

**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**

Nevada



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:

Address:

Person to contact about this report:

Name:

Melissa Swann

Telephone:

775-687-9186

Fax:

775-687-9188

e-mail:

mswann@doe.nv.gov

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

Melissa Swann

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	107		
High schools failing to graduate one third or more of their students	39	11	28
Title I schools that have received additional targeted support under Section 1111(d)(2)(C) of the <i>ESEA</i> and that have not exited that status after a State-determined number of years			
Total Identified	146		

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.

	Number of Schools	Number of Title I Schools	Number of non- Title I Schools
Schools with One or More Consistently Underperforming Subgroups of Students	166	113	53
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)	145	102	43

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 ED*Facts* files and compiled in the EDEN012 "Section 1003 Allocations to LEAs and Schools" report in the ED*Facts* 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 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 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.

CLARK COUNTY SCHOOL DISTRICT 3200060 \$4,944,482.00
 ELKO COUNTY SCHOOL DISTRICT 3200120 \$465,013.00
 LINCOLN COUNTY SCHOOL DISTRICT 3200270 \$235,982.00
 WHITE PINE COUNTY SCHOOL DISTRICT 3200510 \$605,831.00
 CHURCHILL COUNTY SCHOOL DISTRICT 3200030 \$61,730.00
 NYE COUNTY SCHOOL DISTRICT 3200360 \$168,126.00
 STATE-SPONSORED CHARTER SCHOOLS 3200001 \$353,612.00
 MINERAL COUNTY SCHOOL DISTRICT 3200330 \$187,122.00
 HUMBOLDT COUNTY SCHOOL DISTRICT 3200210 \$517,058.00
 WASHOE COUNTY SCHOOL DISTRICT 3200480 \$703,876.00
 LYON COUNTY SCHOOL DISTRICT 3200300 \$177,912.00

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.

00075 Matt Kelly Elementary School \$196,949.00
 00495 Desert Pines High School \$234,210.00
 00234 Natchez Elementary School \$127,581.00
 00753 Jesse D Scott ES \$42,929.00
 00483 Steptoe Valley High School \$470,275.00
 00749 Innovations International Charter School of NV \$107,800.00
 00194 Tonopah Elementary School \$67,042.00
 00462 Duane D Keller Middle School \$17,400.00
 00845 Nevada Learning Academy at CCSD \$139,858.00
 00731 Nevada Connections Academy \$103,200.00
 00660 Jerome Mack Middle School \$284,561.00
 00207 E Otis Vaughn Middle School \$100,300.00
 00371 Ann Lynch Elementary School \$105,854.00
 00536 Mario C & Joanne Monaco Middle School \$153,787.00
 00466 Bernice Mathews Elementary School \$34,934.00
 00195 Tonopah High School \$67,042.00
 00767 Desert Rose High School \$24,360.00
 00652 John Tartan Elementary School \$148,066.00
 00751 Beacon Academy of Nevada \$211,658.00
 00728 West Wendover Middle School \$75,472.00
 00339 Doris M Reed Elementary School \$279,858.00
 00426 Desert Heights Elementary School \$169,950.00
 00720 Lund Elementary School \$135,556.00
 00008 Bertha Ronzone Elementary School \$110,885.00
 00052 J. E. Manch Elementary School \$207,875.00
 00125 Carlin Elementary School \$61,451.00
 00684 Owyhee Junior High School (all NV & Idaho only) \$61,451.00
 00510 Hal Smith Elementary School \$205,854.00
 00169 C O Bastian (Caliente Youth Center) \$117,991.00
 00416 French Ford Middle School \$56,259.00
 00401 Richard J Rundle Elementary School \$206,971.00
 00003 Churchill County Middle School \$30,865.00
 00001 Churchill County High School \$30,865.00
 00584 Richard C. Priest Elementary School \$108,750.00
 00489 Ollie Detwiler Elementary School \$196,949.00
 00441 Arturo Cambeiro Elementary School \$225,258.00
 00141 Wells Elementary School \$112,789.00
 00308 West Wendover Elementary School \$15,474.00
 00331 William G Bennett Elementary School \$50,916.00
 00036 George E Harris Elementary School \$196,949.00
 00153 Mc Dermitt Elementary School \$404,418.00
 00230 Libby C Booth Elementary School \$31,398.00
 00603 enCompass Academy \$147,034.00
 00557 Pathways High (Alternative) \$34,042.00
 00417 Lucile Bruner Elementary School \$108,861.00
 00745 Delta Academy \$103,330.00
 00479 Hawthorne Junior High School \$113,566.00
 00051 J D Smith Middle School \$135,553.00
 00610 Owyhee High School (all NV & Idaho only) \$61,451.00
 00157 Sonoma Heights Elementary School \$56,381.00
 00381 Cynthia Cunningham Elementary School \$19,222.00
 00672 Carroll M Johnston Middle School \$205,040.00
 00079 Mountain View Elementary School \$42,630.00

00759 Quest Academy Northwest \$38,754.00
00218 Glenn Duncan STEM Academy \$32,408.00
00508 William K. Moore Elementary School \$44,850.00
00587 Howard E Hollingsworth Elementary School \$56,550.00
00093 Robert L Taylor Elementary School \$91,971.00
00035 Gene Ward Elementary School \$42,630.00
00209 Echo Loder Elementary School \$33,419.00
00568 Carlin High School \$61,451.00
00438 Eva Wolfe Elementary School \$88,522.00
00445 Mojave High School \$210,050.00
00609 Odyssey Charter High School \$84,750.00
00727 Owyhee Elementary School (all NV & Idaho only) \$15,474.00
00299 Silver Stage Elementary School \$177,912.00
00184 Schurz Elementary School \$73,556.00
00560 Mariposa Dual Language Academy Charter School \$26,852.00
00166 Caliente Elementary School \$117,991.00
00397 Helen Herr Elementary School \$225,253.00
00053 J Harold Brinley Middle School \$202,691.00
00270 Zel & Mary Lowman Elementary \$36,540.00

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	36,842	S	84.1%
American Indian or Alaska Native	351	S	74%
Asian or Pacific Islander	3,013	S	94%
<i>Asian</i>	2,525	S	93.3%
<i>Native Hawaiian or Other Pacific Islander</i>	488	S	89%
Black or African American	4,076	S	72.2%
Hispanic or Latino	15,297	S	83%
White	12,101	S	87.3%
Two or more races	2,004	S	86%
Children with disabilities (<i>IDEA</i>)	3,902	S	67.2%
English Learners	5,281	S	76.8%
Economically disadvantaged students	24,052	S	80.8%
Children in foster care	242	S	44%
Children who are homeless	819	S	86%

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	15,872	13,332		S
American Indian or Alaska Native	88	145		S
Asian or Pacific Islander	1,744	855		S
<i>Asian</i>	1,587	619		S
<i>Native Hawaiian or Other Pacific Islander</i>	157	236		S
Black or African American	1,336	1,468		S
Hispanic or Latino	5,709	6,098		S
White	6,096	4,116		S
Two or more races	899	650		S
Children with disabilities (<i>IDEA</i>)	793	1,655		S
English Learners	1,465	2,223		S
Economically disadvantaged students	8,890	10,082		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.

Special Services or Programs	# Students Served
Children with disabilities (<i>IDEA</i>)	39,942
English learners	62,965
Homeless students	16,320
Migrant students	62

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

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

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

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

Race/Ethnicity	# Students Served
American Indian or Alaska Native	2,039
Asian	13,938
Black or African American	41,973
Hispanic or Latino	154,795
Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander	4,359
White	57,985
Two or more races	16,534
Total	291,623

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

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

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

Age /Grade	Public TAS	Public SWP	Private	Local Neglected	Total
Age Birth through 2	0	6	0	0	6
Age 3 through 5 (not Kindergarten)	0	4,109	0	2	4,111
K	0	23,240	230	15	23,485
1	0	23,731	343	25	24,099
2	0	23,826	434	22	24,282
3	0	24,037	374	18	24,429
4	0	24,600	398	17	25,015
5	0	25,146	362	14	25,522
6	0	25,727	542	20	26,289
7	0	24,551	490	9	25,050
8	0	23,799	502	15	24,316
9	97	17,291	168	29	17,585
10	89	17,519	183	70	17,861
11	103	16,888	149	78	17,218
12	88	16,250	130	82	16,550
Ungraded	0	526	0	47	573
TOTALS	377	291,246	4,305	463	296,391

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.

Nevada does not have any concerns at this tie as the data was collected by the districts and verified by the state Migrant data coordinator

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)	15
K	10
1	10
2	10
3	6
4	5
5	8
6	2
7	7
8	6
9	10
10	2
11	9
12	4
Ungraded	0
Out-of-school	0
Total	104

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.
Nevada did not have an increase or decrease greater than 10%

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	1

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)	3
K	3
1	3
2	2
3	1
4	0
5	2
6	0
7	1
8	2
9	0
10	0
11	2
12	0
Ungraded	0
Out-of-school	0
Total	19

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.

The largest migrant program (Nye county school district) operated summer program for students in 2018-2019. There were 12 migrant students from Nye County who participated in the summer program and 7 migrant students from Humboldt county. In SY 2017-2018 only Humboldt County ran the summer program.

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

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

Do not include:

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

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

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

2.4.3 Child Count Calculation and Validation Procedures

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

2.4.3.1 Methods Used to Count Children

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

- The unduplicated count of eligible migratory children, ages 3-21. Only include children two years of age whose residency in the state has been verified after turning three.
- Children who met the program eligibility criteria (e.g., were within 3 years of a qualifying move, engaged or had parents engage in migratory agricultural or fishing work, and were entitled to a free public education through grade 12 in the State, or preschool children below the age and grade level at which the agency provides free public education). Children who were resident in your State for at least 1 day during the performance period (September 1 through August 31).
- Children who graduated from high school or attained a High School Equivalency Diploma (HSED) *during the performance period* and ensures that these children are not counted in the subsequent performance period's child count.
- Children who—in the case of Category 2—were 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.

Only children ages 3-21, include children two years of age whose residency in the state has been verified after turning three: Nevada's Migrant database is used to verify that only those children who were born after September 1, 1997 and before September 1, 2015 were included during the performance period for SY 2018-2019. The same system verifies that children who have turned three years of age have resided in Nevada for at least one day in order to be included in the system.

Only children who were within 36 months of a QAD: The State Migrant Program personnel (including recruiters, district program directors/coordinators, state data coordinator, and the state director) ensure that the eligibility of each child is valid and has an active status until September 01, 2018. The validation and verification process start with using the August 31, 2019 as the last date to verify the 36 months and then review the QAD for each migratory student to verify if his/her eligibility is still effective and accurate with this timeframe. This process is done by the local program, then state data coordinator, finally reviewed by state migrant director. The final count for children who were within 36 months of a QAD is generated by the MAPS (Migrant Achievement Performance System-the state migrant database system) using the August 31st, 2019 date as a business rule to calculate this category count.

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. This will be verified by district recruiters, district program directors/coordinators, state data coordinator, and the state director. In MAPS, the state migrant database system, there is a flag/field for migratory students to be filled if they graduated from high school or attained a High School Equivalency Diploma (HSED) during the SY2018-19 performance period. The state data coordinator work with the state migrant director to look at the report from MAPS and ensure the migratory students who graduated from high school or attained a High School Equivalency Diploma (HSED) during the performance period are not counted in the following performance period's child count.

Only children who were resident in the State for at least 1 day during the performance period (September 1 through August 31) were included in the state migrant database system during the SY2018-19 performance period: The validation and verification start with the recruiters conduct a home visit to interview the family to verify that children who have recently turned three years of age have resided in Nevada at least one day during the performance period between September 1 and August 31. This information is then entered into the Nevada Migrant database. The State Migrant Data Coordinator generates a report from this database for the two-years old to recheck when they turn three and whether they have resided at least one day in Nevada. She then informs the district Migrant Program to include these children as eligible migrant students in the system for the during the SY2018-19 performance period.

Only children who had not graduated from high school equivalency diploma were included in the state migrant database system during the SY2018-19 performance period: The recruiters conduct a home visit after the first of September to interview "Out-of-School-Youth" to determine whether he or she graduated or received a high school equivalency diploma. If a student has not graduated from high school, he/she would then be eligible to receive Migrant services. Only unique children in Category 1, and eliminates duplicate students with its State MEP database: Nevada designates each student a unique state ID. Therefore, this is the first filter when entering each student into the state's Migrant database. In addition, in case of duplicate names, the district Migrant program personnel recheck their middle names, birthday, and parent names to ensure that no duplicate counts occur in the database system. Nevada has a very small incidence of Migrant children, so this issue has not been a problem. In the MAPS system, no duplicate students are allowed. For category 2 count, only a subset of the Category 1 children who received a MEP-funded service during the summer or intersession term: The district Migrant Program personnel are required to identify migrant students who will be eligible to receive services during the summer or intersession term. The need to ensure that the students are 3-21 years old and met program eligibility criteria such as being a resident of Nevada at least one day, including the children who have turned three years of age during the performance period. For summer session, each program is required to submit its application annually to receive Migrant funds to operate a

program in summer. The application will require providing attendance rosters and student counts per grade. The state Director then reviews the application to determine the funding. Each district enters these data using national COE;s into the State's Migrant database which is operated by the ERTC MAPS. Migrant data are then verified by the State Migrant Data Coordinator and State Migrant Director.

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.

MSIX is utilized when having students moving in to Nevada from other states and randomly verifies the quality of migrant data between MSIX and in MAPS.

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.	60
The number of eligibility determinations sampled for which a re-interview was completed.	30
The number of eligibility determinations sampled for which a re-interview was completed and the child was found eligible.	30

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	Face-to-face interviews

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

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

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

For the quality control the re-interview process for SY 2018-2019 was conducted by an external experienced interviewer (Educational Research and Training Collaboration). The State Migrant Director provided the interviewer the list of all eligible migrant students by districts who needed to be re-interviewed. In the past (2014-2015) the state Migrant Director consulted with the OME to determine a good sample size for Nevada and agreed that 30 students would be sufficient. The interviewer then randomly selected students from each district while ensuring that all (6) districts were represented in the sampling group. The contact list for each district program was given to the interviewer for a purpose of finding the location of the migrant families. The interviewer contacted each selected family prior to his visit to arrange a date and time to conduct an independent interview. Finally, the interviewer submitted the summary of the complete list for the re-interviews and re-interview forms to the state Migrant Director. The State Migrant Director checked and followed up with the district personnel to receive feedback on the re-interview process in regard to how the interview had been conducted. In Nevada the re-interview process had been conducted annually.

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

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

N/A

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

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

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

2.4.4 Eligible Migratory Children

2.4.4.1 Priority for Services

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

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

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)	7
K	5
1	8
2	8
3	3
4	4
5	4
6	1
7	4
8	5
9	7
10	1
11	7
12	0
Ungraded	0
Out-of-school	0
Total	64

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)	0
K	1
1	0
2	0
3	0
4	0
5	2
6	1
7	0
8	0
9	0
10	0
11	2
12	2
Ungraded	0
Out-of-school	0
Total	8

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	1
Age 3 through 5 (not Kindergarten)	15
K	10
1	8
2	7
3	3
4	3
5	6
6	2
7	6
8	3
9	7
10	2
11	5
12	3
Ungraded	0
Out-of-school	0
Total	81

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	2
9	1
10	0
11	0
12	0
Ungraded	
Total	3

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

FAQ on Dropouts:

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

2.4.5.2 HSED (High School Equivalency Diploma)

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

Obtain HSED	#
Obtained a HSED in your State During the Performance Period	1

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

2.4.6 MEP Services - During the Performance Period

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

FAQ on Services:

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

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

Age/Grade	Served During the Performance Period
Age Birth through 2	1
Age 3 through 5 (not Kindergarten)	10
K	10
1	10
2	10
3	6
4	5
5	8
6	2
7	7
8	6
9	10
10	2
11	9
12	4
Ungraded	0
Out-of-school	0
Total	100

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)	1
K	2
1	1
2	2
3	0
4	0
5	2
6	0
7	0
8	0
9	2
10	1
11	1
12	0
Ungraded	0
Out-of-school	0
Total	12

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)	2
K	0
1	0
2	0
3	0
4	1
5	3
6	0
7	0
8	2
9	1
10	0
11	2
12	1
Ungraded	0
Out-of-school	0
Total	12

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	0
Age 3 through 5 (not Kindergarten)	10
K	8
1	10
2	10
3	6
4	5
5	7
6	2
7	6
8	6
9	9
10	2
11	9
12	4
Ungraded	0
Out-of-school	0
Total	94

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	0	0	
Age 3 through 5 (not Kindergarten)	10	10	
K	8	6	
1	10	8	
2	10	9	
3	6	5	
4	5	5	
5	7	6	
6	2	2	
7	6	5	
8	6	5	0
9	9	9	1
10	2	2	1
11	9	9	0
12	4	4	1
Ungraded	0	0	0
Out-of-school	0	0	0
Total	94	85	3

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

FAQ on Types of Instructional Services:

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

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

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

Age/Grade	Support Services During the Performance Period	Breakout of Counseling Services During the Performance Period
Age Birth through 2	0	0
Age 3 through 5 (not Kindergarten)	9	1
K	4	0
1	8	2
2	3	0
3	4	0
4	4	2
5	5	0
6	1	1
7	4	2
8	5	0
9	8	2
10	1	1
11	8	4
12	3	2
Ungraded	0	0
Out-of-school	0	0
Total	67	17

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	0
Number of eligible migratory children enrolled in those schools	0

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

Throughout this section:

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

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

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

2.5.1.1 Programs and Facilities - Subpart 1

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

State Program/Facility Type	# Programs/Facilities	Average Length of Stay in Days
Neglected programs	0	0
Juvenile detention	0	0
Juvenile corrections	2	172
Adult corrections	2	138
Other	0	0
Total	4	

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	2
Adult corrections	2
Other	0
Total	4

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			399	161	
Total Long Term Students Served			399	154	

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>)			48	22	
English Learners (ELs)			16	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			4	0	
Asian			4	1	
Black or African American			145	70	
Hispanic or Latino			126	56	
Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander			7	1	
White			104	20	
Two or more races			9	13	
Total			399	161	

Provide the number of students served by gender.

Sex	Neglected Programs	Juvenile Detention	Juvenile Corrections	Adult Corrections	Other Programs
Male			279	161	
Female			120	0	
Total			399	161	

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			5	0	
14			20	0	
15			71	0	
16			87	9	
17			119	22	
18			85	9	

Age	Neglected Programs	Juvenile Detention	Juvenile Corrections	Adult Corrections	Other Programs
19			12	27	
20			0	46	
21			0	48	
Total			399	161	

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			58		

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					46	S	10			
Obtained high school diploma					66	S	6			

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					292	S	136			
Enrolled in a GED program					25	S	100			
Accepted and/or enrolled into post-secondary education					S	S	S			
Enrolled in job training courses/programs					S	S	15			
Obtained employment					S	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.

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			36	4	
Long-term students with no change in grade level from the pre- to post-test exams			11	53	
Long-term students with improvement up to one full grade level from the pre- to post-test exams			12	17	
Long-term students with improvement of more than one full grade level from the pre- to post-test exams			57	28	
Total students pre/post- tested			116	102	

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			33	S	
Long-term students with no change in grade level from the pre- to post-test exams			4	74	
Long-term students with improvement up to one full grade level from the pre- to post-test exams			12	16	
Long-term students with improvement of more than one full grade level from the pre- to post-test exams			78	S	
Total students pre/post- tested			127	102	

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	5	109
Neglected programs	2	15
Juvenile detention	4	16
Juvenile corrections	5	158
Other	0	0
Total	16	

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

FAQ on average length of stay:

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

2.5.3.2 Programs and Facilities That Reported - Subpart 2

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

The total row will be automatically calculated.

LEA Program/Facility Type	# Reporting Data
At-risk programs	5
Neglected programs	2
Juvenile detention	4
Juvenile corrections	5
Other	0
Total	16

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	566	1,584	2,666	629	
Total Long Term Students Served	296	6	160	416	

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>)	112	332	519	156	
ELs	49	75	220	57	

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	13	14	34	9	
Asian	2	17	32	8	
Black or African American	18	509	931	228	
Hispanic or Latino	218	373	828	187	
Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander	9	12	80	5	
White	270	424	623	159	
Two or more races	36	235	138	33	
Total	566	1,584	2,666	629	

Provide the number of students served by sex.

Sex	At-Risk Programs	Neglected Programs	Juvenile Detention	Juvenile Corrections	Other Programs
Male	338	814	2,002	408	
Female	228	770	664	221	
Total	566	1,584	2,666	629	

Provide the number of students served by age.

Age	At-Risk Programs	Neglected Programs	Juvenile Detention	Juvenile Corrections	Other Programs
3 through 5	0	137	0	0	
6	1	134	0	0	
7	2	121	0	0	
8	7	120	0	0	
9	6	122	2	0	
10	4	115	8	0	
11	5	103	22	0	
12	13	114	88	0	
13	29	103	179	15	
14	56	104	279	44	
15	97	117	517	98	
16	117	125	619	141	
17	116	132	689	190	
18	81	18	191	118	
19	32	18	44	13	

Age	At-Risk Programs	Neglected Programs	Juvenile Detention	Juvenile Corrections	Other Programs
20	0	1	28	6	
21	0	0	0	4	
Total	566	1,584	2,666	629	

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	28	1,341	1,229	425	

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	S	3	S	37	5	S		
Obtained high school diploma	57	S	S	17	3	81	20	18		

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	266	115	3	218	265	947	477	49		
Enrolled in a GED program	S	S	S	25	S	204	8	46		
Accepted and/or enrolled into post- secondary education	4		S		S		S			
Enrolled in job training courses/programs	21	4	S	S	S	S	S			
Obtained employment	41		S		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.

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		S	36	
Long-term students with no change in grade level from the pre- to post-test exams	S		S	45	
Long-term students with improvement up to one full grade level from the pre- to post-test exams	255		4	81	
Long-term students with improvement of more than one full grade level from the pre- to post-test exams	7		12	156	
Total students pre/post- tested	271		19	318	

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		S	43	
Long-term students with no change in grade level from the pre- to post-test exams	7		S	35	
Long-term students with improvement up to one full grade level from the pre- to post-test exams	258		9	101	
Long-term students with improvement of more than one full grade level from the pre- to post-test exams	S		7	138	
Total students pre/post- tested	271		19	317	

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	2,694,934.80
Safe and Healthy Students	2,557,146.44
Effective Use of Technology	891,074.94

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

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	15
Safe and Healthy Students	19
Effective Use of Technology	12
Any Content Area	17

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

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

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

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

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

2.7.2 Local Educational Agency (LEA) Transferability of Funds

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

LEA Transferability of Funds	#
LEAs that notified the State that they were transferring funds under the LEA Transferability authority of Section 5103(b).	0

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

2.7.3 LEA Funds Transfers

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

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

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

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

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

2.8 RURAL EDUCATION ACHIEVEMENT PROGRAM (REAP)

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

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

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

Purpose	# LEAs
Activities authorized under Part A of Title I	2
Activities authorized under Part A of Title II	0
Activities authorized under Title III	0
Activities authorized under Part A of Title IV	0
Parental involvement activities	0

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.

The Nevada Department of Education has incorporated multi-faceted indicators that results in the continuous improvement of all schools. This system is called the Nevada School Performance Framework (NSPF) and results in a school rating of 1- to 5- stars. This rating system will be applied to all public and charter schools that meet the minimum N size requirements. The ratings of schools will be determined by adding the points earned for each indicator in the school rating system. The indicators are Academic Achievement, Academic Progress, Graduation Rate, Progress in Achieving English Language Proficiency, and School Quality or Student Success indicators. Student performance in the status, ELPA, and graduation rates will be measured against the state's defined long term goals and measures of interim progress. Schools identified for targeted supports and improvements will be identified using the status and graduation rate reporting elements that will be associated with the respective indicators. Each of these reporting elements will be disaggregated to take into consideration the performance of each subgroup. Additionally, the school quality indicators are designed to further call attention to the performance of low achieving students and subgroups. Nevada's Title V RLIS support uses a narrative application, with needs assessment information on specific measurable goals. The desired outcomes are increased student academic achievement and decreased student dropout rates. The school district uses state assessments, benchmark tests, writing assessments, classroom observations, parent/community surveys and School Star Rating to determine effectiveness of interventions, programs and strategies

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 Nevada Department of Education's approach to differentiated school improvement identifies the roles and responsibilities for NDE and districts. To facilitate system level alignment and coherence on accountability and supports, Nevada prioritizes its work and more effectively targets resources, supports, and interventions. This will ensure that NDE and districts are aligned and responsive to specific school needs. Effective continuous improvement processes require transparency, strategic collaboration, skill in employing data-based decision-making, reflection, and expertise in providing successful interventions for struggling schools and students. NDE will annually review data that is collected at the school and district levels to determine whether LEAs and schools are achieving state goals and interim benchmarks. Technical assistance for RLIS districts is on-going and provided with on-site visits, emails and phone conversations. A RLIS desktop monitoring tool provides documentation and dialogue around program effectiveness and student achievement, expenditures, fiscal accountability, policies, procedures, and budgets.

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.

Nevada RLIS funds were distributed on a formula per pupil allocation based on the average daily attendance of the eligible LEAs. LEAs were asked to describe the scope and purpose of the project(s) for which funding will used. Include the following: Information provided should cover School Year 2020-2021; Information provided should cover the amount funded; Describe measurable goals and objectives that increase student academic achievement and/or decrease student dropout rates; Identify how funds are used to support district and schools aligned with authorized title activities; and level of evidence; Describe how funds are prioritized funds to schools that are identified for school improvement (comprehensive, Rising Stars, equity); and List the person(s) responsible for the development and execution of the project(s). In addition, Proposed Projects & Associated Costs Summary include a complete Budget spreadsheet with General Federal Grant Assurances and Statement of Certification

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?	2.20%
What percentage of those funds retained for State-level administration were used specifically for technical assistance?	0.00%

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.

3200330 Mineral County School District \$10,427.34

3200360 Nye County School District \$101,394.81

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.	2	9.52%

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