

CONSOLIDATED STATE PERFORMANCE REPORT

PART II

SCHOOL YEAR 2021-2022

OHIO



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 36.50 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

2.1.2 Schools Identified for Comprehensive Support and Improvement

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

Populated with SY2022-2023 SCH-LEVEL FS206/DG842 and FS212/DG866.

Reason Type	Number of Schools	Number of Title I Schools	Number of Non-Title I Schools
Lowest performing five percent of Title I schools	92	90	2
High schools failing to graduate one third or more of their students	146	138	8

2.1.3 Schools Implementing Targeted Support and Improvement Plans

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

Populated with SY2022-2023 SCH-LEVEL FS206/DG842 and FS212/DG867.

Reason Type	Number of Schools	Number of Title I Schools	Number of non-Title I Schools
Schools with One or More Consistently Underperforming Subgroups of Students	512	394	118

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 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 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.

Student Group	# of Graduates	# of Students in Cohort	Graduation Rate
All students	S	134402	86.2
American Indian or Alaska Native	S	200	76
Asian or Pacific Islander	S	3460	94.2
Black or African American	S	20902	75.4
Hispanic or Latino	S	8421	76.3
White	S	94966	89.5
Two or more races	S	6453	82.2
Children with Disabilities (IDEA)	S	21432	68.2
English learners	S	4575	71.0
Economically disadvantaged students	S	54680	76.8
Children in foster care	S	2758	61
Children who are homeless	S	4934	58.9

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.

Student Group	# Enrolled in an IHE	# Not Enrolled in an IHE	# For Which Data Are Unavailable	Total
All students	34736	S	86659	S
American Indian or Alaska Native	21	S	135	S
Asian or Pacific Islander	1464	S	1725	S
Black or African American	3705	S	13364	S
Hispanic or Latino	622	S	5731	S
White	26566	S	62698	S
Two or more races	2358	S	3006	S
Female	19733	S	40715	S
Male	15003	S	45944	S
Children with Disabilities (IDEA)	S	S	17760	S
English Learners	269	S	3173	S
Economically disadvantaged students	12763	S	31920	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.

Special Services or Programs	# Students Served
Children with disabilities (IDEA)	147482
English learners	48039
Homeless students	19901
Migrant students	336

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.

Race Ethnicity	# Students Served
American Indian or Alaska Native	1215
Asian	12163
Black or African American	227787
Hispanic or Latino	75859
Native Hawaiian or Other Pacific Islander	828
White	431738
Two or more races	59427
Total	809017

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.

Age Grade	Public SWP	Public TAS	Local Neglected	Private	Total
Age Birth through 2	0	0	0	0	0
Age 3 through 5 (not Kindergarten)	26580	1	0	0	26581
Kindergarten	84944	2197	1	148	87290
Grade 1	76943	3223	0	170	80336
Grade 2	78993	3096	5	119	82213
Grade 3	78689	2673	6	90	81458
Grade 4	76965	1002	2	41	78010
Grade 5	71401	532	6	17	71956
Grade 6	55942	280	7	8	56237
Grade 7	51167	211	16	5	51399
Grade 8	50660	191	21	1	50873
Grade 9	44368	44	40	0	44452
Grade 10	36247	35	37	0	36319
Grade 11	30478	17	21	0	30516
Grade 12	31524	18	6	0	31548
Ungraded	0
Total	794901	13520	168	599	809188

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, 2021 through June 30, 2022.
- 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	26	365
Juvenile corrections	3	105
Juvenile detention	.	.
Neglected programs	.	.
Other programs	.	.
Total	.	.

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	26
Juvenile corrections	3
Juvenile detention	.
Neglected programs	.
Other programs	.
Total	.

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.

# of Students Served	Neglected Programs	Juvenile Detention	Juvenile Corrections	Adult Corrections	Other Programs
Total Long-Term Students Served	.	.	374	627	.
Total Unduplicated Students Served	.	.	535	627	.

Provide the number of students served by special populations.

Student Subgroups	Neglected Programs	Juvenile Detention	Juvenile Corrections	Adult Corrections	Other Programs
Children with one or more disabilities (IDEA)	.	.	200	205	.
English learners	.	.	9	5	.

Provide the number of students served by race/ethnicity.

Race Ethnicity	Neglected Programs	Juvenile Detention	Juvenile Corrections	Adult Corrections	Other Programs
American Indian or Alaska Native	.	.	2	0	.
Asian	.	.	0	0	.
Black or African American	.	.	363	321	.
Hispanic or Latino	.	.	27	0	.
Native Hawaiian or Other Pacific	.	.	0	0	.
White	.	.	115	291	.
Two or more races	.	.	28	15	.
Total	.	.	535	627	.

Provide the number of students served by gender.

Sex	Neglected Programs	Juvenile Detention	Juvenile Corrections	Adult Corrections	Other Programs
Female	.	.	0	27	.
Male	.	.	535	600	.
Total	.	.	535	627	.

Provide the number of students served by age.

Age	Neglected Programs	Juvenile Detention	Juvenile Corrections	Adult Corrections	Other Programs
Age 3 through 5	.	.	0	0	.
Age 6	.	.	0	0	.
Age 7	.	.	0	0	.
Age 8	.	.	0	0	.
Age 9	.	.	0	0	.
Age 10	.	.	0	0	.
Age 11	.	.	0	0	.
Age 12	.	.	1	0	.
Age 13	.	.	3	0	.
Age 14	.	.	35	0	.
Age 15	.	.	78	0	.
Age 16	.	.	122	10	.
Age 17	.	.	145	17	.
Age 18	.	.	97	101	.
Age 19	.	.	38	188	.
Age 20	.	.	16	145	.
Age 21	.	.	0	166	.
Total	.	.	535	627	.

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, 2021 through June 30, 2022.

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.

Outcomes (Once per Student, Only after Exit)	Neglected Programs	Juvenile Detention	Juvenile Corrections	Adult Corrections	Other Programs
Enrolled in local district school			S	S	

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
Were accepted and/or enrolled into post-secondary education					S
Obtained high school diploma					35
Obtained employment					105
Enrolled in job training courses/programs					533
Enrolled in a GED program					S
Earned high school course credits					448
Earned a GED					34

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
Were accepted and/or enrolled into post-secondary education	S	21	S		
Obtained high school diploma	S	10	S		
Obtained employment	S	627	S		
Enrolled in job training courses/programs	S	S	S		
Enrolled in a GED program	S	209	S		
Earned high school course credits	S	55	S		
Earned a GED	S	34	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, 2021, 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.

Performance Data (Based on Most Recent Pre Post-Test Data)	Neglected Programs	Juvenile Detention	Juvenile Corrections	Adult Corrections	Other Programs
Long-term students with negative grade level change from the pre- to post-test exams			60	S	
Long-term students with no change in grade level from the pre- to post-test exams			10	S	
Long-term students with improvement up to one full grade level from the pre- to post-test exams			40	S	
Long-term students with improvement of more than one full grade level from the pre- to post-test exams			47	S	
Total students pre/post-tested			157	S	

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, 2021, 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.

Performance Data (Based on most recent pre post-test data)	Neglected Programs	Juvenile Detention	Juvenile Corrections	Adult Corrections	Other Programs
Long-term students with negative grade level change from the pre- to post-test exams			44	S	
Long-term students with no change in grade level from the pre- to post-test exams			12	S	
Long-term students with improvement up to one full grade level from the pre- to post-test exams			44	S	
Long-term students with improvement of more than one full grade level from the pre- to post-test exams			39	S	
Total students pre/post-tested			139	S	

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	.	.
Juvenile corrections	23	117
Juvenile detention	38	27
Neglected programs	35	123
Other programs	.	.
Total	.	.

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	.
Juvenile corrections	23
Juvenile detention	38
Neglected programs	35
Other programs	.
Total	.

Data Quality Comments

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.

# of Students Served	At-Risk Programs	Neglected Programs	Juvenile Detention	Juvenile Corrections	Other Programs
Total Long-Term Students Served	.	1237	647	475	.
Total Unduplicated Students Served	.	2358	7137	961	.

Provide the number of students served by special populations.

Student Subgroups	At-Risk Programs	Neglected Programs	Juvenile Detention	Juvenile Corrections	Other Programs
Children with one or more disabilities (IDEA)	.	1032	2099	376	.
English learners	.	97	109	5	.

Provide the number of students served by race/ethnicity.

Race Ethnicity	At-Risk Programs	Neglected Programs	Juvenile Detention	Juvenile Corrections	Other Programs
American Indian or Alaska Native	.	4	4	.	.
Asian	.	13	32	2	.
Black or African American	.	724	2788	302	.
Hispanic or Latino	.	72	251	25	.
Native Hawaiian or Other Pacific	.	2	7	1	.
White	.	1348	3500	568	.
Two or more races	.	195	555	63	.
Total	.	2358	7137	961	.

Provide the number of students served by sex.

Sex	At-Risk Programs	Neglected Programs	Juvenile Detention	Juvenile Corrections	Other Programs
Female	.	1161	1893	133	.
Male	.	1197	5244	828	.
Total	.	2358	7137	961	.

Provide the number of students served by age.

Age	At-Risk Programs	Neglected Programs	Juvenile Detention	Juvenile Corrections	Other Programs
Age 3 through 5	.	8	.	.	.
Age 6	.	8	.	.	.
Age 7	.	14	.	.	.
Age 8	.	54	.	.	.
Age 9	.	43	8	.	.
Age 10	.	72	21	1	.
Age 11	.	121	69	.	.
Age 12	.	168	239	11	.
Age 13	.	242	576	42	.
Age 14	.	338	987	120	.
Age 15	.	375	1425	204	.
Age 16	.	378	1575	242	.
Age 17	.	299	1657	275	.
Age 18	.	128	421	55	.
Age 19	.	52	128	10	.
Age 20	.	36	29	1	.
Age 21	.	22	2	.	.
Total	.	2358	7137	961	.

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, 2021 through June 30, 2022.

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.

Outcomes(once per student, only after exit)	At-Risk Programs	Neglected Programs	Juvenile Detention	Juvenile Corrections	Other Programs
Enrolled in local district school		848	2037	334	

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
Were accepted and/or enrolled into post-secondary education			10	6	3
Obtained high school diploma			67	11	46
Obtained employment			105	23	20
Enrolled in job training courses/programs			160	24	140
Enrolled in a GED program			3	S	7
Earned high school course credits			1114	298	1802
Earned a GED			3	S	S

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
Were accepted and/or enrolled into post-secondary education	4	9	11		
Obtained high school diploma	55	12	29		
Obtained employment	46	5	32		
Enrolled in job training courses/programs	15	42	20		
Enrolled in a GED program	5	20	3		
Earned high school course credits	629	494	214		
Earned a GED	3	4	5		

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, 2021, 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.

Performance Data(Based on Most Recent Pre Post-Test Data)	At-Risk Programs	Neglected Programs	Juvenile Detention	Juvenile Corrections	Other Programs
Long-term students with negative grade level change from the pre- to post-test exams		118	14	50	
Long-term students with no change in grade level from the pre- to post-test exams		311	88	129	
Long-term students with improvement up to one full grade level from the pre- to post-test exams		601	232	147	
Long-term students with improvement of more than one full grade level from the pre- to post-test exams		110	13	95	
Total students pre/post-tested		1140	347	421	

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, 2021, through June 30, 2022.

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, 2021, 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.

Performance Data(Based on most recent pre post-test data)	At-Risk Programs	Neglected Programs	Juvenile Detention	Juvenile Corrections	Other Programs
Long-term students with negative grade level change from the pre- to post-test exams		110	12	33	
Long-term students with no change in grade level from the pre- to post-test exams		331	62	114	
Long-term students with improvement up to one full grade level from the pre- to post-test exams		525	237	148	
Long-term students with improvement of more than one full grade level from the pre- to post-test exams		105	16	101	
Total students pre/post-tested		1071	327	396	

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	\$19,666,040
Safe and Healthy Students	\$10,954,742
Effective Use of Technology	\$5,035,294

Data Quality Comments

Ohio's total expenditures for Question 2.6.1 are above the high threshold listed on the CSPR Verification File for SY 2021-2022. The high threshold is listed as \$31,480,666. Ohio's total funds spent across the three content areas equals \$35,656,076. In comparing this year's low and high thresholds to last year's, there is a significant change. The SY 2020-2021 low threshold was \$32,816,456 and the high threshold was \$54,694,094. With the increase in Title IV-A funds allocated to Ohio for SY 2021-2022 over the prior year, it's unclear what caused the significant decrease in the thresholds for SY 2021-2022. Given our improved expenditure reporting process, Ohio is confident that the total expenditure number is accurate.

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	535
Safe and Healthy Students	468
Effective Use of Technology	278
Any Content Area	750

Data Quality Comments

--

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 SY2021-2022?
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).
167

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)	.	.
English Language Acquisition, Language Enhancement, and Academic Achievement Act (Title III, Part A)	.	1
Improving Basic Programs Operated by LEAs (Title I, Part A)	.	150
Prevention and Intervention Programs for Children and Youth Who Are Neglected, Delinquent, or At-Risk (Title I, Part D)	.	.
Rural Education Initiative (Title V, Part B)	.	.
Student Support and Enrichment Grants (Title IV, Part A)	102	2
Supporting Effective Instruction (Title II, Part A)	65	14

Data Quality Comments

In the table below provide the total amount of FY 2021 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)	.	.
English Language Acquisition, Language Enhancement, and Academic Achievement Act (Title III, Part A)	.	\$30,000
Improving Basic Programs Operated by LEAs (Title I, Part A)	.	\$4,111,645
Prevention and Intervention Programs for Children and Youth Who Are Neglected, Delinquent, or At-Risk (Title I, Part D)	.	.
Rural Education Initiative (Title V, Part B)	.	.
Student Support and Enrichment Grants (Title IV, Part A)	\$2,329,318	\$165,362
Supporting Effective Instruction (Title II, Part A)	\$2,620,035	\$642,347

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 SY2020-21 for each of the listed purposes.

Purpose	# LEAs
Activities authorized under Part A of Title I	71
Activities authorized under Part A of Title II	45
Activities authorized under Title III	4
Activities authorized under Part A of Title IV	58
Parental involvement activities	27

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

In Ohio's ESSA plan the following objectives and outcomes were identified to assist rural districts in Ohio: Objective 1.) Developing partnerships in the Appalachian region of the state and building a peer-to-peer network to connect high-performing districts with similar districts to model and share effective professional development, curriculum, instruction and school improvement activities. Peer-to-peer networks have been developed with districts consisting of district Superintendents, Administrators, Teachers, and Ohio Department of Education (ODE) Staff. The peer-to-peer network meets regularly to share practices. The rural liaison has worked with rural districts to create a rural newsletter for Ohio's rural districts. The rural newsletter was developed in SY2018-2019 and continues to be sent to rural districts in Ohio, showcasing programs and successes that rural districts are experiencing as well as informing districts of resources available for them. New in SY2019-2020 and still continuing, is a cross-office Rural Work Group intended to address issues pertinent to Rural Districts as part of Ohio's Strategic Learning Plan. Objective 2.) Designating a rural education liaison in the Office of Improvement to coordinate school improvement initiatives. Ohio's Rural Liaison continues to work with Rural districts in the field. The Rural Liaison works with State Support Teams (SSTs) in Southeastern Regions 12, 14, 15, and 16. The SSTs work with districts to develop comprehensive needs assessment and improvement plans towards improved student achievement. Ohio established rural focus groups identified four areas for targeted supports for rural districts in Ohio. Focus groups consist of rural district administrators, ESC's, SSTs, and ODE staff. Four strands for targeted supports were identified as 1.) Human Capital Resources for staffing; 2.) Opioid Crisis with Wraparound Healthcare; 3.) Educational Options to increase AP, College Credit Plus, and Career Training opportunities; 4.) Chronic Absenteeism. To address chronic absenteeism, ODE and The National Center for Rural Education Research Networks is working with 20 districts across the state of Ohio that are designated as Rural. The rural liaison works with rural districts in an effort to maintain an understanding and productive relationship between their schools and ODE. Objective 3.) Leveraging Title II for professional development to support the needs of educators in rural schools; The Rural Liaison and the Office of Federal Programs has worked with rural district to assist them with strategies for leveraging their federal funds as well as state and local funds to address challenges rural districts face. As part of a district's funding application for Rural Low-Income program, districts identified the specific challenges they face, described how it addressed in their needs assessment and comprehensive improvement plan, and explained what funds were used to leverage towards addressing these challenges. All districts were required to provide SMART goals, strategies, action steps, measurable student performance measures, and adult implementation measures for their improvement plans beginning in FY 18-19. In relationship with Title IIA, in FY2021-2022, 25 RLIS districts indicated that they were using their funds for teacher and leadership professional development activities. Ten RLIS districts indicated that they were using their funds towards teacher recruitment and retention activities in FY 2021-2022. ODE targeted the state's administrative Title IIA to rural districts for principal leadership activities. Objective 4: Establish streamline communication vehicles to Rural districts in both OII and OFP via Peer to Peer Networking Meetings, Rural Newsletter, and GovDelivery subscription and email system designed to keep LEA Rural contacts abreast of opportunities and deadlines for Rural activities. Outcome 1: Increase the percentage of rural/low-income districts and schools that reach or exceed a graduation rate of an "A" on Ohio's report card. In the years 2019-2020 and 2020-2021 the graduation component rating required to receive a letter grade of A was set at 93%. For the 2021-2022 school year that threshold was raised to 96.5%. In 2019-2020, 67.48% of the 123 rural high poverty districts and 65.63% of the 128 rural high poverty buildings met this. In 2020-2021, 66.67% of the 123 rural high poverty districts and 65.63% of the 128 rural high poverty buildings met this. In 2021-2022, we see that 31.71% of the 123 rural high poverty districts and 30.23% of the 129 rural high poverty buildings met this. Outcome 2: Increase the percentage of rural/low-income districts and schools that reach or exceed a "C," 70 percent level on the state's Performance Index (PI) measure on Ohio's report card. Ohio's PI measures student performance levels on state academic assessments. In the years 2019-2020, 2020-2021, and 2021-2022 the PI percent required to receive a letter grade of C or higher was set at 70%. An important note is that the maximum score for the PI in 2019-2020 and 2020-2021 was 120. While the maximum score for the PI in 2021-2022 at the district level was 107.30 and for buildings the maximum score was 109.10. In 2019-2020, 4.07% of the 123 rural high poverty districts and 8.08% of the 198 rural high poverty buildings met this. In 2020-2021, 26.02% of the 123 rural high poverty districts and 29.64% of the 388 rural high poverty buildings met this. In 2021-2022, we see that 84.55% of the 123 rural high poverty districts and 75.32% of the 397 rural high poverty buildings met this. Outcome 3: Increase the percentage of rural/low-income districts and schools that reach or exceed a "C," 34 percent level on the state's Prepared for Success (PFS) measure on Ohio's report card. Ohio's PFS measure looks at a district or school success at preparing students for college or a career after graduation. No letter grades were assigned in safe harbor years 2020, 2021, or 2022 so the figures below are estimates based on passing the measure percentage through the grading scale. The PFS component has been completely overhauled making comparability with the new component difficult. The PFS measure used 4- and 5-year graduating cohorts. Where the new component called College, Career, Workforce and Military Readiness (CCWM) uses only the 4-year graduating cohort. The PFS component used a tiered set of base and bonus points where only students earning a remediation free ACT or SAT score, an honors diploma, or industry-recognized credential would receive a base point (1 point). Those students who earned a base point could then go on to earn one bonus point (0.3 points) for either earning a three or higher on at least one AP exam, earning a four or higher on at least one IB exam, or earning at least 3 college credits before leaving high school. Meaning a student could get a maximum of 1.3 points. The CCWM component now uses a single tier where all students earn one point for completing a measure, and there are no bonus points available. Making the maximum points possible for a student 1. In the years 2019-2020, 2020-2021, the PFS component percent required to receive a letter grade of C or higher was set at 93%. For our analysis purposes we will apply this same rule to

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
<p>Ohio provides technical assistance to its rural districts at multiple levels. All rural districts have access to an educational program consultant for their RLIS funding application and comprehensive improvement plan, as well as the State Rural Education Coordinator through the Office of Federal Programs (OFP). OFP provides regional training sessions three times throughout the year. There is a Fall regional training session for updates about federal programs and compliance items. In the Spring, there are two separate regional trainings provided. The first training is for districts to assist with their One Needs Assessments and One Plans (improvement plans) and navigating the EDSTEPS system to build and enter their plans. The second session is for completing their funding applications in the consolidated application system. The RLIS in the consolidated application is required to be linked to goals in One Plans (consolidated application). Ohio's REAP State Coordinator is also available for RLI districts to assist with the RLIS applications. During SY21-22, the REAP State Coordinator provided two technical assistance sessions for rural districts to attend during the Ohio Association for Administrators of State and Federal Education Programs (OAASFEP) conference and continues to partner with the State Rural Liaison to maintain the peer-to-peer network. The State Rural Education Coordinator also presents updates to the field quarterly through SST12's rural network. OFP has created a GovDelivery subscription email service for rural LEA contacts in 2022 as well. Rural districts in Ohio also receive support and technical assistance through the State Support Teams (SSTs) that are assigned to regional areas. Any RLIS district identified using State accountability measures with a status of Moderate with a letter grade of D or F, Intensive, or Academic Distress or that had a building identified with a Federal priority or focus status receives support from its SST in the development of its needs assessment and improvement plan. Ohio has transitioned state report cards to a star rating versus a letter grade, in 2021-2022, but the high level of support to rural districts has not changed. Beginning in FY18, a Rural Liaison became available to provide technical assistance to Ohio Appalachian rural districts to address any challenges, questions, and needs they may be experiencing. Through a process with focus groups with representatives from rural districts, four focus areas were identified for targeted technical support and development of peer-to-peer networks with other agencies. The four targeted areas are Human Capital, Opioid Crisis with Healthcare Services, Educational Technology, and Chronic Absenteeism. The Rural Liaison provides technical assistance through SST meetings and/or individual meetings with districts.</p>

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
<p>Ohio uses a funding formula to allocate funds to eligible rural low-income districts. Student average daily attendance (ADA) determines the funding allocation for RLIS districts. A student must be in attendance at the district more than 50% of the time to be counted in the district's ADA. This is to prevent a student from being counted twice when the student attends two districts within a year. For example, a student that attends part day at the public district and part of the day at in a technical-vocational district. Five percent of the SEA's RLIS funds are set aside for state administrative costs. The balance is then distributed by determining the total ADA at eligible RLIS districts then dividing that amount into the remaining SEA RLIS allocation to provide a per-pupil amount (PPA) for districts. In FY22, a total of 79 districts were eligible for the RLIS grant. The PPA amount for LEAs was \$27.83. The range of allocations was \$7,109.55 to \$112,025.77.</p>

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?	100

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 report.

Data Quality Comments

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

Populated with LEA-LEVEL FS131/DG614.

Number of SRSA- and Dual-eligible LEAs informed their SEA of an intent to utilize AFUA, under Section 5211 of the ESEA.	Percent of SRSA- and Dual-eligible LEAs informed their SEA of an intent to utilize AFUA, under Section 5211 of the ESEA.
0	0

STATE CERTIFICATION

**Did the State certify
this report?**

YES

**Date the State
certified**

5/25/2023 9:24:47 AM