

**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**



**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 8303<sup>1</sup> of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act (ESEA), as amended by the Every Student Succeeds Act of 2015(ESSA)<sup>2</sup>.

### 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.

---

<sup>1</sup> 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.

<sup>2</sup> 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:**

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

**Address:**

**Person to contact about this report:**

**Name:**

Michael Mekhayel

**Telephone:**

517-241-4382

**Fax:**

517-335-1186

**e-mail:**

MekhayelM@Michigan.gov

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

Michael Mekhayel

**Submitted Date and Time:**

## 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	92		
High schools failing to graduate one third or more of their students	23	11	12
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	115		

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

**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.

	<b>Number of Schools</b>	<b>Number of Title I Schools</b>	<b>Number of non- Title I Schools</b>
Schools with One or More Consistently Underperforming Subgroups of Students	63	39	24
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)	58	43	15

**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	120,950	S	81.4%
American Indian or Alaska Native	825	S	70%
Asian or Pacific Islander	4,181	S	91.6%
<i>Asian</i>	4,071	S	91.3%
<i>Native Hawaiian or Other Pacific Islander</i>	110	S	81%
Black or African American	21,100	S	70.2%
Hispanic or Latino	8,735	S	76.6%
White	82,347	S	84.7%
Two or more races	3,762	S	76.2%
Children with disabilities ( <i>IDEA</i> )	14,044	S	57.8%
English Learners	5,347	S	73.2%
Economically disadvantaged students	55,612	S	70.8%
Children in foster care	600	S	44%
Children who are homeless	3,472	S	58.4%

#### 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	66,919	S	36,959	S
American Indian or Alaska Native	344	S	274	S
Asian or Pacific Islander	3,269	S	601	S
<i>Asian</i>	3,191	S	543	S
<i>Native Hawaiian or Other Pacific Islander</i>	78	S	58	S
Black or African American	8,678	S	8,021	S
Hispanic or Latino	3,498	S	3,068	S
White	49,475	S	23,933	S
Two or more races	1,655	S	1,062	S
Children with disabilities ( <i>IDEA</i> )	2,993	S	6,068	S
English Learners	1,940	S	1,760	S
Economically disadvantaged students	21,247	S	21,595	S

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

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

**2.3 TITLE I, PART A PROGRAM PARTICIPATION**

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

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

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

<b>Special Services or Programs</b>	<b># Students Served</b>
Children with disabilities ( <i>IDEA</i> )	103,341
English learners	70,684
Homeless students	21,061
Migrant students	1,384

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

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

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

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

<b>Race/Ethnicity</b>	<b># Students Served</b>
American Indian or Alaska Native	4,547
Asian	13,666
Black or African American	197,363
Hispanic or Latino	67,695
Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander	502
White	322,902
Two or more races	27,692
Total	634,367

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

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

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

<b>Age /Grade</b>	<b>Public TAS</b>	<b>Public SWP</b>	<b>Private</b>	<b>Local Neglected</b>	<b>Total</b>
Age Birth through 2	0	1,112	0	0	1,112
Age 3 through 5 (not Kindergarten)	4	7,134	13	0	7,151
K	4,130	71,976	559	62	76,727
1	5,109	64,546	631	65	70,351
2	4,826	63,958	644	51	69,479
3	4,545	62,137	621	59	67,362
4	4,282	62,706	591	65	67,644
5	3,649	60,554	538	102	64,843
6	1,978	45,375	368	99	47,820
7	1,499	40,562	303	85	42,449
8	1,219	38,613	251	127	40,210
9	305	24,580	214	155	25,254
10	178	22,028	213	470	22,889
11	174	18,845	194	113	19,326
12	177	19,276	159	45	19,657
Ungraded	0	104	4	3	111
<b>TOTALS</b>	<b>32,075</b>	<b>603,506</b>	<b>5,303</b>	<b>1,501</b>	<b>642,385</b>

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

## 2.4 EDUCATION OF MIGRATORY CHILDREN

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

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

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

There are two exceptions to this rule:

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

### 2.4.1 Migratory Child Counts

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

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

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

#### FAQs on Child Count:

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

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

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

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

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

Child counts reported accurately reflect the data submitted by the Migrant Education Programs and Identification and Recruitment Centers to the SEA.

**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.

<b>Age/Grade</b>	<b>Eligible Migratory Children</b>
Age 3 through 5 (not Kindergarten)	571
K	320
1	306
2	306
3	296
4	294
5	298
6	287
7	255
8	220
9	250
10	210
11	163
12	99
Ungraded	1
Out-of-school	324
<b>Total</b>	<b>4,200</b>

**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.

Michigan experienced a 13% decrease in the number of eligible migratory children in 2018-19. There are several reasons for this decrease as reported to the SEA by local migrant education programs: 1) the increase in H2A workers reducing the number of families with children that come to state for work; 2) the increase in immigration activity across the state creating fear and tension across the farmerworker community; 3) the increase of large scale, more mechanized farms that require less seasonal and migratory staff; and 4) the loss of eligibility due to the settling out of some families in Michigan.



**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.

<b>Age/Grade</b>	<b>Eligible Migratory Children</b>
Age Birth through 2	362

**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)	304
K	218
1	220
2	214
3	210
4	196
5	198
6	179
7	142
8	123
9	102
10	84
11	43
12	4
Ungraded	0
Out-of-school	93
Total	2,330

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

**2.4.2.1 Category 2 Child Count Increases/Decreases**

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

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

**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	40

**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.

Each local migrant program employs recruiters to survey the area within their school district boundaries to identify and recruit the children of new and returning migratory families. In areas of the state where there are no local migrant education programs, the MDE funds two State-Wide Identification and Recruitment (ID&R) Centers to survey those areas. In all cases, the recruiter interviews the family to determine the child(ren)’s eligibility. The data collected consists of the family data, child data, qualifying move data, and worker data required by the National Certificate of Eligibility (COE). If the family is deemed eligible, a paper National COE is completed for that family’s eligible children. The interviewee and the recruiter sign the COE. The trained local migrant program COE Approver, or trained ID&R COE Approver, reviews the COE for accuracy and completeness. The COE Approver signs if s/he finds that the COE is accurate and the child(ren) is eligible. The COE is given to the data entry specialist who inputs the information into the Migrant Education Data System (MIS2000 as of Spring 2019). MIS2000 collects information on the Title I, Part C services children receive during the reporting period. The COE Approver reviews the electronic information and sends the information to three state COE Approvers. The approval process progresses from recruiter to local approval to state approval.

Recruiters, data entry and local COE Approvers are required to participate in annual trainings to ensure accuracy of recruitment based on the eligibility factors and accuracy of data entry. The trainings demonstrate the correct completion of a Certificate of Eligibility (COE) as well as MIS2000 data entry procedures. Additional customized training is provided by the MEP state consultant, ID&R Center lead and/or state COE Approvers according to local needs. Eligibility questions requiring clarification or approval beyond the local MEP directors due to unusual circumstances are first directed to the program’s assigned, state COE Approver. Michigan’s state COE Approvers each have over ten years’ experience in the field of migrant education eligibility. If the eligibility of a child remains questionable after the local MEP consults with their COE Approver, the COE is referred to the state MEP office where a decision is made after consulting with the local MEP, COE Approvers, and reviewing federal guidelines. OME’s assistance is sought as needed.

For CSPR, data is pulled from the MIS2000 system and analyzed according to the business rules for Category 1 and 2 to ensure migratory children who were eligible during the reporting period are reported and those that received services are reported. Only children who experienced at least one day of eligibility and enrolled within the term are included in the count. MIS2000 programmatically assigns an expiration date exactly 36 months from QAD. A child whose eligibility has expired before the beginning date of term is not counted. Michigan requires enrollments for each performance period, thus only children who are eligible within the performance period are included the counts. This is also true for those children that have graduated or completed the GED. Local MEPs or ID&R Centers update MIS2000 as children graduate or obtain GEDs. MIS2000 has a field with these two options that programmatically sets the expiration date to the graduated/GED date once the option is selected. Again, the child whose eligibility date has expired before the beginning of the term is not included in the count. Children age birth to two and age three to five/not kinder are reported in the category according to their date of birth and the data projects used to select appropriate migrant records filter out any record with a birth date that is not included in current eligibility. The use of local recruiters embedded in the communities ensures that MEPs promptly know when a family has left the area. Michigan requires a withdrawal date in MIS2000 data system and uses data quality reports to ensure no records during the reporting performance period lack one. If a child turned three in the reporting period and was withdrawn after their birthday, they are included in the age three to five group. A child who turns three after the withdrawal would be reported with the birth to two count and not as a three year old. Data is de-duplicated by a unique student number in order to ensure children are only reported once.

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	YES

Accuracy of ED Facts Data Files	Yes/No
required ED Facts data file.	

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.

Michigan changed data systems in 2018-19 from a state system to MIS2000 which is a system used by many states. Throughout this time, we done testing to ensure that data reported by local districts and the state is pushing through MIS2000 to MSIX. There have been a couple of system issues that have been fixed as they arose. Michigan will continue testing and using the data tools in MSIX to ensure accurate and timely data reporting.

**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.	70
The number of eligibility determinations sampled for which a re-interview was completed.	61
The number of eligibility determinations sampled for which a re-interview was completed and the child was found eligible.	61

  

Procedures	SY
What was the most recent year that the MEP conducted independent prospective re-interviews (i.e., interviewers were neither SEA or LEA staff members responsible for administering or operating the MEP, nor any other persons who worked on the initial eligibility determinations being tested)? If independent prospective re-interviews were not administered in any of the three performance periods, please provide an explanation in the "Comment" row at the end of this table.	2018-2019

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

**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	Both

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.

An RFP process was followed and identified an outside organization to conduct the re-interviews. This contract is held by Telamon Corporation who also supports Migrant Headstart and work with the Inter-Agency Migrant Services Committee hosted by Department of Human Resources. Thus, the Telamon team is very knowledgeable about the migrant population. Telamon's re-interviewers report directly to their Telamon supervisors and eligibility determinations are reviewed internally and reported to the Michigan MEP. The Telamon team determines the eligibility status independently from the Michigan MEP. Michigan MEP provides technical assistance as requested and contributes as a member of the team to evaluate the sampling plan, re-interview procedures and results. Michigan MEP uses the re-interview results to plan for technical assistance to the local programs and ID&R Centers.

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.

All re-interviews confirmed accurate initial determinations. No corrective action is necessary at this time. If a child was determined to be ineligible during the reinterview, the following process is used: First, the local program is contacted and the reinterview finding is discussed. The local program can share evidence or additional information if applicable. In previous years, local programs after discussion, have agreed and supported all the findings of the reinterview team. A child who was deemed ineligible is removed from the MEDS and not included in the Category 1 or Category 2 counts. Following re-interviews, each program receives a letter providing them the number of children randomly selected for re-interview, the number re-determined to be eligible, and the non-response rate. The MEP then uses information gained during the reinterview process to improve training and identify areas needing additional guidance.

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.

<b>Age/Grade</b>	<b>Priority for Services During the Performance Period</b>
Age 3 through 5 (not Kindergarten)	35
K	198
1	207
2	213
3	212
4	200
5	193
6	186
7	147
8	131
9	141
10	110
11	73
12	44
Ungraded	
Out-of-school	15
<b>Total</b>	<b>2,105</b>

**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.

<b>Age/Grade</b>	<b>ELs During the Performance Period</b>
Age 3 through 5 (not Kindergarten)	560
K	314
1	299
2	296
3	291
4	285
5	290
6	268
7	243
8	207
9	232
10	194
11	142
12	82
Ungraded	1
Out-of-school	323
Total	4,027

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

**2.4.4.3 Children with Disabilities (IDEA)**

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

Age/Grade	Children with Disabilities ( <i>IDEA</i> ) During the Performance Period
Age Birth through 2	0
Age 3 through 5 (not Kindergarten)	10
K	17
1	13
2	18
3	18
4	24
5	19
6	24
7	17
8	20
9	11
10	10
11	7
12	7
Ungraded	1
Out-of-school	4
Total	220

**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.

<b>Age/Grade</b>	<b>QAD During the Performance Period</b>
Age Birth through 2	281
Age 3 through 5 (not Kindergarten)	392
K	205
1	184
2	185
3	191
4	166
5	187
6	171
7	144
8	131
9	150
10	121
11	85
12	15
Ungraded	
Out-of-school	197
<b>Total</b>	<b>2,805</b>

**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	0
8	0
9	7
10	6
11	5
12	5
Ungraded	0
Total	23

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

#### FAQ on Dropouts:

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

**2.4.5.2 HSED (High School Equivalency Diploma)**

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

<b>Obtain HSED</b>	<b>#</b>
Obtained a HSED in your State During the Performance Period	0

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

**2.4.6 MEP Services - During the Performance Period**

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

**FAQ on Services:**

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

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

<b>Age/Grade</b>	<b>Served During the Performance Period</b>
Age Birth through 2	54
Age 3 through 5 (not Kindergarten)	332
K	296
1	295
2	288
3	278
4	278
5	277
6	272
7	228
8	200
9	201
10	168
11	120
12	84
Ungraded	0
Out-of-school	123
Total	3,494

**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)	35
K	198
1	207
2	213
3	212
4	200
5	193
6	186
7	147
8	131
9	141
10	110
11	73
12	44
Ungraded	0
Out-of-school	15
Total	2,105

**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.

<b>Age/Grade</b>	<b>Continuation of Services During the Performance Period</b>
Age 3 through 5 (not Kindergarten)	4
K	9
1	7
2	15
3	8
4	12
5	6
6	5
7	12
8	5
9	1
10	4
11	1
12	3
Ungraded	0
Out-of-school	0
Total	92

**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.

<b>Age/Grade</b>	<b>Instructional Service During the Performance Period</b>
Age Birth through 2	17
Age 3 through 5 (not Kindergarten)	309
K	292
1	295
2	284
3	276
4	274
5	275
6	267
7	222
8	193
9	192
10	160
11	110
12	81
Ungraded	
Out-of-school	116
<b>Total</b>	<b>3,363</b>

**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	8	8	
Age 3 through 5 (not Kindergarten)	294	292	
K	264	263	
1	271	269	
2	259	259	
3	251	249	
4	249	249	
5	243	243	
6	229	226	
7	188	187	
8	172	170	1
9	140	138	24
10	121	118	19
11	69	68	13
12	35	36	8
Ungraded			
Out-of-school	90	64	0
Total	2,883	2,839	65

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

**FAQ on Types of Instructional Services:**

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

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

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

Age/Grade	Support Services During the Performance Period	Breakout of Counseling Services During the Performance Period
Age Birth through 2	39	0
Age 3 through 5 (not Kindergarten)	160	0
K	85	1
1	105	0
2	108	0
3	93	0
4	97	1
5	79	0
6	84	1
7	66	1
8	58	0
9	50	0
10	48	0
11	33	0
12	13	0
Ungraded		
Out-of-school	37	0
Total	1,155	4

**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.

<b>Schools</b>	<b>#</b>
Number of schools that enrolled eligible migratory children	263
Number of eligible migratory children enrolled in those schools	2,473

**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.

<b>Schools</b>	<b>#</b>
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.  
Michigan does not have any schools that consolidate MEP funds.

**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	2	365
Adult corrections	8	270
Other	0	0
Total	10	

**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.

<b>State Program/Facility Type</b>	<b># Reporting Data</b>
Neglected programs	0
Juvenile detention	0
Juvenile corrections	2
Adult corrections	8
Other	0
Total	10

**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			63	505	
Total Long Term Students Served			63	505	

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> )			27	17	
English Learners (ELs)			0	0	

Provide the number of students served by race/ethnicity.

Race/Ethnicity	Neglected Programs	Juvenile Detention	Juvenile Corrections	Adult Corrections	Other Programs
American Indian or Alaska Native			1	2	
Asian			0	1	
Black or African American			17	334	
Hispanic or Latino			1	9	
Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander			0	1	
White			41	151	
Two or more races			3	7	
Total			63	505	

Provide the number of students served by gender.

Sex	Neglected Programs	Juvenile Detention	Juvenile Corrections	Adult Corrections	Other Programs
Male			55	496	
Female			8	9	
Total			63	505	

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			6	0	
14			11	0	
15			6	0	
16			14	12	
17			12	70	
18			10	121	

Age	Neglected Programs	Juvenile Detention	Juvenile Corrections	Adult Corrections	Other Programs
19			3	139	
20			1	126	
21			0	37	
Total			63	505	

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					

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					6		136			
Obtained high school diploma					3		5			

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					57		5			
Enrolled in a GED program					10		505			
Accepted and/or enrolled into post-secondary education					7		29			
Enrolled in job training courses/programs					24		305			
Obtained employment					3		5			

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

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

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

**2.5.2 Academic Performance – Subpart 1**

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

**2.5.2.1 Academic Performance in Reading – Subpart 1**

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

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

<b>Performance Data (Based on most recent pre/post-test data)</b>	<b>Neglected Programs</b>	<b>Juvenile Detention</b>	<b>Juvenile Corrections</b>	<b>Adult Corrections</b>	<b>Other Programs</b>
Long-term students with negative grade level change from the pre- to post-test exams			5	142	
Long-term students with no change in grade level from the pre- to post-test exams			S	92	
Long-term students with improvement up to one full grade level from the pre- to post-test exams			53	49	
Long-term students with improvement of more than one full grade level from the pre- to post-test exams			S	42	
Total students pre/post- tested			63	325	

**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.

<b>Performance Data (Based on most recent pre/post-test data)</b>	<b>Neglected Programs</b>	<b>Juvenile Detention</b>	<b>Juvenile Corrections</b>	<b>Adult Corrections</b>	<b>Other Programs</b>
Long-term students with negative grade level change from the pre- to post-test exams			11	105	
Long-term students with no change in grade level from the pre- to post-test exams			S	120	
Long-term students with improvement up to one full grade level from the pre- to post-test exams			44	74	
Long-term students with improvement of more than one full grade level from the pre- to post-test exams			S	29	
Total students pre/post- tested			63	328	

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

**FAQ on long-term students:**

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

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

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

**2.5.3.1 Programs and Facilities – Subpart 2**

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

LEA Program/Facility Type	# Programs/Facilities	Average Length of Stay in Days
At-risk programs	0	0
Neglected programs	0	0
Juvenile detention	25	35
Juvenile corrections	44	115
Other	0	0
Total	69	

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

**FAQ on average length of stay:**

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

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

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

The total row will be automatically calculated.

<b>LEA Program/Facility Type</b>	<b># Reporting Data</b>
At-risk programs	0
Neglected programs	0
Juvenile detention	25
Juvenile corrections	44
Other	0
Total	69

**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			5,127	4,049	
Total Long Term Students Served			663	1,866	

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> )			1,091	1,007	
ELs			116	62	

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			49	71	
Asian			11	14	
Black or African American			2,298	1,553	
Hispanic or Latino			293	169	
Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander			6	3	
White			2,142	1,941	
Two or more races			328	298	
Total			5,127	4,049	

Provide the number of students served by sex.

Sex	At-Risk Programs	Neglected Programs	Juvenile Detention	Juvenile Corrections	Other Programs
Male			3,448	3,135	
Female			1,679	914	
Total			5,127	4,049	

Provide the number of students served by age.

Age	At-Risk Programs	Neglected Programs	Juvenile Detention	Juvenile Corrections	Other Programs
3 through 5			3	0	
6			3	0	
7			2	0	
8			6	4	
9			4	4	
10			32	9	
11			93	22	
12			224	91	
13			467	241	
14			843	396	
15			1,274	607	
16			1,477	657	
17			551	562	
18			82	378	
19			27	321	



Age	At-Risk Programs	Neglected Programs	Juvenile Detention	Juvenile Corrections	Other Programs
20			22	358	
21			17	399	
Total			5,127	4,049	

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					

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					3	3	81	6		
Obtained high school diploma					16	6	79	10		

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					1,084	239	1,706	75		
Enrolled in a GED program					18	10	367	16		
Accepted and/or enrolled into post-secondary education					9	4	51	7		
Enrolled in job training courses/programs					22	S	267	10		
Obtained employment					23	29	61	38		

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

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

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

## 2.5.4 Academic Performance – Subpart 2

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

### 2.5.4.1 Academic Performance in Reading – Subpart 2

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

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

Performance Data (Based on most recent pre/post-test data)	At-Risk Programs	Neglected Programs	Juvenile Detention	Juvenile Corrections	Other Programs
Long-term students with negative grade level change from the pre- to post-test exams			67	201	
Long-term students with no change in grade level from the pre- to post-test exams			69	262	
Long-term students with improvement up to one full grade level from the pre- to post-test exams			220	443	
Long-term students with improvement of more than one full grade level from the pre- to post-test exams			114	470	
Total students pre/post- tested			470	1,376	

**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.

<b>Performance Data (Based on most recent pre/post-test data)</b>	<b>At-Risk Programs</b>	<b>Neglected Programs</b>	<b>Juvenile Detention</b>	<b>Juvenile Corrections</b>	<b>Other Programs</b>
Long-term students with negative grade level change from the pre- to post-test exams			69	216	
Long-term students with no change in grade level from the pre- to post-test exams			40	288	
Long-term students with improvement up to one full grade level from the pre- to post-test exams			232	473	
Long-term students with improvement of more than one full grade level from the pre- to post-test exams			96	412	
<b>Total students pre/post- tested</b>			<b>437</b>	<b>1,389</b>	

**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.

<b>Content Area</b>	<b>Amount of Funds Spent</b>
Well-Rounded	0.00
Safe and Healthy Students	0.00
Effective Use of Technology	0.00

**Comments:** The response is limited to 4,000 characters.  
Michigan will update the missing data during the re-open period

**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	0
Safe and Healthy Students	0
Effective Use of Technology	0
Any Content Area	0

**Comments:** The response is limited to 4,000 characters.  
Michigan will update the missing data during the re-open period

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

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

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

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

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

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

<b>LEA Transferability of Funds</b>	<b>#</b>
LEAs that notified the State that they were transferring funds under the LEA Transferability authority of Section 5103(b).	821

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



**2.7.3 LEA Funds Transfers**

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

<b>Program</b>	<b># LEAs Transferring Funds FROM Eligible Program</b>	<b># LEAs Transferring Funds TO Eligible Program</b>
Supporting Effective Instruction (Title II, Part A)	821	147
Student Support and Enrichment Grants (Title IV, Part A)	495	12
Improving Basic Programs Operated by LEAs (Title I, Part A)		538
Education of Migratory Children (Title I, Part C)		0
Prevention and Intervention Programs for Children and Youth Who Are Neglected, Delinquent, or At-Risk (Title I, Part D)		1
English Language Acquisition, Language Enhancement, and Academic Achievement Act (Title III, Part A)		10
Rural Education Initiative (Title V, Part B)		47

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

<b>Program</b>	<b>Total Amount of Funds Transferred FROM Eligible Program</b>	<b>Total Amount of Funds Transferred TO Eligible Program</b>
Supporting Effective Instruction (Title II, Part A)	123,934,645.00	4,222,889.00
Student Support and Enrichment Grants (Title IV, Part A)	12,062,306.00	182,223.00
Improving Basic Programs Operated by LEAs (Title I, Part A)		22,113,867.00
Education of Migratory Children (Title I, Part C)		0.00
Prevention and Intervention Programs for Children and Youth Who Are Neglected, Delinquent, or At-Risk (Title I, Part D)		13,697.00
English Language Acquisition, Language Enhancement, and Academic Achievement Act (Title III, Part A)		403,061.00
Rural Education Initiative (Title V, Part B)		1,076,202.00

**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	75
Activities authorized under Part A of Title II	19
Activities authorized under Title III	1
Activities authorized under Part A of Title IV	42
Parental involvement activities	4

**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.

In 2018-19 Michigan had approximately 890 school districts, of those about 30% are classified as rural and eligible for either Title V, Part B Subparts 1 or 2. Of those approximately 40% received Title V, Part B Subpart 2 funds. These numbers have remained relatively consistent from the prior year. The primary use of these funds by these districts is in support of their Title I, Part A program. This reflects a primary need among these districts for supports to improve the basic program of the district for all students and students in poverty. Based on the 2018-2019 why Rurals Matters Report (<http://www.ruraledu.org/WhyRuralMatters.pdf>) this is having a slight positive impact in Michigan as rural students on average are faring slightly better than their non-rural counterparts. However additional gains need to be made with low-income students from rural area who are trailing significantly behind their non-low-income rural peers.

The second highest area of utilization was on activities authorized under Title IV, Part B. This reflects a historic usage by districts of using the Title IV, Part A funds to focus on improvements in technology. Access to technology by students living in rural communities continues to be a challenge and districts often must supplement their budget with additional funds to provide technology resources needed to allow rural students to access online learning resources. Michigan had adopted in March or 2017 and is actively implementing components of the State Education Technology Plan to support a transformation of education through technology. This has helped support districts in this area and may contribute to a decline in need over time for such utilization by supporting projects such as statewide bidding to reduce infrastructure costs, development of a statewide network infrastructure to support learners, development of high quality open source educational and professional development resources, and establishing a statewide data sharing infrastructure.

The next highest area of utilization was in support of effective instruction through activities authorized under Title II, Part A. Equitable access to high quality instruction remains a challenge for rural districts. Based on the whitepaper available at [https://www.michigan.gov/documents/mde/Michigan\\_Teacher\\_Mobility\\_White\\_Paper\\_639846\\_7.pdf](https://www.michigan.gov/documents/mde/Michigan_Teacher_Mobility_White_Paper_639846_7.pdf) three-year stability rates in rural schools was around 84% which was sizably better than their more urban counterparts. However, the availability of staffing in rural regions often creates challenges in filling vacancies that do occur. As such, there is a higher need for rural districts to invest in training and retaining the staff they currently have which is reflective in the way the Title V, Part B Subpart 2 funds are being utilized by these districts.

Smaller areas of utilization were activities authorized under Title III and parental involvement activities. This is reflective of both smaller numbers of Title III eligible students in rural communities as well as additional need for supports to rural districts to properly identify eligible Title III students who may exist within their schools. In terms of parental involvement activities, many rural communities are heavily engaged in parental involvement in less structured ways which reflects the small community culture of these areas. Approximately 25% of the recipients also receive a Title I, Part A allocation above \$500,000 and provide additional parental and family engagement activities as required as part of their Title I, Part A budgets.

**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.

MDE has updated allowable use guidance provided on its website and has provided additional written guidance to LEAs within the Consolidated Application to help LEAs understand allowable uses for RLIS funds. MDE provides an annual continuous improvement conference to provide additional technical assistance on effective strategies for utilization of RLIS and other supplemental funds and to support and facilitate networking between grant recipients. Regional Consultants review LEA applications for funds and provide assistance to LEAs looking for input and guidance on how to utilize RLIS funds and coordinate utilization of funds to address local needs. Regional Consultants also host workshops each spring to help LEAs understand the requirements and Consolidated Application process. MDE is in process of developing a new continuous improvement system which will allow LEAs to do a more thorough needs assessment, identify effective strategies to address local needs, and direct and coordinate the use of all funds to improve student achievement.

**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.

Michigan awards Title V RLIS funds based on a non-competitive, per pupil formula. Each eligible RLIS agency receives a prorated share of the total funds available based on their student count (average daily attendance).

**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?	4.79%

**Comments:** The response is limited to 4,000 characters.  
Michigan will update the missing data during the re-open period

**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.  
Michigan will update the missing data during the re-open period

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

	<b>Number</b>	<b>Percentage</b>
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.	17	11.26%

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