

**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**

Virginia



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:

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

Address:

Person to contact about this report:

Name:

Julie Moliq

Telephone:

804 225 2232

Fax:

804 371 8978

e-mail:

julie.moliq@doe.virginia.gov

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

Shelley Loving-Ryder

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	37		
High schools failing to graduate one third or more of their students	2	1	1
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	39		

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	10	6	4
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	13	26

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	98,543	S	87.5%
American Indian or Alaska Native	255	S	87%
Asian or Pacific Islander	6,934	S	94%
<i>Asian</i>	6,789	S	93.8%
<i>Native Hawaiian or Other Pacific Islander</i>	145	S	86%
Black or African American	21,991	S	84.1%
Hispanic or Latino	14,810	S	72.9%
White	50,022	S	92.1%
Two or more races	4,531	S	91.3%
Children with disabilities (<i>IDEA</i>)	11,983	S	62.9%
English Learners	8,158	S	56%
Economically disadvantaged students	35,418	S	79.6%
Children in foster care	305	S	50%
Children who are homeless	1,389	S	61%

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	56,638		23,132	S
American Indian or Alaska Native				
Asian or Pacific Islander	5,002		710	S
<i>Asian</i>	5,002		710	S
<i>Native Hawaiian or Other Pacific Islander</i>				
Black or African American	11,981		6,514	S
Hispanic or Latino	5,930		3,680	S
White	33,725		12,228	S
Two or more races				
Children with disabilities (<i>IDEA</i>)	3,438		3,528	S
English Learners	382		4,508	S
Economically disadvantaged students	14,277		10,987	S

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

As per the file specs, Virginia is reporting those student groups defined as major racial ethnic groups identified in the Consolidated State Plan. For 2018-19, that does not include American Indian, other Pacific Islander or two or more races.

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>)	55,066
English learners	53,469
Homeless students	8,409
Migrant students	190

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	945
Asian	11,361
Black or African American	116,653
Hispanic or Latino	76,170
Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander	480
White	130,319
Two or more races	17,774
Total	353,702

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	267	0	0	267
Age 3 through 5 (not Kindergarten)	17	9,070	0	0	9,087
K	1,407	60,749	0	0	62,156
1	1,842	46,659	0	0	48,501
2	1,749	45,715	0	0	47,464
3	1,594	45,253	0	0	46,847
4	1,388	46,270	0	0	47,658
5	1,347	44,444	0	0	45,791
6	275	16,680	0	0	16,955
7	211	11,494	0	0	11,705
8	139	9,794	0	0	9,933
9	0	2,363	0	0	2,363
10	0	1,834	0	0	1,834
11	0	1,541	0	0	1,541
12	0	1,600	0	0	1,600
Ungraded					
TOTALS	9,969	343,733	0	0	353,702

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.

At this time, Virginia does not have any concerns regarding the accuracy of reported child counts or the underlying eligibility determinations on which the counts are based. We acknowledge that there is still a difference between the Category 1 and Category 2 child counts being reported in MSIX and the counts reported in CSPR; however, we have identified the problem and are working to rectify it. We have determined that errors in "Move From State" are causing some students to remain on the excluded list in MSIX. We will have this issue resolved before the end of the performance period.

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)	42
K	30
1	40
2	45
3	42
4	31
5	39
6	46
7	27
8	33
9	29
10	22
11	18
12	22
Ungraded	
Out-of-school	46
Total	512

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.

Virginia did not experience an increase or decrease greater than 10 percent in our Category 1 count.

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	14

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)	23
K	23
1	26
2	26
3	26
4	15
5	23
6	24
7	16
8	9
9	13
10	7
11	10
12	3
Ungraded	0
Out-of-school	1
Total	245

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.

Virginia continues to see a decrease in the number of students participating in our summer programs. We attribute this decrease to a number of factors. Later frost and increased rainfall have impacted the timelines for some crops such as peaches, melons, and tomatoes which are three of the largest crops Virginia produces in the summer. Increasingly, employers are only hiring H2A workers over the age of 21 or not providing summer housing for families.

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

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

Do not include:

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

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

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

2.4.3 Child Count Calculation and Validation Procedures

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

2.4.3.1 Methods Used to Count Children

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

- The unduplicated count of eligible migratory children, ages 3-21. Only include children two years of age whose residency in the state has been verified after turning three.
- Children who met the program eligibility criteria (e.g., were within 3 years of a qualifying move, engaged or had parents engage in migratory agricultural or fishing work, and were entitled to a free public education through grade 12 in the State, or preschool children below the age and grade level at which the agency provides free public education). Children who were resident in your State for at least 1 day during the performance period (September 1 through August 31).
- Children who graduated from high school or attained a High School Equivalency Diploma (HSED) *during the performance period* and ensures that these children are not counted in the subsequent performance period's child count.
- Children who—in the case of Category 2—were 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 Virginia Migrant Education Program (MEP) uses the Migrant Education Program National Identification and Recruitment Manual as a resource and conducts regular statewide training regarding processes and procedures concerning migrant student eligibility. Training occurs on an annual basis.

Eligibility is established using specific processes that are aligned to the procedures outlined in the Migrant Education Program National Identification and Recruitment Manual. Annually, trained LEA MEP recruiters conduct face-to-face interviews using a paper COE. Each COE is reviewed by an LEA data entry specialist and the LEA MEP Coordinator. The State Migrant Coordinator conducts a final review of the COE before the child/family can be determined eligible. Children may only be entered into the Virginia Migrant State Data Collection (MSDC) system database using the State approved COE. Trained LEA MEP staff members conduct internal COE reviews of a random sample of COEs on an annual basis.

LEA MEP staff run child count reports and check them against the COEs in order to ensure that every eligible child listed on the COE has been accounted for. In addition, the State Migrant Coordinator does ongoing reviews using a random sampling method. External re-interviews, as part of the prospective re-interview process, are also done every three years as an additional check for ensuring all students are eligible for the program.

LEA MEP staff run MSIX worklists and data quality reports, i.e., Potential Duplicate, Merges and Splits by User, Data Logic, etc., on a regular basis to compare State counts against MSIX counts as a checks and balances for data quality, student merges and potential duplicates. Staff review any discrepancies found and maintain communication until concerns are resolved. The State Migrant Coordinator runs the MSIX Child Count Reconciliation Report on a regular basis to check for near matches and potential duplicates, as well as to check for completeness, validity and logic issues. These processes and procedures result in strong confidence that every child entered into the database is in fact an eligible migratory child.

Child Eligibility Logic

Data for the State's migratory children are recorded and managed using the MSDC system.

When producing data for the Consolidated State Performance Report (CSPR), the programming logic follows the MSIX logic and includes data checks that calculate the following in hierarchical order:

1) That the child resided in the State during the 2018-2019 Performance Period (September 1, 2018 – August 31, 2019) by checking one or more of the following dates: enrollment date, residency date, recertification/residency verification date, or withdrawal date between 9/1/2018 and 8/31/2019.

2) That the child is only included if he/she is between the ages of 3 through 21 years of age based on the child's birthdate. (The MSDC recognizes migrant students who are between the ages of three and twenty-one as well as those who were previously enrolled.)

3) That the qualifying arrival date (QAD) of the child is within 36 months (QAD must be on or after 9/2/2015) of his/her residency date which occurs between 9/1/2018 and 8/31/2019. (The MSDC automatically calculates a student's three year eligibility based on the birth date and the

qualifying arrival date to ensure a student whose eligibility has expired is not included in the child count.)

4) If a Graduation/High School Equivalency Diploma (HSED) date is on the system for a previous reporting period or entered during the 2018-2019 performance period, that the child's residency is checked against the Graduation/HSED date.

5) If a Continuation of Services (COS) date is on the system for during the 2018-2019 Performance Period, that the child must have been eligible and residing in the State for at least one day during the Performance Period, otherwise he/she is excluded.

Checking for Eligibility

Residency

In order to verify residency in the State during the 2018-2019 Performance Period, MEP staff conducted a home visit after September 1 and before August 31 for every child in the Category 1 count who was not enrolled in school. For every child who was enrolled in school, MEP staff verified the child's residence via school attendance records. A residency date was then recorded in the MSDC. During the summer/intersession terms, LEA MEP Coordinators are required to verify weekly attendance records to ensure accurate counts for students participating in a summer program.

Age

Each MEP has a data entry specialist who is responsible for monitoring two year old children who are turning three and the children who are twenty-one and will become ineligible within a year. Upon the child turning three, the data entry specialist contacts the MEP recruiter and asks him/her to verify the residency of that child by contacting the family via phone or an in-home visit. That date was entered into the system to verify residency after the child turned three years of age. The data entry specialist also keeps MEP staff updated as a child approaches his/her twenty-second birthday. Furthermore, there is a mechanism in the MSDC that prohibits the eligibility expiration date from being after the individual's 22 nd birthday.

Monitoring Participation

Teachers, tutors, and/or migrant student advocates record attendance and/or services provided, and send the attendance/service reports to the LEA MEP Coordinator who reviews for verification prior to being entered into the MSDC system.

Creating a Unique State ID

Numerous checks are also in place to make sure children are not duplicated. Upon initial entry into the MSDC, each child is assigned a unique identifier called the Virginia (VA) Migrant ID. Each child is also assigned a unique Virginia State Testing Identifier (STI), which is entered in the MSDC system and allows the student's migrant student records to link to other data

collections such as Master Schedule Collection (MSC), the source of course enrollment information, and Assessment, the source of student Standards of Learning (SOL) test results. When an STI is entered into the MSDC system, it is used to find the student's VA Migrant Id, if one has already been assigned, or create a new one, if the STI does not already exist in MSDC. MEP data entry specialists conduct initial student searches and checks to ensure that the child is not already in the MSDC before creating a VA Migrant ID or STI for the child in MSDC. As part of the process, data entry specialists also search for matches within the national system, MSIX, in order to ensure that the child was not entered into MSIX by the State. If the child is found in MSIX, the data specialist will then search the State system once again with the State ID listed in MSIX. Staff will also run the MSIX Worklist report on a regular basis to check for possible merges and splits.

Checking for Duplication

LEA MEP staff run the MSIX Potential Duplicate Report to search for possible student duplicates. If any children appear on the report as a potential duplicate, MEP staff manually review all the information available to ensure potential duplicates were in fact different children. If at any time it is determined that a child had been entered twice, the data is merged via the merge process on the MSIX database which merges the two children into one child and assigns one VA Migrant ID to the child, deleting the second VA Migrant ID. The State Migrant Coordinator will run an enrollment report in the MSDC to identify duplicates based on VA Migrant ID, STI, parent data, mother's maiden name, child's birthplace, birth date, age, and home base.

If a child is enrolled in multiple grades during the year, the system calculates a single grade using CSPR Guidelines ensuring that a child is only counted once per grade level.

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.

We cross referenced both the included and excluded Category 1 and Category 2 child count reconciliation reports in MSIX with our CSPR count. Student by student, we checked to make sure all of the students in our count were also showing up in MSIX in the included list. We have determined that approximately 35 students are still not showing up in the included list in MSIX and are working to rectify the problem. We determined that their eligibility expiration dates are incorrect in MSIX due to an issue we had in MSDC with "Move From State" codes. Some of our data entry specialists were not entering the appropriate codes for states in countries other than the United States, so the records in MSIX were not updating during our nightly drops. We have since changed our collection of state to offer a drop down with the acceptable codes already pre-populated and offered a "null" value for state for countries that do not have states.

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.	34
The number of eligibility determinations sampled for which a re-interview was completed.	29
The number of eligibility determinations sampled for which a re-interview was completed and the child was found eligible.	29

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.	2017-2018

Comments: The response is limited to 8,000 characters.
Independent prospective re-interviewing was conducted during the 2017-2018 performance period by ESCORT.

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.
Independent re-interviews were not conducted during the 2018-2019 performance period.

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.

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)	41
K	30
1	39
2	45
3	41
4	31
5	37
6	46
7	27
8	33
9	29
10	22
11	18
12	22
Ungraded	
Out-of-school	44
Total	505

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)	22
K	26
1	38
2	43
3	42
4	30
5	35
6	35
7	24
8	28
9	25
10	20
11	17
12	20
Ungraded	
Out-of-school	4
Total	409

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

2.4.4.3 Children with Disabilities (IDEA)

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

Age/Grade	Children with Disabilities (<i>IDEA</i>) During the Performance Period
Age Birth through 2	
Age 3 through 5 (not Kindergarten)	1
K	
1	
2	4
3	4
4	4
5	3
6	6
7	
8	3
9	3
10	
11	
12	
Ungraded	
Out-of-school	
Total	28

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	3
Age 3 through 5 (not Kindergarten)	10
K	6
1	5
2	9
3	6
4	3
5	9
6	11
7	5
8	7
9	8
10	2
11	1
12	10
Ungraded	
Out-of-school	11
Total	106

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	
8	
9	
10	
11	
12	
Ungraded	
Total	

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	2

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	14
Age 3 through 5 (not Kindergarten)	42
K	30
1	40
2	45
3	42
4	31
5	39
6	46
7	27
8	33
9	29
10	22
11	18
12	22
Ungraded	
Out-of-school	46
Total	526

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)	41
K	30
1	39
2	45
3	41
4	31
5	37
6	46
7	27
8	33
9	29
10	22
11	18
12	22
Ungraded	
Out-of-school	38
Total	499

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)	1
K	2
1	3
2	4
3	5
4	1
5	7
6	6
7	1
8	1
9	0
10	1
11	2
12	6
Ungraded	
Out-of-school	0
Total	40

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	3
Age 3 through 5 (not Kindergarten)	8
K	12
1	15
2	12
3	14
4	12
5	11
6	20
7	5
8	16
9	16
10	10
11	9
12	14
Ungraded	
Out-of-school	19
Total	196

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	1		
Age 3 through 5 (not Kindergarten)	3	3	
K	8	6	
1	12	11	
2	10	9	
3	13	14	
4	9	8	
5	10	9	
6	15	11	
7	2	1	
8	12	6	
9	8	5	
10	7	4	
11	4	2	
12	8	4	3
Ungraded			
Out-of-school	2	1	
Total	124	94	3

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

FAQ on Types of Instructional Services:

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

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

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

Age/Grade	Support Services During the Performance Period	Breakout of Counseling Services During the Performance Period
Age Birth through 2	7	
Age 3 through 5 (not Kindergarten)	16	1
K	15	6
1	17	8
2	22	8
3	22	11
4	14	6
5	18	7
6	29	9
7	12	4
8	21	9
9	17	11
10	16	8
11	12	9
12	17	13
Ungraded		
Out-of-school	30	2
Total	285	112

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	74
Number of eligible migratory children enrolled in those schools	299

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

Throughout this section:

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

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

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

2.5.1.1 Programs and Facilities - Subpart 1

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

State Program/Facility Type	# Programs/Facilities	Average Length of Stay in Days
Neglected programs	0	0
Juvenile detention	24	52
Juvenile corrections	1	365
Adult corrections	0	0
Other	0	0
Total	25	

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

FAQ on Programs and Facilities - Subpart I:

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

2.5.1.2 Programs and Facilities That Reported - Subpart 1

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

The total row will be automatically calculated.

State Program/Facility Type	# Reporting Data
Neglected programs	0
Juvenile detention	24
Juvenile corrections	1
Adult corrections	0
Other	0
Total	25

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

2.5.1.3 Students Served – Subpart 1

In the tables below, provide the number of neglected and delinquent students served in State agency Title I, Part D, Subpart 1 programs and facilities. Report only students who received Title I, Part D, Subpart 1 services during the reporting year. In the first table, provide in row 1 the unduplicated number of students served by each program, and in row 2, the total number of students in row 1 who are long-term. In the subsequent tables provide the number of students served by disability (*IDEA*) and EL status, by race/ethnicity, by sex, and by age. The total number of students by race/ethnicity, by sex and by age will be automatically calculated.

# of Students Served	Neglected Programs	Juvenile Detention	Juvenile Corrections	Adult Corrections	Other Programs
Total Unduplicated Students Served	0	2,929	212	0	0
Total Long Term Students Served	0	397	163	0	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	922	101	0	0
English Learners (ELs)	0	128	15	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	0	0
Asian	0	22	1	0	0
Black or African American	0	1,561	152	0	0
Hispanic or Latino	0	453	18	0	0
Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander	0	2	0	0	0
White	0	780	38	0	0
Two or more races	0	107	2	0	0
Total	0	2,929	212	0	0

Provide the number of students served by gender.

Sex	Neglected Programs	Juvenile Detention	Juvenile Corrections	Adult Corrections	Other Programs
Male	0	2,356	196	0	0
Female	0	573	16	0	0
Total	0	2,929	212	0	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	3	0	0	0
12	0	8	0	0	0
13	0	46	0	0	0
14	0	141	5	0	0
15	0	293	14	0	0
16	0	575	40	0	0
17	0	765	53	0	0
18	0	880	64	0	0

Age	Neglected Programs	Juvenile Detention	Juvenile Corrections	Adult Corrections	Other Programs
19	0	208	29	0	0
20	0	9	6	0	0
21	0	1	1	0	0
Total	0	2,929	212	0	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.

Virginia has a very small number of students with ethnicity of Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander. This is not a student group which we are required to report as outlined in our Consolidated State Plan, in this case, due to the small number of students in Virginia, it is not unusual to have zero students reflected for this student group. Similarly, it is not surprising to have zero students in the lower age groups and lower grades for these categories. This data has been verified as accurate.

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	2,740	42	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	157	S	18	S	S	S	S	S
Obtained high school diploma	S	S	32	S	46	S	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	S	S	209	S	S	S	S	S
Enrolled in a GED program	S	S	S	S	30	S	S	S	S	S
Accepted and/or enrolled into post-secondary education	S	S	S	S	11	14	S	S	S	S
Enrolled in job training courses/programs	S	S	564	S	3	S	S	S	S	S
Obtained employment	S	S	S	S	5	27	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.

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	77	12	S	S
Long-term students with no change in grade level from the pre- to post-test exams	S	61	8	S	S
Long-term students with improvement up to one full grade level from the pre- to post-test exams	S	91	10	S	S
Long-term students with improvement of more than one full grade level from the pre- to post-test exams	S	135	9	S	S
Total students pre/post- tested	S	364	39	S	S

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

FAQ on long-term students:

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

2.5.2.2 Academic Performance in Mathematics – Subpart 1

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

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

Performance Data (Based on most recent pre/post-test data)	Neglected Programs	Juvenile Detention	Juvenile Corrections	Adult Corrections	Other Programs
Long-term students with negative grade level change from the pre- to post-test exams	S	64	16	S	S
Long-term students with no change in grade level from the pre- to post-test exams	S	71	14	S	S
Long-term students with improvement up to one full grade level from the pre- to post-test exams	S	82	10	S	S
Long-term students with improvement of more than one full grade level from the pre- to post-test exams	S	117	15	S	S
Total students pre/post- tested	S	334	55	S	S

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

FAQ on long-term students:

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

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

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

2.5.3.1 Programs and Facilities – Subpart 2

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

LEA Program/Facility Type	# Programs/Facilities	Average Length of Stay in Days
At-risk programs	11	51
Neglected programs	6	95
Juvenile detention	1	3
Juvenile corrections	5	18
Other	0	0
Total	23	

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

FAQ on average length of stay:

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

2.5.3.2 Programs and Facilities That Reported - Subpart 2

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

The total row will be automatically calculated.

LEA Program/Facility Type	# Reporting Data
At-risk programs	11
Neglected programs	6
Juvenile detention	1
Juvenile corrections	5
Other	0
Total	23

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

2.5.3.3 Students Served – Subpart 2

In the tables below, provide the number of neglected and delinquent students served in LEA Title I, Part D, Subpart 2 programs and facilities. Report only students who received Title I, Part D, Subpart 2 services during the reporting year. In the first table, provide in row 1 the unduplicated number of students served by each program, and in row 2, the total number of students in row 1 who are long-term. In the subsequent tables, provide the number of students served by disability (*IDEA*), and EL status, by race/ethnicity, by sex, and by age. The total number of students by race/ethnicity, by sex, and by age will be automatically calculated.

# of Students Served	At-Risk Programs	Neglected Programs	Juvenile Detention	Juvenile Corrections	Other Programs
Total Unduplicated Students Served	1,916	340	13	512	0
Total Long Term Students Served	1,500	228	0	186	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>)	435	229		266	
ELs	106			29	

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	8	0	0	0	0
Asian	22	3	0	1	0
Black or African American	944	84	7	209	0
Hispanic or Latino	258	23	0	66	0
Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander	2	0	0	0	0
White	537	203	5	212	0
Two or more races	145	27	1	24	0
Total	1,916	340	13	512	0

Provide the number of students served by sex.

Sex	At-Risk Programs	Neglected Programs	Juvenile Detention	Juvenile Corrections	Other Programs
Male	1,095	293	13	346	0
Female	821	47	0	166	0
Total	1,916	340	13	512	0

Provide the number of students served by age.

Age	At-Risk Programs	Neglected Programs	Juvenile Detention	Juvenile Corrections	Other Programs
3 through 5	41	0	0	0	0
6	21	1	0	0	0
7	47	0	0	0	0
8	60	1	0	0	0
9	55	0	0	0	0
10	47	1	0	0	0
11	81	2	0	4	0
12	130	12	0	23	0
13	146	29	1	42	0
14	149	52	4	82	0
15	206	72	0	98	0
16	280	74	4	119	0
17	393	71	2	130	0
18	198	22	2	13	0
19	49	3	0	1	0

Age	At-Risk Programs	Neglected Programs	Juvenile Detention	Juvenile Corrections	Other Programs
20	11	0	0	0	0
21	2	0	0	0	0
Total	1,916	340	13	512	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.

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	377	195	13	308	

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	92		3	5	5		5	5		
Obtained high school diploma	203	12	5	10			4	5		

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	803	4	169	124			86	7		
Enrolled in a GED program	121	4	5	5			22	5		
Accepted and/or enrolled into post-secondary education				12				5		
Enrolled in job training courses/programs	91		5	11			17	5		
Obtained employment	12		5	5			8	10		

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

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

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

2.5.4 Academic Performance – Subpart 2

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

2.5.4.1 Academic Performance in Reading – Subpart 2

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

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

Performance Data (Based on most recent pre/post-test data)	At-Risk Programs	Neglected Programs	Juvenile Detention	Juvenile Corrections	Other Programs
Long-term students with negative grade level change from the pre- to post-test exams	S	10	S	19	S
Long-term students with no change in grade level from the pre- to post-test exams	221	26	S	11	S
Long-term students with improvement up to one full grade level from the pre- to post-test exams	106	53	S	18	S
Long-term students with improvement of more than one full grade level from the pre- to post-test exams	S	47	S	15	S
Total students pre/post- tested	428	136	S	63	S

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

FAQ on long-term:

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

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

2.5.4.2 Academic Performance in Mathematics – Subpart 2

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

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

Performance Data (Based on most recent pre/post-test data)	At-Risk Programs	Neglected Programs	Juvenile Detention	Juvenile Corrections	Other Programs
Long-term students with negative grade level change from the pre- to post-test exams	S	6	S	21	S
Long-term students with no change in grade level from the pre- to post-test exams	245	15	S	5	S
Long-term students with improvement up to one full grade level from the pre- to post-test exams	147	53	S	10	S
Long-term students with improvement of more than one full grade level from the pre- to post-test exams	S	46	S	19	S
Total students pre/post- tested	505	120	S	55	S

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

FAQ on long-term:

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

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

2.6 STUDENT SUPPORT AND ACADEMIC ENRICHMENT GRANTS (TITLE IV, PART A)

2.6.1 Funds Spent Under Title IV, Part A

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

Content Area	Amount of Funds Spent
Well-Rounded	2,455,407.00
Safe and Healthy Students	1,516,852.00
Effective Use of Technology	376,874.00

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

The data provided by the Virginia Department of Education are correct. The Department allows LEAs the full 27 months of the grant cycle to encumber funds and 29 months to request reimbursement. This results in many LEAs waiting to the end of the grant cycle to draw down the Title IV, Part A, funds. Also contributing the low amount of funds spent by LEA in the Title IV, Part A, program are 1) the number of LEAS who transferred Title IV, funds and 2) the amount that was transferred; 40 LEAs transferred \$6,035,131 in funds from Title IV, Part A, programs to other eligible federal programs.

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	83
Safe and Healthy Students	74
Effective Use of Technology	49
Any Content Area	109

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).	40

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)	2	20
Student Support and Enrichment Grants (Title IV, Part A)	40	0
Improving Basic Programs Operated by LEAs (Title I, Part A)		21
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)		4
Rural Education Initiative (Title V, Part B)		3

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)	115,000.00	2,551,057.41
Student Support and Enrichment Grants (Title IV, Part A)	6,035,131.08	0.00
Improving Basic Programs Operated by LEAs (Title I, Part A)		2,863,654.68
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)		597,587.48
Rural Education Initiative (Title V, Part B)		137,831.51

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	37
Activities authorized under Part A of Title II	28
Activities authorized under Title III	7
Activities authorized under Part A of Title IV	12
Parental involvement activities	9

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.

As stated in Virginia's current consolidated application, the overall objectives for this program are consistent with the state's long term goals and interim measures of progress as detailed in the accountability framework. A summary of RLIS LEAs' progress in meeting the interim measures of progress for the all students group is below:

- Reading performance – 28 out of 42 RLIS LEAs met the interim measure of progress
- Mathematics performance – 34 out of 42 LEAs met the interim measure of progress
- Federal Graduation indicator – 30 out of 42 LEAs met the interim measure of progress
- Chronic absenteeism- 6 out of 42 LEAs met the interim measure of progress
- EL Progress – 22 out of the 26 LEAs that met the minimum n for this indicator met the interim measure of progress; 16 LEAs did not meet the minimum n
- SOA Rating – 26 out of 42 LEAs have all schools accredited; 8 LEAs have all but one school accredited; 8 have 2 or more schools rated "accredited with conditions"
- Schools identified for comprehensive support and improvement – 38 out of 42 LEAs have no schools identified for comprehensive support and improvement; 4 LEAs have one or more schools identified for comprehensive support and improvement
- Schools identified for targeted support and improvement – 39 out of 42 LEAs have no schools identified for targeted support and improvement; 3 LEAs have one or more schools identified for targeted support and improvement
- Schools identified for additional targeted support and improvement – 35 out of 42 LEAs have no schools identified for additional targeted support and improvement; 7 LEAs have one or more schools identified for additional targeted support and improvement

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.

Virginia's current consolidated application states that the SEA will provide support for LEAs receiving RLIS funds to ensure that the LEAs utilize funds in one or more of the allowable categories to enhance the LEAs' instructional program and to increase student achievement. State level funds will be used for activities such as:

- Providing support for a state-level Title V, Part B, coordinator;
- Conducting federal program monitoring of LEAs;
- Providing professional development offerings at regional locations across the state to increase accessibility for rural LEAs; and
- Providing annual training for LEA coordinators, which may be delivered in- person, by webinar, by conference call, or by recorded presentation.

State level RLIS funds were used to provide support for a SEA Title V, Part B, coordinator. The coordinator provided individualized technical assistance to all LEAs, including through review and approval of Title V, Part B, program applications, budget transfer requests, and reimbursement requests. Federal program monitoring was conducted for twenty (20) LEAs. Professional development offerings for LEAs included professional development in mathematics, "Developing Deeper Learning Through Rich Mathematical Tasks" and professional development and training on meaningful parent and family engagement, Family & Community Engagement (FACE) Institutes. Training for LEA Title V, Part B, coordinators was provided during VDOE's annual Federal Program Coordinators' Academy which included training specifically on use of funds, program monitoring, determining professional development needs of RLIS schools, and developing the grant application. Additional technical assistance was also offered to LEA coordinators on application development.

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.

Virginia does not use a competitive process to allocate RLIS funds. RLIS funds are allocated based on the number of students in average daily attendance served by eligible LEAs in the state.

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?	46.00%

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)

	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.