

**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**

Ohio



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

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

Address:

Person to contact about this report:

Name:

Dr. Ardith M. Allen

Telephone:

614-728-8054

Fax:

None

e-mail:

ardith.allen@education.ohio.gov

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

Ms. Beth Fletcher

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	97		
High schools failing to graduate one third or more of their students	154	149	5
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	251		

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	525	408	117
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)	11	7	4

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	137,765	S	82%
American Indian or Alaska Native	198	S	71%
Asian or Pacific Islander	3,068	S	90.7%
<i>Asian</i>			
<i>Native Hawaiian or Other Pacific Islander</i>			
Black or African American	21,437	S	69.4%
Hispanic or Latino	6,854	S	73.4%
White	100,266	S	85.3%
Two or more races	5,942	S	76.9%
Children with disabilities (<i>IDEA</i>)	22,401	S	48%
English Learners	3,598	S	65.2%
Economically disadvantaged students	57,449	S	71%
Children in foster care	2,830	S	52%
Children who are homeless	4,520	S	54%

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	46,344	S	74,475	S
American Indian or Alaska Native	18	S	134	S
Asian or Pacific Islander	1,442	S	1,378	S
<i>Asian</i>				
<i>Native Hawaiian or Other Pacific Islander</i>				
Black or African American	5,226	S	11,965	S
Hispanic or Latino	754	S	4,252	S
White	36,351	S	54,676	S
Two or more races	2,553	S	2,070	S
Children with disabilities (<i>IDEA</i>)	S	S	16,885	S
English Learners	361	S	2,192	S
Economically disadvantaged students	18,360	S	26,650	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>)	152,413
English learners	43,246
Homeless students	24,994
Migrant students	682

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	1,284
Asian	12,825
Black or African American	231,082
Hispanic or Latino	68,712
Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander	785
White	478,016
Two or more races	56,251
Total	848,955

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	9	0	0	9
Age 3 through 5 (not Kindergarten)	2	28,033	0	0	28,035
K	2,710	86,333	168	1	89,212
1	3,830	83,634	230	0	87,694
2	3,298	82,026	206	0	85,530
3	3,203	85,025	161	0	88,389
4	1,369	84,800	141	0	86,310
5	985	79,474	116	5	80,580
6	809	62,302	45	7	63,163
7	462	52,877	25	29	53,393
8	361	49,627	19	43	50,050
9	33	40,751	22	101	40,907
10	41	35,032	7	70	35,150
11	20	30,627	12	43	30,702
12	20	30,814	19	34	30,887
Ungraded					
TOTALS	17,143	831,364	1,171	333	850,011

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.

Ohio has no concerns about the accuracy of reported child counts or eligibility determinations for the 2018-2019 school year.

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)	167
K	72
1	56
2	70
3	75
4	67
5	64
6	45
7	72
8	62
9	54
10	53
11	51
12	21
Ungraded	
Out-of-school	153
Total	1,082

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.

Ohio had no increases or decreases of >10% in the number of students reported for Category 1 between the 2017-2018 and the 2018-2019 school years.

2.4.1.3 Birth through Two Child Count

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

Age/Grade	Eligible Migratory Children
Age Birth through 2	0

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)	45
K	36
1	21
2	36
3	35
4	31
5	37
6	23
7	28
8	26
9	18
10	12
11	10
12	0
Ungraded	
Out-of-school	44
Total	402

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 -17.5% difference between the 2017-2018 data and the 2018-2019 data has been verified as correct. The significant decrease in the number of served migrant children can be attributed in part to many migrant families making interstate moves out of Ohio but not returning to the state. Additionally, fewer migrant families are coming to Ohio for work, and an increasing number of farmers are employing more H2A workers instead of families.

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

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

Do not include:

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

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

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

2.4.3 Child Count Calculation and Validation Procedures

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

2.4.3.1 Methods Used to Count Children

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

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

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

A query is run against the Ohio Migrant Student Information System (OMSIS2) database to calculate the Category 1 child count. The query identifies those students who meet three requirements: 1) those who are between the ages of 3 and 21 (as shown in the Student Identification Table); 2) those who have made a qualifying move within the past 36 months (as shown in the Educational Enrollment History Data Table); and 3) those who have had a third birthday either before the end date of the program in which they participated (as shown in the Educational Enrollment History Data Table, the Student Identification Table, and the Supplemental Program Information Table) or before the end of their residency in Ohio. A similar query that includes all of the above information is run to calculate the Category 2 child count, but it also has a summer service indicator. The fields used to run this particular query are SID.OHID, SID.LastName, SID.FirstName, ENR.OHID, SID.DeceasedDate, SID.GraduationDate, SID.BirthDate, ENR.LastQualifyingMove, ENR.EnrollmentDate, ENR.WithdrawalDate, ENR.OhioArrivalDate, and several flag fields that serve to exclude specific instances (e.g., children who turn three during the school year, but for whom no Ohio residency can be guaranteed except at the age of two). The database administrator (or the administrator's representative) at the Ohio Migrant Education Center (OMEC) executes these queries and updates a series of flags in a specific order.

Each September, a home visit is made to each student for whom a valid Certificate of Eligibility (COE) exists to determine if the student is still a resident in the state. The verification data are added to our database, and they serve as an indication that the student is eligible to be included in Category 1 for the new program year. All students added through a new COE during the program year are also counted. When a student is identified in Ohio for the first time, the OMSIS2 data system generates a unique ID for that student called the OHID. Every student has a unique OHID number that ensures the child is only counted once. As part of the quality control process at OMEC, "new" students are double-checked to ensure that they have not already been assigned a different OHID. Some of the quality control criteria used to ensure the unique identity of a "new" child include surname, parent first names, alternate spellings of surnames, migratory histories of families with similar names, and date of birth. If a student has been identified previously, then his/her new records are always entered using the student's existing OHID to avoid duplication. This check of the OMSIS2 system is accomplished before any record is entered into the system as new. When eligible students are first identified and entered into the database, they are all Category 1 students. They are not counted in Category 2 unless they also are eligible for and receive funded summer services.

Summer program students are flagged in the Student Information Table. A query is run against these data to generate a list of all students served during the summer. These students are served in one or more of the following ways: district site-based summer programs, in-home instruction, and EL programs. Recorded participation in a funding-eligible instructional service during the summer/intersession period is required and must be documented before an indicator can be updated in OMSIS2 that triggers the inclusion of a particular student in the child count. The timing of this participation is verified when the queries used for the child counts screen by the date of the service(s) provided. If the date shown for the service(s) does not fall during the designated summer period, then that child will not qualify to be counted. Each child who is counted always has at least one qualifying service for which a qualifying date has been documented. Services provided to children whose eligibility has just expired may be reported at the local level, but quality control procedures at OMEC are in place to exclude these records from being entered into OMSIS2.

(Please see our response continued below in the comment box.)

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 Facts Data Files	Yes/No
The State deployed a process that ensured that it transmits accurate migrant data to the Department in every required ED Facts 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.

The MSIX database offers a Reconciliation Report for both the Category I and Category II counts. These reports allow for a one-to-one comparison by student, for each individual counted as Category I and/or Category II, between OMSIS2 and MSIX. Ohio makes these comparisons, notes any discrepancies, and takes appropriate action on a student-by-student basis to ensure that 100% of the Cat I/Cat II data in MSIX matches the corresponding data in OMSIS2, and to identify any potential opportunities to improve on the data exchange process.

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

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

OMSIS2 includes numerous companion fields to each date-type field accessed by the queries used for ED Facts and the CSPR. These companion fields include a number of calculations and comparisons that help locate data that may require further review.

For example, each child record contains query-relevant birth date and current age fields. Each enrollment and service record contains query-relevant fields such as date of service or date of enrollment, residency date, and qualifying move date. One example of a companion field that is used during reporting uses query-relevant fields to calculate the age a student was at the time of residency and service. This produces a flag that is used to exclude, for example, current three-year-olds who were three at the end of the reporting cycle, but not necessarily a resident in Ohio when their third birthday arrived. Such a child is excluded from the Category 1 count. All three-year-olds are examined using the companion calculation field in this way to separate those who are proven and not proven eligible. Similar companion calculation fields exist that guard against incorrect date values being entered in the query relevant fields.

Duplications are prevented through the use of a combination of FileMaker database features, including extensive use of the "Go to Related Records" script command. Searches are initially performed in a related table while seeking funded services delivered during the current reporting period. When this script is run, it results in a found set of students (not services). All counts for the CSPR are then generated from the Students Table, where each student has only one grade level and one unique identifier, in order to ensure that no student can possibly be counted twice in any cell of any CSPR table.

Eligibility for Category 1 is first established for the majority of students using the "Constrain Found Set" tool repeatedly for each criterion that could possibly exclude a student from eligibility for the current reporting period. Students who qualify based on this more rigorous screening compose the first group of students marked as qualifying. Students who qualify but whose eligibility for the current reporting period must be confirmed on a case-by-case basis are excluded from this first group by the stringency of the initial queries. Instead, these students are individually marked as qualifying only after their record is carefully reviewed to confirm, for example, that their age qualified them to be counted as eligible for the reporting period.

After all Category 1 eligibility has been marked, an export of data from the Student Table into an empty Reporting Table is executed. The Reporting Table contains many true-or false fields that correspond to each category of the CSPR. A database relationship links the Student Table to the Reporting Table on the key field OHID. By updating each of the Reporting Table's true-or-false fields directly from within the Student Table, and by doing so only after the Reporting Table already contains exclusively Category 1-eligible records, it is possible to know with certainty that: 1) only eligible students are contained in any individual count; and 2) there is absolutely no duplication within counts.

Accuracy checks are also performed using the Reporting Table as a source and the Student Table as the destination for a "Go to Related Records" script. This technique could be used to find instantly the exact group of students reported as being in the 7th Grade and also receiving Math instruction in the summer. This group can be scrolled through to verify that each student is a 7th grader and when and where they received Math instruction.

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.	86
The number of eligibility determinations sampled for which a re-interview was completed.	76
The number of eligibility determinations sampled for which a re-interview was completed and the child was found eligible.	76

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.

Sampling was conducted without replacements. All students qualified in Ohio from September 1, 2018 through August 31, 2019 were part of the total population sampled for the re-interview. A percentage of eligibility determinations (COEs) were pulled periodically from the state database (OMSIS2) to generate a random sample and given to the re-interviewer to initiate the interview process. Each new random sample was pulled from the database using only eligibility determinations (COEs) entered into OMSIS2 since the last re-interview list was run. Ohio sampled without replacements. Every eligibility determination (COE) entered into the database had exactly one chance to be pulled for the re-interview.

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.

Interviewers were neither SEA nor LEA staff members responsible for administering or operating the MEP, nor any other persons who worked on the initial eligibility determinations being tested.

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

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

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

2.4.4 Eligible Migratory Children

2.4.4.1 Priority for Services

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

Age/Grade	Priority for Services During the Performance Period
Age 3 through 5 (not Kindergarten)	3
K	11
1	18
2	21
3	16
4	14
5	17
6	8
7	11
8	17
9	15
10	7
11	5
12	5
Ungraded	
Out-of-school	23
Total	191

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)	
K	1
1	3
2	20
3	31
4	24
5	29
6	13
7	20
8	26
9	15
10	7
11	5
12	5
Ungraded	
Out-of-school	
Total	199

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

2.4.4.3 Children with Disabilities (IDEA)

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

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

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

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	
Age 3 through 5 (not Kindergarten)	80
K	41
1	20
2	42
3	37
4	31
5	41
6	23
7	37
8	34
9	30
10	22
11	19
12	3
Ungraded	
Out-of-school	95
Total	555

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	2
8	5
9	16
10	5
11	18
12	13
Ungraded	
Total	59

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

FAQ on Dropouts:

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

2.4.5.2 HSED (High School Equivalency Diploma)

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

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

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

2.4.6 MEP Services - During the Performance Period

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

FAQ on Services:

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

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

Age/Grade	Served During the Performance Period
Age Birth through 2	0
Age 3 through 5 (not Kindergarten)	46
K	48
1	40
2	45
3	59
4	51
5	52
6	30
7	49
8	46
9	29
10	29
11	21
12	13
Ungraded	
Out-of-school	44
Total	602

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

2.4.6.1 Priority for Services – During the Performance Period

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

Age/Grade	Priority for Services During the Performance Period
Age 3 through 5 (not Kindergarten)	3
K	11
1	18
2	21
3	16
4	14
5	17
6	8
7	11
8	17
9	15
10	7
11	5
12	5
Ungraded	
Out-of-school	23
Total	191

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

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

FAQ on Continuation of Services:

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

2.4.6.3 Instructional Service – During the Performance Period

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

Age/Grade	Instructional Service During the Performance Period
Age Birth through 2	
Age 3 through 5 (not Kindergarten)	46
K	48
1	40
2	45
3	59
4	51
5	51
6	30
7	49
8	46
9	29
10	29
11	21
12	13
Ungraded	
Out-of-school	44
Total	601

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

2.4.6.4 Type of Instructional Service – During the Performance Period

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

Age/Grade	Reading Instruction During the Performance Period	Mathematics Instruction During the Performance Period	High School Credit Accrual During the Performance Period
Age Birth through 2			
Age 3 through 5 (not Kindergarten)	44	41	
K	44	39	
1	40	34	
2	43	41	
3	56	49	
4	47	41	
5	50	46	
6	29	27	
7	43	39	
8	42	38	1
9	28	25	10
10	23	20	1
11	16	18	3
12	7	8	
Ungraded			
Out-of-school	2	6	
Total	514	472	15

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

FAQ on Types of Instructional Services:

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

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

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

Age/Grade	Support Services During the Performance Period	Breakout of Counseling Services During the Performance Period
Age Birth through 2		
Age 3 through 5 (not Kindergarten)	42	2
K	37	2
1	24	4
2	38	6
3	35	1
4	31	4
5	39	6
6	23	2
7	26	3
8	27	8
9	16	2
10	8	1
11	8	1
12	4	
Ungraded		
Out-of-school	13	
Total	371	42

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	46
Number of eligible migratory children enrolled in those schools	361

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

Throughout this section:

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

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

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

2.5.1.1 Programs and Facilities - Subpart 1

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

State Program/Facility Type	# Programs/Facilities	Average Length of Stay in Days
Neglected programs	0	0
Juvenile detention	0	0
Juvenile corrections	3	101
Adult corrections	9	159
Other	0	0
Total	12	

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

FAQ on Programs and Facilities - Subpart I:

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

2.5.1.2 Programs and Facilities That Reported - Subpart 1

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

The total row will be automatically calculated.

State Program/Facility Type	# Reporting Data
Neglected programs	0
Juvenile detention	0
Juvenile corrections	3
Adult corrections	9
Other	0
Total	12

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			584	906	
Total Long Term Students Served			308	624	

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>)			284	205	
English Learners (ELs)			8	7	

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			5	0	
Asian			0	0	
Black or African American			365	471	
Hispanic or Latino			19	29	
Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander			0	0	
White			159	326	
Two or more races			36	80	
Total			584	906	

Provide the number of students served by gender.

Sex	Neglected Programs	Juvenile Detention	Juvenile Corrections	Adult Corrections	Other Programs
Male			584	839	
Female			0	67	
Total			584	906	

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			0	0	
14			6	0	
15			30	0	
16			84	0	
17			152	0	
18			189	142	

Age	Neglected Programs	Juvenile Detention	Juvenile Corrections	Adult Corrections	Other Programs
19			95	179	
20			28	259	
21			0	326	
Total			584	906	

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			S	S	

Outcomes (once per student) - # of Students Who	Neglected Programs - In fac.	Neglected Programs - 90 days after exit	Juvenile Detention - In fac.	Juvenile Detention - 90 days after exit	Juvenile Corrections - In fac.	Juvenile Corrections - 90 days after exit	Adult Corrections - In fac.	Adult Corrections - 90 days after exit	Other Programs - In fac.	Other Programs - 90 days after exit
Earned a GED					80	S	139	S		
Obtained high school diploma					25	S	35	S		

Outcomes (once per student per time period) - # of Students Who	Neglected Programs - In fac.	Neglected Programs - 90 days after exit	Juvenile Detention - In fac.	Juvenile Detention - 90 days after exit	Juvenile Corrections - In fac.	Juvenile Corrections - 90 days after exit	Adult Corrections - In fac.	Adult Corrections - 90 days after exit	Other Programs - In fac.	Other Programs - 90 days after exit
Earned high school course credits					554	S	33	S		
Enrolled in a GED program					80	S	730	3		
Accepted and/or enrolled into post-secondary education					66	S	43	S		
Enrolled in job training courses/programs					337	S	141	S		
Obtained employment					212	S	381	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			97	33	
Long-term students with no change in grade level from the pre- to post-test exams			11	95	
Long-term students with improvement up to one full grade level from the pre- to post-test exams			72	183	
Long-term students with improvement of more than one full grade level from the pre- to post-test exams			66	259	
Total students pre/post- tested			246	570	

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			114	44	
Long-term students with no change in grade level from the pre- to post-test exams			11	133	
Long-term students with improvement up to one full grade level from the pre- to post-test exams			54	139	
Long-term students with improvement of more than one full grade level from the pre- to post-test exams			80	256	
Total students pre/post- tested			259	572	

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	28	174
Juvenile detention	39	17
Juvenile corrections	21	153
Other	0	0
Total	88	

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

FAQ on average length of stay:

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

2.5.3.2 Programs and Facilities That Reported - Subpart 2

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

The total row will be automatically calculated.

LEA Program/Facility Type	# Reporting Data
At-risk programs	0
Neglected programs	28
Juvenile detention	39
Juvenile corrections	21
Other	0
Total	88

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		2,225	8,865	1,078	
Total Long Term Students Served		1,014	466	696	

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>)		974	2,437	465	
ELs		31	43	1	

Provide the number of students served by race/ethnicity.

Race/Ethnicity	At-Risk Programs	Neglected Programs	Juvenile Detention	Juvenile Corrections	Other Programs
American Indian or Alaska Native		3	7	3	
Asian		9	15	1	
Black or African American		924	3,686	388	
Hispanic or Latino		65	252	19	
Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander		1	4		
White		1,060	4,290	577	
Two or more races		163	611	90	
Total		2,225	8,865	1,078	

Provide the number of students served by sex.

Sex	At-Risk Programs	Neglected Programs	Juvenile Detention	Juvenile Corrections	Other Programs
Male		1,131	6,473	864	
Female		1,094	2,392	214	
Total		2,225	8,865	1,078	

Provide the number of students served by age.

Age	At-Risk Programs	Neglected Programs	Juvenile Detention	Juvenile Corrections	Other Programs
3 through 5		6			
6		10			
7		14			
8		28	2		
9		57	5	2	
10		58	30		
11		79	104	3	
12		117	309	20	
13		188	708	57	
14		324	1,129	128	
15		371	1,721	212	
16		387	2,017	250	
17		319	2,346	289	
18		175	403	97	
19		49	69	14	

Age	At-Risk Programs	Neglected Programs	Juvenile Detention	Juvenile Corrections	Other Programs
20		27	17	6	
21		16	5		
Total		2,225	8,865	1,078	

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		567	2,675	380	

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			4	5	6	3	13	3		
Obtained high school diploma			53	13	59	29	53	14		

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			867	188	3,001	2,054	623	184		
Enrolled in a GED program			4	5	19	3	38	10		
Accepted and/or enrolled into post- secondary education			30	7	4	5	16	6		
Enrolled in job training courses/programs			66	14	12	7	94	16		
Obtained employment			137	25	4	65	19	58		

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		92	22	35	
Long-term students with no change in grade level from the pre- to post-test exams		183	333	123	
Long-term students with improvement up to one full grade level from the pre- to post-test exams		553	283	203	
Long-term students with improvement of more than one full grade level from the pre- to post-test exams		102	34	134	
Total students pre/post- tested		930	672	495	

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		44	539	52	
Long-term students with no change in grade level from the pre- to post-test exams		199	58	109	
Long-term students with improvement up to one full grade level from the pre- to post-test exams		529	508	201	
Long-term students with improvement of more than one full grade level from the pre- to post-test exams		133	150	130	
Total students pre/post- tested		905	1,255	492	

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	11,125,005.77
Safe and Healthy Students	12,634,356.46
Effective Use of Technology	3,348,541.91

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

In order to approximate Title IV-A expenditures by allowable activity area, Ohio utilized a modified expenditure tracking method approved by the United States Department of Education, Office of Elementary and Secondary Education, in May 2020. Local Education Agencies reported Title IV-A expenditures from July 1st, 2018 to June 30th, 2019 on the State Fiscal Year 2019 Final Expenditure Report (FER). The State Education Agency applied the budget percentages from the Local Education Agency's approved State Fiscal Year 2019 Title IV-A application budget against the Local Education Agency's Title IV-A expenditures as reported on the Final Expenditure Report to get expenditure estimates in each of the three Title IV-A allowable activity areas for each Local Education Agency. Ohio is enhancing its financial system by coding each Title IV-A expenditure to allow for grouping by Title IV-A allowable activity area. We anticipate this change to take effect July 1st, 2021 (State Fiscal Year 2022), with data being reported in the School Year 2021-2022 Consolidated State Performance Report.

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	561
Safe and Healthy Students	638
Effective Use of Technology	388
Any Content Area	804

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

In order to approximate Title IV-A expenditures by allowable activity area, Ohio utilized a modified expenditure tracking method approved by the United States Department of Education, Office of Elementary and Secondary Education, in May 2020. Local Education Agencies reported Title IV-A expenditures from July 1st, 2018 to June 30th, 2019 on the State Fiscal Year 2019 Final Expenditure Report (FER). The State Education Agency applied the budget percentages from the Local Education Agency’s approved State Fiscal Year 2019 Title IV-A application budget against the Local Education Agency’s Title IV-A expenditures as reported on the Final Expenditure Report to get expenditure estimates in each of the three Title IV-A allowable activity areas for each Local Education Agency. Ohio is enhancing its financial system by coding each Title IV-A expenditure to allow for grouping by Title IV-A allowable activity area. We anticipate this change to take effect July 1st, 2021 (State Fiscal Year 2022), with data being reported in the School Year 2021-2022 Consolidated State Performance Report.

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).	178

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)	132	9
Student Support and Enrichment Grants (Title IV, Part A)	102	5
Improving Basic Programs Operated by LEAs (Title I, Part A)		223
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)		1

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)	4,518,881.15	262,282.68
Student Support and Enrichment Grants (Title IV, Part A)	2,092,371.99	99,261.86
Improving Basic Programs Operated by LEAs (Title I, Part A)		6,204,708.60
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)		45,000.00

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

For Question 2.7.3, the total number of LEAs transferring funds does not match across columns (i.e., 234 LEAs versus 238 LEAs). This is because two LEAs (NCES IDs 3904607 and 3900185) transferred funds from Title II-A to both Title I-A and Title IV-A, while two other LEAs (NCES IDs 3904625 and 3904429) transferred funds from Title IV-A to both Title I-A and Title II-A. Each of these four LEAs counts once in the "FROM" column, but twice in the "TO" column.

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	73
Activities authorized under Part A of Title II	40
Activities authorized under Title III	3
Activities authorized under Part A of Title IV	42
Parental involvement activities	15

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 Ohio's ESSA plan the following objectives and outcomes were identified to assist rural districts in Ohio:

Objective 1.) Developing partnerships in the Appalachian region of the state and building a peer-to-peer network to connect high-performing districts with similar districts to model and share effective professional development, curriculum, instruction and school improvement activities. Peer to peer networks have been developed with districts consisting of district Superintendents, Administrators, Teachers, and Ohio Department of Education Staff. The peer to peer networks meets regularly to share practices. The rural liaison has worked with rural districts to create a rural newsletter for Ohio's rural districts. The first rural newsletter was developed and sent to rural districts in Ohio, showcasing programs and successes that rural districts are experiencing as well as informing districts of resources available for them.

Objective 2.) Designating a rural education liaison in the Office of Improvement to coordinate school improvement initiatives. Ohio's Rural Liaison continues to work with Rural districts in the field. The Rural Liaison works with State Support Teams in Southeastern Regions 12, 14, 15, and 16. The State Support Teams work with districts to develop comprehensive needs assessment and improvement plans towards improved student achievement. Ohio established rural focus groups identified four areas for targeted supports for rural districts in Ohio. Focus groups consist of rural district administrators, ESC's, SSTs, and ODE staff. Four strands for targeted supports were identified as 1.) Human Capital Resources for staffing; 2.) Opioid Crisis with Wraparound Healthcare; 3.) Educational Options to increase AP, College Credit Plus, and Career Training opportunities; 4.) Chronic Absenteeism. To address chronic absenteeism, Ohio Department of Education and The National Center for Rural Education Research Networks is working with 20 districts across the state of Ohio that are designated as Rural. The rural liaison works with rural districts in an effort to maintain an understanding and productive relationship between their schools and the Ohio Department of Education.

Objective 3.) Leveraging Title II for professional development to support the needs of educators in rural schools; The Rural Liaison and the Office of Federal Programs has worked with rural district to assist them with strategies for leveraging their federal funds as well as state and local funds to address challenges rural districts face. As part of a district's funding application for Rural Low-Income program, districts identified the specific challenges they face, described how it addressed in their need assessment and comprehensive improvement plan, and explained what funds were used to leverage towards addressing these challenges. All districts were required to provide SMART goals and measurable student performance measures and adult implementation measures for their improvement plans in FY 18-19. In relationship with Title IIA, 31 RLIS districts indicated that they were using their funds for teacher and leadership professional development activities. Four RLIS districts indicated that they were using their funds towards teacher recruitment and retention activities. ODE targeted the state's administrative Title IIA to rural districts for principal leadership activities.

Outcome 1: Increase the percentage of rural/low-income districts and schools that reach or exceed a graduation rate of an "A" on Ohio's report card.

Ohio's expected graduation rate for districts and schools is 93% or higher. The baseline percentage of rural low-income schools with this graduation rate is 54.5% for districts and 53.9% for schools. Ohio's graduation rate for rural low-income districts in FY 17-18 was 58.54% with 72 out of 123 districts reaching the state's expected 93% graduation rate for the 4-year graduation measure thus receiving an A on the districts report card for graduation. The FY 18-19 graduation rate for the same measure was 80 out of 123 districts resulting in a 65.04% with 93% or higher on graduation with an A for the districts report card. For buildings in rural low-income districts all buildings that received a rating for graduation, in FY 17-18, 79 out of 131 were at 93% or higher with a percentage of receiving an A for graduation at 63.86%. In FY 18-19, there were 81 buildings out of 128 with a 93% graduation rate which resulted in 63.28 receiving an A on the building's rating for graduation.

Outcome 2: Increase the percentage of rural/low-income districts and schools that reach or exceed a "C," 70 percent level on the state's Performance Index measure on Ohio's report card.

Ohio's performance index measures student performance levels on state academic assessments. The baseline measure for rural low-income districts and school in Ohio is 49.6% for districts and 46.6% for schools. Low-income rural districts that received a C or higher on the state report card was at 66.67% with 82 out of 123 for FY 17-18. In FY 18-19, there were 90 districts out of 123 that reached the same benchmark of C or higher on the state report card resulting in 73.17 percent with a performance index score of 70 or higher. The low-income rural schools in 17-18 received 63.86% with 258 out of 404 buildings with a C or higher on the state report card in performance index measure. FY 18-19 low-income rural schools had 266 out of 398 with 66.83% performance index score of 70% or C and higher on the building report card.

Outcome 3: Increase the percentage of rural/low-income districts and schools that reach or exceed a "C," 34 percent level on the state's Prepared for Success measure on Ohio's report card.

Ohio's Prepared for Success measure looks at a district or school success at preparing students for college or a career after graduation. The baseline measure for rural low-income districts was 31.7% while schools had a baseline measure of 32.8%. At that time the threshold for a C was set at 34%. This threshold has increased to a 60% required to receive a C or higher on the Prepared for Success measure. In FY 17 – 18, low-income rural districts received a C or higher on this measure at 1.62% or 2 districts out of 123 rural low-income districts had a C or higher on their report card. The same districts in FY 18-19 had 3 out of 123 reach a C or higher on their report card resulting in 2.44%. Schools within low-income rural districts had 2 out of 131 buildings in FY 17-18 with 1.52% while FY 18-19 had 3 with 2.34% receiving a C or higher on their report cards for this measure.

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.

Ohio provides technical assistance to its rural districts at multiple levels. All rural districts have access to an educational program consultant for their RLIS funding application and comprehensive improvement plan through the Office of Federal Programs. The Office of Federal Programs provides regional training sessions three times throughout the year. There is a fall regional training session for updates about federal programs and compliance items. In the spring there are two separate regional trainings provided. The first training is for districts with their improvement plans and navigating the system to enter their plans. The second session is for completing their funding applications in the consolidated application. The RLIS is in the consolidated application and is required to be linked to goals in the improvement plan. Ohio's REAP State Coordinator is also available for RLIS districts to assist with the RLIS application. During the FY2019 school year, the REAP State Coordinator provided two technical assistance sessions for rural districts to attend during Ohio Association for Administrators of State and Federal Education Programs (OAASFEP) conference. Districts in Ohio also receive support through the State Support Teams (SSTs) that are assigned to regional areas. Any RLIS district identified using state accountability measures with a status of Moderate with a letter grade of D or F, Intensive, or Academic Distress or that had a building identified with a federal Priority or Focus status receives support from its SST in the development of its needs assessment and improvement plan. Beginning in FY18, a Rural Liaison became available to provide technical assistance to rural districts to address any challenges, questions, and needs they may be experiencing. Through a process with focus groups with representatives from rural districts, four focus areas were identified for targeted technical support and development of peer to peer networks with other agencies. The four targeted areas are Human Capital, Opioid Crisis with Healthcare Services, Educational Technology, and Chronic Absenteeism. The Rural Liaison provides technical assistance through SST meetings and/or individual meetings at the district.

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.

Ohio uses a funding formula to allocate funds to eligible Rural Low-Income districts. Students in average daily attendance (ADA) determines the funding allocation for RLIS districts. A student must be in attendance at a district more than 50% of the time to be counted in the district's ADA. This is to prevent a student from being counted twice when the student attends two districts within a year. For example, a student that attends part of the day at the public district and part of the day at a technical-vocational district. Whichever district has the student more than 50% of the time will receive the ADA count for the student. Five percent of the SEA's RLIS fund was set aside for state administrative costs. The balance was then distributed by determining the total ADA at eligible RLIS districts then dividing that amount into the remaining SEA allocation to provide a PPA amount for districts. In FY 19, a total of 79 districts were eligible for the RLIS grant. The PPA amount for districts was \$18.71. The range of allocations was \$8,734.91 to \$72,261.29

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?	100.00%

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.

The list of LEAs required to be reported for Question 2.8.6 was submitted under separate cover directly to the Partner Support Center on Wednesday, May 27, 2020.

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

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

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