

**CONSOLIDATED STATE PERFORMANCE REPORT:
Part II**

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

**For reporting on
School Year 2018-19**

Idaho



PART II DUE THURSDAY, MAY 28, 2020

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

INTRODUCTION

The Consolidated State Performance Report (CSPR) is the required annual reporting tool for each State, the Bureau of Indian Education, District of Columbia, and Puerto Rico as authorized under Section 8303¹ of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act (ESEA), as amended by the Every Student Succeeds Act of 2015(ESSA)².

Paperwork Burden Statement

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

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

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

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

Consolidated State Performance Report
For
State Formula Grant Programs
under the
Elementary And Secondary Education Act
as amended in 2001

Check the one that indicates the report you are submitting:

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

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

Idaho State Department of Education

Address:

Person to contact about this report:

Name:

Alison Henken

Telephone:

208-332-1579

Fax:

208-334-2632

e-mail:

alison.henken@osbe.idaho.gov

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

Alison Henken

Submitted Date and Time:

06/29/20 6:12:41 PM

2.1 ACCOUNTABILITY

2.1.1 School Performance on Accountability Indicators

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

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

The ED*Facts* files and data groups used in this report are listed in the CSPR Crosswalk. The CSPR Data Key contains more detailed information on how the data are populated into the report. Before certifying Part II of the CSPR, a state user must run the report in ERS and verify that the state's data are correct. The final, certified data from this report will be made publicly available alongside the state's certified CSPR DOCX.

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

2.1.2 Schools Identified for Comprehensive Support and Improvement

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

	Number of Schools	Number of Title I Schools	Number of non-Title I Schools
Lowest performing five percent of Title I schools	28		
High schools failing to graduate one third or more of their students	37	17	20
Title I schools that have received additional targeted support under Section 1111(d)(2)(C) of the ESEA and that have not exited that status after a State-determined number of years			
Total Identified	65		

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

Idaho first identified ATSI schools in the 2017-2018 school year and did not identify schools with chronically low-performing subgroups in 2018-2019, which is defined as schools that do not improve after receiving additional targeted support an improvement for three consecutive years.

2.1.3 Schools Implementing Targeted Support and Improvement Plans

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

	Number of Schools	Number of Title I Schools	Number of non- Title I Schools
Schools with One or More Consistently Underperforming Subgroups of Students	188	93	94
Schools in which any Subgroup of Students, on its own, would lead to Identification Under <i>ESEA</i> Section 1111(c)(4)(D)(i)(I) (i.e., Schools Receiving Additional Targeted Support)	57	41	16

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

2.1.4 Section 1003 of the ESEA School Improvement Funds

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

2.1.4.1 Section 1003 of the ESEA Allocations to LEAs

For each LEA receiving a 1003(a) allocation, list the amount of the allocation. The data for this question are reported through *EDFacts* files and compiled in the EDEN012 "Section 1003 Allocations to LEAs and Schools" report in the *EDFacts* Reporting System (ERS).

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

The *EDFacts* files and data groups used in this report are listed in the CSPR Crosswalk. The CSPR Data Key contains more detailed information on how the data are populated into the report. Before certifying Part II of the CSPR, a state user must run the EDEN012 report in ERS and verify that the state's data are correct. The final, certified data from this report will be made publicly available alongside the state's certified CSPR DOCX.

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

2.1.4.2 Section 1003 of the ESEA Allocations to Schools

For each school receiving a Section 1003(a) allocation of the *ESEA*, list the amount of the allocation. The data for this question are reported through *EDFacts* files and compiled in the EDEN012 "Section 1003 Allocations to LEAs and Schools" report in the *EDFacts* Reporting System (ERS).

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

The *EDFacts* files and data groups used in this report are listed in the CSPR Crosswalk. The CSPR Data Key contains more detailed information on how the data are populated into the report. Before certifying Part II of the CSPR, a state user must run the EDEN012 report in ERS and verify that the state's data are correct. The final, certified data from this report will be made publicly available alongside the state's certified CSPR DOCX.

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

2.2 GRADUATION RATES AND POSTSECONDARY ENROLLMENT

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

2.2.1 Four Year Adjusted Cohort Graduation Rates

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

Student Group	# Students in Cohort	# of Graduates	Graduation Rate
All students	23,332	S	80.8%
American Indian or Alaska Native	275	S	68%
Asian or Pacific Islander	427	S	89%
<i>Asian</i>	325	S	86%
<i>Native Hawaiian or Other Pacific Islander</i>	102	S	76%
Black or African American	345	S	74%
Hispanic or Latino	4,061	S	73.9%
White	17,687	S	82.6%
Two or more races	537	S	79%
Children with disabilities (<i>IDEA</i>)	2,443	S	56%
English Learners	2,360	S	74%
Economically disadvantaged students	12,471	S	72.5%
Children in foster care	109	S	39%
Children who are homeless	1,232	S	57%

Frequently Asked Questions (FAQs) on graduation rates:

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

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

2.2.2 Postsecondary Enrollment

In the table below, provide counts of students who enrolled in programs of postsecondary education during the current reporting period. If data are missing or incomplete, please explain in the comments.

	# Enrolled in an IHE	# Not enrolled in an IHE	# for which data are unavailable	Total
All students	9,426		8,891	S
American Indian or Alaska Native	67		95	S
Asian or Pacific Islander	213		119	S
<i>Asian</i>	181		89	S
<i>Native Hawaiian or Other Pacific Islander</i>	32		30	S
Black or African American	104		85	S
Hispanic or Latino	1,381		1,589	S
White	7,440		6,835	S
Two or more races	221		168	S
Children with disabilities (<i>IDEA</i>)	376		398	S
English Learners	S		S	S
Economically disadvantaged students	2,300		3,526	S

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

Numbers match what was submitted to EDEN.

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

2.3 TITLE I, PART A PROGRAM PARTICIPATION

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

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

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

Special Services or Programs	# Students Served
Children with disabilities (<i>IDEA</i>)	23,044
English learners	15,722
Homeless students	5,459
Migrant students	3,063

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

The number of students has increased in these subgroups over the time period, but the percentages of students have not significantly changed over time for students with disabilities, students with limited English proficiency, students experiencing homelessness, or the students of migratory workers. The State has noted that data is duplicated for students enrolled in multiple LEAs during the reporting period.

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

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

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

Race/Ethnicity	# Students Served
American Indian or Alaska Native	2,352
Asian	1,233
Black or African American	1,725
Hispanic or Latino	38,985
Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander	527
White	112,054
Two or more races	4,374
Total	161,250

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

Although the number of students has slightly increased in these subgroups from 2017 to 2019, the percentages of Hispanic, Native American/Alaska Native, Asian, Black, Native Hawaiian/Pacific Islander, White, or students of two or more races has not significantly increased. The State has noted that data is duplicated for students enrolled in multiple LEAs during the reporting period.

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

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

Age /Grade	Public TAS	Public SWP	Private	Local Neglected	Total
Age Birth through 2	0	14	0	0	14
Age 3 through 5 (not Kindergarten)	17	3,007	2	0	3,026
K	419	16,498	63	6	16,986
1	534	16,729	75	6	17,344
2	445	16,724	59	4	17,232
3	513	16,999	63	10	17,585
4	474	17,315	48	7	17,844
5	452	17,977	42	6	18,477
6	351	13,577	25	13	13,966
7	232	9,968	13	19	10,232
8	230	10,192	10	28	10,460
9	94	4,576	3	21	4,694
10	100	4,512	0	21	4,633
11	110	4,430	1	24	4,565
12	109	4,553	0	10	4,672
Ungraded	0	0	0	0	0
TOTALS	4,080	157,071	404	175	161,730

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

There are fewer students in Targeted Assistance programs over time and more students in Schoolwide Title I programs. Several LEAs have completed Schoolwide/Improvement Plans in order to transition from targeted assistance to Schoolwide programming. The State has noted that data is duplicated for students enrolled in multiple LEAs during the reporting period.

2.4 EDUCATION OF MIGRATORY CHILDREN

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

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

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

There are two exceptions to this rule:

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

2.4.1 Migratory Child Counts

This section collects the Title I, Part C, MEP child counts which States are required to provide and may be used to determine the annual State allocations under Title I, Part C. The child counts should reflect the performance period of September 1, 2018 through August 31, 2019. This section also collects a report on the procedures used by States to produce true, reliable, and valid child counts.

To provide the child counts, each State Education Agency (SEA) should have implemented sufficient procedures and internal controls to ensure that it is counting only those children who are eligible for the MEP. Such procedures are important to protecting the integrity of the State's MEP because they permit the early discovery and correction of eligibility problems and thus help to ensure that only eligible migratory children are counted for funding purposes and are served. If an SEA has reservations about the accuracy of its child counts, it must disclose known data limitations to the Department, and explain how and when it will resolve data quality issues through corrective actions in the box below, which precedes Section 2.4.1.1 *Category 1 Child Count*.

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

FAQs on Child Count:

a. How is "out-of-school" defined? Out-of-school means children up through age 21 who are entitled to a free public education in the State but are not currently enrolled in a K-12 institution. This term could include students who have dropped out of school, youth who are working on a high school equivalency diploma (HSED) outside of a K-12 institution, and youth who are "here-to-work" only. It would not include children in preschool, nor does it include temporary absences (e.g., summer/intersession, suspension or illness). Enrollment in school is not a condition affecting eligibility for the MEP. Therefore, out-of-school youth who meet the definition of a "migratory child" are eligible for the MEP.

b. How is "ungraded" defined? Ungraded means the children are served in an educational unit that has no separate grades. For example, some schools have primary grade groupings that are not traditionally graded or ungraded groupings for children with learning disabilities (IDEA). In some cases, ungraded students may also include special education children (IDEA), transitional bilingual students, students working on a HSED through a K-12 institution, or those in a correctional setting. (Do not count students working on a HSED outside of a K-12 institution as ungraded; these students are counted as out-of-school youth.)

c. How is reporting a child "in the age/grade category in which s/he spent the majority of his/her time while residing in the State" defined? A State must report a child in **only one** age/grade category in which the child spent the majority of his/her time **while residing in the State**. For example, a migratory child resided in State A for three months and in State B for nine months in SY2018-19. While in State A, the child enrolled in ninth grade for two months and in tenth grade for one month. Therefore, State A will report the child in the age/grade category of ninth grade, because the child spent the majority of his/her time in ninth grade in State A. In State B, the child enrolled in eighth grade for one month and in ninth grade for eight months. Therefore, State B will report the child in the age/grade category of ninth grade, because the child spent the majority of his/her time in ninth grade in State B.

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

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

Idaho has a very comprehensive system of accurately identifying and serving migrant children and reporting data. We are very confident that the Category 1 child count is completely accurate. For Category 2, with OME staff assistance, we just discovered that because we have not collected child-specific summer school participation dates (only district summer program dates), we do not have adequate evidence to verify that a 3 year-old child is both 3 years old and with a residency verification date before the end of summer school. In very rare cases, a child who will be three in August, may participate in summer school before his/her 3rd birthday. Further, without these dates, we cannot ensure that a migrant student's eligibility may not have ended during the performance period, but before the first day of summer school. Districts have received training and guidance requiring students to be eligible for the MEP in order to participate in summer school programs, but without dates, we cannot verify

compliance with this rule. In order to correct these issues, we will immediately create data collection in MSIS of individual start and end dates for summer school for every child participating in summer school 2020. Age, residency verification date, and eligibility will be checked to ensure that every student included in the Category 2 count is eligible for at least one day of the summer school program. We believe that the number of children included in the Category 2 count is accurate, but are unable to ensure 100% accuracy due to not collecting these dates on an individual student level.

2.4.1.1 Category 1 Child Count (Eligible Migratory Children)

In the table below, enter the unduplicated statewide number by age/grade of **eligible** migratory children age 3 through 21 who, within 3 years of making a qualifying move, resided in your State for one or more days during the performance period of September 1, 2018 through August 31, 2019. This figure includes all eligible migratory children who may or may not have received MEP services. Count a child who moved from one age/grade level to another during the performance period only once in the age/grade category in which s/he spent the majority of his/her time while residing in the State, during the performance period. The unduplicated statewide total count is calculated automatically.

Do not include children age birth through 2 years.

Age/Grade	Eligible Migratory Children
Age 3 through 5 (not Kindergarten)	813
K	340
1	372
2	351
3	397
4	373
5	357
6	366
7	339
8	355
9	318
10	241
11	273
12	185
Ungraded	0
Out-of-school	403
Total	5,483

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

2.4.1.2 Category 1 Child Count Increases/Decreases

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

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

The number of migrant students increased by 11.5%. This is due to several factors. Primarily, the state has strongly encouraged community-based recruiting supported by three regional MEP coordinators who train recruiters and coordinate recruiting activities outside schools. Statewide training by State Department of Education MEP coordinator also emphasizes the importance of community-based recruiting and provides recruiting tools (e.g. local ID&R Plan, liaison recruiter logs, Google layered map, employer letter of introduction, posters, flyers, etc.) and hands-on practice in using these tools. Second, Idaho adopted a statewide Parent Employment Survey used by all districts and charters (migrant funded and non-funded) with resulting recruiting efforts in non-migrant funded districts done by regional MEP coordinators. Finally, An analysis of Qualifying Arrival Dates clearly showed that the majority of students arrive in the summer, but most districts didn't employ family liaison/recruiters during summer months. The SEA now provides a supplemental grant to districts to hire recruiters in summer. In the summer of 2019, 287 students were recruited during June-August due to this grant. These combined factors have contributed to gradually increasing number of identified migrant students every year for the last five years.

2.4.1.3 Birth through Two Child Count

In the table below, enter the unduplicated statewide number of eligible migratory children from birth through age 2 who, within 3 years of making a qualifying move, resided in your State for one or more days during the performance period of September 1, 2018 through August 31, 2019.

Age/Grade	Eligible Migratory Children
Age Birth through 2	295

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

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

In the table below, enter by age/grade the unduplicated statewide number of **eligible** migratory children age 3 through 21 who, within 3 years of making a qualifying move, were **served** for one or more days in a MEP-funded project conducted during either the summer term or during intersession periods that occurred within the performance period of September 1, 2018 through August 31, 2019. Count a child who moved from one age/grade level to another during the performance period only once in the age/grade category in which s/he spent the majority of his/her time while residing in the State, during the performance period. Count a child who moved to different schools within the State and who was served in both traditional summer and year-round school intersession programs only once. The unduplicated statewide total count is calculated automatically.

Do not include:

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

Age/Grade	Eligible Migratory Children Served by the MEP During the Summer/Intersession Term
Age 3 through 5 (not Kindergarten)	219
K	161
1	180
2	144
3	174
4	157
5	152
6	128
7	78
8	77
9	25
10	29
11	43
12	3
Ungraded	0
Out-of-school	16
Total	1,586

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

We believe that our child count for summer is very close to being fully accurate. However, we have identified a summer program verification issue that applies only to a small number of students, but could reduce our count slightly. This issue is described in more detail in 2.3.4.1 and we are working quickly to address it.

2.4.2.1 Category 2 Child Count Increases/Decreases

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

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

Gain of 17% - Idaho's migrant population has steadily expanded over the past several years, with a 11.5% increase between 2017-18 and 2018-19, and we believe this accounts for a good portion of the increase in summer school participation. Our data also shows a higher proportion of students participating- of those eligible for summer programming, 27.6% actively engaged in summer 2018, while 29.5% participated in summer 2019. Additionally, Idaho State Department of Education staff have continued to strongly encourage LEAs to provide services during the summer. The number of districts providing services has increased and districts have expanded the grade levels they serve to include credit recovery at the secondary level, including using innovative ways of providing services in remote rural areas (e.g. individual tutoring in the home, distance learning supported by migrant staff, and online credit recovery in collaboration with a state virtual charter school and migrant staff from districts, etc.). In summer 2019, there were 3 new elementary programs and 5 new secondary programs, accounting for 107 new students (nearly half our increase).

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

In the table below, enter the unduplicated statewide number of eligible migratory children from age birth through 2 who, within 3 years of making a qualifying move, were served for one or more days in a MEP-funded project conducted during either the summer term or during intersession periods that occurred within the performance period of September 1, 2018 through August 31, 2019. Count a child who moved to different schools within the State and who was served in both traditional summer and year-round school intersession programs only once.

Do not include:

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

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

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

2.4.3 Child Count Calculation and Validation Procedures

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

2.4.3.1 Methods Used to Count Children

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

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

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

Idaho has a robust training and COE approval process to ensure that only students who are eligible are identified. In addition to the importance of identification of eligible children, the Idaho MEP uses data to ensure that all EdFacts submissions are correct and complete.

General Data Collection: To identify and track each student, the state longitudinal data system (SLDS) assigns a unique EDUID to all public school students based on their legal name, gender, and date of birth. LEAs and schools typically request EDUIDs for students during the enrollment process. During the eCOE review process, Regional Coordinators use a MSIS search function to retrieve matching EDUIDs from the SLDS. If a child has never been enrolled in school (preschool and out of school youth), the Regional Coordinator can generate a new EDUID if needed. In very rare cases, a duplicate is discovered and the Regional Coordinator or State Coordinator creates a technology department ticket to merge the records. All data is tied to the child's EDUID in every state database. This allows for Migrant data to come from other state databases including participation in Title 1-A, special education, McKinney Vento (homeless), English learner programs, and other information including school enrollment, demographics, assessment and school performance. Migrant eligibility is obtained from MSIS for other state purposes, such as assessment participation and state accountability.

Migrant Data Collection: In addition to creating the eCOE and importing it into Idaho's Migrant Student Information System (MSIS), Liaisons directly input some data into MSIS. Only current year data may be entered or changed. 2018-2019 data was closed for revision on September 15, 2019. The data points entered for each student may include (as applicable): residency verification date, referred services, priority for services, extended services, summer school attendance, out of state transcript received, home schooled, instructional services, support services, continuation of services status, immunizations, and (for students leaving the district during a grading period) grade-to-date and seat-hours-to-date. Liaisons are frequently and extensively trained on accurate data entry procedures through state trainings and one-on-one support from Regional Coordinators. Liaisons complete monthly data self-checks through the Family Liaison Recordkeeping Log and Regional Coordinators conduct quarterly checks to verify data is being correctly and completely entered. Local district migrant directors must sign the Regional Coordinators' quarterly data checklists. If data issues are found, Regional Coordinators provide additional training. Residency verification dates are collected and entered by Liaisons who personally contact every migrant family every year between September 1 and August 31 and verify that every child on the COE is residing in Idaho. Liaisons also access an MSIS report that identifies students without a valid residency verification date and then collect and enter missing data. If a valid residency verification date cannot be obtained, the student is not included in the submitted data.

Process of Creating EdFacts Data Files: The State programmer analyst runs a query that produces files with all required data to generate migrant EdFacts files. The query includes parameters restricting the data to children deemed MEP eligible based on having a valid, approved COE in MSIS, a QAD on or after the beginning of the performance period, and whose end of eligibility has not been reached before the beginning of the performance period. The end of eligibility date is calculated by MSIS from the QAD plus 36 months. The query further requires the child have a valid residency verification date between September 1, 2018, and August 31, 2019, and on or after the 3rd birthday, and on or after QAD, and before the 22nd birthday. If the only possible residency verification date of a two year-old child is before his or her 3rd birthday, the child is counting in the 0-2 count as instructed by OME. It excludes students with a graduation date or GED completion date (as entered by a Liaison into MSIS) before the beginning of the performance period. The query further verifies no duplicate EDUIDs are included. Based on these queries, a file is generated with student level data which is reviewed by the State Coordinator closely before EdFacts files are submitted. The State Coordinator completes the Data Check file provided by the Office of Migrant Education during this process.

The query used to create the Category 1 count, in combination with the "Attended Migrant Summer School" data point in MSIS, is used to create the data file that is used for the Category 2 count. With OME staff, we just discovered that because we have not collected child-specific summer school participation dates (only for district summer programs), we do not have adequate evidence to verify that a 3 year-old child is both 3 years

old and with a residency verification date before the end of summer school. In very rare cases, a child who will be three in August, may participate in summer school before his/her 3rd birthday. Further, without these dates, we cannot ensure that a migrant student's eligibility may not have ended during the performance period, but before the first day of summer school. Districts have received training and guidance requiring students to be eligible for the MEP in order to participate in summer school programs, but without dates, we cannot verify compliance with this rule. In order to correct these issues, we will immediately create data collection in MSIS of individual start and end dates for summer school for every child participating in summer 2020. Age, residency verification date, and eligibility will be checked to ensure that every student included in the Category 2 count is eligible for at least one day of the summer school program.

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

Accuracy of ED <i>Facts</i> Data Files	Yes/No
The State deployed a process that ensured that it transmits accurate migrant data to the Department in every required ED <i>Facts</i> data file.	YES

Use of MSIX to Verify Data Quality	Yes/No
Does the State use data in the Migrant Student Information Exchange (MSIX) to verify the quality of migrant data?	YES

If MSIX is utilized, please explain how.

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

Using the documents "What is the Category 1 determination?" and "What is the Category 2 determination" from MSIX Reconciliation Report support documents enabled us to insure that we accurately counted the number of children who qualified for these counts. Based on our first reconciliation with MSIX, we have also made improvements to MSIS, so that users are made aware of the validity of residency verification dates as they are entered for the current year, thus improving accuracy. MSIX/MSIS reconciliation is ongoing.

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

2.4.3.2 Quality Control Processes

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

Results	#
The number of eligibility determinations sampled.	171
The number of eligibility determinations sampled for which a re-interview was completed.	157
The number of eligibility determinations sampled for which a re-interview was completed and the child was found eligible.	157

Procedures	SY
What was the most recent year that the MEP conducted independent prospective re-interviews (i.e., interviewers were neither SEA or LEA staff members responsible for administering or operating the MEP, nor any other persons who worked on the initial eligibility determinations being tested)? If independent prospective re-interviews were not administered in any of the three performance periods, please provide an explanation in the "Comment" row at the end of this table.	2016-2017

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

We are in the process of contracting with an independent re-interviewer so that independent re-interviews will be complete before September 1, 2020 as required. Due to current circumstances and school closures re-interviews will be conducted by phone. It may take additional time to complete independent re-interviews.

FAQ on independent prospective re-interviews:

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

Obtaining Data from Families	Re-interview Method
Select how the re-interviews were conducted: Face-to-face re-interviews Phone Interviews Both	Phone interviews

Obtaining Data from Families	Yes/No
Was there a protocol for verifying all information used in making the original eligibility determination?	YES
Were re-interviewers independent from the original interviewers?	YES

If you did conduct independent re-interviews in this reporting period, describe how you ensured that the process was independent. Only enter a response if your State completed independent re-interviews in SY 2018-19.

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

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

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

LEAs are required to partner with neighboring districts for re-interviews 3 times per year (November, February, April). The original district will run the Re-Interview Random List report in MSIS and will select two students each quarter (November, February, and April). The Liaison runs a MSIS report that provides a randomized list of students recruited in the current year (approved after September 1). Every 5th student is selected for re-interviewing. If a family is not available for re-interview after multiple scheduling attempts or if the family has already been re-interviewed during the current year for another child on the COE, the Liaison selects the next student on the list. The originating Liaison provides the questionnaire and sealed copy of the COE to the partner district Liaison. Re-interview results are reported to the State. If a discrepancy is found, the Regional Coordinator conducts a second re-interview. The state makes a final determination of eligibility. If a child is found to be ineligible, (s)he is removed from MSIS. If the lack of eligibility includes all children on the COE, the COE is removed from MSIS. Migrant services are immediately stopped and any liaison training needs are addressed. This has happened once in the last 5 years.

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

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

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

2.4.4 Eligible Migratory Children

2.4.4.1 Priority for Services

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

Age/Grade	Priority for Services During the Performance Period
Age 3 through 5 (not Kindergarten)	88
K	145
1	190
2	158
3	188
4	169
5	161
6	158
7	133
8	148
9	123
10	87
11	109
12	57
Ungraded	
Out-of-school	39
Total	1,953

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

FAQ on priority for services:

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

2.4.4.2 English Learners (ELs)

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

Age/Grade	ELs During the Performance Period
Age 3 through 5 (not Kindergarten)	196
K	265
1	290
2	290
3	325
4	299
5	302
6	297
7	268
8	292
9	226
10	177
11	179
12	102
Ungraded	
Out-of-school	131
Total	3,639

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

The number of migratory children who are also English learners went up by 52% requiring comment. In 18-19, the English learner (EL) program in Idaho implemented the English Learner Management System (ELMS) to track English learners across the state. It compared student test data against exit criteria for many years regardless of the different districts the child attended. The system found EL students who had moved between districts and had not been identified as English learners in subsequent districts. It also found a number of students who had been exited, but had not met exit criteria by test scores for the year in which they were exited. Student EL status is now assigned by this system, creating statewide EL identification consistency as students move between districts in Idaho. This resulted in more students identified as English learners in the short run. This increase is anticipated to decline as Idaho has revised its exit criteria based on an extensive analysis of student scores and performance. This new criteria will be applied to 2019-2020 scores.

2.4.4.3 Children with Disabilities (IDEA)

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

Age/Grade	Children with Disabilities (<i>IDEA</i>) During the Performance Period
Age Birth through 2	
Age 3 through 5 (not Kindergarten)	57
K	43
1	47
2	48
3	48
4	50
5	49
6	46
7	39
8	47
9	22
10	24
11	26
12	20
Ungraded	
Out-of-school	
Total	566

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

2.4.4.4 Qualifying Arrival Date (QAD)

In the table below, provide the unduplicated number of **eligible** migratory children whose QAD occurred within 12 months from the last day of the performance period, August 31, 2019 (i.e., QAD during the performance period). The total is calculated automatically.

Age/Grade	QAD During the Performance Period
Age Birth through 2	172
Age 3 through 5 (not Kindergarten)	302
K	115
1	132
2	119
3	142
4	129
5	131
6	125
7	116
8	125
9	107
10	79
11	86
12	32
Ungraded	
Out-of-school	123
Total	2,035

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

2.4.5 Academic Status

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

2.4.5.1 Dropouts

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

Grade	Dropouts During the Performance Period
7	5
8	9
9	14
10	17
11	17
12	17
Ungraded	
Total	79

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

The number of migratory children who dropped out decreased by 69%, requiring comment.

Per FS032 file spec, we identified two types of dropouts: current year dropouts and previous year dropouts. The current year dropout is defined as a student who was enrolled in school at some time during the reporting year and was not enrolled on the first Friday of November of the following reporting year. If a student’s latest exit code was considered continuing, terminal, transfer, or temporary absence, the student is not considered a dropout. The previous year dropouts is defined as a student who was not enrolled on the first Friday of November of the reporting year although was expected to be enrolled. If the student’s latest enrollment record in the previous reporting year shows the continuing exit codes, the SDE expects the student to be back in the reporting school year.

In 2016-2017, we only reported confirmed dropouts as the “current year dropouts”. Because we did not identify unconfirmed dropouts (e.g. students with an unknown exit code) as dropouts, we underreported the “current year dropouts”. This resulted in a deflation in the overall dropout counts.

In 2017-2018, we fixed the query to report unconfirmed dropouts as dropouts. This resulted in an increase in the “current year dropouts”. In addition, because 2017-2018 “previous year dropouts” picked up some of those students who should have been but were not reported as “current year dropouts” in 2016-2017, we also observed an increase in the “previous year dropouts”. Both of these increases resulted in a significant increase in the overall dropout counts.

In 2018-2019, we reported both confirmed and unconfirmed dropouts as the “current year dropouts”. And because we correctly identified “current year dropouts” in 2017-2018, we have no “previous year dropouts” carried over from 2017-2018. Therefore we believe the number of dropouts report in 2018-2019 is correct.

FAQ on Dropouts:

How is “dropouts” defined? The term used for students, who, (1) were enrolled in a school for at least one day during the 2018-19 performance period, (2) were not enrolled at the beginning of the current (2018-19) performance period, (3) who have not graduated from high school or completed a State- or district-approved educational program, and (4) who do not meet any of the following exclusionary conditions: (a) transfer to another school district, private school or State- or district-approved educational program (including correctional or health facility programs), (b) temporary absence due to suspension or school-excused illness or (c) death. Students who dropped out-of-school prior to the 2018-19 performance period should not be reported in this item.

2.4.5.2 HSED (High School Equivalency Diploma)

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

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

Comments: The response is limited to 4,000 characters.
The Idaho State Department of Education does not collect this information.

2.4.6 MEP Services - During the Performance Period

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

FAQ on Services:

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

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

Age/Grade	Served During the Performance Period
Age Birth through 2	125
Age 3 through 5 (not Kindergarten)	478
K	257
1	287
2	279
3	309
4	287
5	266
6	284
7	256
8	275
9	241
10	175
11	218
12	160
Ungraded	0
Out-of-school	153
Total	4,050

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

2.4.6.1 Priority for Services – During the Performance Period

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

Age/Grade	Priority for Services During the Performance Period
Age 3 through 5 (not Kindergarten)	77
K	135
1	176
2	146
3	174
4	159
5	141
6	143
7	120
8	138
9	113
10	72
11	102
12	51
Ungraded	0
Out-of-school	34
Total	1,781

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

2.4.6.2 Continuation of Services – During the Performance Period

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

Age/Grade	Continuation of Services During the Performance Period
Age 3 through 5 (not Kindergarten)	11
K	7
1	15
2	11
3	15
4	10
5	12
6	9
7	7
8	13
9	17
10	14
11	17
12	10
Ungraded	0
Out-of-school	3
Total	171

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

FAQ on Continuation of Services:

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

2.4.6.3 Instructional Service – During the Performance Period

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

Age/Grade	Instructional Service During the Performance Period
Age Birth through 2	5
Age 3 through 5 (not Kindergarten)	162
K	114
1	137
2	122
3	133
4	123
5	132
6	134
7	124
8	119
9	77
10	66
11	93
12	44
Ungraded	
Out-of-school	18
Total	1,603

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

2.4.6.4 Type of Instructional Service – During the Performance Period

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

Age/Grade	Reading Instruction During the Performance Period	Mathematics Instruction During the Performance Period	High School Credit Accrual During the Performance Period
Age Birth through 2	3	2	
Age 3 through 5 (not Kindergarten)	128	128	
K	82	82	
1	106	105	
2	89	88	
3	97	94	
4	91	86	
5	90	82	
6	72	66	
7	61	60	
8	65	65	7
9	13	9	13
10	12	13	19
11	16	17	32
12	4	4	5
Ungraded			
Out-of-school	7	7	1
Total	936	908	77

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

The number of instructional services provided by a certified teacher increased by 38% for reading and 33% for math, requiring comment. Although this is an increase in the services provided by certified teachers in both areas, a student level analysis of the data showed that Idaho is actually significantly under-reporting the number of instructional services provided to students. Districts report each child who attended summer school in MSIS. However, districts have been unclear about the need to also report instructional services provided to students during summer school. The analysis showed that 18 districts that provided summer school did not mark students as having received instructional services, while 16 districts did. Checking with districts that did not report instructional services and who had summer school programs, districts either reported that they forgot or were unaware that instructional services provided in summer school should also be reported. The MEP coordinator will provide clear instruction to districts to ensure that all districts providing migrant summer school in 2020 correctly record the instructional services that students receive.

FAQ on Types of Instructional Services:

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

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

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

Age/Grade	Support Services During the Performance Period	Breakout of Counseling Services During the Performance Period
Age Birth through 2	125	14
Age 3 through 5 (not Kindergarten)	428	58
K	242	47
1	269	71
2	262	59
3	289	68
4	274	62
5	253	88
6	274	106
7	249	96
8	261	147
9	241	150
10	173	119
11	217	151
12	158	116
Ungraded		
Out-of-school	145	55
Total	3,860	1,407

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

FAQs on Support Services:

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

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

2.4.7 School Data during the Regular School Year

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

2.4.7.1 Schools and Enrollment – During the Regular School Year

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

Schools	#
Number of schools that enrolled eligible migratory children	360
Number of eligible migratory children enrolled in those schools	5,414

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

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

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

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

Comments: The response is limited to 4,000 characters.
No schools consolidated MEP funds in a schoolwide program.

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

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

Throughout this section:

- Report data for the program year of July 1, 2018 through June 30, 2019.
- Count programs/facilities based on how the program was classified to ED for funding purposes.
- Do not include programs funded solely through Title I, Part A.
- Use the definitions listed below:
 - **Adult Corrections:** An adult correctional institution is a facility in which persons, including persons 21 or under, are confined as a result of conviction for a criminal offense.
 - **At-Risk Programs:** Programs operated (through LEAs) that target students who are at risk of academic failure, dependency adjudication, or delinquency adjudication, have a drug or alcohol problem, are pregnant or parenting, have been in contact with the juvenile justice or child welfare system in the past, are at least 1 year behind the expected age/grade level, are English learners, are gang members, have dropped out of school in the past, or have a high absenteeism rate at school.
 - **Juvenile Corrections:** An institution for delinquent children and youth that is a public or private residential facility other than a foster home that is operated for the care of children and youth who have been adjudicated delinquent or in need of supervision. Include any programs serving adjudicated youth (including non- secure facilities and group homes) in this category.
 - **Juvenile Detention Facilities:** Detention facilities are shorter-term institutions that provide care to children who require secure custody pending court adjudication, court disposition, or execution of a court order, or care to children after commitment.
 - **Neglected Programs:** An institution for neglected children and youth is a public or private residential facility, other than a foster home, that is operated primarily for the care of children who have been committed to the institution or voluntarily placed under applicable State law due to abandonment, neglect, or death of their parents or guardians.
 - **Other:** Any other programs, not defined above, that receive Title I, Part D funds and serve non-adjudicated children and youth.

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

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

2.5.1.1 Programs and Facilities - Subpart 1

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

State Program/Facility Type	# Programs/Facilities	Average Length of Stay in Days
Neglected programs	0	0
Juvenile detention	0	0
Juvenile corrections	1	251
Adult corrections	1	240
Other	0	0
Total	2	

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

FAQ on Programs and Facilities - Subpart I:

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

2.5.1.2 Programs and Facilities That Reported - Subpart 1

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

The total row will be automatically calculated.

State Program/Facility Type	# Reporting Data
Neglected programs	0
Juvenile detention	0
Juvenile corrections	1
Adult corrections	1
Other	0
Total	2

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

2.5.1.3 Students Served – Subpart 1

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

# of Students Served	Neglected Programs	Juvenile Detention	Juvenile Corrections	Adult Corrections	Other Programs
Total Unduplicated Students Served			365	540	
Total Long Term Students Served			286	443	

Provide the number of students served by special populations

Student Subgroups	Neglected Programs	Juvenile Detention	Juvenile Corrections	Adult Corrections	Other Programs
Children with disabilities (<i>IDEA</i>)			136	36	
English Learners (ELs)			10	0	

Provide the number of students served by race/ethnicity.

Race/Ethnicity	Neglected Programs	Juvenile Detention	Juvenile Corrections	Adult Corrections	Other Programs
American Indian or Alaska Native			17	20	
Asian			1	1	
Black or African American			19	19	
Hispanic or Latino			63	100	
Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander			2	0	
White			253	368	
Two or more races			10	32	
Total			365	540	

Provide the number of students served by gender.

Sex	Neglected Programs	Juvenile Detention	Juvenile Corrections	Adult Corrections	Other Programs
Male			308	452	
Female			57	88	
Total			365	540	

Provide the number of students served by age.

Age	Neglected Programs	Juvenile Detention	Juvenile Corrections	Adult Corrections	Other Programs
3 through 5			0	0	
6			0	0	
7			0	0	
8			0	0	
9			0	0	
10			0	0	
11			0	0	
12			0	0	
13			8	0	
14			29	0	
15			48	0	
16			78	1	
17			109	4	
18			67	33	

Age	Neglected Programs	Juvenile Detention	Juvenile Corrections	Adult Corrections	Other Programs
19			23	105	
20			3	186	
21			0	211	
Total			365	540	

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

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

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

FAQ on Unduplicated Count:

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

FAQ on long-term:

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

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

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

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

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

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

Outcomes (once per student, only after exit)	Neglected Programs	Juvenile Detention	Juvenile Corrections	Adult Corrections	Other Programs
# of Students Who Enrolled in their local district school 90 days after exit			33	S	

Outcomes (once per student) - # of Students Who	Neglected Programs - In fac.	Neglected Programs - 90 days after exit	Juvenile Detention - In fac.	Juvenile Detention - 90 days after exit	Juvenile Corrections - In fac.	Juvenile Corrections - 90 days after exit	Adult Corrections - In fac.	Adult Corrections - 90 days after exit	Other Programs - In fac.	Other Programs - 90 days after exit
Earned a GED					140	4	82	S		
Obtained high school diploma					51	3	S	S		

Outcomes (once per student per time period) - # of Students Who	Neglected Programs - In fac.	Neglected Programs - 90 days after exit	Juvenile Detention - In fac.	Juvenile Detention - 90 days after exit	Juvenile Corrections - In fac.	Juvenile Corrections - 90 days after exit	Adult Corrections - In fac.	Adult Corrections - 90 days after exit	Other Programs - In fac.	Other Programs - 90 days after exit
Earned high school course credits					358	33	S	S		
Enrolled in a GED program					169	10	163	S		
Accepted and/or enrolled into post-secondary education					65	8	S	S		
Enrolled in job training courses/programs					294	S	142	S		
Obtained employment					S	80	S	S		

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

Comments: The response is limited to 8,000 characters. The IDOC is not able to report outcomes on all offenders after their release. If the student is released to probation and parole, their employment or post secondary education is tracked qualitatively in notes.

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

2.5.2 Academic Performance – Subpart 1

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

2.5.2.1 Academic Performance in Reading – Subpart 1

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

Report only information on a student’s most recent testing data. Students who were pre-tested prior to July 1, 2018, may be included if their post-test was administered during the reporting year. Students who were post-tested after the reporting year ended should be counted in the following year. Below the table is an FAQ about the data collected in this table.

Performance Data (Based on most recent pre/post-test data)	Neglected Programs	Juvenile Detention	Juvenile Corrections	Adult Corrections	Other Programs
Long-term students with negative grade level change from the pre- to post-test exams			8	16	
Long-term students with no change in grade level from the pre- to post-test exams			16	6	
Long-term students with improvement up to one full grade level from the pre- to post-test exams			32	8	
Long-term students with improvement of more than one full grade level from the pre- to post-test exams			230	35	
Total students pre/post- tested			286	65	

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

FAQ on long-term students:

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

2.5.2.2 Academic Performance in Mathematics – Subpart 1

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

Report only information on a student's most recent testing data. Students who were pre-tested prior to July 1, 2018, may be included if their post-test was administered during the reporting year. Students who were post-tested after the reporting year ended should be counted in the following year. Below the table is an FAQ about the data collected in this table.

Performance Data (Based on most recent pre/post-test data)	Neglected Programs	Juvenile Detention	Juvenile Corrections	Adult Corrections	Other Programs
Long-term students with negative grade level change from the pre- to post-test exams			5	12	
Long-term students with no change in grade level from the pre- to post-test exams			34	6	
Long-term students with improvement up to one full grade level from the pre- to post-test exams			43	20	
Long-term students with improvement of more than one full grade level from the pre- to post-test exams			204	42	
Total students pre/post- tested			286	80	

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

Typically 50% of the inmates under the age of 22 years have obtained their GED or High School Diploma before entering the IDOC. Students enrolled in transition classes or career technical classes are not administered pre or post testing in academic areas.

FAQ on long-term students:

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

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

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

2.5.3.1 Programs and Facilities – Subpart 2

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

LEA Program/Facility Type	# Programs/Facilities	Average Length of Stay in Days
At-risk programs	2	206
Neglected programs	0	0
Juvenile detention	16	257
Juvenile corrections	0	0
Other	0	0
Total	18	

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

This past year we have worked to refine our Title ID, Subpart 2 program to identify new sites within the State and to clarify criteria for different categories. Due to this we are reporting:

- 1 new Delinquent site being served
- 1 Neglected and 3 At-Risk sites no longer being served
- Changed designation: 2 At-Risk sites are now meeting the criteria to be served as Delinquent sites, 3 Neglected sites are now meeting the criteria to be served as Delinquent sites, and 1 Neglected site is now meeting the criteria to be served as an At-Risk site.

FAQ on average length of stay:

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

2.5.3.2 Programs and Facilities That Reported - Subpart 2

In the table below, provide the number of LEA Title I, Part D, Subpart 2 programs and facilities that reported data on neglected and delinquent students.

The total row will be automatically calculated.

LEA Program/Facility Type	# Reporting Data
At-risk programs	2
Neglected programs	0
Juvenile detention	16
Juvenile corrections	0
Other	0
Total	18

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

2.5.3.3 Students Served – Subpart 2

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

# of Students Served	At-Risk Programs	Neglected Programs	Juvenile Detention	Juvenile Corrections	Other Programs
Total Unduplicated Students Served	216		2,864		
Total Long Term Students Served	216		611		

Provide the number of students served by special populations.

Student Subgroups	At-Risk Programs	Neglected Programs	Juvenile Detention	Juvenile Corrections	Other Programs
Children with disabilities (<i>IDEA</i>)	74		533		
ELs	2		76		

Provide the number of students served by race/ethnicity.

Race/Ethnicity	At-Risk Programs	Neglected Programs	Juvenile Detention	Juvenile Corrections	Other Programs
American Indian or Alaska Native	3		135		
Asian	2		17		
Black or African American	5		89		
Hispanic or Latino	37		473		
Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander			10		
White	136		1,977		
Two or more races	33		163		
Total	216		2,864		

Provide the number of students served by sex.

Sex	At-Risk Programs	Neglected Programs	Juvenile Detention	Juvenile Corrections	Other Programs
Male	136		1,860		
Female	80		1,004		
Total	216		2,864		

Provide the number of students served by age.

Age	At-Risk Programs	Neglected Programs	Juvenile Detention	Juvenile Corrections	Other Programs
3 through 5			1		
6	6		4		
7	6		7		
8	4		11		
9	10		20		
10	7		35		
11	4		62		
12	16		125		
13	20		189		
14	26		347		
15	24		526		
16	25		625		
17	33		789		
18	30		107		
19	5		16		

Age	At-Risk Programs	Neglected Programs	Juvenile Detention	Juvenile Corrections	Other Programs
20					
21					
Total	216		2,864		

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

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

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

FAQ on Unduplicated Count:

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

FAQ on long-term:

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

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

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

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

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

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

Outcomes (once per student, only after exit)	At-Risk Programs	Neglected Programs	Juvenile Detention	Juvenile Corrections	Other Programs
# of Students Who Enrolled in their local district school 90 days after exit	4		551		

Outcomes (once per student) - # of Students Who	At-Risk Programs - In fac.	At-Risk Programs - 90 days after exit	Neglected Programs - In fac.	Neglected Programs - 90 days after exit	Juvenile Detention - In fac.	Juvenile Detention - 90 days after exit	Juvenile Corrections - In fac.	Juvenile Corrections - 90 days after exit	Other Programs - In fac.	Other Programs - 90 days after exit
Earned a GED	S	S			47	13				
Obtained high school diploma	36	S			61	34				

Outcomes (once per student per time period) - # of Students Who	At-Risk Programs - In fac.	At-Risk Programs - 90 days after exit	Neglected Programs - In fac.	Neglected Programs - 90 days after exit	Juvenile Detention - In fac.	Juvenile Detention - 90 days after exit	Juvenile Corrections - In fac.	Juvenile Corrections - 90 days after exit	Other Programs - In fac.	Other Programs - 90 days after exit
Earned high school course credits	141	4			798	417				
Enrolled in a GED program	S	S			122	18				
Accepted and/or enrolled into post-secondary education	25	S			15	27				
Enrolled in job training courses/programs	3	S			266	14				
Obtained employment	43	S			10	115				

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

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

One of the At-Risk facilities runs on a school year calendar and did not report 90 days after exit because students would be enrolled again in the next school year after the summer break.

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

2.5.4 Academic Performance – Subpart 2

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

2.5.4.1 Academic Performance in Reading – Subpart 2

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

Report only information on a student’s most recent testing data. Students who were pre-tested prior to July 1, 2018, may be included if their post-test was administered during the reporting year. Students who were post-tested after the reporting year ended should be counted in the following year. Below the table is an FAQ about the data collected in this table.

Performance Data (Based on most recent pre/post-test data)	At-Risk Programs	Neglected Programs	Juvenile Detention	Juvenile Corrections	Other Programs
Long-term students with negative grade level change from the pre- to post-test exams	S		84		
Long-term students with no change in grade level from the pre- to post-test exams	23		92		
Long-term students with improvement up to one full grade level from the pre- to post-test exams	47		75		
Long-term students with improvement of more than one full grade level from the pre- to post-test exams	S		218		
Total students pre/post- tested	75		469		

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

FAQ on long-term:

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

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

2.5.4.2 Academic Performance in Mathematics – Subpart 2

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

Report only information on a student's most recent testing data. Students who were pre-tested prior to July 1, 2018, may be included if their post-test was administered during the reporting year. Students who were post-tested after the reporting year ended should be counted in the following year. Below the table is an FAQ about the data collected in this table.

Performance Data (Based on most recent pre/post-test data)	At-Risk Programs	Neglected Programs	Juvenile Detention	Juvenile Corrections	Other Programs
Long-term students with negative grade level change from the pre- to post-test exams	S		30		
Long-term students with no change in grade level from the pre- to post-test exams	27		80		
Long-term students with improvement up to one full grade level from the pre- to post-test exams	35		77		
Long-term students with improvement of more than one full grade level from the pre- to post-test exams	S		284		
Total students pre/post- tested	72		471		

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

FAQ on long-term:

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

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

2.6 STUDENT SUPPORT AND ACADEMIC ENRICHMENT GRANTS (TITLE IV, PART A)**2.6.1 Funds Spent Under Title IV, Part A**

This section collects data on the amount of funds spent by LEAs on the three content areas under Title IV, Part A of the *ESEA*. The data are reported through the Annual Performance Reporting Tool.

Content Area	Amount of Funds Spent
Well-Rounded	1,855,108.00
Safe and Healthy Students	1,768,103.00
Effective Use of Technology	392,139.00

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

LEAs spent the most funds on Well-Rounded Education program activities. LEAs spent close to an equal amount on program activities in the Safe and Healthy Students content area. Sample expenditures for Well-Rounded Education include college visits for high school students, or supplemental arts and music programs. Many districts have used Safe and Healthy Students funds for School Resource Officers and to fund training and implementation of positive behavior programs or anti-bullying campaigns. Funds for Effective Use of Technology included the purchase of Promethean Boards, Chromebooks, and professional development to guide the implementation of new technology resources.

2.6.2 LEAs Who Spent Funds Under Title IV, Part A

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

Content Area	Number of LEAs Spending Funds
Well-Rounded	111
Safe and Healthy Students	82
Effective Use of Technology	57
Any Content Area	127

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

The State has some larger LEAs that receive over \$30,000 in an allocation, requiring a 20%/20%/not more than 15% spending on the three content areas. The majority of our LEAs receive less than \$30,000, therefore do not have the 20%/20%/not more than 15% spending requirement. Many of our LEAs received allocations of only \$10,000.

2.7 FUNDING TRANSFERABILITY FOR STATE AND LOCAL EDUCATIONAL AGENCIES (TITLE V, PART A)**2.7.1 State Transferability of Funds**

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

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

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

2.7.2 Local Educational Agency (LEA) Transferability of Funds

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

LEA Transferability of Funds	#
LEAs that notified the State that they were transferring funds under the LEA Transferability authority of Section 5103(b).	40

Comments: The response is limited to 4,000 characters.
Counted LEA once, for example, transfer from IIA and IVA to receiving program - one count.
Transfer from IIA to receiving program - one count.

2.7.3 LEA Funds Transfers

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

Program	# LEAs Transferring Funds FROM Eligible Program	# LEAs Transferring Funds TO Eligible Program
Supporting Effective Instruction (Title II, Part A)	17	0
Student Support and Enrichment Grants (Title IV, Part A)	33	0
Improving Basic Programs Operated by LEAs (Title I, Part A)		36
Education of Migratory Children (Title I, Part C)		1
Prevention and Intervention Programs for Children and Youth Who Are Neglected, Delinquent, or At-Risk (Title I, Part D)		1
English Language Acquisition, Language Enhancement, and Academic Achievement Act (Title III, Part A)		1
Rural Education Initiative (Title V, Part B)		2

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

Program	Total Amount of Funds Transferred FROM Eligible Program	Total Amount of Funds Transferred TO Eligible Program
Supporting Effective Instruction (Title II, Part A)	541,241.00	0.00
Student Support and Enrichment Grants (Title IV, Part A)	748,408.00	0.00
Improving Basic Programs Operated by LEAs (Title I, Part A)		1,067,150.00
Education of Migratory Children (Title I, Part C)		60,000.00
Prevention and Intervention Programs for Children and Youth Who Are Neglected, Delinquent, or At-Risk (Title I, Part D)		14,273.00
English Language Acquisition, Language Enhancement, and Academic Achievement Act (Title III, Part A)		25,169.00
Rural Education Initiative (Title V, Part B)		123,057.00

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

2.8 RURAL EDUCATION ACHIEVEMENT PROGRAM (REAP)

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

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

In the table below, provide the number of eligible LEAs that used RLIS funds during SY2018-19 for each of the listed purposes.

Purpose	# LEAs
Activities authorized under Part A of Title I	15
Activities authorized under Part A of Title II	6
Activities authorized under Title III	5
Activities authorized under Part A of Title IV	5
Parental involvement activities	6

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

2.8.2 RLIS Objectives and Outcomes

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

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

Idaho school districts receiving awards under the Subpart 2 Rural and Low-Income Schools (RLIS) program are using their funds to help all students meet the State academic standards planned for in the district's Consolidated Federal and State Grant Application (CFSGA). All efforts provided for in the CFSGA are intended to increase student achievement standards for all students. The authorized uses of the Rural, Low Income funds have a direct correlation to our state goals. The Idaho State Department of Education (SDE) will ensure, through the consolidated application approval process, that the Rural, Low Income districts apply their funds to those authorized uses.

2.8.3 RLIS Technical Assistance

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

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

The State is actively working with districts involved with RISE while trying to recruit more districts to join for common learning activities. RISE participants have the ability to correspond and collaborate on Schoology. Ongoing recruiting for Idaho Principals Network and Idaho Superintendents Network is also taking place to connect like-situated administrators. Other opportunities for assistance have taken place at the New and Experienced Federal Directors Meeting as well as with the CFSGA Tour.

2.8.4 RLIS Subgrant Award Determination

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

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

The State used a formula based on the number of students in average daily attendance served by eligible LEAs in the State.

2.8.5 RLIS State Administrative Funds

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

Question	Percentage
What percentage of the RLIS grant funds were retained for State-level administration?	5.00%
What percentage of those funds retained for State-level administration were used specifically for technical assistance?	1.00%

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

2.8.6 RLIS LEAs Awarded Funds

Please list the NCES LEA ID and name of each LEA that received RLIS funds and the amount each received. This information will be collected from SEAs outside of the CSPR collection tool.

- NCES LEA ID
- LEA Name
- RLIS Award Amount

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

NCES LEA ID LEA Name RLIS Award Amount

381 American Falls Joint District \$27,472.00

101 Boundary County District \$25,526.00

365 Bruneau-Grand View Joint District \$5,679.00

242 Cottonwood Joint District \$7,429.00

221 Emmett Independent District \$42,848.00

215 Fremont County Joint District \$39,829.00

231 Gooding Joint District \$24,225.00

370 Homedale Joint District \$21,571.00

261 Jerome Joint District \$71,976.00

391 Kellogg Joint District \$19,751.00

272 Lakeland District \$79,718.00

321 Madison District \$98,441.00

363 Marsing Joint District \$15,189.00

193 Mountain Home District \$70,312.00

371 Payette Joint District \$27,745.00

291 Salmon District \$13,914.00

52 Snake River District \$32,591.00

431 Weiser District \$28,737.00

83 West Bonner County District \$20,130.00

133 Wilder District \$8,922.00

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

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

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

All of the SRSA grantees are eligible for REAP flex Title VI, Part B, Subpart 1. However, Idaho does not track any part of the SRSA grant, as it is completely done in the G5 (application and budget).