

CONSOLIDATED STATE PERFORMANCE REPORT

PART II

SCHOOL YEAR 2019-2020

IDAHO



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 of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act (ESEA), as amended by the Every Student Succeeds Act of 2015 (ESSA)

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, DC 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, DC 20202.

2.1 ACCOUNTABILITY

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.

Populated with SCH-LEVEL FS132/DG794

Data published outside of report

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.

Populated with SCH-LEVEL FS132/DG794

Data published outside of report

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.

Populated with SEA-LEVEL FS150/DG695 and FS151/DG696

State	Student Group	# of Graduates	# of Students in Cohort	Graduation Rate
IDAHO	All students	S	23585	82.2
IDAHO	American Indian or Alaska Native	S	281	65
IDAHO	Asian	S	323	89
IDAHO	Native Hawaiian or Other Pacific Islander	S	74	76
IDAHO	Black or African American	S	327	69
IDAHO	Hispanic or Latino	S	4247	75.7
IDAHO	White	S	17760	84.2
IDAHO	Two or more races	S	573	79
IDAHO	Children with Disabilities (IDEA)	S	2418	59
IDAHO	English Learners	S	912	65
IDAHO	Economically disadvantaged students	S	12191	73.8
IDAHO	Children in foster care	S	155	40
IDAHO	Children who are homeless	S	1278	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.

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.

Populated with SEA-LEVEL FS160/DG739

State	Student Group	# Enrolled in an IHE	# Not Enrolled in an IHE	# for which data are unavailable	Total
IDAHO	All students	9459	S	9975	S
IDAHO	American Indian or Alaska Native	76	S	119	S
IDAHO	Asian	193	S	105	S
IDAHO	Native Hawaiian or Other Pacific Islander	31	S	47	S
IDAHO	Black or African American	135	S	120	S
IDAHO	Hispanic or Latino	339	S	416	S
IDAHO	White	7405	S	7567	S
IDAHO	Two or more races	1280	S	1601	S
IDAHO	Female	5646	S	4240	S
IDAHO	Male	3813	S	5735	S
IDAHO	Children with Disabilities (IDEA)	373	S	410	S
IDAHO	English Learners	193	S	346	S
IDAHO	Economically disadvantaged students	2193	S	3683	S

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.

Populated with SEA-LEVEL FS037/DG548

State	Special Services or Programs	# Students Served
IDAHO	Children with disabilities (IDEA)	22571
IDAHO	English learners	16577
IDAHO	Homeless students	5345
IDAHO	Migrant students	3260

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.

Populated with SEA-LEVEL FS037/DG548

State	Race Ethnicity	# Students Served
IDAHO	American Indian or Alaska Native	2218
IDAHO	Asian	1147
IDAHO	Black or African American	1752
IDAHO	Hispanic or Latino	39311
IDAHO	Native Hawaiian or Other Pacific Islander	534
IDAHO	Total	159466
IDAHO	Two or more races	4393
IDAHO	White	110111

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).

Populated with SEA-LEVEL FS134/DG670

State	Age Grade	Public SWP	Public TAS	Local Neglected	Private	Total
IDAHO	Age 3 through 5 (Not Kindergarten)	1174	0	0	0	1174
IDAHO	Age Birth through 2	0	0	0	0	0
IDAHO	Grade 1	16513	603	0	91	17207
IDAHO	Grade 10	4700	208	77	4	4989
IDAHO	Grade 11	4619	73	95	0	4787
IDAHO	Grade 12	4852	64	80	4	5000
IDAHO	Grade 2	16209	511	1	99	16820
IDAHO	Grade 3	16384	409	1	77	16871
IDAHO	Grade 4	16695	417	8	57	17177
IDAHO	Grade 5	17165	402	3	57	17627
IDAHO	Grade 6	13595	393	8	41	14037
IDAHO	Grade 7	10246	425	11	28	10710
IDAHO	Grade 8	10124	302	12	17	10455
IDAHO	Grade 9	4565	227	53	3	4848
IDAHO	Kindergarten	16323	458	0	109	16890
IDAHO	Total	153164	4492	349	587	158592
IDAHO	Ungraded	0	0	0	0	0

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, 2019 through August 31, 2020. 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 2.3.1.1 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
We have no concerns. Students have been individually matched through the MSIX reconciliation process resulting in updates to our data pull logic. Although MSIX data is not completely accurate yet, the migratory children included in EdFacts are accurate. (See 2.4.3.1 for information of how the MSIX Reconciliation process has affected data reporting.)

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, 2019 through August 31, 2020. 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.

Populated with SEA-LEVEL FS121/DG634

State	Age Grade	Eligible Migratory Children
IDAHO	Age 3 through 5 (Not Kindergarten)	497
IDAHO	Kindergarten	523
IDAHO	Grade 1	366
IDAHO	Grade 2	394
IDAHO	Grade 3	367
IDAHO	Grade 4	397
IDAHO	Grade 5	374
IDAHO	Grade 6	371
IDAHO	Grade 7	354
IDAHO	Grade 8	358
IDAHO	Grade 9	362
IDAHO	Grade 10	291
IDAHO	Grade 11	243
IDAHO	Grade 12	241
IDAHO	Ungraded	0
IDAHO	Out of school	396
IDAHO	Total	5534

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
Not applicable.

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, 2019 through August 31, 2020.

Populated with SEA-LEVEL FS121/DG634

State	Age Grade	Eligible Migratory Children
IDAHO	Age Birth through 2	273

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, 2019 through August 31, 2020. 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).

Populated with SEA-LEVEL FS122/DG635

State	Age Grade	Eligible Migratory Children Served by the MEP During the Summer Intersession Term
IDAHO	Age 3 through 5 (Not Kindergarten)	139
IDAHO	Kindergarten	208
IDAHO	Grade 1	148
IDAHO	Grade 2	164
IDAHO	Grade 3	134
IDAHO	Grade 4	169
IDAHO	Grade 5	143
IDAHO	Grade 6	142
IDAHO	Grade 7	105
IDAHO	Grade 8	93
IDAHO	Grade 9	42
IDAHO	Grade 10	46
IDAHO	Grade 11	29
IDAHO	Grade 12	8
IDAHO	Out of school	30
IDAHO	Ungraded	0
IDAHO	Total	1600

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
Not applicable.

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, 2019 through August 31, 2020. 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).

Populated with SEA-LEVEL FS122/DG635

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

2.4.3 Child Count Calculation and Validation Procedures

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

2.4.3.1 Methods Used to Count Children

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

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

Comments

General Data Collection: To identify and track each student, the state longitudinal data system (SLDS) assigns a unique EDUID to all public-school students based on their legal name, gender, and date of birth. LEAs and schools typically request EDUIDs for students during the enrollment process. During the eCOE review process, Regional Coordinators use a MSIS search function to retrieve matching EDUIDs from the SLDS. If a child has never been enrolled in school (preschool and out of school youth), the Regional Coordinator can generate a new EDUID if needed. In very rare cases, a duplicate is discovered (often as a near match in MSIX) and the Regional Coordinator or State Coordinator creates a technology department ticket to merge the records. All data is tied to the child's EDUID in every state database. This allows for Migrant data to come from other state databases including participation in Title 1-A, special education, McKinney Vento (homeless), English learner programs, and other information including school enrollment, demographics, assessment and school performance. Migrant eligibility is obtained from MSIS for other state purposes, such as assessment participation and state accountability.

Migrant Data Collection: The identification of students is done through an electronic COE process. Family liaison/recruiters interview a parent or guardian to obtain information about the agricultural worker, children, qualifying moves and work. The eCOE is submitted electronically through Idaho's Migrant Student Information System (MSIS) to the regional MEP coordinator who approves or rejects the COE. When submitted as approved, the State program specialist approves or rejects the COE. Students are eligible for services and inclusion in EdFacts only after State approval. In addition to creating the eCOE and importing them, liaisons directly input some data into MSIS. The data points entered for each student may include (as applicable): residency verification date, referred services, priority for services, extended services, out of state transcript received, home schooled, instructional services, support services, continuation of services status, immunizations, and (for students leaving the district during a grading period) grade-to-date and seat-hours-to-date. As a result of CSPR feedback last year, a new section was added to MSIS to capture summer school data, including Attendance Begin Date, Attendance End Date, and services (referred, support, and instructional). Liaisons complete monthly data self-checks through the Family Liaison Recordkeeping Log and regional MEP coordinators conduct quarterly checks to verify data is being correctly and completely entered. Local district migrant directors must sign the regional coordinators' quarterly data checklists. If data issues are found, regional MEP coordinator provides additional training. Residency verification dates are collected and entered by family liaisons who personally contact every migrant family every year between September 1 and August 31 and verify that every child on the COE is residing in Idaho. Liaisons also access an MSIS report that identifies students without a valid residency verification date and then collect and enter missing data, if possible.

Process of Creating EdFacts Data Files: Category 1 (FS 121): Through the MSIX reconciliation process we found that we were not including every child eligible to be counted in the Category 1 count. We have revised the data logic that controls the students returned by the query. The data pull starts with all students with an approved, current COE. Each child is unique and counted only once even if he/she is on more than one COE during the performance period (See data check 3.) Then the following logic checks are applied to each record.

Definitions: The date that establishes residency in the logic below is the residency verification date, enrollment date, withdrawal date, or residency date. The Performance Period is 9/1/19 to 8/31/20. End of eligibility (EOE) date is calculated by MSIS as the QAD plus 36 months minus one day.

Check 1: Student must be less than 22
 Part A-Student must be less than 22 at the start of the performance period. AND Part B- Student must be less than 22 after a date that establishes residency
 Check 2: Qualifying Arrival Date
 Part A-Qualifying Arrival Date must occur on or before the end of the performance period AND Part B-Qualifying Arrival Date must occur on or before a date that establishes residency
 Check 3: Eligibility Expiration due to new COE
 Part A-Record is not disabled (The system disables the record when a new COE is created for the student in another district.) OR Part B-Record is disabled after the start of the performance period AND Part C-Disabled after a date that establishes residency.
 Check 4: Graduation/HSE Date
 Part A-There is no Graduation/HSE date OR Part B-Graduation/HSE Date is after the start of the performance period AND Part C-Graduation/HSE is after a date that establishes residency
 Check 5: End of Eligibility date
 Part A-EOE date must be after the beginning of the performance period
 Check 6: Date that establishes residency
 Part A-Ensure the date that establishes residency is inside the performance period.

Age/Grade calculation for children turning 3: Count as 3TO5NOTK if the child has a date that establishes residency on or after the child's 3rd birthday, otherwise count as UNDER3.

Category 2 (FS122): The data pull logic for participation in summer programs is similar to Category 1 with two differences. Definition: the date that establishes residency is the Summer Attendance Begin date ONLY (per file specification revision 19-20). Checks 1-6: above and Check 7: Summer Session
 Part A- EOE date is on or after summer Attendance Begin date
 Age/Grade Calculation for children turning 3: Count as 3TO5NOTK if Part A-has a date that establishes residency on or after the child's 3rd birthday AND Part B-3rd birthday is on or after the summer Attendance Begin date, otherwise count as UNDER3.

Does the State ensure that the system that transmits migrant data to the Department accurately accounts for all the migratory children in every EDFacts data file? Please respond in the table below.

The State deployed a process that ensured that it transmits accurate migrant data to the Department in every required EDFacts data file.

Yes

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

<p>This fall we have been working hard on our MSIX Data Reconciliation (currently on the 6th iteration). At the beginning of the process, we resolved every potential duplicate, potential split, and near match in MSIX and continue to keep up daily on any new ones that appear in reports and worklist items. Next, we compared our EdFacts data pull to the MSIX Data Reconciliation Included and Excluded lists. Differences were investigated and we updated our data pull logic to ensure that we are using the same dates to establish residency that MSIX does. We have also made adjustments to how we upload enrollment, especially for Residency and OSY. We have been able to fix many issues. Although we are continuing to work on the remaining MSIX upload issues, we were able to verify that every student in our Category 1 count has a valid date to establish residency and meets all other criteria. For Category 2, we used the EdFacts file specification revision for 2019-2020 to update our data pull logic so that the date that establishes residency in summer programs is ONLY the individual student's Summer Attendance Begin date. All other criteria are met in our data pull logic.</p>

Data Quality Comments

--

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.	150
The number of eligibility determinations sampled for which a re-interview was completed.	50
The number of eligibility determinations sampled for which a re-interview was completed and the child was found eligible.	49

<p>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.</p>
2019-20

Comments

FAQ on independent prospective re-interviews:

a. 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	Response
How were the re-interviews conducted	Phone interviews
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 SY2018-19.

Comments
<p>Although we were not a member state, we contacted the IRRC for assistance finding an experience independent re-interviewer. Justyn Settles of Tennessee was recommended. We contracted with Justyn to complete the re-interviews. Ahead of the re-interviews we discussed the size of the randomized list needed to complete 50 re-interviews, logistics of phone re-interviews, and scripted an introduction for Justyn to use to minimize parent concerns about being called by a stranger. The randomized list and interview materials were shipped to him in June 2020. His final report was submitted in August 2020. After the re-interviews were complete the state coordinator and regional coordinators met with Justyn virtually to de-brief and discuss training needs demonstrated by the re-interview results.</p>

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
One student was found not to be eligible and was removed from the state migrant database, MSIS. The student was not eligible because he did not make the move with the rest of the family, although he had qualified for the MEP on a previous move. Since 2015, we have found only one other student not to be eligible during annual prospective re-interviews, and it was for the same reason. Statewide fall training this year addressed the interview process and requires that the family liaison/recruiter ask if every child on a prospective COE made the qualifying move with (or to join) the worker. Regional MEP coordinators also emphasize this interview requirement during one-on-one training with new family liaisons.

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

Does the state collect all the required data elements and data sections on the National Certificate of Eligibility (COE)?
Yes

Data Quality Comments

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.

Populated with SEA-LEVEL FS121/DG634

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.

Populated with SEA-LEVEL FS121/DG634

State	Age Grade	ELs During the Performance Period
IDAHO	Age 3 through 5 (Not Kindergarten)	49
IDAHO	Kindergarten	381
IDAHO	Grade 1	282
IDAHO	Grade 2	310
IDAHO	Grade 3	309
IDAHO	Grade 4	326
IDAHO	Grade 5	247
IDAHO	Grade 6	221
IDAHO	Grade 7	176
IDAHO	Grade 8	176
IDAHO	Grade 9	171
IDAHO	Grade 10	119
IDAHO	Grade 11	95
IDAHO	Grade 12	99
IDAHO	Out of school	71
IDAHO	Ungraded	.
IDAHO	Total	3032

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.

Populated with SEA-LEVEL FS121/DG634

State	Age Grade	Children with Disabilities (IDEA) During the Performance Period
IDAHO	Age Birth through 2	2
IDAHO	Age 3 through 5 (Not Kindergarten)	51
IDAHO	Kindergarten	34
IDAHO	Grade 1	37
IDAHO	Grade 2	60
IDAHO	Grade 3	48
IDAHO	Grade 4	54
IDAHO	Grade 5	48
IDAHO	Grade 6	45
IDAHO	Grade 7	42
IDAHO	Grade 8	40
IDAHO	Grade 9	42
IDAHO	Grade 10	21
IDAHO	Grade 11	26
IDAHO	Grade 12	15
IDAHO	Out of school	.
IDAHO	Ungraded	.
IDAHO	Total	565

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, 2020 (i.e., QAD during the performance period). The total is calculated automatically.

Populated with SEA-LEVEL FS121/DG634

State	Age Grade	QAD During the Performance Period
IDAHO	Age Birth through 2	181
IDAHO	Age 3 through 5 (Not Kindergarten)	154
IDAHO	Kindergarten	183
IDAHO	Grade 1	129
IDAHO	Grade 2	110
IDAHO	Grade 3	114
IDAHO	Grade 4	113
IDAHO	Grade 5	109
IDAHO	Grade 6	102
IDAHO	Grade 7	111
IDAHO	Grade 8	104
IDAHO	Grade 9	94
IDAHO	Grade 10	82
IDAHO	Grade 11	70
IDAHO	Grade 12	34
IDAHO	Out of school	151
IDAHO	Ungraded	.
IDAHO	Total	1841

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.

Populated with SEA-LEVEL FS032/DG326

State	Grade	Dropouts During the Performance Period
IDAHO	Grade 7	6
IDAHO	Grade 8	9
IDAHO	Grade 9	14
IDAHO	Grade 10	20
IDAHO	Grade 11	14
IDAHO	Grade 12	17
IDAHO	Ungraded	.
IDAHO	Total	80

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 2019-20 performance period, (2) were not enrolled at the beginning of the current (2020-21) 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 2019-20 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).

Obtained a HSED in your State During the Performance Period
4

Data Quality Comments

The State Migrant Coordinator contacted HEP Program Directors to manually collect information on GED completers in their HEP programs in 2019-2020 and matched these students to eligible students included in EdFacts for 2019-2020. Idaho has not previously collected this data, and unfortunately, we were not able to gather additional data for 2019-2020. The State Department of Education is in the process of creating an MOU with the third-party vendor that manages all Idaho GEDs so that we can automatically identify eligible migrant children who have completed a GED in the future.

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.

Populated with SEA-LEVEL FS054/DG102

State	Age Grade	Served During the Performance Period
IDAHO	Age Birth through 2	125
IDAHO	Age 3 through 5 (Not Kindergarten)	348
IDAHO	Kindergarten	404
IDAHO	Grade 1	284
IDAHO	Grade 2	306
IDAHO	Grade 3	269
IDAHO	Grade 4	312
IDAHO	Grade 5	298
IDAHO	Grade 6	294
IDAHO	Grade 7	283
IDAHO	Grade 8	280
IDAHO	Grade 9	298
IDAHO	Grade 10	228
IDAHO	Grade 11	183
IDAHO	Grade 12	194
IDAHO	Ungraded	0
IDAHO	Out of school	200
IDAHO	Total	4306

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.

Populated with SEA-LEVEL FS054/DG102

State	Age Grade	Priority for Services During the Performance Period
IDAHO	Age 3 through 5 (Not Kindergarten)	35
IDAHO	Kindergarten	125
IDAHO	Grade 1	101
IDAHO	Grade 2	113
IDAHO	Grade 3	106
IDAHO	Grade 4	102
IDAHO	Grade 5	104
IDAHO	Grade 6	108
IDAHO	Grade 7	134
IDAHO	Grade 8	122
IDAHO	Grade 9	127
IDAHO	Grade 10	95
IDAHO	Grade 11	78
IDAHO	Grade 12	65
IDAHO	Ungraded	0
IDAHO	Out of school	39
IDAHO	Total	1454

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.

Populated with SEA-LEVEL FS054/DG102

State	Age Grade	Continuation of Services During the Performance Period
IDAHO	Age 3 through 5 (Not Kindergarten)	1
IDAHO	Kindergarten	0
IDAHO	Grade 1	2
IDAHO	Grade 2	1
IDAHO	Grade 3	2
IDAHO	Grade 4	1
IDAHO	Grade 5	3
IDAHO	Grade 6	4
IDAHO	Grade 7	1
IDAHO	Grade 8	7
IDAHO	Grade 9	4
IDAHO	Grade 10	7
IDAHO	Grade 11	7
IDAHO	Grade 12	5
IDAHO	Ungraded	0
IDAHO	Out of school	0
IDAHO	Total	45

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.

Populated with SEA-LEVEL FS145/DG684

State	Age Grade	Instructional Service During the Performance Period
IDAHO	Age Birth through 2	2
IDAHO	Age 3 through 5 (Not Kindergarten)	181
IDAHO	Kindergarten	241
IDAHO	Grade 1	170
IDAHO	Grade 2	189
IDAHO	Grade 3	160
IDAHO	Grade 4	195
IDAHO	Grade 5	172
IDAHO	Grade 6	181
IDAHO	Grade 7	148
IDAHO	Grade 8	144
IDAHO	Grade 9	124
IDAHO	Grade 10	104
IDAHO	Grade 11	74
IDAHO	Grade 12	79
IDAHO	Ungraded	.
IDAHO	Out of school	35
IDAHO	Total	2199

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.

Populated with SEA-LEVEL FS145/DG684

State	Age Grade	Reading Instruction During the Performance Period	Mathematics Instruction During the Performance Period	High School Credit Accrual During the Performance Period
IDAHO	Age 3 through 5 (Not Kindergarten)	123	121	.
IDAHO	Age Birth through 2	.	.	.
IDAHO	Grade 1	128	129	.
IDAHO	Grade 10	22	17	32
IDAHO	Grade 11	19	16	29
IDAHO	Grade 12	17	16	13
IDAHO	Grade 2	146	145	.
IDAHO	Grade 3	119	117	.
IDAHO	Grade 4	148	139	.
IDAHO	Grade 5	137	128	.
IDAHO	Grade 6	122	110	.
IDAHO	Grade 7	88	86	.
IDAHO	Grade 8	82	77	20
IDAHO	Grade 9	35	32	36
IDAHO	Kindergarten	180	181	.
IDAHO	Out of school	23	21	3
IDAHO	Total	1389	1335	133
IDAHO	Ungraded	.	.	.

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.

Populated with SEA-LEVEL FS145/DG684

State	Age Grade	Support Services During the Performance Period	Breakout of Counseling Services During the Performance Period
IDAHO	Age 3 through 5 (Not Kindergarten)	336	26
IDAHO	Age Birth through 2	125	10
IDAHO	Grade 1	274	48
IDAHO	Grade 10	227	164
IDAHO	Grade 11	182	140
IDAHO	Grade 12	192	146
IDAHO	Grade 2	293	62
IDAHO	Grade 3	262	49
IDAHO	Grade 4	304	51
IDAHO	Grade 5	292	67
IDAHO	Grade 6	280	139
IDAHO	Grade 7	275	187
IDAHO	Grade 8	276	176
IDAHO	Grade 9	293	204
IDAHO	Kindergarten	382	58
IDAHO	Out of school	197	40
IDAHO	Total	4190	1567
IDAHO	Ungraded	.	.

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 counsees, 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.

Populated with SCH-LEVEL FS165/DG110

State	Number of schools that enrolled eligible migratory children	Number of eligible migratory children enrolled in those schools
IDAHO	348	5529

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.

Populated with SCH-LEVEL FS165/DG110 and FS165/DG514

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, 2019 through June 30, 2020.
- 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:
 - o 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.
 - o 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.
 - o 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.
 - o 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.
 - o 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.
 - o 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 or Facility Type	# Programs or Facilities	Average Length of Stay in Days
Adult corrections	1	240
Juvenile corrections	1	209
Juvenile detention	0	0
Neglected programs	0	0
Other programs	0	0
Total	2	.

FAQ on Programs and Facilities - Subpart 1:

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.

Data Quality Comments

The average length of stay is calculated using the weighted by number of students and the number of days, per visit, for each student enrolled during the reporting year, regardless of entry or exit date. Students who entered, exited and then reentered a facility are included in the average for each stay. 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
Adult corrections	1
Juvenile corrections	1
Juvenile detention	0
Neglected programs	0
Other programs	0
Total	2

Data Quality Comments

No changes to State Agency 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.

Populated with SEA-LEVEL FS119/DG656

State	# of Students Served	Neglected Programs	Juvenile Detention	Juvenile Corrections	Adult Corrections	Other Programs
IDAHO	Total Long-Term Students Served	.	.	264	222	.
IDAHO	Total Unduplicated Students Served	.	.	323	327	.

Provide the number of students served by special populations.

State	Student Subgroups	Neglected Programs	Juvenile Detention	Juvenile Corrections	Adult Corrections	Other Programs
IDAHO	Children with one or more disabilities (IDEA)	.	.	142	104	.
IDAHO	English learner	.	.	9	0	.

Provide the number of students served by race/ethnicity.

State	Race Ethnicity	Neglected Programs	Juvenile Detention	Juvenile Corrections	Adult Corrections	Other Programs
IDAHO	American Indian or Alaska Native	.	.	14	10	.
IDAHO	Asian	.	.	1	3	.
IDAHO	Black or African American	.	.	22	11	.
IDAHO	Hispanic or Latino	.	.	56	55	.
IDAHO	Native Hawaiian or Other Pacific	.	.	2	16	.
IDAHO	Total	.	.	323	327	.
IDAHO	Two or more races	.	.	10	0	.
IDAHO	White	.	.	218	232	.

Provide the number of students served by gender.

State	Sex	Neglected Programs	Juvenile Detention	Juvenile Corrections	Adult Corrections	Other Programs
IDAHO	Female	.	.	54	69	.
IDAHO	Male	.	.	269	258	.
IDAHO	Total	.	.	323	327	.

Provide the number of students served by age.

State	Age	Neglected Programs	Juvenile Detention	Juvenile Corrections	Adult Corrections	Other Programs
IDAHO	10 years old	.	.	0	0	.
IDAHO	11 years old	.	.	0	0	.
IDAHO	12 years old	.	.	4	0	.
IDAHO	13 years old	.	.	8	0	.
IDAHO	14 years old	.	.	28	0	.
IDAHO	15 years old	.	.	57	0	.
IDAHO	16 years old	.	.	64	0	.
IDAHO	17 years old	.	.	82	1	.
IDAHO	18 years old	.	.	62	11	.
IDAHO	19 years old	.	.	15	46	.
IDAHO	20 years old	.	.	3	122	.
IDAHO	21 years old	.	.	0	147	.
IDAHO	3 through 5	.	.	0	0	.
IDAHO	6 years old	.	.	0	0	.
IDAHO	7 years old	.	.	0	0	.
IDAHO	8 years old	.	.	0	0	.
IDAHO	9 years old	.	.	0	0	.
IDAHO	Total	.	.	323	327	.

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, 2019 through June 30, 2020.

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.

Populated with SEA-LEVEL FS180/DG783 and FS181/DG785

State	Outcomes (once per student, only after exit)	Neglected Programs	Juvenile Detention	Juvenile Corrections	Adult Corrections	Other Programs
IDAHO	Enrolled in local district school			S	S	

State	Outcomes	Neglected Programs - In Fac	Neglected Programs - 90 Days After Exit	Juvenile Detention - In Fac	Juvenile Detention - 90 Days After Exit	Juvenile Corrections - In Fac
IDAHO	Were accepted and/or enrolled into post-secondary education					33
IDAHO	Obtained high school diploma					44
IDAHO	Obtained employment					S
IDAHO	Enrolled in job training courses/programs					242
IDAHO	Enrolled in a GED program					139
IDAHO	Earned high school course credits					318
IDAHO	Earned a GED					104

State	Outcomes	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
IDAHO	Were accepted and/or enrolled into post-secondary education	5	S	S		
IDAHO	Obtained high school diploma	S	S	S		
IDAHO	Obtained employment	94	S	S		
IDAHO	Enrolled in job training courses/programs	S	45	S		
IDAHO	Enrolled in a GED program	S	149	S		
IDAHO	Earned high school course credits	S	S	S		
IDAHO	Earned a GED	S	149	S		

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, 2019, 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.

Populated with SEA-LEVEL FS113/DG628

State	Performance Data (Based on most recent pre post-test data)	Neglected Programs	Juvenile Detention	Juvenile Corrections	Adult Corrections	Other Programs
IDAHO	Negative change			13	14	
IDAHO	No Change			20	26	
IDAHO	Up to one full grade			36	3	
IDAHO	More than one full grade			194	9	
IDAHO	Total			263	52	

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, 2019, 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.

Populated with SEA-LEVEL FS113/DG628

State	Performance Data (Based on most recent pre post-test data)	Neglected Programs	Juvenile Detention	Juvenile Corrections	Adult Corrections	Other Programs
IDAHO	Negative change			13	14	
IDAHO	No Change			20	26	
IDAHO	Up to one full grade			36	3	
IDAHO	More than one full grade			194	9	
IDAHO	Total			263	52	

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 or Facility Type	# Programs or Facilities	Average Length of Stay (# days)
At-risk programs	3	158
Juvenile corrections	0	0
Juvenile detention	15	26
Neglected programs	0	0
Other programs	0	0
Total	18	.

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.

Data Quality Comments

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 or Facility Type	# Reporting Data
At-risk programs	3
Juvenile corrections	0
Juvenile detention	15
Neglected programs	0
Other programs	0
Total	18

Data Quality Comments

We are currently awarding grants to 3 LEAs who partner with 3 at-risk community day programs within their district boundaries. 6 LEAs partner with Delinquent facilities that are diversion programs where students are determined to be in need of supervision or where they are court ordered to participate. 9 LEAs currently are being awarded Subpart 2 grants to provide supplemental supports for LEAs who provide collaboratively run educational programs within County/Locally run Juvenile Detention 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.

Populated with LEA-LEVEL FS127/DG657

State	# of students served	At-Risk Programs	Neglected Programs	Juvenile Detention	Juvenile Corrections	Other Programs
IDAHO	Total Long-Term Students Served	268	.	529	.	.
IDAHO	Total Unduplicated Students Served	283	.	2549	.	.

Provide the number of students served by special populations.

State	Student Subgroups	At-Risk Programs	Neglected Programs	Juvenile Detention	Juvenile Corrections	Other Programs
IDAHO	Children with one or more disabilities (IDEA)	89	.	734	.	.
IDAHO	English learner	41	.	33	.	.

Provide the number of students served by race/ethnicity.

State	Race Ethnicity	At-Risk Programs	Neglected Programs	Juvenile Detention	Juvenile Corrections	Other Programs
IDAHO	American Indian or Alaska Native	14	.	132	.	.
IDAHO	Asian	.	.	21	.	.
IDAHO	Black or African American	9	.	94	.	.
IDAHO	Hispanic or Latino	65	.	398	.	.
IDAHO	Native Hawaiian or Other Pacific	.	.	6	.	.
IDAHO	Total	283	.	2549	.	.
IDAHO	Two or more races	8	.	95	.	.
IDAHO	White	187	.	1803	.	.

Provide the number of students served by sex.

State	Sex	At-Risk Programs	Neglected Programs	Juvenile Detention	Juvenile Corrections	Other Programs
IDAHO	Female	90	.	886	.	.
IDAHO	Male	193	.	1663	.	.
IDAHO	Total	283	.	2549	.	.

Provide the number of students served by age.

State	Age	At-Risk Programs	Neglected Programs	Juvenile Detention	Juvenile Corrections	Other Programs
IDAHO	10 years old	8	.	38	.	.
IDAHO	11 years old	8	.	65	.	.
IDAHO	12 years old	13	.	94	.	.
IDAHO	13 years old	30	.	169	.	.
IDAHO	14 years old	29	.	340	.	.
IDAHO	15 years old	32	.	473	.	.
IDAHO	16 years old	35	.	652	.	.
IDAHO	17 years old	52	.	644	.	.
IDAHO	18 years old	41	.	35	.	.
IDAHO	19 years old	7	.	1	.	.
IDAHO	20 years old
IDAHO	21 years old
IDAHO	3 through 5	3	.	2	.	.
IDAHO	6 years old	6	.	4	.	.
IDAHO	7 years old	6	.	7	.	.
IDAHO	8 years old	7	.	8	.	.
IDAHO	9 years old	6	.	17	.	.
IDAHO	Total	283	.	2549	.	.

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, 2019 through June 30, 2020.

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 vocational 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 vocational 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.

Populated with LEA-LEVEL FS180/DG782 and FS181/DG784

State	Outcomes(once per student, only after exit)	At-Risk Programs	Neglected Programs	Juvenile Detention	Juvenile Corrections	Other Programs
IDAHO	Enrolled in local district school	123		440		

State	Outcomes	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
IDAHO	Were accepted and/or enrolled into post-secondary education	49	S			18
IDAHO	Obtained high school diploma	59	S			37
IDAHO	Enrolled in job training courses/programs	S	S			9
IDAHO	Enrolled in a GED program	S	S			121
IDAHO	Earned high school course credits	198	39			1012
IDAHO	Obtained employment	54	S			106
IDAHO	Earned a GED	S	S			29

State	Outcomes	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
IDAHO	Were accepted and/or enrolled into post-secondary education	27				
IDAHO	Obtained high school diploma	17				
IDAHO	Enrolled in job training courses/programs	16				
IDAHO	Enrolled in a GED program	41				
IDAHO	Earned high school course credits	204				
IDAHO	Obtained employment	129				
IDAHO	Earned a GED	18				

2.5.3.5 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.

2.5.3.5.1 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, 2019, 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.

Populated with LEA-LEVEL FS125/DG629

State	Performance Data(Based on most recent pre post-test data)	At-Risk Programs	Neglected Programs	Juvenile Detention	Juvenile Corrections	Other Programs
IDAHO	No change	15		46		
IDAHO	Negative change	10		59		
IDAHO	Up to one full grade	144		94		
IDAHO	More than one full grade	3		115		
IDAHO	Total	172		314		

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, 2019, through June 30, 2020.

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.

2.5.3.5.2 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, 2019, 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.

Populated with LEA-LEVEL FS125/DG629

State	Performance Data(Based on most recent pre post-test data)	At-Risk Programs	Neglected Programs	Juvenile Detention	Juvenile Corrections	Other Programs
IDAHO	No change	17		50		
IDAHO	Negative change	S		54		
IDAHO	Up to one full grade	140		100		
IDAHO	More than one full grade	S		110		
IDAHO	Total	173		314		

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.

Content Area	Amount of Funds Spent
Well-Rounded	\$2,021,974
Safe and Healthy Students	\$1,989,974
Effective Use of Technology	\$410,499

Data Quality Comments

Overall, more funds were spent in all three content areas in 2019-20 over 2018-19. However, some LEAs have funds which they were not able to spend last year and are carrying over to the current school year after being granted a waiver from US ED.

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).

Content Area	Number of LEAs Spending Funds
Well-Rounded	104
Safe and Healthy Students	74
Effective Use of Technology	52
Any Content Area	117

Data Quality Comments

Although expenditures increased across all content areas from 2018-19 to 2019-20, it appears that the number of LEAs allocating to the content areas has decreased.

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.

Did the State transfer funds under the State Transferability authority of Section 5103(a) during SY2019-20?
No

Data Quality Comments

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.

LEAs that notified the State that they were transferring funds under the LEA Transferability authority of Section 5103(b).
56

Data Quality Comments

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
Education of Migratory Children (Title I, Part C)	.	1
English Language Acquisition, Language Enhancement, and Academic Achievement Act (Title III, Part A)	.	1
Improving Basic Programs Operated by LEAs (Title I, Part A)	.	44
Prevention and Intervention Programs for Children and Youth Who Are Neglected, Delinquent, or At-Risk (Title I, Part D)	.	0
Rural Education Initiative (Title V, Part B)	.	1
Student Support and Enrichment Grants (Title IV, Part A)	39	0
Supporting Effective Instruction (Title II, Part A)	17	0

Data Quality Comments

In the table below provide the total amount of FY 2019 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
Education of Migratory Children (Title I, Part C)	.	\$2,500
English Language Acquisition, Language Enhancement, and Academic Achievement Act (Title III, Part A)	.	\$39,000
Improving Basic Programs Operated by LEAs (Title I, Part A)	.	\$973,275
Prevention and Intervention Programs for Children and Youth Who Are Neglected, Delinquent, or At-Risk (Title I, Part D)	.	\$0
Rural Education Initiative (Title V, Part B)	.	\$63,022
Student Support and Enrichment Grants (Title IV, Part A)	\$739,807	\$0
Supporting Effective Instruction (Title II, Part A)	\$337,990	\$0

Data Quality Comments

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 SY2019-20 for each of the listed purposes.

Purpose	# LEAs
Activities authorized under Part A of Title I	11
Activities authorized under Part A of Title II	3
Activities authorized under Title III	1
Activities authorized under Part A of Title IV	5
Parental involvement activities	4

Data Quality Comments

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

Idaho school districts receiving awards under the Subpart 2 Rural and Low-Income Schools (RLIS) program are using their funds to help all students meet the State academic standards planned for in the district's Consolidated Federal and State Grant Application (CFSGA). All efforts provided for in the CFSGA are intended to increase student achievement standards for all students. The authorized uses of the Rural, Low Income funds have a direct correlation to our state goals. The Idaho State Department of Education (SDE) will ensure, through the consolidated application approval process, that the Rural, Low Income districts apply their funds to those authorized uses.

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 State is actively working with districts involved with RISE while trying to recruit more districts to join for common learning activities. RISE participants have the ability to correspond and collaborate on Schoology. Ongoing recruiting for Idaho Principals Network and Idaho Superintendents Network is also taking place to connect like-situated administrators. Other opportunities for assistance have taken place at the New and Experienced Federal Directors Meeting as well as with the CFSGA Tour.

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 State used a formula 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
What percentage of those funds retained for State-level administration were used specifically for technical assistance?	1

Data Quality Comments
The percentage indicated in the response refers to the total percentage of the State's allocation retained for State-level administration. When calculating the percentage of funds retained for State-level administration that were used for technical assistance, the denominator of the calculation is the funds retained for State-level administration, not the total RLIS allocation.

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.

Data published outside of report

Data Quality Comments
emailed to OESE.CSPR@ed.gov on 2/8/2021

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

Populated with LEA-LEVEL FS131/DG614