement in Schools with Title I, Part A Programs

The following sections collect data on student academic achievement on the State's assessments in schools that receive Title I, Part A funds and operate either Schoolwide programs or Targeted Assistance programs.

2.1.1.1 Student Achievement in Mathematics in Schoolwide Schools (SWP)

In the format of the table below, provide the number of students in SWP schools who completed the assessment and for whom a proficiency level was assigned, in grades 3 through 8 and high school, on the State's mathematics assessments under Section 1111(b)(3) of ESEA. Also, provide the number of those students who scored at or above proficient. The percentage of students who scored at or above proficient is calculated automatically.

Grade	# Students Who Completed the Assessment and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned	# Students Scoring at or above Proficient	Percentage at or above Proficient
3	30,321	S	37.8
4	29,091	S	32.1
5	27,435	S	31.5
6	19,662	S	29.6
7	17,040	S	24.8
8	17,168	S	20.7
High School	8,930	S	20.8
Total	149,647	S	30.0
Comments:			

2.1.1.2 Student Achievement in Reading/Language Arts in Schoolwide Schools (SWP)

This section is similar to 2.1.1.1. The only difference is that this section collects data on performance on the State's reading/language arts assessment in SWP.

Grade	# Students Who Completed the Assessment and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned	# Students Scoring at or above Proficient	Percentage at or above Proficient
3	30,231	S	33.9
4	29,037	S	32.9
5	27,382	S	32.1
6	19,622	S	29.8
7	16,986	S	30.7
8	17,112	S	29.6
High School	8,745	S	28.5
Total	149,115	S	31.7
Comments:			

2.1.1.3 Student Achievement in Mathematics in Targeted Assistance Schools (TAS)

In the table below, provide the number of all students in TAS who completed the assessment and for whom a proficiency level was assigned, in grades 3 through 8 and high school, on the State's mathematics assessments under Section 1111(b)(3) of *ESEA*. Also, provide the number of those students who scored at or above proficient. The percentage of students who scored at or above proficient is calculated automatically.

Grade	# Students Who Completed the Assessment and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned	# Students Scoring at or above Proficient	Percentage at or above Proficient
3	16,893	S	57.7
4	16,299	S	55.5
5	15,801	S	55.1
6	15,163	S	53.7
7	12,777	S	48.9
8	12,838	S	42.4
High School	4,681	S	42.4
Total	94,452	S	52.2

Comments:

2.1.1.4 Student Achievement in Reading/Language Arts in Targeted Assistance Schools (TAS)

This section is similar to 2.1.1.3. The only difference is that this section collects data on performance on the State's reading/language arts assessment by all students in TAS.

Grade	# Students Who Completed the Assessment and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned	# Students Scoring at or above Proficient	Percentage at or above Proficient
3	16,884	S	51.5
4	16,290	S	53.2
5	15,798	S	52.0
6	15,159	S	53.0
7	12,782	S	50.7
8	12,836	S	50.7
High School	4,648	S	50.0
Total	94,397	S	51.8

Comments:

2.1.2 Title I, Part A Student Participation

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

2.1.2.1 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 SWP or TAS programs 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>)	53,821
Limited English proficient students	36,262
Students who are homeless	11,024
Migratory students	374
Comments:	

2.1.2.2 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 public 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	6,712
Asian	13,590
Black or African American	72,635
Hispanic or Latino	59,570
Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander	352
White	174,908
Two or more races	10,454
Total	338,221
Comments:	

2.1.2.3 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 targeted assistance programs (Public TAS), Title I schoolwide programs (Public 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	105	199	3	0	307
Age 3 through 5 (not Kindergarten)	2,158	21,049	185	53	23,445
K	3,682	29,122	1,160	63	34,027
1	3,902	30,983	1,487	66	36,438
2	3,517	30,917	1,400	58	35,892
3	2,945	31,083	1,252	49	35,329
4	2,537	29,843	1,031	39	33,450
5	2,602	27,944	937	39	31,522
6	2,780	20,374	735	57	23,946
7	2,438	17,816	681	47	20,982
8	2,293	18,007	534	64	20,898
9	1,307	13,981	560	0	15,848
10	1,565	11,612	197	2	13,376
11	1,390	10,846	121	0	12,357
12	1,745	9,479	106	0	11,330
Ungraded	0	0	0	0	0
TOTALS	34,966	303,255	10,389	537	349,147
Comments:					

2.1.2.4 Student Participation in Title I, Part A Targeted Assistance Programs by Instructional and Support Services

The following sections collect data about the participation of students in TAS.

2.1.2.4.1 Student Participation in Title I, Part A Targeted Assistance Programs by Instructional Services

In the table below, provide the number of students receiving each of the listed instructional services through a TAS program funded by Title I, Part A. Students may be reported as receiving more than one instructional service. However, students should be reported only once for each instructional service regardless of the frequency with which they received the service.

TAS Instructional Service	# Students Served
Mathematics	17,375
Reading/language arts	49,649
Science	7,051
Social studies	7,079
Vocational/career	1,464
Other instructional services	2,835
Comments:	

2.1.2.4.2 Student Participation in Title I, Part A Targeted Assistance Programs by Support Services

In the table below, provide the number of students receiving each of the listed support services through a TAS program funded by Title I, Part A. Students may be reported as receiving more than one support service. However, students should be reported only once for each support service regardless of the frequency with which they received the service.

TAS Support Service	# Students Served
Health, dental, and eye care	1,145
Supporting guidance/advocacy	3,221
Other support services	87
Comments:	

2.1.3 Staff Information for Title I, Part A Targeted Assistance Programs (TAS)

In the table below, provide the number of full-time equivalent (FTE) staff funded by a Title I, Part A TAS in each of the staff categories. For staff who work with both TAS and SWP, report only the FTE attributable to their TAS responsibilities.

For paraprofessionals only, provide the percentage of paraprofessionals who were qualified in accordance with Section 1119 (c) and (d) of ESEA.

See the FAQs following the table for additional information.

Staff Category	Staff FTE	Percentage Qualified
Teachers	770.63	
Paraprofessionals ¹	173.96	79.55
Other paraprofessionals (translators, parental involvement, computer assistance) ²	0.00	
Clerical support staff	103.72	
Administrators (non-clerical)	23.49	
Comments:		

FAQs on staff information

- a. *What is a "paraprofessional?"* An employee of an LEA who provides instructional support in a program supported with Title I, Part A funds. Instructional support includes the following activities:
- (1) Providing one-on-one tutoring for eligible students, if the tutoring is scheduled at a time when a student would not otherwise receive instruction from a teacher;
 - (2) Providing assistance with classroom management, such as organizing instructional and other materials;
 - (3) Providing assistance in a computer laboratory;
 - (4) Conducting parental involvement activities;
 - (5) Providing support in a library or media center;
 - (6) Acting as a translator; or
 - (7) Providing instructional services to students.
- b. *What is an "other paraprofessional?"* Paraprofessionals who do not provide instructional support, for example, paraprofessionals who are translators or who work with parental involvement or computer assistance.
- c. *Who is a qualified paraprofessional?* A paraprofessional who has (1) completed 2 years of study at an institution of higher education; (2) obtained an associate's (or higher) degree; or (3) met a rigorous standard of quality and been able to demonstrate, through a formal State or local academic assessment, knowledge of and the ability to assist in instructing reading, writing, and mathematics (or, as appropriate, reading readiness, writing readiness, and mathematics readiness) (Sections 1119(c) and (d).) For more information on qualified paraprofessionals, please refer to the Title I paraprofessionals Guidance, available at: <http://www.ed.gov/policy/elsec/guid/paraguidance.doc>

¹ Consistent with ESEA, Title I, Section 1119(g)(2).

² Consistent with ESEA, Title I, Section 1119(e).

2.1.3.1 Paraprofessional Information for Title I, Part A Schoolwide Programs

In the table below, provide the number of FTE paraprofessionals who served in SWP and the percentage of these paraprofessionals who were qualified in accordance with Section 1119 (c) and (d) of *ESEA*. Use the additional guidance found below the previous table.

Paraprofessional Information	Paraprofessionals FTE	Percentage Qualified
Paraprofessionals ³	4,642.35	94.43
Comments:		

³ Consistent with *ESEA*, Title I, Section 1119(g)(2).

2.1.4 Parental Involvement Reservation Under Title I, Part A

In the table below provide information on the amount of Title I, Part A funds reserved by LEAs for parental involvement activities under Section 1118 (a)(3) of the ESEA. The percentage of LEAs FY 2015 Title I Part A allocations reserved for parental involvement will be automatically calculated from the data entered in Rows 2 and 3.

Parental Involvement Reservation	LEAs that Received a Federal Fiscal Year (FY) 2015 (School Year 2015-16) Title I, Part A Allocation of \$500,000 or less	LEAs that Received a Federal Fiscal Year (FY) 2015 (School Year 2015-16) Title I, Part A Allocation of more than \$500,000
Number of LEAs*	349	46
Sum of the amount reserved by LEAs for parental involvement	182,540	4,074,071
Sum of LEAs' FY 2015 Title I, Part A allocations	56,460,761	135,765,171
Percentage of LEAs' FY 2015 Title I, Part A allocations reserved for parental involvement	0.32	3.00

*The sum of Column 2 and Column 3 should equal the number of LEAs that received an FY 2015 Title I, Part A allocation.

In the comment box below, provide examples of how LEAs in your State used their Title I Part A, set-aside for parental involvement during SY 2015-16.

This response is limited to 8,000 characters.

Parent involvement set-asides are used to fund activities, supplies, and accessible communication formats that support the involvement of both public and private school parents of Title I children. Examples include Title I parent meetings and workshops, and associated expenses; and accessible communication with parents, including translation and interpretation services, as appropriate. Other funds are used for books and materials that supplement and support literacy activities parents can use at home, or they are used for books and materials that supplement and support skills parents learn at Title I parenting workshops. A portion of funds, particularly in the largest districts, are used to pay salaries for parent involvement coordinators.

2.3 EDUCATION OF MIGRANT CHILDREN (TITLE I, PART C)

This section collects data on the Migrant Education Program (Title I, Part C) for the performance period of September 1, 2015 through August 31, 2016. This section is composed of the following subsections:

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

Where the table collects data by age/grade, report children in the highest age/grade that they attained during the performance period.

2.3.1 Migrant Child Counts

This section collects the Title I, Part C, Migrant Education Program (MEP) child counts which States are required to provide and may be used to determine the annual State allocations under Title I, Part C. The child counts should reflect the performance period of September 1, 2015 through August 31, 2016. 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 SEA should have sufficient procedures in place to ensure that it is counting only those children who are eligible for the MEP. Such procedures are important to protecting the integrity of the State's MEP because they permit the early discovery and correction of eligibility problems and thus help to ensure that only eligible migrant children are counted for funding purposes and are served. If an SEA has reservations about the accuracy of its child counts, it must inform the Department of its concerns and explain how and when it will resolve them in the box below, which precedes Section 2.3.1.1 *Category 1 Child Count*.

Note: In submitting this information, the Authorizing State Official must certify that, to the best of his/her knowledge, the 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:

1. *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 could include students who have dropped out of school in the previous performance period (September 1, 2014 - August 31, 2015), youth who are working on a HSED outside of a K-12 institution, and youth who are "here-to-work" only. It does not include preschoolers, who are counted by age grouping. Children who were enrolled in school for at least one day, but dropped out of school during the performance period should be counted in the highest age/grade level attained during the performance period.
2. *How is "ungraded" defined?* Ungraded means the children are served in an educational unit that has no separate grades. For example, some schools have primary grade groupings that are not traditionally graded or ungraded groupings for children with learning disabilities. In some cases, ungraded students may also include special education children, transitional bilingual students, students working on a HSED through a K-12 institution, or those in a correctional setting. (Students working on a HSED outside of a K-12 institution are counted as out-of-school youth.)

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.

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

Comments:

2.3.1.1 Category 1 Child Count (Eligible Migrant Children)

In the table below, enter the unduplicated statewide number by age/grade of **eligible** migrant children age 3 through 21 who, within 3 years of making a qualifying move, resided in your State for one or more days during the performance period of September 1, 2015 through August 31, 2016. This figure includes all eligible migrant 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 highest age/grade that he/she attained during the performance period. The unduplicated statewide total count is calculated automatically.

Do not include:

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

Age/Grade	Eligible Migrant Children
Age 3 through 5 (not Kindergarten)	106
K	49
1	59
2	70
3	57
4	51
5	45
6	52
7	41
8	52
9	47

10	62
11	43
12	38
Ungraded	0
Out-of-school	24
Total	796
Comments:	

2.3.1.1.1 Category 1 Child Count Increases/Decreases

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

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

Comments:

2.3.1.1.2 Birth through Two Child Count

In the table below, enter the unduplicated statewide number of eligible migrant 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, 2015 through August 31, 2016.

Age/Grade	Eligible Migrant Children
Age Birth through 2	87
Comments:	

2.3.1.2 Category 2 Child Count (Eligible Migrant Children Served by the MEP During the Summer/ Intersession Term)

In the table below, enter by age/grade the unduplicated statewide number of **eligible** migrant children age 3 through 21 who, within 3 years of making a qualifying move, were **served** for one or more days in a MEP-funded project conducted during either the summer term or during intersession periods that occurred within the performance period of September 1, 2015 through August 31, 2016. Count a child who moved from one age/grade level to another during the performance period only once in the highest age/grade that he/she attained 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 served by the MEP (under the continuation of services authority) after their period of eligibility has expired when other services are not available to meet their needs.
- ┆ Previously eligible secondary-school children who are receiving credit accrual services (under the continuation of services authority).
- ┆ Children who received only referred services (non-MEP funded).

Age/Grade	Eligible Migrant Children Served by the MEP During the Summer/Intersession Term
Age 3 through 5 (not Kindergarten)	6
K	13
1	15
2	16
3	20
4	14
5	13
6	9
7	11
8	12
9	13
10	9
11	6
12	7
Ungraded	0
Out-of-school	0
Total	164
Comments:	

2.3.1.2.1 Category 2 Child Count Increases/Decreases

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

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

Comments:

2.3.1.2.2 Birth through Two Eligible Migrant Children Served by the MEP During the Summer/Intersession Term

In the table below, enter the unduplicated statewide number of eligible migrant 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, 2015 through August 31, 2016. 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 Migrant Children Served by the MEP During the Summer/Intersession Term
Age Birth through 2	0
Comments:	

2.3.1.3 Child Count Calculation and Validation Procedures

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

2.3.1.3.1 Student Information System

In the space below, respond to the following questions: What system did the State use to compile and generate the Category 1 child count for this performance period? Please check the box that applies.

Student Information System	(Yes/No)
NGS	<u>Yes</u>
MIS 2000	<u>No Response</u>
COEStar	<u>No Response</u>
MAPS	<u>No Response</u>
Other Student Information System. Please identify the system:	<u>No Response</u>

Student Information System	(Yes/No)
Was the Category 2 child count for this performance period generated using the same system?	<u>Yes</u>

If the State's Category 2 count was generated using a different system than the Category 1 count please identify the specific system that generates the Category 2 count.

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

The same system was used.

2.3.1.3.3 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 are accounted for in the performance period. In particular, describe how the State includes and counts only:

- 1 The unduplicated count of eligible migrant children, ages 3-21. Only include children two years of age whose residency in the state has been verified after turning three.
- 1 Children who met the program eligibility criteria (e.g., were within 3 years of a qualifying move, had a qualifying activity).
- 1 Children who were resident in your State for at least 1 day during the performance period (September 1 through August 31).
- 1 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.
- 1 Children once per age/grade level for each child count category.
- 1 Children who are eligible for a free appropriate public education (e.g., have not yet obtained a high school diploma or equivalent).

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

Wisconsin uses the New Generation System (NGS) as its database.

Identification and Recruitment (ID&R) specialists participate in an annual training and receive on-going training throughout the year to learn eligibility criteria as established in the law, its corresponding non-regulatory guidance, and ID&R procedures.

ID&R specialists use the Certificate of Eligibility COE to interview migrant children's families as they arrive in Wisconsin. During the face-to-face interviews, ID&R specialists collect birthdates, residency, and other required information to determine eligibility status.

Eligibility is reviewed at the Local Education Agency (LEA) level or at the state Wisconsin Department of Public Instruction (WDPI) level and data verification checks are conducted by WDPI data specialists upon submission of the COE. The WDPI data specialists also review data throughout the enrollment periods.

Unduplicated count of eligible migrant children, ages 3-21 - An NGS query is programmed to include only children who were between the ages of 3 and 21 and who were eligible for at least one day during the period 9/1/15 - 8/31/16. Additionally, NGS accommodates for the reporting of graduation information and the software will update the eligibility status for the correct performance period based on the date of graduation.

Children who met the program eligibility criteria (e.g., were within 3 years of a qualifying move, had a qualifying activity) - The NGS database has set parameters that identify unique counts of only children who meet the migrant child eligibility criteria, including having had a "qualifying activity" and a "qualifying move."

Children who were resident in your State for at least 1 day during the performance period (September 1 through August 31) - The majority of eligible migratory students arrive during the summer months - at the end of a performance period. LEAs are trained to conduct and report a residency/eligibility re-verification at the start of each new performance period. A residency/eligibility re-verification data point is entered into NGS on a new history line. The NGS database is programmed to restrict the count of eligible migrant children to the days specified within the performance period of September 1, 2015 to August 31, 2016. Specific coding is set in place to ensure unique residency counts. Prior to entering the data into NGS, the data collection instruments, including COEs, are reviewed by the LEA. Then, the qualifying move, activity data, and residency data are confirmed by the LEA and WDPI to ensure accurate annual counts. A child is not included in counts for a new reporting period until the residency/eligibility re-verification is complete.

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 - The state operates summer and regular term programs. The state requires all funded LEAs/projects to report on supplemental migrant funded instructional and support services for both summer and regular term programs.

For every student served, funded LEAs/projects submit a supplemental services report to the WDPI. These reports are due upon withdrawal of the students or at the end of the project. The reports identify the type of services provided, grades or credits earned, days enrolled, dates in attendance, and enrollment and withdrawal dates.

Count only children once per age/grade level for each child count category

At the WDPI level, the NGS query is programmed to count a migrant child only once statewide in Category 1 and Category 2 counts. NGS was developed to create a unique student identification (USID) number for each new migrant child entered into the NGS centralized database. Before a new record is created, the system checks for duplication based on the child's last name or similar last names by using a system-generated wild card prompt. Potential duplicates are then checked against additional fields such as first name, birth date, gender, and mother's name. Any matches generated require additional further review. As part of the data quality process before the NGS snapshot is run, the WDPI staff works with the NGS Help Desk administrators to ensure that all potential duplicates have been merged into a single student record. This process is carried out on a continuous basis throughout the performance period.

Children who are eligible for a free appropriate public education (e.g., have not yet obtained a high school diploma or equivalent) - ID&R specialists are trained to identify and recruit all eligible children, through age 21, who have yet to complete a high school diploma or its equivalent. ID&R specialists are also trained to provide information relative to the rights of migrant children/young adults to access to a free and appropriate public education. ID&R specialists are directed to provide their local LEA administrators information about youth in need of completion of a high school diploma or the equivalent for the LEA to appropriately provide any available services to them. The ID&R specialists collaborate with other migrant service providers to make referrals when necessary.

How does the State ensure that the system that transmits migrant data to the Department accurately accounts for all the migrant children in every ED Facts data file (see the Office of Migrant Education's CSPR Rating Instrument for the criteria needed to address this question)?

As mentioned earlier, WDPI used NGS and makes continuous efforts all year long to ensure a strong data management system, both internally and externally with local school district personnel. The WDPI provides trainings to all appropriate parties at the local project sites and emphasizes accurate reporting and timely transfer of records from the LEA to the WDPI. LEA reports are screened at the LEA and WDPI levels prior to entering data into NGS. When necessary, the WDPI requires LEAs to make corrections and re-submit reports before reports are entered into the NGS database. In cases where MEP child data is entered locally, WDPI data staff monitors and conducts spot-checks regularly.

The WDPI data specialists reviews NGS snapshot data before determining and uploading the final counts to ensure accuracy in reporting. Comparisons are made with the previous year's data and documentation is confirmed for the current year's counts in multiple ways.

The 2015-16 assessment data reported in the CSPR I was data collected and reported by all LEAs in the state through the state's Individual Student Enrollment System (ISES). The ISES data map specifically states that a Certificate of Eligibility (COE) must be on file in the district verifying the student's eligibility (reference: <http://dpi.wi.gov/cst/data-collections/student/ises/data-collection/cd-ye-child-count-data-elements/migrant>). LEAs are expected to submit data per the definition as part of the ISES collection process. However, WDPI found that some LEAs are reporting migrant students when a COE is

not on file. The WDPI is taking the following steps to eliminate this opportunity for error.

In 2016-17, the state replaced ISES with WISEdata. ISES collected student demographics once or twice per year from LEAs via file upload. WISEdata consists of an application program interface (API) that LEAs configure to push student data to WDPI via their local student information systems on a daily, weekly or as needed basis. LEAs and MEP staff then have the opportunity to review district data for errors and discrepancies via a state web portal as often as the data is pushed to WDPI instead of only once or twice per year. If issues are found, they are corrected in the local student information system at the district, and then changes are pushed back to WDPI.

One of the co-MEP directors is working with the WISEdata Team to include a validation for every identified migrant student identified in WISEdata by 2017-18. This validation will require LEAs to ensure a COE was submitted and approved by WDPI.

WDPI MEP staff is working with LEAs alongside the IT Customer Services Team to ensure every student reported in NGS has a student identifier (WISEid) and is included in WISEdata for the 2016-17 school year.

WDPI IT and Customer Services staff collaborated with the LEA's student information system (SIS) vendors by co-hosting three user group sessions in the fall of 2016. WDPI IT and Customer Services staff reminded LEAs of the definition of migrant student and inform LEAs how to certify migrant students.

WDPI is hosting a WISEdata conference in February 2017 and WDPI IT Customer Services, alongside program area staff, will reiterate the definition of migrant student and inform LEAs how to certify migrant students.

WDPI MEP staff are conducting a cost/benefit analysis to determine if WDPI should continue with NGS or find another system that will meet the federal MEP requirements and possibly be able to interface more directly with WISEdata.

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?	<u>Yes</u>

If MSIX is utilized, please explain how.

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

The WDPI MEP program has participated in national data quality initiatives to help analyze the quality of the state's MEP data in NGS and MSIX. MEP data specialist and other WDPI NGS users regularly utilize MSIX as a way to conduct data checks. The quality of the state's migrant student data is strengthened as a result of this practice.

2.3.1.3.4 Quality Control Processes

In the space below, respond to the following questions :

Quality Control Processes	Yes/No
Is student eligibility based on a personal interview (face-to-face or phone call) with a parent, guardian, or other responsible adult, or youth-as-worker?	<u>Yes</u>
Does the SEA and/or regional offices train recruiters at least annually on eligibility requirements, including the basic eligibility definition, economic necessity, temporary vs. seasonal, processing, etc.?	<u>Yes</u>
Does the SEA have a formal process, beyond the recruiter's determination, for reviewing and ensuring the accuracy of written eligibility information [e.g., COEs are reviewed and initialed by the recruiter's supervisor and/or other reviewer(s)]?	<u>Yes</u>
Are incomplete or otherwise questionable COEs returned to the recruiter for correction, further explanation, documentation, and/or verification?	<u>Yes</u>
Does the SEA provide recruiters with written eligibility guidance (e.g., a handbook)?	<u>Yes</u>
Does the SEA review student attendance records at summer/intersession projects to verify that the total unduplicated number of eligible migrant students served in the summer/intersession is reconciled with the Category 2 Count ?	<u>Yes</u>
Does the SEA have both a local and state-level process for resolving eligibility questions?	<u>Yes</u>
Are written procedures provided to regular school year and summer/intersession personnel on how to collect and report pupil enrollment and withdrawal data?	<u>Yes</u>
Are records/data entry personnel provided training on how to review regular school year and summer/inter-session site records, input data, and run reports used for child count purposes?	<u>Yes</u>

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.	88
The number of eligibility determinations sampled for which a re-interview was completed.	58
The number of eligibility determinations sampled for which a re-interview was completed and the child was found eligible.	58

Describe any reasons for non-response in the re-interviewing process.

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

Eighty-eight (88) children were randomly sampled and fifty-eight (58) or the equivalent of sixty-six percent (66%) were found and re-interviewed. Note: All children in the sample were extracted from the universe of eligible students for the school year 2015-16.

The reasons for non-response in the re-interviewing process included: Family moved from the area (1 child); Family did not return to the area (4 children); Not found (6 children); Did not return calls (13 children); Moved to Texas (3 children); Family in hospital (2 children); and not accepting calls - could not connect with family (1 child).

In reference to one specific geographical area, the independent re-interviewer stated the following:

"Area X: The random sampling [for Area X] resulted in twenty-seven (27) students. Of these 27, we were only able to locate eight (8). All had relocated within the city and had new addresses and new phone numbers. Of the remaining, three (3) were no longer in the area and had moved out-of-town or out-of-state. The rest, thirteen (13), were mostly unreachable. We tried contacting them by phone and left voicemail messages, but no one returned our calls. Others were either not accepting calls or had new unavailable phone numbers."

Procedures	
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)?	SY 2015-16
Procedures	Yes/No
Was the sampling of eligible children random?	<u>Yes</u>
Was the sampling statewide?	<u>Yes</u>

FAQ on independent prospective reinterviews:

- a. *What are independent prospective re-interviews?* Independent prospective re-interviews allow confirmation of your State's eligibility determinations and the accuracy of the numbers of migrant 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 migrant children.

If the sampling was stratified by group/area please describe the procedures.

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

Once every three years, Wisconsin contracts with an independent re-interviewer to review and verify the accuracy of the Certificates of Eligibility (COEs) from a sample in districts where migrant students were reported to be eligible.

The following plan was followed for the 2015-16 regular term and 2016 summer term in selecting the samples from each respective area of the state where COEs had been completed confirming the eligibility of migrant children and youth.

To determine the families for re-interview, Wisconsin's statistician clustered and stratified school districts with an eligible migrant population by size, based on the number of eligible migrant children within those districts. Then, the statistician randomly selected a proportional number of districts from each cluster and, from these districts, he randomly selected the sampling of students to be re-interviewed. Districts with an eligible migrant student population of 9 children or less (or less than 1 percent) were excluded from sampling.

The results of the random selection from districts with migrant eligible populations greater than 1% yield a sample sufficient enough to account for any possible non-responses and sufficient enough to secure at least the minimum number of 50 eligible children required by the Office of Migrant Education.

To ensure successful completion of at least 50 re-interviews, 75 students were randomly selected from the districts. These students were included in the re-interviewing sample.

The re-interviews took place at the beginning of the 2016-17 school year, in early fall, but all sampled children were extracted from the universe of eligible students for the school year 2015-16, September 1, 2015 through August 31, 2016.

Please describe the sampling replacement by the State.

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

To ensure successful completion of at least 50 re-interviews, 75 students were randomly selected and included in the re-interviewing sample. An additional replacement random sampling of 15 children was extracted from the selected districts to be used should significant attrition occur due to non-responses.

The additional replacement random sampling of 15 children resulted in two of them being duplicates. Therefore, instead of a total of 90 students in the sampling, the total was 88, from which 58 were re-interviewed. Of these 58 re-interviews, one (1) was conducted by telephone and fifty-seven (57) were conducted face-to-face.

Obtaining Data From Families		
Check the applicable box to indicate how the re-interviews were conducted		
Face-to-face re-interviews	<u>Both</u>	
Phone Interviews		
Both		
Obtaining Data From Families		Yes/No
Was there a protocol for verifying all information used in making the original eligibility determination?		<u>Yes</u>
Were re-interviewers independent from the original interviewers?		<u>Yes</u>

If you did conduct independent re-interviews in this reporting period, describe how you ensured that the process was independent.

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

WDPI contracted an independent consultant with over forty (40) years of experience in the field of migrant education (as recruiter, teacher, education consultant, state director, and independent contractor, including experience as a re-interviewer for several states, both large and small).

Once the sampling was completed by the state statistician, the WDPI's MEP staff held an initial orientation meeting with the independent re-interviewer to: discuss the re-interview process; review data samples; schedule site visits for re-interviewing; arrange for travel itinerary and logistics; review the role of the SEA MEP and LEA MEP staff; and schedule post-re-interviewing debriefing and reporting follow-up.

Copies of all of the COEs corresponding to the sampled students were sorted by project area and provided to the independent re-interviewer for his planning.

WDPI's MEP staff assisted in contacting LEA MEP staff prior to and during the visits to inform them of the on-going re-interviewing process in case local assistance was needed. LEA MEP staff did not join the re-interviewing process.

The role of the WDPI MEP staff help build report between the re-interviewer and the families. WDPI MEP staff accompanied the independent re-interviewer to the different migrant project sites. It was important to have a state representatives along in case it was necessary to explain the purpose of the visits and to assist in introducing the re-interviewer. WDPI MEP staff also address emerging concerns from families that because of their nature, not related to the re-interviewing process, could not or would not be addressed by the independent re-interviewer. The WDPI MEP staff did not intervene, nor were they present during the face-to-face re-interview. Once introductions concluded at the camp-sites, homes, or work-sites, the WDPI MEP staff stepped aside to allow for the independent contractor to conduct his work.

In the space below, refer to the results of any re-interview processes used by the SEA, and if any of the migrant 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.

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

Of the eighty-eight (88) children randomly sampled, fifty-eight (58) or the equivalent of sixty-six percent (66%) were located and re-interviewed. Of these, all of the 58 children re-interviewed, or 100%, were confirmed as eligible.

The re-interviewer found the data in the COEs to be consistent with what the families verified for him, but the quality of COEs varied from one site to another. Occasionally, he found a miss-spelled name, crossed out information, and/or blank spaces. The re-interviewer recommended for WDPI to use an electronic COE rather than a paper COE.

WDPI has addressed COE quality throughout the year and will it as part of the annual ID&R training in the spring. NGS does interface with electronic COEs, therefore WDPI is conducting a cost/benefit analysis to determine if WDPI should continue with NGS or find another system that will meet the federal MEP requirements.

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

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

2.3.2 Eligible Migrant Children

2.3.2.1 Priority for Services

In the table below, provide the unduplicated number of **eligible** migrant 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)	0
K	13
1	28
2	34
3	18
4	13
5	12
6	18
7	19
8	12
9	19
10	30
11	19
12	18
Ungraded	0
Out-of-school	2
Total	255
Comments:	

FAQ on priority for services:

Who is classified as having "priority for service?" Migratory children who are failing or most at risk of failing to meet the State's challenging academic content standards and student academic achievement standards, and whose education has been interrupted during the regular school year.

2.3.2.2 Limited English Proficient

In the table below, provide the unduplicated number of **eligible** migrant children who are also limited English proficient (LEP). The total is calculated automatically.

Age/Grade	Limited English Proficient (LEP) During the Performance Period
Age 3 through 5 (not Kindergarten)	9
K	18
1	28
2	33
3	25
4	21
5	18
6	21
7	17
8	14
9	12
10	13
11	11
12	11
Ungraded	0
Out-of-school	2
Total	253
Comments:	

2.3.2.3 Children with Disabilities (IDEA)

In the table below, provide the unduplicated number of **eligible** migrant 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 (IDEA) During the Performance Period
Age Birth through 2	1
Age 3 through 5 (not Kindergarten)	0
K	3
1	1
2	2
3	0
4	0
5	2
6	5
7	3
8	0
9	3
10	5
11	6
12	3
Ungraded	0
Out-of-school	3
Total	37

Comments:

2.3.2.4 Qualifying Arrival Date (QAD)

In the table below, provide the unduplicated number of **eligible** migrant children whose qualifying arrival date (QAD) occurred within 12 months from the last day of the performance period, August 31, 2016 (i.e., QAD during the performance period). The total is calculated automatically.

Age/Grade	Qualifying Arrival Date During the Performance Period
Age Birth through 2	64
Age 3 through 5 (not Kindergarten)	73
K	28
1	33
2	39
3	36
4	31
5	31
6	29
7	24
8	21
9	24
10	38
11	20
12	14
Ungraded	0
Out-of-school	18
Total	523

Comments:

2.3.2.5 Qualifying Arrival Date During the Regular School Year

In the table below, provide the unduplicated number of **eligible** migrant children whose qualifying arrival date occurred during the performance period's regular school year (i.e., QAD during the 2015-16 regular school year). The total is calculated automatically.

Age/Grade	Qualifying Arrival Date During the Regular School Year
Age Birth through 2	20
Age 3 through 5 (not Kindergarten)	23
K	7
1	12
2	16
3	7
4	8
5	13
6	10
7	9
8	9
9	3
10	7
11	3
12	4
Ungraded	0
Out-of-school	3
Total	154
Comments:	

2.3.2.6 Referrals — During the Performance Period

In the table below, provide the unduplicated number of **eligible** migrant children who, during the performance period, received an educational or educationally related service funded by a non-MEP program/organization that they would not have otherwise received without efforts supported by MEP funds. Children should be reported only once regardless of the frequency with which they received a referred service. Include children who received a referral only or who received both a referral and MEP-funded services. Do not include children who received a referral from the MEP, but did not receive services from the non-MEP program/organization to which they were referred. The total is calculated automatically.

Age/Grade	Referrals During the Performance Period
Age Birth through 2	1
Age 3 through 5 (not Kindergarten)	1
K	1
1	1
2	1
3	0
4	0
5	0
6	4
7	1
8	0
9	1
10	2
11	1
12	2
Ungraded	0
Out-of-school	2
Total	18
Comments:	

2.3.2.8 Academic Status

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

2.3.2.8.1 Dropouts

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

Grade	Dropouts During the Performance Period
7	S
8	S
9	S
10	S
11	S
12	S
Ungraded	
Total	S
Comments:	

FAQ on Dropouts:

How is "drop outs" defined? The term used for students, who, during the reporting period, were enrolled in a public school for at least one day, but who subsequently left school with no plans on returning to enroll in a school and continue toward a high school diploma. Students who dropped out-of-school prior to the 2015-16 reporting period should be classified NOT as "drop-outs" but as "out-of-school youth."

2.3.2.8.2 HSED (High School Equivalency Diploma)

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

Obtained HSED	#
Obtained a HSED in your State During the Performance Period	S
Comments: Wisconsin's MEP does not provide GED/HSED services with migrant funds. We refer students to services funded by other sources.	

2.3.3 Services for Eligible Migrant Children

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

Eligible migrant children who are served include:

- Migrant children who were eligible for and received instructional or support services funded in whole or in part with MEP funds.
- Children who continued to receive MEP-funded services during the term their eligibility ended.

Do not include:

- Children who were served through a Title I **Schoolwide Program** (SWP) where MEP funds were consolidated with those of other programs.
- Children who received only referred services (non-MEP funded).
- Children who were served for one additional school year after their eligibility ended, if comparable services were not available through other programs.
- Children who were in secondary school after their eligibility ended, and served through credit accrual programs until graduation (e.g., children served under the continuation of services authority, Section (1304(e)(2-3))).

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 migrant child; (2) address a need of a migrant 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 migrant families on available reading programs as part of an effort to increase the reading skills of migrant children. Although these are allowable activities, they are not services because they do not meet all of the criteria above.

2.3.3.2 Priority for Services – During the Regular School Year

In the table below, provide the unduplicated number of **eligible** migrant children who have been classified as having "priority for services" and who received MEP funded instructional or support services during the regular school year. The total is calculated automatically.

Age/Grade	Priority for Services During the Regular School Year
Age 3 through 5 (not Kindergarten)	0
K	12
1	26
2	31
3	16
4	11
5	6
6	16
7	15
8	8
9	15
10	25
11	16
12	15
Ungraded	0
Out-of-school	2
Total	214
Comments:	

2.3.4.2 Priority for Services – During the Summer/Intersession Term

In the table below, provide the unduplicated number of **eligible** migrant children who have been classified as having "priority for services" and who received MEP- funded instructional or support services during the summer/intersession term. The total is calculated automatically.

Age/Grade	Priority for Services During the Summer/Intersession Term
Age 3 through 5 (not Kindergarten)	0
K	2
1	10
2	6
3	5
4	6
5	2
6	6
7	6
8	3
9	7
10	8
11	4
12	4
Ungraded	0
Out-of-school	0
Total	69
Comments:	

2.3.5 MEP Services – During the Performance Period

In the table below, provide the unduplicated number of **eligible** migrant 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	2
Age 3 through 5 (not Kindergarten)	16
K	34
1	46
2	57
3	45
4	41
5	33
6	42
7	26
8	39
9	35
10	35
11	30
12	31
Ungraded	0
Out-of-school	8
Total	520
Comments:	

2.3.5.1 Priority for Services – During the Performance Period

In the table below, provide the unduplicated number of **eligible** migrant 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)	0
K	13
1	27
2	32
3	16
4	11
5	7
6	16
7	15
8	9
9	15
10	27
11	16
12	17
Ungraded	0
Out-of-school	2
Total	223
Comments:	

2.3.5.2 Continuation of Services – During the Performance Period

In the table below, provide the unduplicated number of migrant children who received MEP-funded instructional or support services during the performance period under the continuation of services authority Sections 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)	0
K	0
1	0
2	0
3	0
4	0
5	0
6	0
7	0
8	0
9	9
10	8
11	6
12	5
Ungraded	0
Out-of-school	0
Total	28
Comments:	

2.3.5.3 Instructional Service – During the Performance Period

In the table below, provide the unduplicated number of **eligible** migrant 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	0
Age 3 through 5 (not Kindergarten)	10
K	24
1	33
2	35
3	29
4	28
5	26
6	28
7	22
8	23
9	22
10	26
11	21
12	24
Ungraded	0
Out-of-school	2
Total	353
Comments:	

2.3.5.3.1 Type of Instructional Service – During the Performance Period

In the table below, provide the number of **eligible** migrant 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	0	0	////////////////////////////////////
Age 3 through 5 (not Kindergarten)	8	8	////////////////////////////////////
K	13	8	////////////////////////////////////
1	16	13	////////////////////////////////////
2	21	20	////////////////////////////////////
3	16	14	////////////////////////////////////
4	15	16	////////////////////////////////////
5	12	14	////////////////////////////////////
6	8	9	////////////////////////////////////
7	7	9	////////////////////////////////////
8	8	10	////////////////////////////////////
9	9	8	9
10	6	8	12
11	3	6	11
12	7	7	15
Ungraded	0	0	0
Out-of-school	0	0	0
Total	149	150	47
Comments:			

FAQ on Types of Instructional Services:

What is "high school credit accrual"? Instruction 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. Includes correspondence courses taken by a student under the supervision of a teacher.

2.3.5.3.2 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** migrant 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** migrant 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 Service During the Performance Period
Age Birth through 2	2	2
Age 3 through 5 (not Kindergarten)	16	6
K	33	9
1	46	12
2	57	22
3	45	15
4	41	12
5	33	6
6	41	16
7	25	3
8	39	15
9	35	13
10	33	7
11	29	8
12	31	9
Ungraded	0	0
Out-of-school	7	2
Total	513	157
Comments:		

FAQs on Support Services:

- a. *What are support services?* These MEP-funded services include, but are not limited to, health, nutrition, counseling, and social services for migrant families; necessary educational supplies, and transportation. 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, between students and students, and between counselors and other staff members. The services can also help the child address life problems or personal crisis that result from the culture of migrancy.

2.3.6 School Data - During the Regular School Year

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

2.3.6.1 Schools and Enrollment - During the Regular School Year

In the table below, provide the number of public schools that enrolled **eligible** migrant 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** migrant children who were enrolled in those schools. Since more than one school in a State may enroll the same migrant child at some time during the regular school year, the number of children may include duplicates.

Schools	#
Number of schools that enrolled eligible migrant children	101
Number of eligible migrant children enrolled in those schools	606
Comments:	

2.3.6.2 Schools Where MEP Funds Were Consolidated in Schoolwide Programs (SWP) – 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** migrant 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 migrant 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 migrant children enrolled in those schools	
Comments: MEP funds are not used at the school level during the regular school year. They are allocated and used at the LEA and state level.	

2.3.7 MEP Project Data

The following questions collect data on MEP projects.

2.3.7.1 Type of MEP Project

In the table below, provide the number of projects that are funded in whole or in part with MEP funds. A MEP project is the entity that receives MEP funds from the State or through an intermediate entity that receives the MEP funds from the State and provides services directly to the migrant child. Do not include projects where MEP funds were consolidated in SWP.

Also, provide the number of migrant children **served** in the projects. Since children may receive services in more than one project, the number of children may include duplicates.

Type of MEP Project	Number of MEP Projects	Number of Migrant Children Served in the Projects
Regular school year - school day only	19	470
Regular school year - school day/extended day		
Summer/intersession only	10	138
Year round		

Comments: The WDPI funds projects to serve students either during the regular school year or during the summer. While some LEAs serve students for both terms, Wisconsin does not host a year round migrant program. WDPI re-verifies student eligibility at the beginning of each regular year and summer project period to ensure that only eligible students are served. At the point of withdrawal or at the end of the term, projects report the services provided to each student served. This data is updated in NGS and used for this count.

FAQs on type of MEP project:

- a. *What is a project?* A project is any entity that receives MEP funds and provides services directly to migrant children in accordance with the State Service Delivery Plan and State approved subgrant applications or contracts. A project's services may be provided in one or more sites. Each project should be counted once, regardless of the number of sites in which it provides services.
- b. *What are Regular School Year – School Day Only projects?* Projects where all MEP services are provided during the school day during the regular school year.
- c. *What are Regular School Year – School Day/Extended Day projects?* Projects where some or all MEP services are provided during an extended day or week during the regular school year (e.g., some services are provided during the school day and some outside of the school day; e.g., all services are provided outside of the school day).
- d. *What are Summer/Intersession Only projects?* Projects where all MEP services are provided during the summer/intersession term.
- e. *What are Year Round projects?* Projects where all MEP services are provided during the regular school year and summer/intersession term.

2.3.8 MEP Personnel Data

The following questions collect data on MEP personnel data.

2.3.8.1 MEP State Director

In the table below, provide the FTE amount of time the State director performs MEP duties (regardless of whether the director is funded by State, MEP, or other funds) during the performance period (e.g., September 1 through August 31).

State Director FTE	0.50
Comments:	

FAQs on the MEP State director

- a. *How is the FTE calculated for the State director?* Calculate the FTE using the number of days worked for the MEP. To do so, first define how many full-time days constitute one *FTE* for the State director in your State for the performance period. To calculate the FTE number, sum the total days the State director worked for the MEP during the performance period and divide this sum by the number of full-time days that constitute one FTE in the reporting period.
- b. *Who is the State director?* The manager within the SEA who administers the MEP on a statewide basis.

2.3.8.2 MEP Staff

In the table below, provide the headcount and FTE by job classification of the staff funded by the MEP. Do **not** include staff employed in SWP where MEP funds were combined with those of other programs.

Job Classification	Regular School Year		Summer/Intersession Term		Performance Period
	Headcount	FTE	Headcount	FTE	Headcount
Teachers	16	1.44	27	20.82	43
Counselors	0	0.00	0	0.00	0
Non-qualified paraprofessionals	1	0.01	7	7.00	8
Qualified paraprofessionals	9	2.53	21	12.42	30
Recruiters	10	3.55	7	2.48	17
Records transfer staff	0	0.00	2	0.66	2
Administrators	8	0.80	15	6.80	23
Comments:					

Note: The Headcount value displayed represents the greatest whole number submitted in file specification N/X065 for the corresponding Job Classification. For example, an ESS submitted value of 9.8 will be represented in your CSPR as 9.

FAQs on MEP staff:

- a. *How is the FTE calculated?* The FTE may be calculated using one of two methods:
 1. To calculate the FTE, in each job category, sum the percentage of time that staff were funded by the MEP and enter the total FTE for that category.
 2. Calculate the FTE using the number of days worked. To do so, first define how many full-time days constitute one FTE for each job classification in your State for each term. (For example, one regular-term FTE may equal 180 full-time (8 hour) work days; one summer term FTE may equal 30 full-time work days; or one intersession FTE may equal 45 full-time work days split between three 15-day non-contiguous blocks throughout the year.) To calculate the FTE number, sum the total days the individuals worked in a particular job classification for a term and divide this sum by the number of full-time days that constitute one FTE in that term.
- b. *Who is a teacher?* A classroom instructor who is licensed and meets any other teaching requirements in the State.
- c. *Who is a counselor?* A professional staff member who guides individuals, families, groups, and communities by assisting them in problem-solving, decision-making, discovering meaning, and articulating goals related to personal, educational, and career development.
- d. *Who is a paraprofessional?* An individual who: (1) provides one-on-one tutoring if such tutoring is scheduled at a time when a student would not otherwise receive instruction from a teacher; (2) assists with classroom management, such as organizing instructional and other materials; (3) provides instructional assistance in a computer laboratory; (4) conducts parental involvement activities; (5) provides support in a library or media center; (6) acts as a translator; or (7) provides instructional support services under the direct supervision of a teacher (Title I, Section 1119(g)(2)). Because a paraprofessional provides instructional support, he/she should not be providing planned direct instruction or introducing to students new skills, concepts, or academic content. Individuals who work in food services, cafeteria or playground supervision, personal care services, non-instructional computer assistance, and similar positions are not considered paraprofessionals under Title I.
- e. *Who is a qualified paraprofessional?* A qualified paraprofessional must have a secondary school diploma or its recognized equivalent and have (1) completed 2 years of study at an institution of higher education; (2) obtained an associate's (or higher) degree; or (3) met a rigorous standard of quality and be able to demonstrate, through a formal State or local academic assessment, knowledge of and the ability to assist in instructing reading, writing, and mathematics (or, as appropriate, reading readiness, writing readiness, and mathematics readiness) (Section 1119(c) and (d) of ESEA).
- f. *Who is a recruiter?* A staff person responsible for identifying and recruiting children as eligible for the MEP and documenting their eligibility on the Certificate of Eligibility.
- g. *Who is a record transfer staffer?* An individual who is responsible for entering, retrieving, or sending student records from or to another school or student records system.
- h. *Who is an administrator?* A professional staff member, including the project director or regional director. The SEA MEP Director should not be included.

2.4 PREVENTION AND INTERVENTION PROGRAMS FOR CHILDREN AND YOUTH WHO ARE NEGLECTED, DELINQUENT, OR AT RISK (TITLE I, PART D, SUBPARTS 1 AND 2)

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, 2015 through June 30, 2016.
- | 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, have a drug or alcohol problem, are pregnant or parenting, have been in contact with the juvenile justice system in the past, are at least 1 year behind the expected age/grade level, have limited English proficiency, 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 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, which receive Title I, Part D funds and serve non-adjudicated children and youth.

2.4.1 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.

2.4.1.1 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		
Juvenile detention		
Juvenile corrections	3	106
Adult corrections	16	90
Other		
Total	19	////////////////////
Comments:		

FAQ on Programs and Facilities - Subpart 1:

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

2.4.1.1.1 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	
Juvenile detention	
Juvenile corrections	3
Adult corrections	16
Other	
Total	19
Comments:	

2.4.1.2 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 limited English proficiency (LEP), 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	0	0	564	828	0
Total Long Term Students Served	0	0	285	345	0

Student Subgroups	Neglected Programs	Juvenile Detention	Juvenile Corrections	Adult Corrections	Other Programs
Students with disabilities (<i>IDEA</i>)	0	0	256	193	0
LEP Students	0	0	0	7	0

Race/Ethnicity	Neglected Programs	Juvenile Detention	Juvenile Corrections	Adult Corrections	Other Programs
American Indian or Alaska Native	0	0	24	27	0
Asian	0	0	6	3	0
Black or African American	0	0	225	549	0
Hispanic or Latino	0	0	38	52	0
Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander	0	0	0	0	0
White	0	0	112	188	0
Two or more races	0	0	159	9	0
Total	0	0	564	828	0

Sex	Neglected Programs	Juvenile Detention	Juvenile Corrections	Adult Corrections	Other Programs
Male	0	0	504	771	0
Female	0	0	60	57	0
Total	0	0	564	828	0

Age	Neglected Programs	Juvenile Detention	Juvenile Corrections	Adult Corrections	Other Programs
3 through 5	0	0	0	0	0
6	0	0	0	0	0
7	0	0	0	0	0
8	0	0	0	0	0
9	0	0	0	0	0
10	0	0	0	0	0
11	0	0	0	0	0
12	0	0	0	0	0
13	0	0	0	0	0
14	0	0	10	0	0
15	0	0	43	0	0
16	0	0	126	0	0
17	0	0	200	17	0
18	0	0	121	91	0
19	0	0	35	203	0
20	0	0	11	267	0
21	0	0	18	250	0
Total	0	0	564	828	0

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

This response is limited to 8,000 characters.

Comments:

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, 2015 through June 30, 2016.

2.4.1.3.1 Transition Services in Subpart 1

In the first row of the table below indicate whether programs/facilities receiving Subpart 1 funds within the State are legally permitted to track student outcomes after leaving the program or facility by entering Yes or No. In the second row, provide the unduplicated count of students receiving transition services that specifically target planning for further schooling and/or employment. If not, provide more information in the comment field.

Transition Services	Neglected Programs	Juvenile Detention	Juvenile Corrections	Adult Corrections	Other Programs
Are facilities in your state permitted to collect data on student outcomes after exit ? (Yes or No)	N/A	N/A	No	No	N/A
Number of students receiving transition services that address further schooling and/or employment.			564	828	

This response is limited to 4,000 characters.

Comments: Staff at the juvenile and adult corrections institutions are not allowed to have contact with inmates after they leave the institutions due to the law against any fraternization in this state. Institutions provide transition services for preparation for exit upon entry and during the time students are incarcerated to prepare them for exit or employment, and/or schooling.

FAQ on facilities collecting data on student outcomes after exit:

If only some, but not all, facilities in the State are legally permitted to collect data on student outcomes after exit, enter 'yes' for the first question and provide a comment indicating why some facilities are unable to collect these data.

2.4.1.3.2 Academic and Vocational 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 and vocational 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 while enrolled in the State agency program/facility column ("in fac.") or in the 90 days after exit 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 and vocational 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 and vocational outcomes within 90 calendar days after exiting. If a student attained an outcome once in the program/facility and once during the 90 day transition period, that student may be reported once in each column.

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					S		S			
Outcomes (once per student)	Neglected Programs		Juvenile Detention		Juvenile Corrections		Adult Corrections		Other Programs	
# of Students Who	In fac.	90 days after exit	In fac.	90 days after exit	In fac.	90 days after exit	In fac.	90 days after exit	In fac.	90 days after exit
Earned a GED					16	S	92	S		
Obtained high school diploma					22	S	20	S		
Outcomes (once per student per time period)	Neglected Programs		Juvenile Detention		Juvenile Corrections		Adult Corrections		Other Programs	
# of Students Who	In fac.	90 days after exit	In fac.	90 days after exit	In fac.	90 days after exit	In fac.	90 days after exit	In fac.	90 days after exit
Earned high school course credits					457	S	S	S		
Enrolled in a GED program					45	S	543	S		
Accepted and/or enrolled into post-secondary education					S	S	32	S		
Enrolled in job training courses/programs					563	S	223	S		
Obtained employment					S	S	S	S		

This response is limited to 4,000 characters.

Comments:

2.4.1.6 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.

2.4.1.6.1 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, 2015, 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			43	29	
Long-term students with no change in grade level from the pre- to post-test exams			78	95	
Long-term students with improvement up to one full grade level from the pre- to post-test exams			20	52	
Long-term students with improvement of more than one full grade level from the pre- to post-test exams			117	109	
Comments:					

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, 2015 through June 30, 2016.

2.4.1.6.2 Academic Performance in Mathematics – Subpart 1

This section is similar to 2.4.1.6.1. The only difference is that this section collects data on mathematics performance.

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			49	30	
Long-term students with no change in grade level from the pre- to post-test exams			99	111	
Long-term students with improvement up to one full grade level from the pre- to post-test exams			23	40	
Long-term students with improvement of more than one full grade level from the pre- to post-test exams			79	90	
Comments:					

2.4.2 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.

2.4.2.1 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 (# days)
At-risk programs		
Neglected programs	4	303
Juvenile detention	7	51
Juvenile corrections		
Other	13	87
Total	24	////////////////////
Comments:		

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.

2.4.2.1.1 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	
Neglected programs	2
Juvenile detention	7
Juvenile corrections	
Other	13
Total	22
Comments: Despite WDPI intervention, two institutions did not submit data in time for this collection. WDPI will work with these institutions to ensure a more timely submission next year.	

2.4.2.2 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 limited English proficiency (LEP), 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		151	931		1,462
Total Long Term Students Served		151	265		1,370

Student Subgroups	At-Risk Programs	Neglected Programs	Juvenile Detention	Juvenile Corrections	Other Programs
Students with disabilities (<i>IDEA</i>)		148	255		851
LEP Students		0	12		0

Race/Ethnicity	At-Risk Programs	Neglected Programs	Juvenile Detention	Juvenile Corrections	Other Programs
American Indian or Alaska Native		6	22		27
Asian		4	5		8
Black or African American		25	418		933
Hispanic or Latino		3	78		87
Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander		0	0		0
White		107	396		360
Two or more races		6	12		47
Total		151	931		1,462

Sex	At-Risk Programs	Neglected Programs	Juvenile Detention	Juvenile Corrections	Other Programs
Male		116	658		1,162
Female		35	273		300
Total		151	931		1,462

Age	At-Risk Programs	Neglected Programs	Juvenile Detention	Juvenile Corrections	Other Programs
3 through 5		1	0		1
6		3	0		1
7		3	0		3
8		9	0		7
9		9	0		5
10		18	5		19
11		12	18		28
12		14	22		45
13		17	46		108
14		22	89		208
15		13	120		353
16		11	150		446
17		13	219		211
18		6	144		25
19		0	72		2
20		0	43		0
21		0	3		0
Total		151	931		1,462

If the total number of students differs by demographics, please explain. The response is limited to 8,000 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, 2015 through June 30, 2016.

2.4.2.3.1 Transition Services in Subpart 2

In the first row of the table below indicate whether programs/facilities receiving Subpart 2 funds within the State are legally permitted to track student outcomes after leaving the program or facility by entering Yes or No. In the second row, provide the unduplicated count of students receiving transition services that specifically target planning for further schooling and/or employment. If not, provide more information in the comment field.

Transition Services	At-Risk Programs	Neglected Programs	Juvenile Detention	Juvenile Corrections	Other Programs
Are facilities in your state permitted to collect data on student outcomes after exit ? (Yes or No)	N/A	Yes	Yes	N/A	Yes
Number of students receiving transition services that address further schooling and/or employment.		151	754		1,432

This response is limited to 4,000 characters.

Comments: Our state would encourage gathering data outcomes on exiting students however, the students do not always reside or return to a home district where the residential facility could collaborate, gather, or retain information on the student upon leaving the residential facility.

FAQ on facilities collecting data on student outcomes after exit:

If only some, but not all, facilities in the State are legally permitted to collect data on student outcomes after exit, enter 'yes' for the first question and provide a comment indicating why some facilities are unable to collect these data.

2.4.2.3.2 Academic and Vocational 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 and vocational 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 while enrolled in the LEA program/facility column ("in fac.") or in the 90 days after exit 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 and vocational outcomes while enrolled in the LEA program/facility. In the "90 days after exit" column provide the unduplicated number of students who attained academic and vocational outcomes within 90 calendar days after exiting. If a student attained an outcome once in the program/facility and once during the 90 day transition period, that student may be reported once in each column.

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			S		231				236	
Outcomes (once per student)	At-Risk Programs		Neglected Programs		Juvenile Detention		Juvenile Corrections		Other Programs	
# of Students Who Earned a GED	In fac.	90 days after exit	In fac.	90 days after exit	In fac.	90 days after exit	In fac.	90 days after exit	In fac.	90 days after exit
Obtained high school diploma			4	S	22	27			14	S
Outcomes (once per student per time period)	At-Risk Programs		Neglected Programs		Juvenile Detention		Juvenile Corrections		Other Programs	
# of Students Who Earned high school course credits	In fac.	90 days after exit	In fac.	90 days after exit	In fac.	90 days after exit	In fac.	90 days after exit	In fac.	90 days after exit
Enrolled in a GED program			S	S	S	S			4	S
Accepted and/or enrolled into post-secondary education			S	S	S	S			S	S
Enrolled in job training courses/programs			20	S	S	S			114	34
Obtained employment			15	S	S	S			6	S

This response is limited to 4,000 characters.

Comments:

2.4.2.6 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.

2.4.2.6.1 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, 2015, 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		S	9		59
Long-term students with no change in grade level from the pre- to post-test exams		22	16		65
Long-term students with improvement up to one full grade level from the pre- to post-test exams		100	29		111
Long-term students with improvement of more than one full grade level from the pre- to post-test exams		0	5		111
Comments:					

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, 2015, through June 30, 2016.

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.

2.4.2.6.2 Academic Performance in Mathematics – Subpart 2

This section is similar to 2.4.2.6.1. The only difference is that this section collects data on mathematics performance.

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		S	8		63
Long-term students with no change in grade level from the pre- to post-test exams		27	19		52
Long-term students with improvement up to one full grade level from the pre- to post-test exams		87	34		106
Long-term students with improvement of more than one full grade level from the pre- to post-test exams		4	S		113
Comments:					

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, 2015, through June 30, 2016.

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.

2.9 RURAL EDUCATION ACHIEVEMENT PROGRAM (REAP) (TITLE VI, PART B, SUBPARTS 1 AND 2)

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

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

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

Purpose	# LEAs
Teacher recruitment and retention, including the use of signing bonuses and other financial incentives	5
Teacher professional development, including programs that train teachers to utilize technology to improve teaching and to train special needs teachers	11
Educational technology, including software and hardware as described in Title II, Part D	9
Parental involvement activities	2
Activities authorized under the Safe and Drug-Free Schools Program (Title IV, Part A)	2
Activities authorized under Title I, Part A	10
Activities authorized under Title III (Language instruction for LEP and immigrant students)	2
Comments:	

2.9.2.1 Goals and Objectives

In the space below, describe the progress the State has made in meeting the goals and objectives for the Rural Low-Income Schools (RLIS) Program as described in its June 2002 Consolidated State application. Provide quantitative data where available.

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

Twenty-two school districts in Wisconsin were eligible for RLIS for the 2015-2016 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 2015-2016 funds, as reported in their application budgets and subsequent claims: (Note: many districts used their grants in more than one area.)

Five districts used the funds for Purpose 1, teacher recruitment and retention. All five of the districts used the grant to support instruction in reading and math at various grade levels.

Eleven districts used all or part of their funding for Purpose 2, teacher professional development. As in the past, most of these districts provided specific training in how to use educational technology, including software and SmartBoards, as well as training in the Educator Effectiveness standards in Wisconsin.

Nine districts used the funding for Purpose 3, educational technology. Most of these districts used the funds for Chromebooks, Whiteboards, computers, and educational software.

Two districts used funds for Purpose 4, parental involvement. Both of these districts used funds to support family engagement events, and one of the districts also used some of the grant to enhance a pre-school literacy program.

Two districts used funds for Purpose 5, Safe and Drug-Free schools. Both of these districts enhanced their behavior management program for students.

Ten districts used funds for Purpose 6, Title I activities. These activities included enhancing pre-school literacy programs, supporting tutoring and coaching programs in math and literacy, instituting STAR assessments, and sending personnel to the state-wide Title I conference.

Two districts used funds for Purpose 7, language instruction. These districts enhanced their support of ELL students in learning English and math.

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.

Many rural districts are in danger of falling behind in this rapidly evolving aspect of instructional methodology. For the past few years, many districts have also used these funds for professional development, spurred by Wisconsin's Educator Effectiveness standards.

2.10 FUNDING TRANSFERABILITY FOR STATE AND LOCAL EDUCATIONAL AGENCIES (TITLE VI, PART A, SUBPART 2)

2.10.1 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 6123(a) during SY 2015-16?	<u>No</u>
Comments:	

2.10.2 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 6123(b).	5
Comments:	

2.10.2.1 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
Improving Teacher Quality State Grants (Section 2121)	5	
Educational Technology State Grants (Section 2412(a)(2)(A))		
Safe and Drug-Free Schools and Communities (Section 4112(b)(1))		
State Grants for Innovative Programs (Section 5112(a))		
Title I, Part A, Improving Basic Programs Operated by LEAs		5

In the table below provide the total amount of FY 2015 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
Improving Teacher Quality State Grants (Section 2121)	83,661.00	
Educational Technology State Grants (Section 2412(a)(2)(A))		
Safe and Drug-Free Schools and Communities (Section 4112(b)(1))		
State Grants for Innovative Programs (Section 5112(a))		
Title I, Part A, Improving Basic Programs Operated by LEAs		83,661.00
Total	83,661.00	83,661.00
Comments:		

The Department plans to obtain information on the use of funds under both the State and LEA Transferability Authority through evaluation studies.

2.11 GRADUATION RATES⁴

This section collects graduation rates.

2.11.1 Regulatory Adjusted Cohort Graduation Rates

In the table below, provide the graduation rates calculated using the methodology that was approved as part of the State's accountability plan for the **current school year** (SY 2015-16). Below the table are FAQs about the data collected in this table.

Note: States are not required to report these data by the racial/ethnic groups shown in the table below; instead, they are required to report these data by the major racial and ethnic groups that are identified in their Accountability Workbooks or Accountability Workbooks Addenda. The charts below display racial/ethnic data that have been mapped from the major racial and ethnic groups identified in their workbooks, to the racial/ethnic groups shown.

Student Group	# Students in Cohort	# of Graduates	Graduation Rate
All Students	65,478	S	86.8
American Indian or Alaska Native	773	S	77
Asian or Pacific Islander	2,286	S	88
<i>Asian</i>	2,234	S	88
<i>Native Hawaiian or Other Pacific Islander</i>	52	S	81
Black or African American	6,192	S	64.0
Hispanic or Latino	5,967	S	79.4
White	48,824	S	90.8
Two or more races	1,436	S	84
Children with disabilities (<i>IDEA</i>)	7,108	S	67.3
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	1,346	S	65
Economically disadvantaged students	20,789	S	76.5

FAQs on graduation rates:

What is the regulatory adjusted cohort graduation rate? For complete definitions and instructions, please refer to the non-regulatory guidance, which can be found here: <http://www2.ed.gov/policy/elsec/guid/hsgrguidance.pdf>.

The response is limited to 500 characters.

⁴ The "Asian/Pacific Islander" row in the tables below represent either the value reported by the state to the Department of Education for the major racial and ethnic group "Asian/Pacific Islander" or an aggregation of values reported by the state for the major racial and ethnic groups "Asian" and "Native Hawaiian/Other Pacific Islander or Pacific Islander" (and "Filipino" in the case of California). When the values reported in the Asian/Pacific Islander row represent the U. S. Department of Education aggregation of other values reported by the state, the detail for "Asian" and "Native Hawaiian or Other Pacific Islander" are also included in the following rows. Disaggregated reporting for the adjusted cohort graduation rate data is done according to the provisions outlined within each state's Accountability Workbooks or Accountability Workbooks Addenda. Accordingly, not every state uses major racial and ethnic groups which enable detail of Asian American/Pacific Islander (AAPI) populations.

2.12 LISTS OF SCHOOLS AND DISTRICTS

Per the *ESSA* FAQs located at the following link, *EDFacts* files C106, C107, C109, C111, and C130 (DGs 778 and 779) are no longer required: <http://www2.ed.gov/policy/elsec/leg/essa/faq/essa-faqs.pdf>.

This section contains data on school statuses. States with approved *ESEA* Flexibility requests should follow the instructions in sections 2.12.1 and 2.12.3. All other states should follow the instructions in sections 2.12.2 and 2.12.4. These tables will be generated based on data submitted to *EDFacts* and included as part of each state's certified report; states will no longer upload their lists separately. Data will be generated into separate reports for each question listed below.

2.12.1 List of Schools for *ESEA* Flexibility States

2.12.1.2 List of Priority and Focus Schools

Instructions for States that identified priority and focus schools ⁵ under *ESEA* flexibility for SY 2016-17: Provide the information listed in the bullets below for those schools.

- | District Name
- | District NCES ID Code
- | School Name
- | School NCES ID Code
- | Whether the school met the proficiency target in reading/language arts in accordance with the State's approved *ESEA* flexibility request
- | Whether the school met the 95 percent participation rate target for the reading/language arts assessment
- | Whether the school met the proficiency target in mathematics in accordance with the State's approved *ESEA* flexibility request
- | Whether the school met the 95 percent participation rate target for the mathematics assessment
- | Whether the school met the other academic indicator for elementary/middle schools (if applicable) in accordance with the State's approved *ESEA* flexibility request
- | Whether the school met the graduation rate goal or target for high schools (if applicable) in accordance with the State's approved *ESEA* flexibility request
- | Status for SY 2016-17 (Use one of the following status designations: priority or focus)
- | If applicable, State-specific status in addition to priority or focus (e.g., grade, star, or level)
- | Whether (yes or no) the school is a Title I school (*This information must be provided by all States.*)
- | Whether (yes or no) the school was provided assistance through Section 1003(a).
- | Whether (yes or no) the school was provided assistance through Section 1003(g).

The data for this question are reported through *EDFacts* files and compiled in the EDEN031 "List of Priority and Focus Schools" report in the *EDFacts* Reporting System (ERS). The *EDFacts* files and data groups used in this report are listed in the CSPR Crosswalk. The CSPR Data Key contains more detailed information on how the data are populated into the report.

Before certifying Part II of the CSPR, a state user must run the EDEN031 report in ERS and verify that the state's data are correct. The final, certified data from this report will be made publicly available alongside the state's certified CSPR PDF.

Comments:

⁵ The definitions of priority and focus schools are provided in the document titled, *ESEA Flexibility*. This document may be accessed on the Department's Web page at <http://www.ed.gov/esea/flexibility/documents/esea-flexibility.doc>

2.12.2 List of Schools for All Other States

2.12.2.1 List of Schools Identified for Improvement

Instructions for States that identified schools for improvement, corrective action, or restructuring under *ESEA* section 1116 for SY 2016-17: Provide the information listed in the bullets below for those schools.

- | District Name
- | District NCES ID Code
- | School Name
- | School NCES ID Code
- | Whether the school met the proficiency target in reading/language arts in accordance with the State's Accountability Plan
- | Whether the school met the 95 percent participation rate target for the reading/language arts assessment
- | Whether the school met the proficiency target in mathematics in accordance with the State's Accountability Plan
- | Whether the school met the 95 percent participation rate target for the mathematics assessment
- | Whether the school met the other academic indicator for elementary/middle schools (if applicable) in accordance with the State's Accountability Plan
- | Whether the school met the graduation rate target for high schools (if applicable) in accordance with the State's Accountability Plan
- | Status for SY 2016-17 (Use one of the following status designations: School Improvement – Year 1, School Improvement – Year 2, Corrective Action, Restructuring Year 1 (planning), or Restructuring Year 2 (implementing)⁶
- | Whether (yes or no) the school is a Title I school (*This information must be provided by all States.*)
- | Whether (yes or no) the school was provided assistance through Section 1003(a).
- | Whether (yes or no) the school was provided assistance through Section 1003(g).

The data for this question are reported through *EDFacts* files and compiled in the EDEN033 "List of Schools Identified for Improvement" report in the *EDFacts* Reporting System (ERS). The *EDFacts* files and data groups used in this report are listed in the CSPR Crosswalk. The CSPR Data Key contains more detailed information on how the data are populated into the report.

Before certifying Part II of the CSPR, a state user must run the EDEN033 report in ERS and verify that the state's data are correct. The final, certified data from this report will be made publicly available alongside the state's certified CSPR PDF.

Comments:

⁶ The school improvement statuses are defined in *LEA and School Improvement Non-Regulatory Guidance*. This document may be accessed on the Department's Web page at <http://www.ed.gov/policy/elsec/guid/schoolimprovementguid.doc>.

2.12.3 List of Districts for ESEA Flexibility States**2.12.3.1 List of Identified Districts with State Specific Statuses**

Instructions for States that identified school districts with State-specific statuses under *ESEA* flexibility for SY 2016-17: Provide the information listed in the bullets below for those districts.

- | District name
- | District NCES ID code
- | Whether the district met the proficiency target in reading/language arts in accordance with the State's approved *ESEA* flexibility request
- | Whether the district met the 95 percent participation rate target for the reading/language arts assessment
- | Whether the district met the proficiency target in mathematics in accordance with the State's approved *ESEA* flexibility request
- | Whether the district met the 95 percent participation rate target for the mathematics assessment
- | Whether the district met the other academic indicator for elementary/middle schools (if applicable) in accordance with the State's approved *ESEA* flexibility request
- | Whether the district met the graduation rate for high schools (if applicable) in accordance with the State's approved *ESEA* flexibility request
- | State-specific status for SY 2016-17 (e.g., grade, star, or level)
- | Whether the district received Title I funds.

The data for this question are reported through *EDFacts* files and compiled in the EDEN034 List of Identified Districts with State Specific Statuses. 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 EDEN034 report in ERS and verify that the state's data are correct. The final, certified data from this report will be made publicly available alongside the state's certified CSPR PDF.

Comments:

2.12.4 List of Districts for All Other States

2.12.4.1 List of Districts Identified for Improvement

Instructions for States that identified school districts for improvement or corrective action⁷ under *ESEA* section 1116 for SY 2016-17: Provide the information listed in the bullets below for those districts.

- | District Name
- | District NCES ID Code
- | Whether the district met the proficiency target in reading/language arts as outlined in the State's Accountability Plan
- | Whether the district met the participation rate target for the reading/language arts assessment
- | Whether the district met the proficiency target in mathematics as outlined in the State's Accountability Plan
- | Whether the district met the participation rate target for the mathematics assessment
- | Whether the district met the other academic indicator for elementary/middle schools (if applicable) as outlined in the State's Accountability Plan
- | Whether the district met the graduation rate for high schools (if applicable) as outlined in the State's Accountability Plan
- | Improvement status for SY 2016-17 (Use one of the following improvement status designations: Improvement or Corrective Action)
- | Whether the district received Title I funds.

The data for this question are reported through *EDFacts* files and compiled in the EDEN035 "List of Districts Identified for Improvement" report in the *EDFacts* Reporting System (ERS). The *EDFacts* files and data groups used in this report are listed in the CSPR Crosswalk. The CSPR Data Key contains more detailed information on how the data are populated into the report.

Before certifying Part II of the CSPR, a state user must run the EDEN035 report in ERS and verify that the state's data are correct. The final, certified data from this report will be made publicly available alongside the state's certified CSPR PDF.

Comments:

⁷ The district improvement statuses are defined in *LEA and School Improvement Non-Regulatory Guidance*. This document may be accessed on the Department's Web page at <http://www.ed.gov/policy/elsec/guid/schoolimprovementguid.doc>.