

**CONSOLIDATED STATE PERFORMANCE REPORT:
Part II**

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

For reporting on
School Year 2018-19

South Carolina



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:

Katie Smith

Telephone:

8037348272

Fax:

8037344857

e-mail:

KESmith@ed.sc.gov

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

Molly Spearman

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	27		
High schools failing to graduate one third or more of their students	17	10	7
Title I schools that have received additional targeted support under Section 1111(d)(2)(C) of the ESEA and that have not exited that status after a State-determined number of years			
Total Identified	44		

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			
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)	196	102	94

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	60,110	S	81.1%
American Indian or Alaska Native	419	S	71%
Asian or Pacific Islander	1,278	S	93%
<i>Asian</i>			
<i>Native Hawaiian or Other Pacific Islander</i>			
Black or African American	21,986	S	76.4%
Hispanic or Latino	4,750	S	79.5%
White	31,638	S	84.2%
Two or more races			
Children with disabilities (<i>IDEA</i>)	7,909	S	54.4%
English Learners	3,143	S	79.3%
Economically disadvantaged students	28,423	S	84.3%
Children in foster care	347	S	52%
Children who are homeless	1,909	S	67%

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	33,014	12,957	1,484	S
American Indian or Alaska Native	76	59	S	S
Asian or Pacific Islander	762	128	24	S
<i>Asian</i>	715	109	S	S
<i>Native Hawaiian or Other Pacific Islander</i>	47	19	S	S
Black or African American	9,934	5,084	660	S
Hispanic or Latino	1,937	1,198	55	S
White	19,065	5,990	715	S
Two or more races	922	399	26	S
Children with disabilities (<i>IDEA</i>)	1,788	1,692	118	S
English Learners	1,302	874	49	S
Economically disadvantaged students	692	610	26	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>)	52,169
English learners	25,746
Homeless students	5,804
Migrant students	41

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	1,129
Asian	2,544
Black or African American	147,327
Hispanic or Latino	38,768
Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander	453
White	122,257
Two or more races	14,772
Total	327,275

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	0	0	0	0
Age 3 through 5 (not Kindergarten)	0	21,768	0	0	21,768
K	0	36,532	47	64	36,643
1	0	36,998	39	70	37,107
2	0	36,531	41	74	36,646
3	0	36,486	30	80	36,596
4	0	38,257	39	112	38,408
5	17	38,132	44	106	38,299
6	0	20,978	23	231	21,232
7	0	18,436	19	273	18,728
8	0	17,763	15	379	18,157
9	0	8,865	0	651	9,516
10	0	6,434	0	373	6,807
11	0	5,056	0	205	5,261
12	0	5,022	0	96	5,118
Ungraded	0	0	0	0	0
TOTALS	17	327,258	297	2,714	330,286

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.

SCMEP acknowledged an issue regarding disparities between 18-19 Category 1 and Category 2 child counts in the original submission of this CSPR data spreadsheet on 04/03/2020. The issue has been resolved. In addition, on 05/22/20, SCMEP requested and received approval from OME to resubmit FS121 and FS122. The information below details the process and outcomes that prompted the resubmission.

At the MEP ADM in March 2020, the SCMEP Director met with OME Program Officer and the MSIX Help Desk to review the disparities between the 18-19 Category 1 and Category 2 counts as they appear in our state migrant database (MIS2000) and in MSIX. The 18-19 MSIX Category 2 count in particular was (and remains) significantly higher than the MIS2000 Category 2 count. The 18-19 Category 1 counts were much closer by

comparison, although the 18-19 MSIX Category 1 count was slightly higher.

Following the ADM, the SCMEP Director met virtually with the MSIX help desk on 04/03 and 04/24 for technical assistance with the child count reconciliation process. Crosschecks of included and excluded students both in MIS2000 and MSIX led to some reconciliation. The SCMEP Director also worked with the MSEdD/MIS2000 team to review how our FS121 and FS122 reports are counting students. SCMEP updated the MIS2000 reporting criteria to match MSIX criteria for dates that establish residency including residency, enrollment, residency verification, and enrollment dates. SCMEP also fixed a reporting glitch that prevented some 3to5notK students from appearing in MIS2000 FS121 and FS122 counts.

The MSIX child count reconciliation process identified errors in MSIX records that SCMEP corrected through resolving MSIX worklist items and through corrections to records in MIS2000. It also prompted SCMEP to review and update the MIS2000 FS121 and FS122 reports. The result was an increase 18-19 FS121 and FS122 child counts in comparison to the FS121 and FS122 child counts included in the first EDFacts submission on 02/12/20. SC ME P recognizes the importance of frequent child count reconciliation checks as a proactive quality control measure throughout each performance period and will continue to do so. To date, the MIS2000 Category 2 Count remains significantly lower than the MSIX Category 2 Count; however, SCMEP is confident that the updated MIS2000 FS122 is accurate and reflective of the decline in 18-19 summer counts due to reasons outlined in the CSPR II Category 2 Child Count Increases/Decreases narrative.

There is no concern with the underlying eligibility determinations on which the counts are based. Prospective re-interviews in 2018-19 resulted in a 0% error rate.

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)	37
K	33
1	37
2	28
3	37
4	43
5	23
6	23
7	25
8	16
9	17
10	8
11	10
12	8
Ungraded	0
Out-of-school	205
Total	550

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.
N/A - No increases or decreases in excess of 10%.

2.4.1.3 Birth through Two Child Count

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

Age/Grade	Eligible Migratory Children
Age Birth through 2	56

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)	33
K	20
1	24
2	13
3	15
4	26
5	13
6	15
7	13
8	7
9	8
10	7
11	3
12	7
Ungraded	0
Out-of-school	142
Total	346

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 Category 2 child count for 2017-18 was 401. The resubmitted 2018-19 Category 2 child count is 346 and represents a 13.7% decrease in the number of students from the 2017-18 summer portion of the MEP performance period. The decrease is due in part to a rapid change in the demographics of the agricultural workers that perform qualifying work and moves during the summer/intersession months. Summer seasonal crops are increasingly harvested by H2A visa contract workers who are often over than 22 years of age and do not travel with children. In addition, the subgrantee with the highest counts of eligible student each year (Beaufort) experienced a decrease in Category 2 numbers due to lower numbers of children and families traveling in the eastern migratory stream. The decrease is also due to a large seasonal agricultural employer going out of business completely, and another that significantly downsized their operation. Additionally, a new MEP subgrantee and new recruiters in the western peach-belt region of the state struggled with ID&R, despite regular technical assistance from state MEP staff. Finally, in consultation with parents it was understood that the level of fear and misinformation in the general immigrant/migrant/Latinx community is such that families are hesitant to sign up for MEP (particularly new families). Recruiters confirmed this based on their interactions with the communities and growers.

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	21

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.

Eligibility determinations began w/ an in person interview conducted by a State MEP or subgrantee recruiter w/ student, if appropriate (i.e. for OSY or emancipated youth), or w/ the student's parent/guardian/spouse/en loco parentis. Eligibility was documented on a paper-based Certificate of Eligibility (COE) approved for use by Office of Migrant Education (OME), which includes all the minimum data elements (MDE) of the nationally approved COE. This was first performance period whereby an electronic COE was implemented for use by State recruiters in order to increase speed & efficiency of overall approval process. The COE was reviewed by the recruiter & supervisor using COE checklist before submission to the State Data Specialist. The State Data Specialist then reviewed each COE individually for accuracy & quality. If COE was determined to be incomplete, the State Data Specialist contacted the recruiter in order to verify missing/incomplete data. If the COE was rejected, an explanation was given to the recruiter, along w/ an option to appeal the State's ineligibility determination. If COE was approved, the State Data Specialist manually entered the COE data into the State Migratory Student Data System, MIS2000. Electronic COE submissions that were approved were automatically uploaded into MIS2000. The State Data Specialist verified each paper COE & data entered into MIS2000 individually several times, along with documentation for services from the service tracking forms. The State Director reviewed the work of the State Data Specialist. Furthermore, the Service Provider (MIS2000) was consulted if there were any difficulties or uncertainty about reports. MIS2000 is programmed to only report children aged 3-21 for the performance period of 9/1 to 8/31.

Original eligibility data was obtained from State & local MEP subgrantee recruiters. The recruiters filled out COEs with the nationally approved data elements for eligible students via face-to-face interviews. All recruiters received training & regular technical assistance that aligned with the OME ID&R manual, Identification and Recruitment Rapid Response Consortium (IRRC) resources, and the SC Identification and Recruitment (ID&R) manual and State-specific ID&R resources. Any eligibility questions or appeals were reviewed by the local MEP Directors & the State Data Specialist & clarified before entry into MIS2000. The data was reviewed several times at the State level as described above. Furthermore, MIS2000 is programmed to calculate a student's end of eligibility based on the qualifying arrival data.

Residency is verified through recruiter check-ins with eligible students. The MIS2000 formula makes certain that student's end of eligibility date is not before 9/1 of the report year. Since the SCMEP program is relatively small & all students are known individually to each LOA program and recruiter, or state recruiter, if a student has graduated, or obtained a high school equivalency diploma it is known right away. This data is directly communicated to the State level and noted in MIS2000 so that only students who have not graduated or earned a high school equivalency diploma are counted w/in the MSI2000 program parameters dictated by the needs of the federal requirements. Furthermore, MIS2000 student lists are cross-checked w/ SC Dept. of Education's State Student Database (PowerSchool) to verify graduation outcomes before reporting child counts.

SC MEP verifies that Category 2 children are served for one or more days through tracking forms that are completed by both State and MEP subgrantee staff to indicate attendance and services. The tracking documentation is then sent to the State Data Specialist for verification & confirmed during On-Site Monitoring, & MEP subgrantee Final Program Evaluations. The Final Program Evaluations include the names of students served, including a separate list of Priority for Service (PFS) students, type of service & amount of services provided. The State Data Specialist & the State Director individually and repeatedly reviewed the names, amount, & type of service each student was given. Data was manually inputted into MIS2000 at the State level. After original data has been verified at the local & State Level (described above) the State Director and Data Specialists cross check each student with MSIX & performs searches for students in MIS2000. This is done several times in both systems using alternate spellings, wild card prompts, & positioning of last names. If an exact match is found the student number is used & the record is updated to eliminate duplicates. If there are potential duplicates, they are verified w/ further checks, such as parents' names, students' date & place of birth, MSIX reports, & local staff. If no record exists MIS2000 creates a new unique ID number. The State Data Specialist & State Director review MSIX, MIS2000, & LOA records to minimize duplicate counts & ensure that each student is only counted once per age/grade level for each child count category. LOAs verify their counts & services by end of program reports. These reports are reviewed by

the State Data Specialist & State Director. Preparation for CSPR is conducted by the State Data Specialist, overseen by the State Director, & in collaboration w/ SC Dept. of Education Office of Research and Data Analysis (ORDA). This review involves individual review of every COE, every sheet of paper w/ service documented by the LOA, & every data entry for every student to ensure that records are accurate & duplication is minimized. Before final submission, counts are reviewed by State Data Specialist, State Director & another Dept. staff member.

The validity of the type of enrollment is verified by COEs, service logs, on-site monitoring, & LOA reporting requirements. The State Data Specialist, overseen by the State Director, reviews each document before inputting data in MIS2000. The State Data Specialist then reviews each data element before final reporting. For Category 1, 2 processes are in place for residency verification for children "turning 3 years of age" during a performance period. Both processes begin w/ a report that is generated from MIS2000 of children who will turn 3 years old during a performance period. In non-project areas, & after the child has already turned 3, SCMEP recruiters first attempt to make physical contact w/ the family at the place of residence. In project areas or areas served by East Coast Migrant Headstart Project, SCMEP recruiters also attempt to make contact w/ the family at the place of residence. However, if contact is not made or family has moved, the State Data Specialist is notified and MEP and/or LEA attendance records & service tracking forms are cross-checked to verify residency. In instances where a family has moved at the time of residency verification but the child turned 3 while in SC & there's evidence of residency (e.g., attendance records, service tracking forms), SCMEP will count that child for Category 1. In any of the aforementioned scenarios, the State Data Specialist updates the child's enrollment record accordingly in MIS2000.

For Category 2, children are enrolled with code "03" in alignment w/ MSIX enrollment types. "Enrollment Type" is a field on the COE and SCMEP Recruiters that identify & recruit new eligible children during summer use "03" to indicate an enrollment for summer months. In instances where eligible migratory children are identified during the regular school year & roll into the summer performance period, subgrantee summer MEP evaluation student data spreadsheets are used to cross-check students & they receive a new enrollment type of "03" in MIS2000. However, the MIS2000 Category 2 report will only count a child if the "03" enrollment type is also connected w/ services (excluding referrals). In non-project areas, tracking forms used by state recruiters are cross-checked to ensure "03" enrollments & summer services.

Does the State ensure that the system that transmits migrant data to the Department accurately accounts for all the migratory children in every ED*Facts* data file? See the Office of Migrant Education's CSPR Rating Instrument for the criteria needed to address this question. Please respond in the table below.

Accuracy of ED<i>Facts</i> Data Files	Yes/No
The State deployed a process that ensured that it transmits accurate migrant data to the Department in every required ED <i>Facts</i> data file.	YES
Use of MSIX to Verify Data Quality	Yes/No
Does the State use data in the Migrant Student Information Exchange (MSIX) to verify the quality of migrant data?	YES

If MSIX is utilized, please explain how.

Comments: The response is limited to 8,000 characters. The child count reconciliation process is used to ensure integrity of the State migrant database (MIS2000) with regards to duplications, disparities in Category 1 and 2 child counts, and file submission reports. Specifically, this process was used for 2018-19 Category 1 and 2 child counts and resulted in an increase in FS121 and FS122 that lessened the disparity between MIS2000 and MSIX. It also prompted a resubmission of FS121 and FS122 counts.

SCMEP will continue to work with the MSIX technical assistance team to maximize the use of MSIX to verify the quality of migrant data.

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

2.4.3.2 Quality Control Processes

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

Results	#
The number of eligibility determinations sampled.	100
The number of eligibility determinations sampled for which a re-interview was completed.	41
The number of eligibility determinations sampled for which a re-interview was completed and the child was found eligible.	41

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

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

FAQ on independent prospective re-interviews:

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

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

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

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

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

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.

Prospective re-interviews were conducted during the 2018-19 performance period. Two random samples of 50 students each (100 total) were obtained from MIS2000. Of the total number of re-interviews completed, all were found to be eligible.

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)	20
K	18
1	18
2	19
3	23
4	29
5	15
6	12
7	22
8	12
9	15
10	7
11	10
12	6
Ungraded	0
Out-of-school	27
Total	253

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)	27
K	28
1	27
2	23
3	34
4	40
5	19
6	21
7	22
8	14
9	14
10	7
11	8
12	5
Ungraded	0
Out-of-school	192
Total	481

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	3
Age 3 through 5 (not Kindergarten)	1
K	0
1	4
2	3
3	4
4	2
5	4
6	1
7	0
8	1
9	0
10	1
11	0
12	0
Ungraded	0
Out-of-school	5
Total	29

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	47
Age 3 through 5 (not Kindergarten)	34
K	25
1	27
2	15
3	25
4	29
5	16
6	14
7	17
8	12
9	12
10	5
11	5
12	7
Ungraded	0
Out-of-school	198
Total	488

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

2.4.5 Academic Status

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

2.4.5.1 Dropouts

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

Grade	Dropouts During the Performance Period
7	0
8	0
9	0
10	0
11	2
12	2
Ungraded	0
Total	4

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	6

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	52
Age 3 through 5 (not Kindergarten)	27
K	25
1	31
2	19
3	25
4	36
5	18
6	14
7	22
8	12
9	15
10	8
11	10
12	8
Ungraded	0
Out-of-school	169
Total	491

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)	20
K	18
1	18
2	19
3	23
4	29
5	15
6	12
7	22
8	12
9	15
10	7
11	10
12	6
Ungraded	0
Out-of-school	27
Total	253

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	0
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	44
Age 3 through 5 (not Kindergarten)	24
K	22
1	26
2	14
3	21
4	34
5	13
6	12
7	15
8	11
9	11
10	7
11	4
12	6
Ungraded	0
Out-of-school	128
Total	392

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	44	44	
Age 3 through 5 (not Kindergarten)	24	24	
K	21	22	
1	26	26	
2	13	14	
3	21	21	
4	34	34	
5	13	13	
6	12	12	
7	15	15	
8	11	11	0
9	11	11	2
10	7	7	3
11	4	4	0
12	6	6	1
Ungraded	0	0	0
Out-of-school	128	127	0
Total	390	391	6

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	52	28
Age 3 through 5 (not Kindergarten)	27	19
K	25	19
1	31	24
2	19	12
3	25	12
4	36	27
5	18	13
6	14	8
7	22	14
8	12	7
9	15	8
10	8	6
11	10	2
12	8	5
Ungraded	0	0
Out-of-school	169	71
Total	491	275

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	56
Number of eligible migratory children enrolled in those schools	75

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.
NONE.

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	4	31
Juvenile corrections	9	90
Adult corrections	9	356
Other	0	0
Total	22	

Comments: The response is limited to 4,000 characters. According to the Office of State & Federal Accountability, no Neglected program in South Carolina was identified, or received an allocation under this subpart.

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	4
Juvenile corrections	9
Adult corrections	9
Other	0
Total	22

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

According to the Office of State & Federal Accountability, no Neglected program in South Carolina was identified, or received an allocation under this subpart.

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	0	1,770	899	289	0
Total Long Term Students Served	0	1,770	899	289	0

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>)	0	482	431	43	0
English Learners (ELs)	0	31	14	0	0

Provide the number of students served by race/ethnicity.

Race/Ethnicity	Neglected Programs	Juvenile Detention	Juvenile Corrections	Adult Corrections	Other Programs
American Indian or Alaska Native	0	4	1	1	0
Asian	0	4	1	1	0
Black or African American	0	1,012	602	192	0
Hispanic or Latino	0	92	38	2	0
Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander	0	1	1	0	0
White	0	617	238	84	0
Two or more races	0	40	18	9	0
Total	0	1,770	899	289	0

Provide the number of students served by gender.

Sex	Neglected Programs	Juvenile Detention	Juvenile Corrections	Adult Corrections	Other Programs
Male	0	1,350	793	265	0
Female	0	420	106	24	0
Total	0	1,770	899	289	0

Provide the number of students served by age.

Age	Neglected Programs	Juvenile Detention	Juvenile Corrections	Adult Corrections	Other Programs
3 through 5	0	0	0	0	0
6	0	0	0	0	0
7	0	0	0	0	0
8	0	0	0	0	0
9	0	0	0	0	0
10	0	0	0	0	0
11	0	0	0	0	0
12	0	1	1	0	0
13	0	27	5	0	0
14	0	139	37	0	0
15	0	287	106	0	0
16	0	448	219	0	0
17	0	572	293	16	0
18	0	246	185	51	0

Age	Neglected Programs	Juvenile Detention	Juvenile Corrections	Adult Corrections	Other Programs
19	0	45	48	89	0
20	0	5	5	98	0
21	0	0	0	35	0
Total	0	1,770	899	289	0

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

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

According to the Office of State & Federal Accountability, no Neglected program in South Carolina was identified, or received an allocation under this subpart.

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	927	681	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	S	S	19	12	59	13	54	S	S	S
Obtained high school diploma	S	S	S	S	S	3	S	S	S	S

Outcomes (once per student per time period) - # of Students Who	Neglected Programs - In fac.	Neglected Programs - 90 days after exit	Juvenile Detention - In fac.	Juvenile Detention - 90 days after exit	Juvenile Corrections - In fac.	Juvenile Corrections - 90 days after exit	Adult Corrections - In fac.	Adult Corrections - 90 days after exit	Other Programs - In fac.	Other Programs - 90 days after exit
Earned high school course credits	S	S	409	387	542	148	S	S	S	S
Enrolled in a GED program	S	S	34	57	70	46	289	S	S	S
Accepted and/or enrolled into post-secondary education	S	S	S	9	38	13	S	S	S	S
Enrolled in job training courses/programs	S	S	S	21	62	29	54	S	S	S
Obtained employment	S	S	S	78	5	146	S	S	S	S

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

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

According to the Office of State & Federal Accountability, no Neglected program in South Carolina was identified, or received an allocation under this subpart. For Juvenile Detention, Juvenile Corrections, and Adult Corrections, it was confirmed that these are "true" zeroes.

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	S	S	152	16	S
Long-term students with no change in grade level from the pre- to post-test exams	S	S	63	S	S
Long-term students with improvement up to one full grade level from the pre- to post-test exams	S	S	50	32	S
Long-term students with improvement of more than one full grade level from the pre- to post-test exams	S	S	114	S	S
Total students pre/post- tested	S	S	379	56	S

Comments: The response is limited to 4,000 characters. According to the Office of State & Federal Accountability, no Neglected program in South Carolina was identified, or received an allocation under this subpart. For Juvenile Detention, it was confirmed that the are "true" zeroes.

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	S	S	128	13	S
Long-term students with no change in grade level from the pre- to post-test exams	S	S	60	S	S
Long-term students with improvement up to one full grade level from the pre- to post-test exams	S	S	49	36	S
Long-term students with improvement of more than one full grade level from the pre- to post-test exams	S	S	132	S	S
Total students pre/post- tested	S	S	369	54	S

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

According to the Office of State & Federal Accountability, no Neglected program in South Carolina was identified, or received an allocation under this subpart. For Juvenile Detention, it was confirmed that these are "true" zeroes.

FAQ on long-term students:

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

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

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

2.5.3.1 Programs and Facilities – Subpart 2

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

LEA Program/Facility Type	# Programs/Facilities	Average Length of Stay in Days
At-risk programs	0	0
Neglected programs	0	0
Juvenile detention	1	20
Juvenile corrections	1	100
Other	0	0
Total	2	

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

According to the Office of State & Federal Accountability, no At-Risk or Neglected programs in South Carolina were identified, or received an allocation under Title I, subpart 2 for this reporting period.

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	0
Juvenile detention	1
Juvenile corrections	1
Other	0
Total	2

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

According to the Office of State & Federal Accountability, no At-risk or Neglected program in South Carolina was identified, or received an allocation under Title I, subpart 2.

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	0	0	307	193	0
Total Long Term Students Served	0	0	12	102	0

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>)	0	0	80	67	0
ELs	0	0	31	14	0

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	0	0	1	0	0
Asian	0	0	0	0	0
Black or African American	0	0	225	92	0
Hispanic or Latino	0	0	13	4	0
Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander	0	0	1	0	0
White	0	0	67	93	0
Two or more races	0	0	0	4	0
Total	0	0	307	193	0

Provide the number of students served by sex.

Sex	At-Risk Programs	Neglected Programs	Juvenile Detention	Juvenile Corrections	Other Programs
Male	0	0	238	75	0
Female	0	0	69	118	0
Total	0	0	307	193	0

Provide the number of students served by age.

Age	At-Risk Programs	Neglected Programs	Juvenile Detention	Juvenile Corrections	Other Programs
3 through 5	0	0	0	0	0
6	0	0	0	0	0
7	0	0	0	0	0
8	0	0	0	0	0
9	0	0	0	0	0
10	0	0	0	0	0
11	0	0	0	0	0
12	0	0	2	3	0
13	0	0	28	10	0
14	0	0	61	19	0
15	0	0	95	30	0
16	0	0	121	40	0
17	0	0	0	39	0
18	0	0	0	43	0
19	0	0	0	9	0

Age	At-Risk Programs	Neglected Programs	Juvenile Detention	Juvenile Corrections	Other Programs
20	0	0	0	0	0
21	0	0	0	0	0
Total	0	0	307	193	0

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

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

No At-risk or Neglected programs in South Carolina were identified, or received an allocation, under Title I, subpart 2 for this reporting period. For Juvenile Detention and Juvenile Corrections, numbers are provided for students served in the specified age group.

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	S	S	S	S	S

Outcomes (once per student) - # of Students Who	At-Risk Programs - In fac.	At-Risk Programs - 90 days after exit	Neglected Programs - In fac.	Neglected Programs - 90 days after exit	Juvenile Detention - In fac.	Juvenile Detention - 90 days after exit	Juvenile Corrections - In fac.	Juvenile Corrections - 90 days after exit	Other Programs - In fac.	Other Programs - 90 days after exit
Earned a GED	S	S	S	S	S	S	10	S	S	S
Obtained high school diploma	S	S	S	S	S	S	S	S	S	S

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	S	S	S	S	S	77	6	S	S	S
Enrolled in a GED program	S	S	S	S	S	S	S	S	S	S
Accepted and/or enrolled into post- secondary education	S	S	S	S	S	S	S	S	S	S
Enrolled in job training courses/programs	S	S	S	S	S	S	S	S	S	S
Obtained employment	S	S	S	S	S	S	S	S	S	S

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

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

According to the Office of State & Federal Accountability, no At-Risk or Neglected programs in South Carolina were identified, or received an allocation under Title I, subpart II for this reporting period. It was confirmed that for Juvenile Justice and Juvenile Corrections, zeroes are "true" zeroes.

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

2.5.4 Academic Performance – Subpart 2

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

2.5.4.1 Academic Performance in Reading – Subpart 2

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

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

Performance Data (Based on most recent pre/post-test data)	At-Risk Programs	Neglected Programs	Juvenile Detention	Juvenile Corrections	Other Programs
Long-term students with negative grade level change from the pre- to post-test exams			S	S	
Long-term students with no change in grade level from the pre- to post-test exams			5	S	
Long-term students with improvement up to one full grade level from the pre- to post-test exams			S	S	
Long-term students with improvement of more than one full grade level from the pre- to post-test exams			3	S	
Total students pre/post- tested			12	6	

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

According to the Office of State & Federal Accountability, no At-risk or Neglected programs in South Carolina were identified, or received an allocation under Title I, subpart 2 for this reporting period. It was confirmed that zeroes for Juvenile Detention and Juvenile Corrections are "true" zeroes.

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			3	S	
Long-term students with no change in grade level from the pre- to post-test exams			5	S	
Long-term students with improvement up to one full grade level from the pre- to post-test exams			S	S	
Long-term students with improvement of more than one full grade level from the pre- to post-test exams			S	S	
Total students pre/post- tested			12	6	

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

According to the Office of State & Federal Accountability, no At-risk or Neglected programs in South Carolina were identified, or received an allocation under Title I, subpart 2 for this reporting period. It was confirmed that zeroes for Juvenile Detention and Juvenile Corrections are "true" zeroes.

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	8,723,211.14
Safe and Healthy Students	5,513,066.12
Effective Use of Technology	1,633,403.25

Comments: The response is limited to 4,000 characters.
Spending categories were allotted to districts via approved applications.

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	62
Safe and Healthy Students	62
Effective Use of Technology	59
Any Content Area	62

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

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

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

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

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

2.7.2 Local Educational Agency (LEA) Transferability of Funds

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

LEA Transferability of Funds	#
LEAs that notified the State that they were transferring funds under the LEA Transferability authority of Section 5103(b).	25

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

2.7.3 LEA Funds Transfers

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

Program	# LEAs Transferring Funds FROM Eligible Program	# LEAs Transferring Funds TO Eligible Program
Supporting Effective Instruction (Title II, Part A)	0	9
Student Support and Enrichment Grants (Title IV, Part A)	25	0
Improving Basic Programs Operated by LEAs (Title I, Part A)		3
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)		13

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

Program	Total Amount of Funds Transferred FROM Eligible Program	Total Amount of Funds Transferred TO Eligible Program
Supporting Effective Instruction (Title II, Part A)	0.00	1,068,062.18
Student Support and Enrichment Grants (Title IV, Part A)	2,714,113.56	0.00
Improving Basic Programs Operated by LEAs (Title I, Part A)		494,193.50
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)		1,151,857.88

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

2.8 RURAL EDUCATION ACHIEVEMENT PROGRAM (REAP)

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

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

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

Purpose	# LEAs
Activities authorized under Part A of Title I	32
Activities authorized under Part A of Title II	13
Activities authorized under Title III	4
Activities authorized under Part A of Title IV	14
Parental involvement activities	5

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.

Each LEA defines how each objective in its project is measured and what the outcome will be. The state Title V coordinator will review the outcomes for success submitted by the districts at the end of each school term. Anticipated outcomes are based on the individual activities of the district's plan.

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.

Differentiated technical assistance regarding the administration of the grant to districts varies depending on the district's individual needs as determined by their grant applications and by direct communication between the LEA and the SCDE. Professional development, annual training opportunities, federal program monitoring, webinars, emails, telephone conversations are offered throughout the year (i.e., South Carolina Association of Title I Administrators (SCATA)); The National Association of ESEA State Program Administrators (NESEA); National Forum to Advance Rural Education.

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.

RLIS subgrant award determination is a formula subgrant based on the poverty index census data and locale codes (NCES) as determined by the Secretary of Education and by the Average Daily Attendance (ADA) provided to USED by the South Carolina Department of Education (SCDE).

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?	9.04%
What percentage of those funds retained for State-level administration were used specifically for technical assistance?	5.00%

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.

4500690 Abbeville \$ 56,800
 4500750 Allendale \$ 22,700
 4500840 Anderson 3 \$ 48,920
 4500930 Bamberg 1 \$ 25,840
 4500960 Bamberg 2 \$ 13,260
 4501020 Barnwell 19 \$ 12,042
 4501050 Barnwell 29 \$ 16,560
 4501080 Barnwell 45 \$ 41,160
 4501250 Calhoun \$ 33,120
 4501530 Chester \$ 98,000
 4501560 Chesterfield \$ 134,394
 4501740 Clarendon 1 \$ 14,500
 4501770 Clarendon 2 \$ 56,020
 4501800 Clarendon 3 \$ 23,280
 4501830 Colleton \$ 105,674
 4501950 Dillon 3 \$ 31,360
 4501920 Dillon 4 \$ 76,660
 450002 Dorchester 4 \$ 43,020
 4502070 Edgefield \$ 66,600
 4502100 Fairfield \$ 52,620
 4502160 Florence 2 21,280
 4502190 Florence 3 \$ 70,160
 4502220 Florence 4 \$ 13,100
 4502250 Florence 5 \$ 24,320
 4502340 Greenwood 50 \$ 167,214
 4502370 Greenwood 51 \$ 18,100
 4502430 Hampton 1 \$ 44,140
 4502460 Hampton 2 \$ 13,880
 4502520 Jasper \$ 49,960
 4502610 Laurens 55 \$ 109,854
 4502640 Laurens 56 \$ 57,800
 4502670 Lee \$ 37,380
 4502760 Lexington 3 \$ 39,040
 4503000 McCormick \$ 15,120
 4503908 Marion \$ 89,620
 4502970 Marlboro \$ 75,420
 4503030 Newberry \$ 115,174
 4503150 Orangeburg 3 \$52,740
 4503210 Orangeburg 5 \$122,974
 4503460 Saluda \$ 42,620
 4503750 Union \$ 76,300
 4503780 Williamsburg \$ 76,300

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.
N/A.