

**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**

**Tennessee**



**PART II DUE THURSDAY, MAY 28, 2020**

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

## INTRODUCTION

The Consolidated State Performance Report (CSPR) is the required annual reporting tool for each State, the Bureau of Indian Education, District of Columbia, and Puerto Rico as authorized under Section 8303<sup>1</sup> of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act (ESEA), as amended by the Every Student Succeeds Act of 2015(ESSA)<sup>2</sup>.

### Paperwork Burden Statement

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

---

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

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

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

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

**Check the one that indicates the report you are submitting:**

Part I, 2018-19     Part II, 2018-19

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

Tennessee Department of Education

**Address:**

9th Floor  
Andrew Johnson Tower  
710 James Robertson Pkwy  
Nashville, TN, 37243-0375

**Person to contact about this report:**

**Name:**

Trish Kelly

**Telephone:**

6152790996

**Fax:**

6157701059

**e-mail:**

Trish.Kelly@tn.gov

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

Trish Kelly, EDFacts-CSPR Coordinator

**Submitted Date and Time:**

06/29/20 5:45:58 PM

## 2.1 ACCOUNTABILITY

### 2.1.1 School Performance on Accountability Indicators

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

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

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

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

**2.1.2 Schools Identified for Comprehensive Support and Improvement**

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

	Number of Schools	Number of Title I Schools	Number of non-Title I Schools
Lowest performing five percent of Title I schools	80		
High schools failing to graduate one third or more of their students	7	6	1
Title I schools that have received additional targeted support under Section 1111(d)(2)(C) of the <i>ESEA</i> and that have not exited that status after a State-determined number of years			
Total Identified	87		

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

**2.1.3 Schools Implementing Targeted Support and Improvement Plans**

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

	<b>Number of Schools</b>	<b>Number of Title I Schools</b>	<b>Number of non- Title I Schools</b>
Schools with One or More Consistently Underperforming Subgroups of Students	185	158	27
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)	39	35	4

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

**2.1.4 Section 1003 of the ESEA School Improvement Funds**

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

**2.1.4.1 Section 1003 of the ESEA Allocations to LEAs**

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

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

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

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

**2.1.4.2 Section 1003 of the ESEA Allocations to Schools**

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

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

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

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



## 2.2 GRADUATION RATES AND POSTSECONDARY ENROLLMENT

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

### 2.2.1 Four Year Adjusted Cohort Graduation Rates

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

Student Group	# Students in Cohort	# of Graduates	Graduation Rate
All students	71,767	S	90.5%
American Indian or Alaska Native	267	S	90%
Asian or Pacific Islander	1,777	S	95%
<i>Asian</i>	1,650	S	95%
<i>Native Hawaiian or Other Pacific Islander</i>	127	S	94%
Black or African American	17,277	S	84.6%
Hispanic or Latino	6,667	S	84.4%
White	45,779	S	93.4%
Two or more races			
Children with disabilities ( <i>IDEA</i> )	9,520	S	73.9%
English Learners	2,676	S	72%
Economically disadvantaged students	28,363	S	84.4%
Children in foster care	739	S	61%
Children who are homeless	2,556	S	78%

#### 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	40,985		23,870	S
American Indian or Alaska Native	54		53	S
Asian or Pacific Islander	1,109		279	S
<i>Asian</i>	1,066		253	S
<i>Native Hawaiian or Other Pacific Islander</i>	43		26	S
Black or African American	7,853		6,185	S
Hispanic or Latino	2,285		2,574	S
White	28,972		14,374	S
Two or more races	712		405	S
Children with disabilities ( <i>IDEA</i> )	2,388		4,269	S
English Learners	635		1,133	S
Economically disadvantaged students	9,783		12,143	S

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

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

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

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

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

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

<b>Special Services or Programs</b>	<b># Students Served</b>
Children with disabilities ( <i>IDEA</i> )	90,815
English learners	41,440
Homeless students	14,699
Migrant students	359

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

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

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

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

<b>Race/Ethnicity</b>	<b># Students Served</b>
American Indian or Alaska Native	928
Asian	9,603
Black or African American	183,286
Hispanic or Latino	82,607
Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander	640
White	320,914
Two or more races	20,929
Total	618,907

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

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

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

<b>Age /Grade</b>	<b>Public TAS</b>	<b>Public SWP</b>	<b>Private</b>	<b>Local Neglected</b>	<b>Total</b>
Age Birth through 2	0	0	0	0	0
Age 3 through 5 (not Kindergarten)	215	1,823	3	1	2,042
K	75	60,581	356	14	61,026
1	85	59,594	329	36	60,044
2	74	58,359	315	61	58,809
3	67	57,903	318	75	58,363
4	108	57,876	308	113	58,405
5	104	59,001	335	162	59,602
6	73	50,310	328	281	50,992
7	99	47,633	258	455	48,445
8	92	46,348	219	688	47,347
9	94	32,543	234	1,018	33,889
10	64	29,745	147	1,125	31,081
11	64	28,031	182	901	29,178
12	85	27,861	145	467	28,558
Ungraded	0	0	0	79	79
<b>TOTALS</b>	<b>1,299</b>	<b>617,608</b>	<b>3,477</b>	<b>5,476</b>	<b>627,860</b>

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

## 2.4 EDUCATION OF MIGRATORY CHILDREN

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

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

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

There are two exceptions to this rule:

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

### 2.4.1 Migratory Child Counts

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

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

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

#### FAQs on Child Count:

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

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

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

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

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

No concerns. All staff were trained on identification and recruiting practices, received ongoing training, and completed Migrant Recruiter Certification and Guidance tests. In addition, the data were closely monitored and verified.

**2.4.1.1 Category 1 Child Count (Eligible Migratory Children)**

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

Do not include children age birth through 2 years.

<b>Age/Grade</b>	<b>Eligible Migratory Children</b>
Age 3 through 5 (not Kindergarten)	133
K	77
1	89
2	77
3	82
4	69
5	64
6	67
7	72
8	62
9	61
10	47
11	40
12	26
Ungraded	0
Out-of-school	500
<b>Total</b>	<b>1,466</b>

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

**2.4.1.2 Category 1 Child Count Increases/Decreases**

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

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

Tennessee's category 1 child count increased from 1,302 students in 2017-18 to 1,466 students in 2018-19 or by 13% due to improvements in outreach and identification strategies especially for out of school youth as farmers sought additional H2A workers.



**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	108

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

The birth through 2 count remained nearly stable as it increased from 107 in 2017-18 to 108 in 2018-19.

**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)	75
K	35
1	50
2	43
3	47
4	44
5	46
6	39
7	42
8	42
9	36
10	27
11	24
12	6
Ungraded	0
Out-of-school	201
Total	757

**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.

In order to serve more students, back to school services were provided during the summer rather than at the beginning of the school year. This change increased the category 2 child count by 54% - from 493 in 2017-18 to 757 in 2018-19.

**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	41

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

Participation in summer programs by the birth through 2 age group decreased from 48 in 2017-18 to 41 in 2018-19 despite the increase in summer program participation by older migratory children.

### 2.4.3 Child Count Calculation and Validation Procedures

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

#### 2.4.3.1 Methods Used to Count Children

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

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

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

The Tennessee Department of Education (TDOE) contracted with Conexión Américas to qualify migratory children through a Certificate of Eligibility (COE) and to provide services to migratory children. Completed COEs were entered into the MIS2000 database after checking for existing enrollments in MIS2000, MSIX and TDOE databases using birth date, qualifying arrival date, school history, and a variety of name versions to address spelling variations. Conexión Américas also used MIS2000 to generate monthly reports of certified migratory children as well as those who received services within three years of the qualifying arrival date. The list of eligible students was downloaded from MIS2000 each month and match-merged against the state's databases. LEAs reviewed this information monthly and uploaded revisions to the eligible migrant student identifier in SIS/state databases. This process ensures consistency between MIS2000 and state databases. Reporting for EDFacts is anchored in MS2000, which includes reports that auto-populate to EDFacts specifications. TN-MEP works with Ms/EdD to update the MIS2000 reports annually to meet changes in EDFacts file specifications. To ensure the completeness and accuracy of its submissions, TN-MEP checks the EDFacts files generated by MIS2000 against enrollment, service, and other data in MIS2000 and state databases, investigates discrepancies, and resolves them by modifying the business rules in the reports or correcting errors in the databases.

TN-MEP implemented a set of quality control procedures to assure accurate MEP eligibility determinations. The process began with training for recruiters that emphasized MEP eligibility requirements, COE completion procedures, and interview skills. This training prepared recruiters for eligibility interviews. After the interviews, recruiters completed COEs for each family that qualified. Next, completed COEs were reviewed by a regional coordinator for completeness and accuracy prior to submission to the SEA reviewer. Finally, to ensure that enrolled students meet eligibility requirements, the TN-MEP conducts re-interviews each year. Every three years, an outside party conducts independent re-interviews. Independent re-interviews were conducted in SY 2018-19 and are discussed in greater detail below. This process ensured that every child entered into the MIS2000 database was in fact an eligible migratory child.

The use of an id, unique to each child, ensured that each child was counted once per SEA, district or school for unduplicated counts by state, district or school, respectively. Likewise, eliminating duplicates by id, age/grade (or any other characteristic) ensured that each child was counted once per age/grade (and for other characteristics).

Eligibility for services was limited to students within three years of their qualifying arrival date. However, typically services were provided through the semester/term when children exhausted eligibility within a semester/term.

School/program enrollment and withdrawal dates combined with birth dates and qualifying arrival dates ensured that only migratory students at least 3 years old and less than 22 years old who resided in the state for one or more days during the program year were included in counts including students who only resided in the state during the summer or intersession. Regular school year (R) and summer/intersession (S/I) program services were coded and tracked separately to identify children served in each program.

Only children identified as having received a service provided during the summer were included in the category 2 count.

Children who turned three during the performance period were included in the 3TO5NOTK category only when their residency was verified after turning three.

Year-end procedures excluded children who graduated from high school or attained a High School Equivalency Diploma (HSED) during the performance period from the list of eligible students for the next performance period, ensuring that they are not counted in the subsequent performance period's child count. In addition, during the program year, out of school youths' school histories were searched in MIS2000, MSIX and TDOE databases to ensure that they had not obtained a high school diploma/equivalent and thus, remain eligible for a free appropriate

public education.

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.

<b>Accuracy of ED<i>Facts</i> Data Files</b>	<b>Yes/No</b>
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

<b>Use of MSIX to Verify Data Quality</b>	<b>Yes/No</b>
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.

Reports were created in MSIX to identify students who moved to/from Tennessee and whether or not the moves met the qualifying move eligibility criteria. Additionally, as another quality control measure, MSIX was checked regularly to identify students whose duplicate records required merging.

**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.	84
The number of eligibility determinations sampled for which a re-interview was completed.	53
The number of eligibility determinations sampled for which a re-interview was completed and the child was found eligible.	53

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

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

To ensure enrolled students meet eligibility requirements, the agency conducts re-interviews each year. Every three years an outside party conducts independent re-interviews. Independent re-interviews were conducted in SY 2018-19.

**FAQ on independent prospective re-interviews:**

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

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

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

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

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

A multi-state team through the Interstate Rapid Response Consortium (IRRC) conducted Tennessee's independent re-interview process in 2018-19. In the first phase of the project, an independent, out-of-state re-interview team, who were bilingual in English and Spanish, re-interviewed a random sample of migrant families and workers at their homes. In the second phase of the project, an independent review panel reviewed the completed re-interview forms and the original Certificates of Eligibility (COEs) to determine whether migrant eligibility requirements were met.

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.

TN MEP used MIS2000's random sample report to produce the sample of COEs for re-interviews. An initial random sample of 55 COEs was selected in order to complete at least 52 re-interviews, 10% of the total number of COEs produced during the prior reporting period, a best practice recommended by the IRRC. A supplemental random sample was also drawn to replace COEs for families that had relocated or could not be reached. After the third unsuccessful attempt to reach a family, a replacement COE was selected randomly. The independent re-interview team sampled a total of 84 COEs to complete 53 re-interviews. The independent review panel concluded that all 53 children/families had been properly identified and were eligible for MEP services.

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

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

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





**2.4.4 Eligible Migratory Children**

**2.4.4.1 Priority for Services**

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

<b>Age/Grade</b>	<b>Priority for Services During the Performance Period</b>
Age 3 through 5 (not Kindergarten)	38
K	36
1	52
2	44
3	50
4	40
5	41
6	43
7	37
8	33
9	39
10	28
11	10
12	2
Ungraded	
Out-of-school	
<b>Total</b>	<b>493</b>

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

The number of priority for services of migratory students in 2018-19 (493) was 1% higher than the number in 2017-18 (488).

**FAQ on priority for services:**

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

**2.4.4.2 English Learners (ELs)**

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

<b>Age/Grade</b>	<b>ELs During the Performance Period</b>
Age 3 through 5 (not Kindergarten)	49
K	47
1	67
2	48
3	50
4	38
5	34
6	40
7	28
8	20
9	37
10	17
11	10
12	8
Ungraded	
Out-of-school	208
Total	701

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

The number of migrant students identified as LEP increased from 645 in 2017-18 to 701 in 2018-19 due to the increased migration of families from Central America to Tennessee.

**2.4.4.3 Children with Disabilities (IDEA)**

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

Age/Grade	Children with Disabilities ( <i>IDEA</i> ) During the Performance Period
Age Birth through 2	
Age 3 through 5 (not Kindergarten)	3
K	3
1	4
2	4
3	2
4	4
5	7
6	6
7	2
8	5
9	
10	2
11	2
12	2
Ungraded	
Out-of-school	
Total	46

**Comments:** The response is limited to 4,000 characters.  
 The number of migratory children identified with disabilities increased from 42 in 2017-2018 to 46 in 2018-19. Small fluctuations of this sort reflect normal year-to-year variation in the number of migratory students identified with disabilities.

**2.4.4.4 Qualifying Arrival Date (QAD)**

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

<b>Age/Grade</b>	<b>QAD During the Performance Period</b>
Age Birth through 2	43
Age 3 through 5 (not Kindergarten)	45
K	24
1	30
2	26
3	26
4	30
5	29
6	33
7	28
8	26
9	25
10	16
11	18
12	4
Ungraded	
Out-of-school	277
<b>Total</b>	<b>680</b>

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

The number of eligible migratory students with a qualifying move within 12 months of the last day of the performance period increased from 618 in 2017-2018 to 680 in 2018-19 due to improved identification and recruiting practices.

## 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	1
8	1
9	0
10	1
11	0
12	1
Ungraded	
Total	4

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

The number of migratory dropouts increased from 4 in 2017-18 to 6 in 2018-19 including dropouts below grade 7.

#### FAQ on Dropouts:

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

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

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

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

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

No migrant students were identified as having earned a high school equivalency diploma in 2018-19.

#### 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	64
Age 3 through 5 (not Kindergarten)	98
K	47
1	67
2	56
3	62
4	54
5	55
6	57
7	58
8	46
9	50
10	32
11	31
12	15
Ungraded	0
Out-of-school	308
Total	1,100

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

The number of migratory children receiving MEP-funded services increased from 1,010 in 2017-2018 to 1,100 in 2018-19 or by 9% due to higher program participation and improvements in service delivery.

**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)	27
K	22
1	38
2	29
3	44
4	33
5	35
6	38
7	31
8	26
9	32
10	20
11	6
12	1
Ungraded	0
Out-of-school	0
Total	382

**Comments:** The response is limited to 4,000 characters.  
 The number of priority for services migratory students that received instructional and support services decreased from 397 in 2017-18 to 382 in 2018-19 or by 4%.



**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.  
 No migratory children received instructional or support services under continuation of services authority in 2018-19.

**FAQ on Continuation of Services:**

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

**2.4.6.3 Instructional Service – During the Performance Period**

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

Age/Grade	Instructional Service During the Performance Period
Age Birth through 2	5
Age 3 through 5 (not Kindergarten)	51
K	27
1	53
2	38
3	46
4	41
5	36
6	41
7	41
8	27
9	35
10	11
11	11
12	7
Ungraded	
Out-of-school	3
Total	473

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

The number of migratory children receiving instructional services during the performance period exhibited modest growth increasing from 467 in 2017-2018 to 473 in 2018-19 or by 1%.

**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.

<b>Age/Grade</b>	<b>Reading Instruction During the Performance Period</b>	<b>Mathematics Instruction During the Performance Period</b>	<b>High School Credit Accrual During the Performance Period</b>
Age Birth through 2			
Age 3 through 5 (not Kindergarten)	16	16	
K	14	14	
1	34	34	
2	18	18	
3	23	23	
4	24	24	
5	23	23	
6	22	22	
7	19	18	
8	10	10	
9	4	4	
10	2	2	
11	1		
12			
Ungraded			
Out-of-school			
<b>Total</b>	<b>210</b>	<b>208</b>	

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

Higher summer camp attendance and changes in service delivery that emphasized providing literacy and math instruction during summer camps led the number of migratory children receiving reading and math instructional services during the performance period to increase from 177 and 176 in 2017-18 to 210 and 208 in 2018-19, or by 19% and 18%, respectively.

**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	63	1
Age 3 through 5 (not Kindergarten)	92	9
K	46	9
1	63	18
2	54	10
3	61	16
4	51	9
5	55	13
6	53	9
7	55	15
8	46	17
9	49	24
10	32	14
11	30	21
12	13	7
Ungraded		
Out-of-school	307	1
Total	1,070	193

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

Support services increased from 959 in 2017-18 to 1070 in 2018-19 growing at a rate (12%) that was roughly comparable to the growth in eligible migratory students.

Greater emphasis on counseling services for new-arrivals and providing college readiness services increased the number of students receiving counseling from 124 in 2017-18 to 193 in 2018-19.

#### 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	209
Number of eligible migratory children enrolled in those schools	805

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

The number of eligible migratory children enrolled in public schools during the regular school year increased from 709 in 2017-18 to 805 in 2018-19. This 14% increase roughly paralleled the growth in the category 1 child count (13%). The number of schools enrolling eligible migratory students increased from 205 in 2017-18 to 209 in 2018-19.

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

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

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

**Comments:** The response is limited to 4,000 characters.  
Tennessee does not allocate MEP funds to schools.

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

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

Throughout this section:

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

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

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

**2.5.1.1 Programs and Facilities - Subpart 1**

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

State Program/Facility Type	# Programs/Facilities	Average Length of Stay in Days
Neglected programs	0	0
Juvenile detention	0	0
Juvenile corrections	1	189
Adult corrections	1	192
Other	0	0
Total	2	

**Comments:** The response is limited to 4,000 characters. In 2018-19, state agencies in Tennessee used Title ID, Neglected & Delinquent, Subpart I funds to support two programs/facilities. The Department of Children’s services operated one juvenile corrections program and the Department of Corrections operated one adult corrections program. State agencies in Tennessee did not use Title ID, Neglected & Delinquent, Subpart I funds to support neglected, juvenile detention, and other programs.

**FAQ on Programs and Facilities - Subpart I:**

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

**2.5.1.2 Programs and Facilities That Reported - Subpart 1**

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

The total row will be automatically calculated.

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

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

The two facilities that used Title ID, Subpart 1 funds to support juvenile corrections and adult corrections programs reported on the students served in those programs.



**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			204	64	
Total Long Term Students Served			162	43	

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> )			74	14	
English Learners (ELs)			2	2	

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	0	
Asian			0	0	
Black or African American			178	46	
Hispanic or Latino			3	2	
Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander			0	0	
White			18	16	
Two or more races			5	0	
Total			204	64	

Provide the number of students served by gender.

Sex	Neglected Programs	Juvenile Detention	Juvenile Corrections	Adult Corrections	Other Programs
Male			204	64	
Female			0	0	
Total			204	64	

Provide the number of students served by age.

Age	Neglected Programs	Juvenile Detention	Juvenile Corrections	Adult Corrections	Other Programs
3 through 5			0	0	
6			0	0	
7			0	0	
8			0	0	
9			0	0	
10			0	0	
11			0	0	
12			0	0	
13			0	0	
14			3	0	
15			17	0	
16			37	2	
17			55	8	
18			90	0	

Age	Neglected Programs	Juvenile Detention	Juvenile Corrections	Adult Corrections	Other Programs
19			2	20	
20			0	15	
21			0	19	
Total			204	64	

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

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

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

The number of students served in the juvenile corrections program declined from 316 in 2017-18 to 204 in 2018-19 due to the closure of a facility. The number of students served in the adult corrections program fell from 71 to 64; no students were served in programs for women in 2018-19.

**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			14	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					18	S	7	S		
Obtained high school diploma					24	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					187	S	S	S		
Enrolled in a GED program					27	S	64	S		
Accepted and/or enrolled into post-secondary education					S	S	S	S		
Enrolled in job training courses/programs					S	S	8	S		
Obtained employment					13	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.

Limited post-exit outcome data are available. The juvenile corrections program began to track post-exit outcomes in 2018-19; 14 students were identified as enrolling in local school districts after exiting the program. The adult corrections program does not track post-exit outcomes.

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

**2.5.2 Academic Performance – Subpart 1**

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

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

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

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

<b>Performance Data (Based on most recent pre/post-test data)</b>	<b>Neglected Programs</b>	<b>Juvenile Detention</b>	<b>Juvenile Corrections</b>	<b>Adult Corrections</b>	<b>Other Programs</b>
Long-term students with negative grade level change from the pre- to post-test exams			42	12	
Long-term students with no change in grade level from the pre- to post-test exams			19	4	
Long-term students with improvement up to one full grade level from the pre- to post-test exams			16	6	
Long-term students with improvement of more than one full grade level from the pre- to post-test exams			3	6	
Total students pre/post- tested			80	28	

**Comments:** The response is limited to 4,000 characters. Twenty-four percent and 42% of long-term students with pre and post test results achieved grade gains in reading in juvenile and adult corrections programs, respectively.

**FAQ on long-term students:**

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

**2.5.2.2 Academic Performance in Mathematics – Subpart 1**

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

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

<b>Performance Data (Based on most recent pre/post-test data)</b>	<b>Neglected Programs</b>	<b>Juvenile Detention</b>	<b>Juvenile Corrections</b>	<b>Adult Corrections</b>	<b>Other Programs</b>
Long-term students with negative grade level change from the pre- to post-test exams			44	20	
Long-term students with no change in grade level from the pre- to post-test exams			21	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	13	
Total students pre/post- tested			76	40	

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

Fifteen percent and 50% of long-term students with pre and post test results achieved grade gains in math in juvenile and adult corrections programs, respectively.

**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	24	67
Juvenile corrections	0	0
Other	0	0
Total	24	

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

In 2018-19, Title ID, Neglected & Delinquent, Subpart 2 funds supported juvenile detention programs in 24 facilities in 16 LEAs. Title ID, Subpart 2 funds did not support at-risk, neglected, juvenile corrections, or other programs in 2018-19.

**FAQ on average length of stay:**

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

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

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

The total row will be automatically calculated.

<b>LEA Program/Facility Type</b>	<b># Reporting Data</b>
At-risk programs	0
Neglected programs	0
Juvenile detention	24
Juvenile corrections	0
Other	0
Total	24

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

The 24 facilities/programs that used Title ID, Subpart 2 funds to support juvenile detention programs reported on the students served in those programs.

**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			4,581		
Total Long Term Students Served			1,198		

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> )			982		
ELs			18		

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			4		
Asian			13		
Black or African American			2,321		
Hispanic or Latino			249		
Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander					
White			1,850		
Two or more races			144		
Total			4,581		

Provide the number of students served by sex.

Sex	At-Risk Programs	Neglected Programs	Juvenile Detention	Juvenile Corrections	Other Programs
Male			3,927		
Female			654		
Total			4,581		

Provide the number of students served by age.

Age	At-Risk Programs	Neglected Programs	Juvenile Detention	Juvenile Corrections	Other Programs
3 through 5					
6			1		
7			3		
8			1		
9			4		
10			3		
11			14		
12			100		
13			248		
14			496		
15			886		
16			1,156		
17			1,320		
18			346		
19			3		



Age	At-Risk Programs	Neglected Programs	Juvenile Detention	Juvenile Corrections	Other Programs
20					
21					
Total			4,581		

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

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

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

The number of students served in juvenile detention programs decreased from 4,831 in 2017-18 to 4,581 in 2018-19 or by 5.2%.

**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			738		

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					35	5				
Obtained high school diploma					73	27				

Outcomes (once per student per time period) - # of Students Who	At-Risk Programs - In fac.	At-Risk Programs - 90 days after exit	Neglected Programs - In fac.	Neglected Programs - 90 days after exit	Juvenile Detention - In fac.	Juvenile Detention - 90 days after exit	Juvenile Corrections - In fac.	Juvenile Corrections - 90 days after exit	Other Programs - In fac.	Other Programs - 90 days after exit
Earned high school course credits					1,442	546				
Enrolled in a GED program					89	14				
Accepted and/or enrolled into post-secondary education					10	11				
Enrolled in job training courses/programs					17	45				
Obtained employment					11	19				

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

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

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

Within program outcomes increased by 12% in 2018-19 (from 1,494 in 2017-18 to 1,677 in 2018-19). Post-exit outcomes rose by 2% over the same period (from 1,379 in 2017-18 to 1,401 in 2018-19).

**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.

<b>Performance Data (Based on most recent pre/post-test data)</b>	<b>At-Risk Programs</b>	<b>Neglected Programs</b>	<b>Juvenile Detention</b>	<b>Juvenile Corrections</b>	<b>Other Programs</b>
Long-term students with negative grade level change from the pre- to post-test exams			251		
Long-term students with no change in grade level from the pre- to post-test exams			259		
Long-term students with improvement up to one full grade level from the pre- to post-test exams			240		
Long-term students with improvement of more than one full grade level from the pre- to post-test exams			197		
Total students pre/post- tested			947		

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

The number of long-term students in juvenile detention programs with pre and post test results in reading increased from 638 in 2017-18 to 947 in 2018-19 or by 48%.

**FAQ on long-term:**

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

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

**2.5.4.2 Academic Performance in Mathematics – Subpart 2**

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

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

<b>Performance Data (Based on most recent pre/post-test data)</b>	<b>At-Risk Programs</b>	<b>Neglected Programs</b>	<b>Juvenile Detention</b>	<b>Juvenile Corrections</b>	<b>Other Programs</b>
Long-term students with negative grade level change from the pre- to post-test exams			224		
Long-term students with no change in grade level from the pre- to post-test exams			290		
Long-term students with improvement up to one full grade level from the pre- to post-test exams			213		
Long-term students with improvement of more than one full grade level from the pre- to post-test exams			208		
<b>Total students pre/post- tested</b>			<b>935</b>		

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

The number of long-term students in juvenile detention programs with pre and post test results in math increased from 644 in 2017-18 to 935 in 2018-19 or by 45%.

**FAQ on long-term:**

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

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

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

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

<b>Content Area</b>	<b>Amount of Funds Spent</b>
Well-Rounded	6,691,171.00
Safe and Healthy Students	6,017,193.00
Effective Use of Technology	1,650,230.00

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

**2.6.2 LEAs Who Spent Funds Under Title IV, Part A**

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

<b>Content Area</b>	<b>Number of LEAs Spending Funds</b>
Well-Rounded	82
Safe and Healthy Students	76
Effective Use of Technology	65
Any Content Area	89

**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.

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

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

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

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

<b>LEA Transferability of Funds</b>	<b>#</b>
LEAs that notified the State that they were transferring funds under the LEA Transferability authority of Section 5103(b).	98

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

Ninety-eight leas notified the state they were making 140 transfers under the LEA Transferability authority of Section 5103(b).



**2.7.3 LEA Funds Transfers**

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

<b>Program</b>	<b># LEAs Transferring Funds FROM Eligible Program</b>	<b># LEAs Transferring Funds TO Eligible Program</b>
Supporting Effective Instruction (Title II, Part A)	18	51
Student Support and Enrichment Grants (Title IV, Part A)	94	0
Improving Basic Programs Operated by LEAs (Title I, Part A)		71
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)		5
Rural Education Initiative (Title V, Part B)		0

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

<b>Program</b>	<b>Total Amount of Funds Transferred FROM Eligible Program</b>	<b>Total Amount of Funds Transferred TO Eligible Program</b>
Supporting Effective Instruction (Title II, Part A)	855,788.00	2,841,841.00
Student Support and Enrichment Grants (Title IV, Part A)	8,318,144.00	0.00
Improving Basic Programs Operated by LEAs (Title I, Part A)		6,186,988.00
Education of Migratory Children (Title I, Part C)		0.00
Prevention and Intervention Programs for Children and Youth Who Are Neglected, Delinquent, or At-Risk (Title I, Part D)		0.00
English Language Acquisition, Language Enhancement, and Academic Achievement Act (Title III, Part A)		145,103.00
Rural Education Initiative (Title V, Part B)		0.00

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

**2.8 RURAL EDUCATION ACHIEVEMENT PROGRAM (REAP)**

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

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

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

Purpose	# LEAs
Activities authorized under Part A of Title I	70
Activities authorized under Part A of Title II	36
Activities authorized under Title III	14
Activities authorized under Part A of Title IV	15
Parental involvement activities	21

**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.

Tennessee's consolidated application identifies specific measurable goals and objectives for Title V, Part B, Subpart 2 related to increasing student academic achievement as measured by an increase in the percentage of students proficient or above on state assessments or a decrease in the student dropout rate. In their consolidated applications, applicants address how the use of funds will assist them in meeting the state's goals. The state approves only applications that show that the use of Title V funds helps to increase student performance or reduce the dropout rate.

With Title V funds, districts improved student performance through the following.

- Parental involvement activities
- Title I-A (Improving Basic Programs Operated by local education agencies)
- Title II-A (Supporting Effective Instruction)
- Title III (Language Instruction for English Learners and Immigrant Students)
- Title IV-A (Student Support and Academic Enrichment)

**2.8.3 RLIS Technical Assistance**

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

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

The state provides focused and individualized technical assistance to districts for both the planning process and the strategic use of RLIS funds through its Federal Programs and Oversight (FPO) monitoring team. A team of four regional consultants works directly with districts to develop RLIS budgets, identify evidence-based solutions, coordinate the use of federal, state and local funds, and align the use of funds to identified needs. Regional consultants provide districts with written RLIS statutes, non-regulatory guidance, budget and planning guidance, templates, rubrics, training, and other supports as necessary to assist in understanding the allowable use of funds, RLIS eligibility, program requirements, and effective use of funds.

**2.8.4 RLIS Subgrant Award Determination**

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

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

The grant is non-competitive, and eligibility is determined by statute. Awards are issued annually to the state by the U.S. Department of Education, which makes sub-grants to LEAs that meet the applicable requirements:

- Twenty percent or more of the children ages 5 through 17 years served by the district are from families with incomes below poverty; and
- All of the schools served by the LEA are designated with a school locale code of 32, 33, 41, 42, or 43.

NOTE: Dual eligibility can occur when districts meet the eligibility requirements for both the SRSA program and the RLIS program. These LEAs must choose one grant to receive funds.

**2.8.5 RLIS State Administrative Funds**

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

Question	Percentage
What percentage of the RLIS grant funds were retained for State-level administration?	5.00%
What percentage of those funds retained for State-level administration were used specifically for technical assistance?	100.00%

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

**2.8.6 RLIS LEAs Awarded Funds**

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

- NCES LEA ID
- LEA Name
- RLIS Award Amount

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

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

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

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

None of the SRSA and Dual-eligible LEAS informed the state of an intent to utilize SRSA's AFUA under section 5211 of the ESEA.