

# CONSOLIDATED STATE PERFORMANCE REPORT

## PART II

SCHOOL YEAR 2019-2020

PENNSYLVANIA



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
PENNSYLVANIA	All students	S	136155	87.4
PENNSYLVANIA	American Indian or Alaska Native	S	221	78
PENNSYLVANIA	Asian	S	5481	92.9
PENNSYLVANIA	Native Hawaiian or Other Pacific Islander	S	121	83
PENNSYLVANIA	Black or African American	S	19919	76.5
PENNSYLVANIA	Hispanic or Latino	S	15691	77.2
PENNSYLVANIA	White	S	91139	91.4
PENNSYLVANIA	Two or more races	S	3583	81.4
PENNSYLVANIA	Children with Disabilities (IDEA)	S	23757	72.8
PENNSYLVANIA	English Learners	S	5047	69.0
PENNSYLVANIA	Economically disadvantaged students	S	49514	79.6
PENNSYLVANIA	Children in foster care	S	928	56
PENNSYLVANIA	Children who are homeless	S	2222	70

#### 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
PENNSYLVANIA	All students	S	S	124928	S
PENNSYLVANIA	American Indian or Alaska Native	S	S	186	S
PENNSYLVANIA	Asian	S	S	5215	S
PENNSYLVANIA	Native Hawaiian or Other Pacific Islander	S	S	S	S
PENNSYLVANIA	Black or African American	S	S	16683	S
PENNSYLVANIA	Hispanic or Latino	S	S	13115	S
PENNSYLVANIA	White	S	S	86503	S
PENNSYLVANIA	Two or more races	S	S	S	S
PENNSYLVANIA	Female	S	S	61857	S
PENNSYLVANIA	Male	S	S	63071	S
PENNSYLVANIA	Children with Disabilities (IDEA)	S	S	20552	S
PENNSYLVANIA	English Learners	S	S	3721	S
PENNSYLVANIA	Economically disadvantaged students	S	S	42222	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
PENNSYLVANIA	Children with disabilities (IDEA)	152191
PENNSYLVANIA	English learners	59451
PENNSYLVANIA	Homeless students	14831
PENNSYLVANIA	Migrant students	2290

### 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
PENNSYLVANIA	American Indian or Alaska Native	1499
PENNSYLVANIA	Asian	27912
PENNSYLVANIA	Black or African American	207735
PENNSYLVANIA	Hispanic or Latino	152217
PENNSYLVANIA	Native Hawaiian or Other Pacific Islander	834
PENNSYLVANIA	Total	765457
PENNSYLVANIA	Two or more races	40870
PENNSYLVANIA	White	334390

### 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
PENNSYLVANIA	Age 3 through 5 (Not Kindergarten)	6147	50	0	17	6214
PENNSYLVANIA	Age Birth through 2	0	322	0	2	324
PENNSYLVANIA	Grade 1	74385	8313	35	1924	84657
PENNSYLVANIA	Grade 10	33001	1295	690	377	35363
PENNSYLVANIA	Grade 11	28744	959	560	248	30511
PENNSYLVANIA	Grade 12	27670	754	304	203	28931
PENNSYLVANIA	Grade 2	74151	7521	50	1702	83424
PENNSYLVANIA	Grade 3	74751	5843	65	1586	82245
PENNSYLVANIA	Grade 4	74391	4990	109	1511	81001
PENNSYLVANIA	Grade 5	70067	3891	141	1190	75289
PENNSYLVANIA	Grade 6	56578	2882	193	936	60589
PENNSYLVANIA	Grade 7	43102	2134	321	706	46263
PENNSYLVANIA	Grade 8	40624	1883	447	587	43541
PENNSYLVANIA	Grade 9	39800	1213	652	470	42135
PENNSYLVANIA	Kindergarten	73448	6548	5	1635	81636
PENNSYLVANIA	Total	716859	48598	3572	13094	782123
PENNSYLVANIA	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
The PA MEP has no concerns about the accuracy of the reported child counts or the underlying eligibility determinations. The PA MEP has a mature data collection system and EdFacts/CSPR process as well as a high quality ID&R quality control process.

### 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
PENNSYLVANIA	Age 3 through 5 (Not Kindergarten)	613
PENNSYLVANIA	Kindergarten	287
PENNSYLVANIA	Grade 1	318
PENNSYLVANIA	Grade 2	348
PENNSYLVANIA	Grade 3	352
PENNSYLVANIA	Grade 4	286
PENNSYLVANIA	Grade 5	302
PENNSYLVANIA	Grade 6	285
PENNSYLVANIA	Grade 7	272
PENNSYLVANIA	Grade 8	295
PENNSYLVANIA	Grade 9	292
PENNSYLVANIA	Grade 10	237
PENNSYLVANIA	Grade 11	181
PENNSYLVANIA	Grade 12	153
PENNSYLVANIA	Ungraded	0
PENNSYLVANIA	Out of school	504
PENNSYLVANIA	Total	4725

### 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 PA MEP did not have an increase or decrease greater than 10%

### 2.4.1.3 Birth through Two Child Count

In the table below, enter the unduplicated statewide number of eligible migratory children from birth through age 2 who, within 3 years of making a qualifying move, resided in your State for one or more days during the performance period of September 1, 2019 through August 31, 2020.

Populated with SEA-LEVEL FS121/DG634

State	Age Grade	Eligible Migratory Children
PENNSYLVANIA	Age Birth through 2	175

## 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
PENNSYLVANIA	Age 3 through 5 (Not Kindergarten)	418
PENNSYLVANIA	Kindergarten	182
PENNSYLVANIA	Grade 1	208
PENNSYLVANIA	Grade 2	233
PENNSYLVANIA	Grade 3	237
PENNSYLVANIA	Grade 4	178
PENNSYLVANIA	Grade 5	180
PENNSYLVANIA	Grade 6	176
PENNSYLVANIA	Grade 7	164
PENNSYLVANIA	Grade 8	178
PENNSYLVANIA	Grade 9	175
PENNSYLVANIA	Grade 10	138
PENNSYLVANIA	Grade 11	92
PENNSYLVANIA	Grade 12	6
PENNSYLVANIA	Out of school	159
PENNSYLVANIA	Ungraded	0
PENNSYLVANIA	Total	2724

### 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
<p>The PA MEP Category 2 count decreased by 19% for the 2019-2020 Performance Period vs the 2018-2019 Period. The general overall reason for this was the COVID-19 pandemic and various effects detailed below that impacted the program and the ability to recruit and serve during these difficult times. One of the reasons is that there was a drop in our overall pool of students to serve due to decreased successful recruitment caused by COVID-19. Starting in March, virtually no worksite, school or community visits could be performed during this time as a result of the virus and government mandated restrictions on non-essential travel and contact. In addition, many agricultural operations were highly impacted by COVID-19 and as a result, less workers were moving and/or available and the ability to contact them was severely restricted. Concerns over COVID-19 caused partner employers to re-focus their attention and were less able to work in partnership with the MEP. While many efforts were made for remote recruitment after guidance was issued for this process, the overall recruitment was down especially during the summer months, impacting the number of students potentially available for summer service. In addition, some families lost jobs due to COVID-19 and left the area before summer, so they were not able to be served. The remote nature of things in this COVID-19 world had significant impacts on partnerships and the ability to work with employers, schools and families during this time. Schools were closed prior to Summer, meaning the typical contacts that were previously used were not available. When it came to Summer Services, even with great efforts to use technology for remote instruction, there were still obstacles that limited the ability to serve as many children as in previous years. Despite this, every effort was made to serve as many students as possible using various methods of remote learning, including individual and group remote instruction. One of the big challenges was the lack of necessary technology such as devices and Internet access. Attempts were made to overcome these challenges, but ultimately fewer students were served. Efforts were made to work with schools and families to see what technology was available to each family and where there were gaps. The MEP attempted to fill these gaps by providing technology if it was not provided by schools. Even when the technology was available, the need for additional training and assistance with using the technology further hampered efforts. In addition to the decreased overall number of students available to serve in the Summer and technological hurdles, there were other COVID-19 related challenges to providing such services. Some families sent their children away for the summer to be with relatives for safety and economic reasons (lack of child care), meaning they were not available to be served. Some families were simply concerned about COVID-19, and did not want any type of contact during the Summer and even refused remote contact despite repeated efforts by MEP staff. Loss of income also sometimes resulted in phones being disconnected and losing our only method of contact. Since students were already subject to remote learning in the Spring, many students experienced "Zoom fatigue" and as such were less likely to engage in the optional summer service we provided, especially with lack of parental supervision due to work and other requirements resulting in less overall engagement. In addition, we found that some older students joined the workforce in a higher number than usual to help their families deal with issues caused by the pandemic and were less available for summer services. Other students moved, potentially even within the same city, but did not provide forwarding addresses and were difficult to track down in the pandemic remote world. Overall, the PA MEP is proud of the innovation and success of our summer programs, but due to factors outside of our control, the overall number of children served in the summer did decrease by the aforementioned 19%. The obstacles overcome during this past summer and the innovations learned should lead to even more successful outcomes in the future.</p>

## 2.4.3 Child Count Calculation and Validation Procedures

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

### 2.4.3.1 Methods Used to Count Children

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

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

### Comments

The PA MEP has strong central management of the program, including a regional structure where all aspects are overseen by managers who are focused on the MEP. This also includes a strong state-wide management of ID&R as well as the data system. Written guidelines are in place as well as regular statewide and regional trainings. Program eligibility is established using a strict quality control process that includes adherence to a PA MEP quality control manual. This process begins with face-to-face interviews (or remote interviews due to COVID-19) being performed by highly trained recruiters using an electronic COE that automatically provides various data quality checks. However, these checks are only one part of the system. Extensive reviews are also conducted by trained MEP personnel. The COE then goes through various levels of quality control that includes review by a trained and qualified regional recruitment coordinator/COE Reviewer and then further review by a regional quality control team before the child/family can be approved as eligible. Students/Youth can ONLY be entered into Pennsylvania's migratory student database using the Pennsylvania approved version of the National COE. In addition, monthly reviews are done by the state ID&R Coordinator using a random sampling method. Re-interviews are also done on a regional as well as state-wide level as additional check for ensuring all students are indeed eligible for the program. This results in strong confidence that every child entered into the database is in fact an eligible migrant child/youth. Data is managed using a centralized database which eliminates duplicates and ensures that a student is only counted once. When producing data for CSPR, the programming logic is a mature logic that was developed many years ago and has been compared to MSIX child count logic and includes data checks that ensure: 1) That the QAD of the child is at least within 36 months (QAD must be on or after 9/2/2016) of their residency during the period between 9/1/2019 and 8/31/2020 or before their service in summer 2020. 2) That they have a resident enrollment at least one day between 9/1/2019 and 8/31/2020. Enrollments for students not making a qualifying move during the year are re-verified every year by requiring staff to complete an annual needs-assessment, which requires meeting with the child and/or family thus ensuring residency and entering a residency verification date that must be confirmed during the eligibility window, which is typically the performance period, but with special restrictions on students who turn age 3 or age 22 during the period. 3) Initial eligibility/ID&R process will not allow for entering a child who has already received a diploma or HSED. When an already enrolled child/youth receives a HSED or Diploma, the date is entered into the system. This date is then compared to make sure they had at least one day of eligibility and residency between 9/1/2019 and 8/31/2020 that was prior to receiving the diploma or HSED. As required, services are no longer provided to students who have received a HSED or Diploma and they will not be counted in future years. In addition, data checks are in place to make sure a student who received a HSED or Diploma prior to the Summer Session are not included in the Category 2 count. 4) Numerous checks are also in place to make sure children are not duplicated. This includes initial searches and checks by the Data Specialist upon approving a child in the system, looking for matches within MSIX, and various reports used to search for students on the state database that have similar data elements to manually ensure they are in fact different students. If at any time it is deemed a student has been entered twice, the data is merged and they are then handled as a single student. 5) If a student is enrolled in multiple grades during the year, the system calculates a single grade using OME Guidelines and that is what is used to ensure that they are only counted once in each grade. In addition, grade totals are totaled and compared to overall counts to ensure they match, as part of a report-quality check. 6) When performing the Category 2 count, the system uses our Service Delivery system that indicates what (if any) types of summer services have been provided to a student. Staff are trained according to OME guidelines as to what constitutes a service and the Commonwealth has developed standards. Only those students who are indicated as having received a service provided during the summer are counted on the Category 2 count. 7) Once a student turns 22, they are no longer served and reports will not count them in Category 1 and/or Category 2 counts as appropriate. Data on any child who turns age three during either the entire Category 1 period or specifically in the Category 2 period are painstakingly examined to determine whether they should be counted as □Age birth through 2□ or □Age 3-5□. This includes checking to see if they left the area prior to turning age 3. If so, they are counted in the Age birth to 2 count, even though they turned 3 during the year. The same philosophy is used with Category 2 and if the child did not turn Age 3 prior to receiving the summer service, they are not listed in the Age 3-5 subcategory. Also, once a student graduates or receives a HSED, they are withdrawn from the system and thus will not be counted in subsequent years. As mentioned below, MSIX is also used to ensure the child counts and child count logic are accurate and for the 2019-2020 year, our Category 1 and Category 2 counts were an exact match to MSIX.

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>PA uses MSIX to verify quality of data in various ways. First of all, the MSIX matching system helps us identify any potential duplicates, above and beyond our internal controls. MSIX can also be used as a way to verify prior history to determine eligibility and also to check on prior moves. We also utilize the MSIX child reconciliation reports to compare our counts to MSIX and had a perfect match for both our Category 1 and Category 2 counts at the time we took our snapshot of our database for the data we are reporting for 2019-2020 Performance Period. Part of Pennsylvania's Child Count verification is the use of MSIX. In the months leading up to the reporting period, PA downloads the MSIX Category 1 included list from the child reconciliation reports. A similar report is run in MIS2000 and the raw student data is saved. We subtract the data both ways, looking for children who appear only on the MSIX Included list, and then for students only reported in MIS2000's report. Each discrepancy is carefully reviewed to discover the reason. After that, appropriate changes are made in MIS2000 to resolve these errors. The reports are run repeatedly, looking for any differences in the count/student list between the two systems. As Category 2 Summer Data becomes available, the same process is used to ensure the counts/student lists are resolved between MSIX and MIS2000. In addition to these checks, various MSIX data quality/validation lists are run throughout the year to address any potential data issues as they arise. We have used MSIX's duplicate check each year and have always resolved any potential duplicates as soon as we become aware that students are flagged. As with our child reconciliation counts, keeping up with these throughout the year is a key element in ensuring accurate data.</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><b>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.</b></p>
2019-20

Comments
N/A (since the re-interviews were conducted for the 19-20 performance period)

**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>The PA-MEP contracted the external agency <input type="checkbox"/> ESCORT/Research Foundation of SUNY <input type="checkbox"/> to conduct the state's external re-interview for the 2019-2020 performance period. Due to restrictions from COVID-19, re-interviews were conducted over the phone. One out-of-state external re-interviewer contacted the families to conduct the re-interviews. The re-interviewer was not an employee or former employee of the PA-MEP and was not involved on the initial eligibility determination into the PA-MEP for any of the children in the randomly selected sample. A review panel comprised of three (3) out-of-state MEP experts reviewed the completed re-interviews in order to add an extra layer of independence for the process. A statewide randomly selected sample included 50 <input type="checkbox"/>main<input type="checkbox"/> and 100 <input type="checkbox"/>alternate<input type="checkbox"/> names of students for whom an eligibility determination had been during the 2019-20 performance period.</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
<p>The 2019-2020 external re-interview for the PA-MEP was conducted in the Fall of 2020. The re-interview was conducted over the phone due to limitations caused by COVID-19. A total of 50 re-interviews were conducted by an out of state, external re-interviewer. An independent review panel determined that 49 of the 50 cases resulted in eligibility determinations. Only one (1) case resulted in a non-eligible determination, resulting in a 2% discrepancy rate. For this case, it was determined that the child/family still were eligible during the 2019-20 year based on a prior valid COE. The not-eligible COE form was removed from the state's migrant database. Information relevant to the erroneous eligibility determination was also removed from MSIX. The PA-MEP has implemented the following corrective actions that must be taken if a child is incorrectly determined to be eligible for the MEP. These are: " Stop serving the child (and any sibling if also not eligible) immediately. [It was determined that in the case located during re-interview that the family was still eligible based on a prior COE] " Inform the family that the child is not eligible for the MEP. [This was not necessary for the case discovered during re-interview as indicated in the prior item due to previous eligibility from an earlier COE. The family was notified of the change in end of eligibility which was based on the prior valid COE] " Take the appropriate steps to remove from the local database the migrant status or other program eligibility indicators for the migrant students affected (contact the district's student information systems manager for the appropriate procedures). [In the instance related to re-interview, the ineligible COE was removed from the state and local system as well as MSIX and the End of Eligibility Date updated based on the prior COE] " Do not include the child(ren) in the state's migrant child count. [Because the child identified during re-interview was still eligible in the 2019-2020 Performance Period due to another COE, the child was NOT removed] In addition to removing the not-eligible determination from the MEP's database and updating the information in MSIX, the PA MEP will continue to periodically review its quality control processes to avoid COE completion errors such as those identified in the re-interview □ accurate qualifying activity, correct qualifying worker, multiple COEs if needed. Training will be provided to any future eligibility determination errors.</p>

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

<b>State</b>	<b>Age Grade</b>	<b>ELs During the Performance Period</b>
PENNSYLVANIA	Age 3 through 5 (Not Kindergarten)	542
PENNSYLVANIA	Kindergarten	198
PENNSYLVANIA	Grade 1	226
PENNSYLVANIA	Grade 2	265
PENNSYLVANIA	Grade 3	274
PENNSYLVANIA	Grade 4	218
PENNSYLVANIA	Grade 5	229
PENNSYLVANIA	Grade 6	214
PENNSYLVANIA	Grade 7	212
PENNSYLVANIA	Grade 8	215
PENNSYLVANIA	Grade 9	235
PENNSYLVANIA	Grade 10	187
PENNSYLVANIA	Grade 11	128
PENNSYLVANIA	Grade 12	119
PENNSYLVANIA	Out of school	431
PENNSYLVANIA	Ungraded	0
PENNSYLVANIA	Total	3693

### 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

<b>State</b>	<b>Age Grade</b>	<b>Children with Disabilities (IDEA) During the Performance Period</b>
PENNSYLVANIA	Age Birth through 2	2
PENNSYLVANIA	Age 3 through 5 (Not Kindergarten)	25
PENNSYLVANIA	Kindergarten	19
PENNSYLVANIA	Grade 1	13
PENNSYLVANIA	Grade 2	29
PENNSYLVANIA	Grade 3	21
PENNSYLVANIA	Grade 4	28
PENNSYLVANIA	Grade 5	18
PENNSYLVANIA	Grade 6	17
PENNSYLVANIA	Grade 7	19
PENNSYLVANIA	Grade 8	25
PENNSYLVANIA	Grade 9	22
PENNSYLVANIA	Grade 10	13
PENNSYLVANIA	Grade 11	8
PENNSYLVANIA	Grade 12	6
PENNSYLVANIA	Out of school	6
PENNSYLVANIA	Ungraded	0
PENNSYLVANIA	Total	271

### 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
PENNSYLVANIA	Age Birth through 2	77
PENNSYLVANIA	Age 3 through 5 (Not Kindergarten)	126
PENNSYLVANIA	Kindergarten	60
PENNSYLVANIA	Grade 1	64
PENNSYLVANIA	Grade 2	71
PENNSYLVANIA	Grade 3	65
PENNSYLVANIA	Grade 4	62
PENNSYLVANIA	Grade 5	57
PENNSYLVANIA	Grade 6	63
PENNSYLVANIA	Grade 7	49
PENNSYLVANIA	Grade 8	47
PENNSYLVANIA	Grade 9	51
PENNSYLVANIA	Grade 10	27
PENNSYLVANIA	Grade 11	28
PENNSYLVANIA	Grade 12	12
PENNSYLVANIA	Out of school	132
PENNSYLVANIA	Ungraded	0
PENNSYLVANIA	Total	991

## 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
PENNSYLVANIA	Grade 7	4
PENNSYLVANIA	Grade 8	3
PENNSYLVANIA	Grade 9	6
PENNSYLVANIA	Grade 10	10
PENNSYLVANIA	Grade 11	4
PENNSYLVANIA	Grade 12	10
PENNSYLVANIA	Ungraded	.
PENNSYLVANIA	Total	37

#### 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

## 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

<b>State</b>	<b>Age Grade</b>	<b>Served During the Performance Period</b>
PENNSYLVANIA	Age Birth through 2	73
PENNSYLVANIA	Age 3 through 5 (Not Kindergarten)	573
PENNSYLVANIA	Kindergarten	257
PENNSYLVANIA	Grade 1	284
PENNSYLVANIA	Grade 2	321
PENNSYLVANIA	Grade 3	326
PENNSYLVANIA	Grade 4	261
PENNSYLVANIA	Grade 5	271
PENNSYLVANIA	Grade 6	252
PENNSYLVANIA	Grade 7	254
PENNSYLVANIA	Grade 8	271
PENNSYLVANIA	Grade 9	261
PENNSYLVANIA	Grade 10	211
PENNSYLVANIA	Grade 11	158
PENNSYLVANIA	Grade 12	143
PENNSYLVANIA	Ungraded	0
PENNSYLVANIA	Out of school	369
PENNSYLVANIA	Total	4285

### 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

<b>State</b>	<b>Age Grade</b>	<b>Priority for Services During the Performance Period</b>
PENNSYLVANIA	Age 3 through 5 (Not Kindergarten)	209
PENNSYLVANIA	Kindergarten	112
PENNSYLVANIA	Grade 1	117
PENNSYLVANIA	Grade 2	147
PENNSYLVANIA	Grade 3	140
PENNSYLVANIA	Grade 4	95
PENNSYLVANIA	Grade 5	116
PENNSYLVANIA	Grade 6	104
PENNSYLVANIA	Grade 7	95
PENNSYLVANIA	Grade 8	107
PENNSYLVANIA	Grade 9	143
PENNSYLVANIA	Grade 10	77
PENNSYLVANIA	Grade 11	55
PENNSYLVANIA	Grade 12	33
PENNSYLVANIA	Ungraded	0
PENNSYLVANIA	Out of school	224
PENNSYLVANIA	Total	1774

## 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
PENNSYLVANIA	Age 3 through 5 (Not Kindergarten)	0
PENNSYLVANIA	Kindergarten	0
PENNSYLVANIA	Grade 1	0
PENNSYLVANIA	Grade 2	0
PENNSYLVANIA	Grade 3	0
PENNSYLVANIA	Grade 4	0
PENNSYLVANIA	Grade 5	0
PENNSYLVANIA	Grade 6	0
PENNSYLVANIA	Grade 7	0
PENNSYLVANIA	Grade 8	0
PENNSYLVANIA	Grade 9	18
PENNSYLVANIA	Grade 10	76
PENNSYLVANIA	Grade 11	109
PENNSYLVANIA	Grade 12	132
PENNSYLVANIA	Ungraded	0
PENNSYLVANIA	Out of school	0
PENNSYLVANIA	Total	335

### 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
PENNSYLVANIA	Age Birth through 2	11
PENNSYLVANIA	Age 3 through 5 (Not Kindergarten)	507
PENNSYLVANIA	Kindergarten	223
PENNSYLVANIA	Grade 1	251
PENNSYLVANIA	Grade 2	293
PENNSYLVANIA	Grade 3	289
PENNSYLVANIA	Grade 4	223
PENNSYLVANIA	Grade 5	241
PENNSYLVANIA	Grade 6	232
PENNSYLVANIA	Grade 7	216
PENNSYLVANIA	Grade 8	249
PENNSYLVANIA	Grade 9	238
PENNSYLVANIA	Grade 10	193
PENNSYLVANIA	Grade 11	139
PENNSYLVANIA	Grade 12	113
PENNSYLVANIA	Ungraded	0
PENNSYLVANIA	Out of school	329
PENNSYLVANIA	Total	3747

## 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
PENNSYLVANIA	Age 3 through 5 (Not Kindergarten)	172	146	.
PENNSYLVANIA	Age Birth through 2	4	2	.
PENNSYLVANIA	Grade 1	113	103	.
PENNSYLVANIA	Grade 10	47	47	0
PENNSYLVANIA	Grade 11	49	40	0
PENNSYLVANIA	Grade 12	14	12	0
PENNSYLVANIA	Grade 2	145	139	.
PENNSYLVANIA	Grade 3	158	151	.
PENNSYLVANIA	Grade 4	117	113	.
PENNSYLVANIA	Grade 5	106	105	.
PENNSYLVANIA	Grade 6	105	98	.
PENNSYLVANIA	Grade 7	94	84	.
PENNSYLVANIA	Grade 8	84	76	0
PENNSYLVANIA	Grade 9	54	54	0
PENNSYLVANIA	Kindergarten	109	98	.
PENNSYLVANIA	Out of school	37	22	0
PENNSYLVANIA	Total	1408	1290	0
PENNSYLVANIA	Ungraded	0	0	0

### 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
PENNSYLVANIA	Age 3 through 5 (Not Kindergarten)	569	69
PENNSYLVANIA	Age Birth through 2	72	13
PENNSYLVANIA	Grade 1	280	30
PENNSYLVANIA	Grade 10	209	65
PENNSYLVANIA	Grade 11	155	59
PENNSYLVANIA	Grade 12	143	57
PENNSYLVANIA	Grade 2	313	44
PENNSYLVANIA	Grade 3	318	36
PENNSYLVANIA	Grade 4	252	35
PENNSYLVANIA	Grade 5	260	29
PENNSYLVANIA	Grade 6	241	32
PENNSYLVANIA	Grade 7	244	24
PENNSYLVANIA	Grade 8	258	48
PENNSYLVANIA	Grade 9	259	78
PENNSYLVANIA	Kindergarten	252	33
PENNSYLVANIA	Out of school	347	32
PENNSYLVANIA	Total	4172	684
PENNSYLVANIA	Ungraded	0	0

### 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.

Populated with SCH-LEVEL FS165/DG110

State	Number of schools that enrolled eligible migratory children	Number of eligible migratory children enrolled in those schools
PENNSYLVANIA	443	3312

### 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	213
Juvenile corrections	5	142
Juvenile detention	0	.
Neglected programs	0	.
Other programs	0	.
Total	6	.

### 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

### 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	5
Juvenile detention	0
Neglected programs	0
Other programs	0
Total	6

Data Quality Comments

### 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
PENNSYLVANIA	Total Long-Term Students Served	0	0	436	100	0
PENNSYLVANIA	Total Unduplicated Students Served	0	0	618	121	0

Provide the number of students served by special populations.

State	Student Subgroups	Neglected Programs	Juvenile Detention	Juvenile Corrections	Adult Corrections	Other Programs
PENNSYLVANIA	Children with one or more disabilities (IDEA)	0	0	280	44	0
PENNSYLVANIA	English learner	0	0	0	0	0

Provide the number of students served by race/ethnicity.

State	Race Ethnicity	Neglected Programs	Juvenile Detention	Juvenile Corrections	Adult Corrections	Other Programs
PENNSYLVANIA	American Indian or Alaska Native	0	0	1	0	0
PENNSYLVANIA	Asian	0	0	4	0	0
PENNSYLVANIA	Black or African American	0	0	318	65	0
PENNSYLVANIA	Hispanic or Latino	0	0	39	8	0
PENNSYLVANIA	Native Hawaiian or Other Pacific	0	0	0	0	0
PENNSYLVANIA	Total	0	0	618	121	0
PENNSYLVANIA	Two or more races	0	0	155	37	0
PENNSYLVANIA	White	0	0	101	11	0

Provide the number of students served by gender.

State	Sex	Neglected Programs	Juvenile Detention	Juvenile Corrections	Adult Corrections	Other Programs
PENNSYLVANIA	Female	0	0	77	0	0
PENNSYLVANIA	Male	0	0	541	121	0
PENNSYLVANIA	Total	0	0	618	121	0

Provide the number of students served by age.

State	Age	Neglected Programs	Juvenile Detention	Juvenile Corrections	Adult Corrections	Other Programs
PENNSYLVANIA	10 years old	0	0	0	0	0
PENNSYLVANIA	11 years old	0	0	0	0	0
PENNSYLVANIA	12 years old	0	0	1	0	0
PENNSYLVANIA	13 years old	0	0	6	0	0
PENNSYLVANIA	14 years old	0	0	21	0	0
PENNSYLVANIA	15 years old	0	0	64	1	0
PENNSYLVANIA	16 years old	0	0	136	2	0
PENNSYLVANIA	17 years old	0	0	204	9	0
PENNSYLVANIA	18 years old	0	0	120	31	0
PENNSYLVANIA	19 years old	0	0	42	48	0
PENNSYLVANIA	20 years old	0	0	24	26	0
PENNSYLVANIA	21 years old	0	0	0	4	0
PENNSYLVANIA	3 through 5	0	0	0	0	0
PENNSYLVANIA	6 years old	0	0	0	0	0
PENNSYLVANIA	7 years old	0	0	0	0	0
PENNSYLVANIA	8 years old	0	0	0	0	0
PENNSYLVANIA	9 years old	0	0	0	0	0
PENNSYLVANIA	Total	0	0	618	121	0

**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
PENNSYLVANIA	Enrolled in local district school			134	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
PENNSYLVANIA	Were accepted and/or enrolled into post-secondary education					14
PENNSYLVANIA	Obtained high school diploma					104
PENNSYLVANIA	Obtained employment					129
PENNSYLVANIA	Enrolled in job training courses/programs					294
PENNSYLVANIA	Enrolled in a GED program					109
PENNSYLVANIA	Earned high school course credits					516
PENNSYLVANIA	Earned a GED					63

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
PENNSYLVANIA	Were accepted and/or enrolled into post-secondary education	S	4	S		
PENNSYLVANIA	Obtained high school diploma	S	26	4		
PENNSYLVANIA	Obtained employment	122	S	S		
PENNSYLVANIA	Enrolled in job training courses/programs	95	12	S		
PENNSYLVANIA	Enrolled in a GED program	7	S	3		
PENNSYLVANIA	Earned high school course credits	138	118	S		
PENNSYLVANIA	Earned a GED	4	3	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
PENNSYLVANIA	No Change			53	19	
PENNSYLVANIA	Negative change			55	S	
PENNSYLVANIA	Up to one full grade			56	27	
PENNSYLVANIA	More than one full grade			59	S	
PENNSYLVANIA	Total			223	56	

## 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
PENNSYLVANIA	No Change			53	19	
PENNSYLVANIA	Negative change			55	S	
PENNSYLVANIA	Up to one full grade			56	27	
PENNSYLVANIA	More than one full grade			59	S	
PENNSYLVANIA	Total			223	56	

## 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	0	.
Juvenile corrections	96	103
Juvenile detention	13	22
Neglected programs	88	154
Other programs	0	.
Total	197	.

#### 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	0
Juvenile corrections	94
Juvenile detention	10
Neglected programs	87
Other programs	0
Total	191

#### Data Quality Comments

NOTE: Six facilities were unable to run Title I programs based on the COVID-19 pandemic and therefore had no Title I students to report.

### 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
PENNSYLVANIA	Total Long-Term Students Served	.	2153	131	3336	.
PENNSYLVANIA	Total Unduplicated Students Served	.	4112	3498	7667	.

Provide the number of students served by special populations.

State	Student Subgroups	At-Risk Programs	Neglected Programs	Juvenile Detention	Juvenile Corrections	Other Programs
PENNSYLVANIA	Children with one or more disabilities (IDEA)	.	1805	640	3002	.
PENNSYLVANIA	English learner	.	19	3	45	.

Provide the number of students served by race/ethnicity.

State	Race Ethnicity	At-Risk Programs	Neglected Programs	Juvenile Detention	Juvenile Corrections	Other Programs
PENNSYLVANIA	American Indian or Alaska Native	.	3	3	4	.
PENNSYLVANIA	Asian	.	17	5	12	.
PENNSYLVANIA	Black or African American	.	739	793	1068	.
PENNSYLVANIA	Hispanic or Latino	.	132	130	308	.
PENNSYLVANIA	Native Hawaiian or Other Pacific	.	1	5	6	.
PENNSYLVANIA	Total	.	4112	3498	7667	.
PENNSYLVANIA	Two or more races	.	2680	2326	5038	.
PENNSYLVANIA	White	.	540	236	1231	.

Provide the number of students served by sex.

State	Sex	At-Risk Programs	Neglected Programs	Juvenile Detention	Juvenile Corrections	Other Programs
PENNSYLVANIA	Female	.	2113	581	1950	.
PENNSYLVANIA	Male	.	1999	2917	5717	.
PENNSYLVANIA	Total	.	4112	3498	7667	.

Provide the number of students served by age.

State	Age	At-Risk Programs	Neglected Programs	Juvenile Detention	Juvenile Corrections	Other Programs
PENNSYLVANIA	10 years old	.	135	8	58	.
PENNSYLVANIA	11 years old	.	202	24	97	.
PENNSYLVANIA	12 years old	.	273	82	242	.
PENNSYLVANIA	13 years old	.	419	211	573	.
PENNSYLVANIA	14 years old	.	520	413	885	.
PENNSYLVANIA	15 years old	.	587	612	1341	.
PENNSYLVANIA	16 years old	.	730	785	1691	.
PENNSYLVANIA	17 years old	.	658	896	1753	.
PENNSYLVANIA	18 years old	.	180	305	589	.
PENNSYLVANIA	19 years old	.	68	107	201	.
PENNSYLVANIA	20 years old	.	65	51	87	.
PENNSYLVANIA	21 years old	.	11	.	12	.
PENNSYLVANIA	3 through 5	.	15	.	10	.
PENNSYLVANIA	6 years old	.	29	1	15	.
PENNSYLVANIA	7 years old	.	49	.	27	.
PENNSYLVANIA	8 years old	.	65	2	39	.
PENNSYLVANIA	9 years old	.	106	1	47	.
PENNSYLVANIA	Total	.	4112	3498	7667	.

**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
PENNSYLVANIA	Enrolled in local district school		2450	3052	4996	

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
PENNSYLVANIA	Were accepted and/or enrolled into post-secondary education			76	76	4
PENNSYLVANIA	Obtained high school diploma			112	42	S
PENNSYLVANIA	Obtained employment			243	295	22
PENNSYLVANIA	Enrolled in job training courses/programs			345	252	86
PENNSYLVANIA	Enrolled in a GED program			25	10	9
PENNSYLVANIA	Earned high school course credits			1846	1665	1035
PENNSYLVANIA	Earned a GED			10	S	4

<b>State</b>	<b>Outcomes</b>	<b>Juvenile Detention - 90 Days After Exit</b>	<b>Juvenile Corrections - In Fac</b>	<b>Juvenile Corrections - 90 Days After Exit</b>	<b>Other Programs - In Fac</b>	<b>Other Programs - 90 Days After Exit</b>
PENNSYLVANIA	Were accepted and/or enrolled into post-secondary education	S	95	217		
PENNSYLVANIA	Obtained high school diploma	7	335	48		
PENNSYLVANIA	Obtained employment	46	395	461		
PENNSYLVANIA	Enrolled in job training courses/programs	44	1220	438		
PENNSYLVANIA	Enrolled in a GED program	12	284	56		
PENNSYLVANIA	Earned high school course credits	1292	5612	4803		
PENNSYLVANIA	Earned a GED	9	160	26		

### 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
PENNSYLVANIA	Negative change		41	S	237	
PENNSYLVANIA	More than one full grade		50	S	480	
PENNSYLVANIA	No change		196	11	435	
PENNSYLVANIA	Up to one full grade		205	9	659	
PENNSYLVANIA	Total		492	21	1811	

#### 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
PENNSYLVANIA	More than one full grade		45	S	398	
PENNSYLVANIA	Negative change		45	S	254	
PENNSYLVANIA	Up to one full grade		201	8	658	
PENNSYLVANIA	No change		206	10	448	
PENNSYLVANIA	Total		497	19	1758	

## 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	\$11,820,012
Safe and Healthy Students	\$9,661,095
Effective Use of Technology	\$3,918,219

#### Data Quality Comments

a combination of LEAS not spending Title IV due to Covid shutdowns and charter schools in PA increasing the number of LEAS on the original list

### 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	407
Safe and Healthy Students	355
Effective Use of Technology	296
Any Content Area	1058

#### Data Quality Comments

a combination of LEAS not spending Title IV due to Covid shutdowns and charter schools in PA increasing the number of LEAS on the original list

## 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).
312

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)	.	0
English Language Acquisition, Language Enhancement, and Academic Achievement Act (Title III, Part A)	.	0
Improving Basic Programs Operated by LEAs (Title I, Part A)	.	250
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)	.	0
Student Support and Enrichment Grants (Title IV, Part A)	252	10
Supporting Effective Instruction (Title II, Part A)	164	61

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)	.	\$0
English Language Acquisition, Language Enhancement, and Academic Achievement Act (Title III, Part A)	.	\$0
Improving Basic Programs Operated by LEAs (Title I, Part A)	.	\$27,293,362
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)	.	\$0
Student Support and Enrichment Grants (Title IV, Part A)	\$20,947,889	\$428,130
Supporting Effective Instruction (Title II, Part A)	\$9,613,623	\$2,840,020

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	19
Activities authorized under Part A of Title II	20
Activities authorized under Title III	1
Activities authorized under Part A of Title IV	32
Parental involvement activities	.

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**

The goal of embedding the Rural and Low Income Schools (RLIS) grant into the Pennsylvania Department of Education's (PDE) eGrant system was available to school districts for the 2019-20 school year. The uses of funds remain tied to the planning and accountability processes of Every Student Succeeds Act plan. All efforts provided for in the Department's state consolidated plan and each program, including the RLIS program, are intended to increase student achievement for all students. The RLIS program application is aligned with other ESSA program and all programs are mutually supportive of each other. The PDE continues to ensure that the RLIS districts are striving to make adequate yearly progress for all students. The PDE provides technical assistance to RLIS districts in need of additional support to assist them in meeting their goals.

### 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 Pennsylvania Department of Education, Division of Federal Programs, provides several opportunities throughout the year for technical assistance to RLIS districts. On a yearly basis we hold an annual conference, a fall regional meeting, and three federal programs coordinator trainings. Districts are encouraged to attend to stay informed and learn about updates and best practices.

### 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
Pennsylvania awards districts based on formula. ADA of all eligible districts, added up to get total number, then divide in allocation to get per pupil dollar amount, then multiplied by the total number of students in the district, this determines district allocation.

## 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?	0
What percentage of those funds retained for State-level administration were used specifically for technical assistance?	0

Data Quality Comments

## 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
The file was sent to <a href="mailto:oese.cspr@ed.gov">oese.cspr@ed.gov</a> .

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

Populated with LEA-LEVEL FS131/DG614

State	Number of SRSA- and Dual-eligible LEAs informed their SEA of an intent to utilize SRSA's AFUA, under Section 5211 of the ESEA.	Percent of SRSA- and Dual-eligible LEAs informed their SEA of an intent to utilize SRSA's AFUA, under Section 5211 of the ESEA.
PENNSYLVANIA	13	39.4