

# CONSOLIDATED STATE PERFORMANCE REPORT:

Parts I and II

for

**STATE FORMULA GRANT PROGRAMS**  
under the  
**ELEMENTARY AND SECONDARY EDUCATION ACT**  
As amended by the  
**No Child Left Behind Act of 2001**

For reporting on

**School Year 2008-09**

**WISCONSIN**



**PART I DUE FRIDAY, DECEMBER 18, 2009**  
**PART II DUE FRIDAY, FEBRUARY 12, 2010**

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

## INTRODUCTION

Sections 9302 and 9303 of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act (ESEA), as amended by the No Child Left Behind Act of 2001 (NCLB) provide to States the option of applying for and reporting on multiple ESEA programs through a single consolidated application and report. Although a central, practical purpose of the Consolidated State Application and Report is to reduce "red tape" and burden on States, the Consolidated State Application and Report are also intended to have the important purpose of encouraging the integration of State, local, and ESEA programs in comprehensive planning and service delivery and enhancing the likelihood that the State will coordinate planning and service delivery across multiple State and local programs. The combined goal of all educational agencies—State, local, and Federal—is a more coherent, well-integrated educational plan that will result in improved teaching and learning. The Consolidated State Application and Report includes the following ESEA programs:

- Title I, Part A – Improving Basic Programs Operated by Local Educational Agencies
- Title I, Part B, Subpart 3 – William F. Goodling Even Start Family Literacy Programs
- Title I, Part C – Education of Migratory Children (Includes the Migrant Child Count)
- Title I, Part D – Prevention and Intervention Programs for Children and Youth Who Are Neglected, Delinquent, or At-Risk
- Title II, Part A – Improving Teacher Quality State Grants (Teacher and Principal Training and Recruiting Fund)
- Title III, Part A – English Language Acquisition, Language Enhancement, and Academic Achievement Act
- Title IV, Part A, Subpart 1 – Safe and Drug-Free Schools and Communities State Grants
- Title IV, Part A, Subpart 2 – Safe and Drug-Free Schools and Communities National Activities (Community Service Grant Program)
- Title V, Part A – Innovative Programs
- Title VI, Section 6111 – Grants for State Assessments and Related Activities
- Title VI, Part B – Rural Education Achievement Program
- Title X, Part C – Education for Homeless Children and Youths

The NCLB Consolidated State Performance Report (CSPR) for school year (SY) 2008-09 consists of two Parts, Part I and Part II.

### PART I

Part I of the CSPR requests information related to the five ESEA Goals, established in the June 2002 Consolidated State Application, and information required for the Annual State Report to the Secretary, as described in Section 1111(h)(4) of the ESEA. The five ESEA Goals established in the June 2002 Consolidated State Application are:

- **Performance Goal 1: By SY 2013-14, all students will reach high standards, at a minimum attaining proficiency or better in reading/language arts and mathematics.**
- **Performance Goal 2: All limited English proficient students will become proficient in English and reach high academic standards, at a minimum attaining proficiency or better in reading/language arts and mathematics.**
- **Performance Goal 3: By SY 2005-06, all students will be taught by highly qualified teachers.**
- **Performance Goal 4: All students will be educated in learning environments that are safe, drug free, and conducive to learning.**
- **Performance Goal 5: All students will graduate from high school.**

Beginning with the CSPR SY 2005-06 collection, the Education of Homeless Children and Youths was added. The Migrant Child count was added for the SY 2006-07 collection.

### PART II

Part II of the CSPR consists of information related to State activities and outcomes of specific ESEA programs. While the information requested varies from program to program, the specific information requested for this report meets the following criteria:

1. The information is needed for Department program performance plans or for other program needs.
2. The information is not available from another source, including program evaluations pending full implementation of required EDFacts submission.
3. The information will provide valid evidence of program outcomes or results.

## GENERAL INSTRUCTIONS AND TIMELINES

All States that received funding on the basis of the Consolidated State Application for the SY 2008-09 must respond to this Consolidated State Performance Report (CSPR). Part I of the Report is due to the Department by Friday, December 18, 2009. Part II of the Report is due to the Department by Friday, February 12, 2010. Both Part I and Part II should reflect data from the SY 2008-09, unless otherwise noted.

The format states will use to submit the Consolidated State Performance Report has changed to an online submission starting with SY 2004-05. This online submission system is being developed through the Education Data Exchange Network (EDEN) and will make the submission process less burdensome. Please see the following section on transmittal instructions for more information on how to submit this year's Consolidated State Performance Report.

### TRANSMITTAL INSTRUCTIONS

The Consolidated State Performance Report (CSPR) data will be collected online from the SEAs, using the EDEN web site. The EDEN web site will be modified to include a separate area (sub-domain) for CSPR data entry. This area will utilize EDEN formatting to the extent possible and the data will be entered in the order of the current CSPR forms. The data entry screens will include or provide access to all instructions and notes on the current CSPR forms; additionally, an effort will be made to design the screens to balance efficient data collection and reduction of visual clutter.

Initially, a state user will log onto EDEN and be provided with an option that takes him or her to the "SY 2008-09 CSPR". The main CSPR screen will allow the user to select the section of the CSPR that he or she needs to either view or enter data. After selecting a section of the CSPR, the user will be presented with a screen or set of screens where the user can input the data for that section of the CSPR. A user can only select one section of the CSPR at a time. After a state has included all available data in the designated sections of a particular CSPR Part, a lead state user will certify that Part and transmit it to the Department. Once a Part has been transmitted, ED will have access to the data. States may still make changes or additions to the transmitted data, by creating an updated version of the CSPR. Detailed instructions for transmitting the SY 2008-09 CSPR will be found on the main CSPR page of the EDEN web site (<https://EDEN.ED.GOV/EDENPortal/>).

According to the Paperwork Reduction Act of 1965, no persons are required to respond to a collection of information unless it displays a valid OMB control number. The valid OMB control number for this information collection is 1810-0614. The time required to complete this information collection is estimated to average 111 hours per response, including the time to review instructions, search existing data resources, gather the data needed, and complete and review the information collection. If you have any comments concerning the accuracy of the time estimates(s) contact School Support and Technology Programs, 400 Maryland Avenue, SW, Washington DC 20202-6140. Questions about the new electronic CSPR submission process, should be directed to the EDEN Partner Support Center at 1-877-HLPEDEN (1-877-457-3336).

OMB Number: 1810-0614

Expiration Date: 10/31/2010

Consolidated State Performance Report  
For  
State Formula Grant Programs  
under the  
Elementary And Secondary Education Act  
as amended by the  
No Child Left Behind Act of 2001

Check the one that indicates the report you are submitting:

Part I, 2008-09

Part II, 2008-09

Name of State Educational Agency (SEA) Submitting This Report:  
Wisconsin Department of Public Instruction

Address:  
125 South Webster Street, P.O. Box 7841  
Madison, WI 53707-7841

Person to contact about this report:

Name: Mary Jo Parman

Telephone: 608-266-2158

Fax: 608-266-5188

e-mail: maryjo.parman@dpi.wi.gov

Name of Authorizing State Official: (Print or Type):  
Michael J. Thompson

Wednesday, March 10, 2010, 5:02:44 PM

Signature

Date

**CONSOLIDATED STATE PERFORMANCE REPORT  
PART I**

For reporting on  
**School Year 2008-09**



**PART I DUE DECEMBER 18, 2009  
5PM EST**

## 1.1 STANDARDS AND ASSESSMENT DEVELOPMENT

### STANDARDS OF ASSESSMENT DEVELOPMENT

This section requests descriptions of the State's implementation of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act, as amended (ESEA) academic content standards, academic achievement standards and assessments to meet the requirements of Section 1111(b)(1) of ESEA.

#### 1.1.1 Academic Content Standards

In the space below, provide a description and timeline of any actions the State has taken or is planning to take to make revisions to or change the State's academic content standards in mathematics, reading/language arts or science. Responses should focus on actions taken or planned since the State's content standards were approved through ED's peer review process for State assessment systems. Indicate specifically in what school year your State expects the changes to be implemented.

If the State has not made or is not planning to make revisions or changes, respond "No revisions or changes to content standards made or planned."

The response is limited to 4,000 characters.

Revisions are underway to Wisconsin's Model Academic Standards in English language arts and mathematics:

Wisconsin's Department of Public Instruction (WDPI) began the revision of state standards in English language arts (ELA) and mathematics by joining both the American Diploma Project and the Partnership for 21st Century Skills in January 2007. In March 2007, WDPI convened a summit on education attended by 200 representatives of business, industry, labor, city and county government, state workforce development entities, and community-based organizations. The consensus was to embed in each subject area skills essential for 21st century citizens, such as critical thinking and problem solving, collaborative communication skills, contextual learning skills, responsibility, ethics, and adaptability.

In May 2007, Standards Design Teams were convened for English language arts and mathematics. The teams were charged with conducting the alignment process through the American Diploma Project while simultaneously engaging the assistance of the Partnership for 21st Century Skills. Consultants from Achieve and the Partnership provided specific critique of WI's existing standards and guidance on the revision process. Through this process the design teams had two lenses for developing the blueprint for revising Wisconsin's model academic standards.

In addition, a statewide Standards Leadership Team was convened, augmenting the State Superintendent's Collaborative Council with additional representatives of the business community and parents. The Leadership Team was charged with providing a policy perspective, responding to issues raised by the American Diploma Project (ADP), Partnership for 21st Century Skills (P21), and the standards design teams.

In June 2008, the leadership and design teams presented to the State Superintendent recommendations for revising the Wisconsin standards. These recommendations provided a blueprint for the second phase of the standards revision process: developing specific draft revisions.

Standards Writing Teams were convened in November 2008 to draft specific revisions of Wisconsin's model academic standards, combining rigor and relevance. Two rounds of input and broad review led to the development of draft revisions by June 2009. This document completed the official alignment process through the American Diploma Project. Achieve praised the Wisconsin standards as presenting "student-learning expectations that are intellectually demanding and well aligned with the ADP Benchmarks. ...In addition, the proposed Wisconsin Model Academic Standards (WMAS) for English Language Arts and (WMAS) for Mathematics include the complete subset of 22 ADP Core English Benchmarks and the complete subset of 34 ADP Core Mathematics Benchmarks that 19 other states that have completed the alignment process have deemed critical."

Wisconsin is reviewing the draft Common Core State Standards (K-12) and the College and Career Readiness Standards and preparing to use 100% of these standards in the final version of WI's model academic standards for English language arts and mathematics. WDPI will move to complete statewide input immediately following the release of the final version of the Common Core, which is currently targeted for February 2010. The state process is predicted to take three months following the finalization of the Common Core standards, ending with the State Superintendent's promulgation of new Wisconsin standards.

WDPI is participating in the Science Education Assessment project of CCSSO. This project is already linking with proposed efforts by Achieve to involve the National Academies of Science and other groups to outline a process for and begin development of common core standards for science. Wisconsin will coordinate its revision of Wisconsin model academic standards in science with the development of national common core standards for science.

Source – Manual input by the SEA using the online collection tool.

### 1.1.2 Assessments in Mathematics and Reading/Language Arts

In the space below, provide a description and timeline of any actions the State has taken or is planning to take to make revisions to or change the State's assessments and/or academic achievement standards in mathematics or reading/language arts required under Section 1111(b)(3) of ESEA. Responses should focus on actions taken or planned since the State's assessment system was approved through ED's peer review process. Responses also should indicate specifically in what school year your State expects the changes to be implemented.

As applicable, include any assessment (e.g., alternate assessments based on alternate achievement standards, alternate assessments based on modified achievement standards, native language assessments, or others) implemented to meet the assessment requirements under Section 1111(b)(3) of ESEA as well as alternate achievement standards for students with significant cognitive disabilities and modified academic achievement standards for certain students with disabilities implemented to meet the requirements of Section 1111(b)

(3) of ESEA. Indicate specifically in what year your state expects the changes to be implemented.

If the State has not made or is not planning to make revisions or changes, respond "No revisions or changes to assessments and/or academic achievement standards taken or planned."

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

Revisions or changes to assessments and/or academic achievement standards will be made following the timelines of the national initiatives.

Wisconsin expects to adopt the Common Core content standards and will have to design the new assessment system in relation to the common standards. In light of this, DPI is investigating whether to join a consortium of states that will share not only common standards, but also a common assessment or item bank. These conversations will continue, at a minimum, through Fall 2010 when the first round of ARRA grants are awarded to states.

The WI Department Public Instruction (DPI) convened the Next Generation Assessment Task Force to formulate Wisconsin's vision for a balanced system of assessment. We listened to leaders from business and technology sectors, as well as leaders from PK-12 and higher education. The task force reported out their process, definitions, assumptions, and recommendations and DPI plans to use these findings as a blueprint for the next generation of assessment in Wisconsin. The work of the task force highlighted the need to have internationally benchmarked standards working in concert with a balanced assessment system.

Our current assessment system consists of two standardized assessments: the Wisconsin Knowledge and Concepts Exam (WKCE) and the Wisconsin Alternate Assessment for Students with Disabilities (WAA-SwD). These summative assessments provide annual snapshots of student achievement in relation to state standards and fulfill state and federal mandates. The focus of these assessments is to gauge overall academic achievement of schools and districts across the state. Gleaning information at the student-level from these summative tests can be limited. As such, the task force concluded the need for a system of complementary assessments that includes formative strategies with benchmark assessment and summative assessment data. In short, it was recommended that Wisconsin move to a balanced assessment system that goes beyond annual, large-scale testing.

In August 2009, the new state superintendent announced the work of this task force would be the foundation of a new assessment system in Wisconsin. As such, DPI is moving to transform the statewide testing program in a number of ways. We expect the new system will be more responsive to students, teachers, and parent needs while also offering public accountability.

The WKCE will continue to be an important part of the state assessment system for two to three years. It will take about three years to have a fully operational test, depending on funding and opportunities to collaborate with other states, it is hoped field testing can occur in 2011-12 school year and begin operational testing in 2012-13. These new Next Generation assessments at the elementary and middle school level will likely be computer-based with multiple opportunities to benchmark student progress during the school year. At the high school level, the new assessments will provide more information on college and workforce readiness.

Source – Manual input by the SEA using the online collection tool.

### 1.1.4 Assessments in Science

If your State's assessments and academic achievement standards in science required under Section 1111(b)(3) of ESEA have been approved through ED's peer review process, provide in the space below a description and timeline of any actions the State has taken or is planning to take to make revisions to or change the State's assessments and/or academic achievement standards in science required under Section 1111(b)(3) of ESEA. Responses should focus on actions taken or planned since the State's assessment system was approved through ED's peer review process. Responses also should indicate specifically in what school year your State expects the changes to be implemented.

As applicable, include any assessment (e.g., alternate assessments based on alternate achievement standards, alternate assessments based on modified achievement standards, native language assessments, or others) implemented to meet the assessment requirements under Section 1111(b)(3) of ESEA as well as alternate achievement standards for students with significant cognitive disabilities and modified academic achievement standards for certain students with disabilities implemented to meet the requirements of Section 1111(b)(3) of ESEA.

If the State has not made or is not planning to make revisions or changes, respond "No revisions or changes to assessments and/or academic achievement standards taken or planned."

If the State's assessments in science required under Section 1111(b)(3) of ESEA have not been approved through ED's peer review process, respond "State's assessments and academic achievement standards in science not yet approved."

The response is limited to 4,000 characters.

• The Department of Public Instruction is participating in the Science Education Assessment project of CCSSO. This project is already linking with proposed efforts by Achieve to involve the National Academies of Science and other groups to outline a process for and begin development of common core standards for science. Wisconsin will coordinate its revision of Wisconsin model academic standards in science with the development of national common core standards for science. Revisions or changes to assessments and/or academic achievement standards will be made following the timeline of this national initiative.

Revisions or changes to assessments and/or academic achievement standards will be made following the timelines of the national initiatives.

Wisconsin expects to adopt the Common Core content standards and will have to design the new assessment system in relation to the common standards. In light of this, DPI is investigating whether to join a consortium of states that will share not only common standards, but also a common assessment or item bank. These conversations will continue, at a minimum, through Fall 2010 when the first round of ARRA grants are awarded to states.

The WI Department Public Instruction (DPI) convened the Next Generation Assessment Task Force to formulate Wisconsin's vision for a balanced system of assessment. We listened to leaders from business and technology sectors, as well as leaders from PK-12 and higher education. The task force reported out their process, definitions, assumptions, and recommendations and DPI plans to use these findings as a blueprint for the next generation of assessment in Wisconsin. The work of the task force highlighted the need to have internationally benchmarked standards working in concert with a balanced assessment system.

Our current assessment system consists of two standardized assessments: the Wisconsin Knowledge and Concepts Exam (WKCE) and the Wisconsin Alternate Assessment for Students with Disabilities (WAA-SwD). These summative assessments provide annual snapshots of student achievement in relation to state standards and fulfill state and federal mandates. The focus of these assessments is to gauge overall academic achievement of schools and districts across the state. Gleaning information at the student-level from these summative tests can be limited. As such, the task force concluded the need for a system of complementary assessments that includes formative strategies with benchmark assessment and summative assessment data. In short, it was recommended that Wisconsin move to a balanced assessment system that goes beyond annual, large-scale testing.

In August 2009, the new state superintendent announced the work of this task force would be the foundation of a new assessment system in Wisconsin. As such, DPI is moving to transform the statewide testing program in a number of ways. We expect the new system will be more responsive to students, teachers, and parent needs while also offering public accountability.

The WKCE will continue to be an important part of the state assessment system for two to three years. It will take about three years to have a fully operational test, depending on funding and opportunities to collaborate with other states, it is hoped field testing can occur in 2011-12 school year and begin operational testing in 2012-13. These new Next Generation assessments at the elementary and middle school level will likely be computer-based with multiple opportunities to benchmark student progress during the school year. At the high school level, the new assessments will provide more information on college and workforce readiness.

Source – Manual input by the SEA using the online collection tool.

## 1.2 PARTICIPATION IN STATE ASSESSMENTS

This section collects data on the participation of students in the State assessments.

### 1.2.1 Participation of all Students in Mathematics Assessment

In the table below, provide the number of students enrolled during the State's testing window for mathematics assessments required under Section 1111(b)(3) of ESEA (regardless of whether the students were present for a full academic year) and the number of students who participated in the mathematics assessment in accordance with ESEA. The percentage of students who were tested for mathematics will be calculated automatically.

*The student group "children with disabilities (IDEA)" includes children who participated in the regular assessments with or without accommodations and alternate assessments. Do not include former students with disabilities(IDEA). Do not include students only covered under Section 504 of the Rehabilitation Act of 1973.*

*The student group "limited English proficient (LEP) students" includes recently arrived students who have attended schools in the United States for fewer than 12 months. Do not include former LEP students.*

Student Group	# Students Enrolled	# Students Participating	Percentage of Students Participating
All students	434,292		>97%
American Indian or Alaska Native	6,351		>97%
Asian or Pacific Islander	15,925		>97%
Black, non-Hispanic	45,131		>97%
Hispanic	34,092		>97%
White, non-Hispanic	332,782		>97%
Children with disabilities (IDEA)	59,985		>97%
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	25,240		>97%
Economically disadvantaged students	150,537		>97%
Migratory students	714		>97%
Male	222,945		>97%
Female	211,341		>97%
<b>Comments:</b>			

Source – The table above is produced through EDFacts. The SEA submits the data in file N/X081 that includes data group 588, category sets A, B, C, D, E, and F, and subtotal 1. If the SEA has additional racial/ethnic groups or combinations of racial/ethnic groups in its accountability plan under NCLB, the SEA will report the above data for those groups through the online collection tool.

### 1.2.2 Participation of Students with Disabilities in Mathematics Assessment

In the table below, provide the number of children with disabilities (IDEA) participating during the State's testing window in mathematics assessments required under Section 1111(b)(3) of ESEA (regardless of whether the children were present for a full academic year) by the type of assessment. The percentage of children with disabilities (IDEA) who participated in the mathematics assessment for each assessment option will be calculated automatically. The total number of children with disabilities (IDEA) participating will also be calculated automatically.

The data provided below should include mathematics participation data from all students with disabilities as defined under the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act(IDEA). Do not include former students with disabilities (IDEA). Do not include students only covered under Section 504 of the Rehabilitation Act of 1973.

Type of Assessment	# Children with Disabilities (IDEA) Participating	Percentage of Children with Disabilities (IDEA) Participating, Who Took the Specified Assessment
Regular Assessment without Accommodations	18,238	30.7
Regular Assessment with Accommodations	35,911	60.4
Alternate Assessment Based on Grade-Level Achievement Standards		
Alternate Assessment Based on Modified Achievement Standards		
Alternate Assessment Based on Alternate Achievement Standards	5,306	8.9
Total	59,455	
<b>Comments:</b>		

### 1.2.3 Participation of All Students in the Reading/Language Arts Assessment

This section is similar to 1.2.1 and collects data on the State's reading/language arts assessment.

Student Group	# Students Enrolled	# Students Participating	Percentage of Students Participating
All students	434,292		>97%
American Indian or Alaska Native	6,351		>97%
Asian or Pacific Islander	15,925		>97%
Black, non-Hispanic	45,131		>97%
Hispanic	34,092	32,954	96.7
White, non-Hispanic	332,782		>97%
Children with disabilities (IDEA)	59,985		>97%
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	25,240	23,859	94.5
Economically disadvantaged students	150,537		>97%
Migratory students	714	660	92.4
Male	222,945		>97%
Female	211,341		>97%
<b>Comments: LEP students that are recent immigrants can be exempted from the Reading Assessment thereby producing a lower participation rate. The Migratory student population is very small during the cold months in WI.</b>			

Source – The same file specification as 1.2.1 is used, but with data group 589 instead of 588.

### 1.2.4 Participation of Students with Disabilities in Reading/Language Arts Assessment

This section is similar to 1.2.2 and collects data on the State's reading/language arts assessment.

The data provided should include reading/language arts participation data from all students with disabilities as defined under the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act (IDEA). Do not include former students with disabilities (IDEA). Do not include students only covered under Section 504 of the Rehabilitation Act of 1973.

Type of Assessment	# Children with Disabilities (IDEA) Participating	Percentage of Children with Disabilities (IDEA) Participating, Who Took the Specified Assessment
Regular Assessment without Accommodations	19,989	33.7
Regular Assessment with Accommodations	33,994	57.3
Alternate Assessment Based on Grade-Level Achievement Standards		
Alternate Assessment Based on Modified Achievement Standards		
Alternate Assessment Based on Alternate Achievement Standards	5,313	9.0
Total	59,296	
<b>Comments:</b>		

### 1.2.5 Participation of All Students in the Science Assessment

This section is similar to 1.2.1 and collects data on the State's science assessment.

Student Group	# Students Enrolled	# Students Participating	Percentage of Students Participating
All students	191,300		>97%
American Indian or Alaska Native	2,846		>97%
Asian or Pacific Islander	6,987		>97%
Black, non-Hispanic	19,525		>97%
Hispanic	14,183		>97%
White, non-Hispanic	147,756		>97%
Children with disabilities (IDEA)	26,301		>97%
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	9,905	9,584	96.8
Economically disadvantaged students	63,077		>97%
Migratory students	250	231	92.4
Male	98,271		>97%
Female	93,025		>97%
<b>Comments: The Migratory student population is very small during the cold months in WI.</b>			

Source – Manual input by the SEA using the online collection tool.

### 1.2.6 Participation of Students with Disabilities in Science Assessment

This section is similar to 1.2.2 and collects data on the State's science assessment.

The data provided should include science participation results from all students with disabilities as defined under the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act (IDEA). Do not include former students with disabilities (IDEA). Do not include students only covered under Section 504 of the Rehabilitation Act of 1973.

<b>Type of Assessment</b>	<b># Children with Disabilities (IDEA) Participating</b>	<b>Percentage of Children with Disabilities (IDEA) Participating, Who Took the Specified Assessment</b>
Regular Assessment without Accommodations	8,569	33.2
Regular Assessment with Accommodations	14,908	57.8
Alternate Assessment Based on Grade-Level Achievement Standards		
Alternate Assessment Based on Modified Achievement Standards		
Alternate Assessment Based on Alternate Achievement Standards	2,298	8.9
Total	25,775	
<b>Comments: Science is assessed at Grades 4, 8, and 10.</b>		

Source – Manual input by the SEA using the online collection tool.

### 1.3 STUDENT ACADEMIC ACHIEVEMENT

This section collects data on student academic achievement on the State assessments.

#### 1.3.1 Student Academic Achievement in Mathematics

In the format of the table below, provide the number of students who received a valid score on the State assessment(s) in mathematics implemented to meet the requirements of Section 1111(b)(3) of ESEA (regardless of whether the students were present for a full academic year) and for whom a proficiency level was assigned, and the number of these students who scored at or above proficient, in grades 3 through 8 and high school. The percentage of students who scored at or above proficient is calculated automatically.

The student group "children with disabilities (IDEA)" includes children who participated, and for whom a proficiency level was assigned in the regular assessments with or without accommodations and alternate assessments. Do not include former students with disabilities (IDEA). The student group "limited English proficient (LEP) students" does include recently arrived students who have attended schools in the United States for fewer than 12 months. Do not include former LEP students.

##### 1.3.1.1 Student Academic Achievement in Mathematics -Grade 3

<b>Grade 3</b>	<b># Students Who Received a Valid Score and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned</b>	<b># Students Scoring at or Above Proficient</b>	<b>Percentage of Students Scoring at or Above Proficient</b>
All students	60,826	46,486	76.4
American Indian or Alaska Native	879	537	61.1
Asian or Pacific Islander	2,296	1,723	75.0
Black, non-Hispanic	6,408	2,894	45.2
Hispanic	5,458	3,229	59.2
White, non-Hispanic	45,785	38,103	83.2
Children with disabilities (IDEA)	8,246	4,445	53.9
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	4,730	2,798	59.2
Economically disadvantaged students	23,096	14,102	61.1
Migratory students	124	78	62.9
Male	31,255	23,926	76.6
Female	29,571	22,560	76.3
<b>Comments: due to small numbers of migratory students</b>			

Source – Initially populated from EDFacts. See Attachment D: CSPR & EDFacts Data Crosswalk. If the SEA has additional racial/ethnic groups or combinations of racial/ethnic groups in its accountability plan under NCLB, the SEA will report the above data for those groups through the online collection tool.

##### 1.3.2.1 Student Academic Achievement in Reading/Language Arts -Grade 3

<b>Grade 3</b>	<b># Students Who Received a Valid Score and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned</b>	<b># Students Scoring at or Above Proficient</b>	<b>Percentage of Students Scoring at or Above Proficient</b>
All students	60,539	48,123	79.5
American Indian or Alaska Native	877	595	67.8
Asian or Pacific Islander	2,260	1,681	74.4
Black, non-Hispanic	6,407	3,584	55.9
Hispanic	5,228	3,347	64.0
White, non-Hispanic	45,767	38,916	85.0
Children with disabilities (IDEA)	8,200	4,080	49.8
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	4,460	2,673	59.9
Economically disadvantaged students	22,841	14,994	65.6
Migratory students	114	85	74.6
Male	31,083	23,729	76.3
Female	29,456	24,394	82.8
<b>Comments: due to small numbers of migratory students</b>			

Source – Initially populated from EDFacts. See Attachment D: CSPR & EDFacts Data Crosswalk. If the SEA has additional racial/ethnic groups or combinations of racial/ethnic groups in its accountability plan under NCLB, the SEA will report the above data for those groups through the online collection tool.

**1.3.3.1 Student Academic Achievement in Science -Grade 3**

<b>Grade 3</b>	<b># Students Who Received a Valid Score and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned</b>	<b># Students Scoring at or Above Proficient</b>	<b>Percentage of Students Scoring at or Above Proficient</b>
All students			
American Indian or Alaska Native			
Asian or Pacific Islander			
Black, non-Hispanic			
Hispanic			
White, non-Hispanic			
Children with disabilities (IDEA)			
Limited English proficient (LEP) students			
Economically disadvantaged students			
Migratory students			
Male			
Female			
<b>Comments:</b>			

Source – Manual input by the SEA using the online collection tool. If the SEA has additional racial/ethnic groups or combinations of racial/ethnic groups in its accountability plan under NCLB, the SEA will report the above data for those groups through the online CSPR collection tool.

**1.3.1.2 Student Academic Achievement in Mathematics -Grade 4**

<b>Grade 4</b>	<b># Students Who Received a Valid Score and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned</b>	<b># Students Scoring at or Above Proficient</b>	<b>Percentage of Students Scoring at or Above Proficient</b>
All students	60,208	48,901	81.2
American Indian or Alaska Native	906	654	72.2
Asian or Pacific Islander	2,212	1,767	79.9
Black, non-Hispanic	6,471	3,562	55.0
Hispanic	5,422	3,618	66.7
White, non-Hispanic	45,197	39,300	87.0
Children with disabilities (IDEA)	8,557	4,877	57.0
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	4,264	2,746	64.4
Economically disadvantaged students	22,618	15,398	68.1
Migratory students	123	98	79.7
Male	30,945	25,345	81.9
Female	29,261	23,556	80.5
<b>Comments:</b>			

Source – Initially populated from ED Facts. See Attachment D: C SPR & ED Facts Data Crosswalk. If the SEA has additional racial/ethnic groups or combinations of racial/ethnic groups in its accountability plan under NCLB, the SEA will report the above data for those groups through the online collection tool.

### 1.3.2.2 Student Academic Achievement in Reading/Language Arts -Grade 4

<b>Grade 4</b>	<b># Students Who Received a Valid Score and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned</b>	<b># Students Scoring at or Above Proficient</b>	<b>Percentage of Students Scoring at or Above Proficient</b>
All students	60,027	49,226	82.0
American Indian or Alaska Native	905	670	74.0
Asian or Pacific Islander	2,172	1,669	76.8
Black, non-Hispanic	6,465	3,828	59.2
Hispanic	5,281	3,548	67.2
White, non-Hispanic	45,204	39,511	87.4
Children with disabilities (IDEA)	8,524	4,268	50.1
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	4,067	2,475	60.9
Economically disadvantaged students	22,456	15,468	68.9
Migratory students	120	93	77.5
Male	30,852	24,542	79.6
Female	29,173	24,684	84.6
<b>Comments:</b>			

Source – Initially populated from EDFacts. See Attachment D: CSPR & EDFacts Data Crosswalk. If the SEA has additional racial/ethnic groups or combinations of racial/ethnic groups in its accountability plan under NCLB, the SEA will report the above data for those groups through the online collection tool.

### 1.3.3.2 Student Academic Achievement in Science -Grade 4

<b>Grade 4</b>	<b># Students Who Received a Valid Score and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned</b>	<b># Students Scoring at or Above Proficient</b>	<b>Percentage of Students Scoring at or Above Proficient</b>
All students	60,087	45,909	76.4
American Indian or Alaska Native	906	606	66.9
Asian or Pacific Islander	2,194	1,547	70.5
Black, non-Hispanic	6,445	2,913	45.2
Hispanic	5,343	3,190	59.7
White, non-Hispanic	45,199	37,653	83.3
Children with disabilities (IDEA)	8,520	5,019	58.9
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	4,170	2,275	54.6
Economically disadvantaged students	22,509	13,722	61.0
Migratory students	120	86	71.7
Male	30,867	23,502	76.1
Female	29,218	22,407	76.7
<b>Comments:</b>			

Source – Manual input by the SEA using the online collection tool. If the SEA has additional racial/ethnic groups or combinations of racial/ethnic groups in its accountability plan under NCLB, the SEA will report the above data for those groups through the online CSPR collection tool.

### 1.3.1.3 Student Academic Achievement in Mathematics -Grade 5

<b>Grade 5</b>	<b># Students Who Received a Valid Score and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned</b>	<b># Students Scoring at or Above Proficient</b>	<b>Percentage of Students Scoring at or Above Proficient</b>
All students	60,076	47,266	78.7
American Indian or Alaska Native	885	583	65.9
Asian or Pacific Islander	2,141	1,705	79.6
Black, non-Hispanic	6,442	3,221	50.0
Hispanic	5,026	3,226	64.2
White, non-Hispanic	45,581	38,531	84.5
Children with disabilities (IDEA)	8,519	4,259	50.0
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	3,745	2,229	59.5
Economically disadvantaged students	22,030	14,058	63.8
Migratory students	149	113	75.8
Male	30,832	24,253	78.7
Female	29,244	23,013	78.7
<b>Comments:</b>			

Source – Initially populated from EDFacts. See Attachment D: CSPR & EDFacts Data Crosswalk. If the SEA has additional racial/ethnic groups or combinations of racial/ethnic groups in its accountability plan under NCLB, the SEA will report the above data for those groups through the online collection tool.

### 1.3.2.3 Student Academic Achievement in Reading/Language Arts -Grade 5

<b>Grade 5</b>	<b># Students Who Received a Valid Score and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned</b>	<b># Students Scoring at or Above Proficient</b>	<b>Percentage of Students Scoring at or Above Proficient</b>
All students	59,915	48,757	81.4
American Indian or Alaska Native	884	642	72.6
Asian or Pacific Islander	2,111	1,581	74.9
Black, non-Hispanic	6,442	3,721	57.8
Hispanic	4,904	3,307	67.4
White, non-Hispanic	45,573	39,505	86.7
Children with disabilities (IDEA)	8,505	3,968	46.6
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	3,583	2,014	56.2
Economically disadvantaged students	21,898	14,871	67.9
Migratory students	141	107	75.9
Male	30,749	24,307	79.0
Female	29,166	24,450	83.8
<b>Comments:</b>			

Source – Initially populated from EDFacts. See Attachment D: CSPR & EDFacts Data Crosswalk. If the SEA has additional racial/ethnic groups or combinations of racial/ethnic groups in its accountability plan under NCLB, the SEA will report the above data for those groups through the online collection tool.

**1.3.3.3 Student Academic Achievement in Science -Grade 5**

<b>Grade 5</b>	<b># Students Who Received a Valid Score and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned</b>	<b># Students Scoring at or Above Proficient</b>	<b>Percentage of Students Scoring at or Above Proficient</b>
All students			
American Indian or Alaska Native			
Asian or Pacific Islander			
Black, non-Hispanic			
Hispanic			
White, non-Hispanic			
Children with disabilities (IDEA)			
Limited English proficient (LEP) students			
Economically disadvantaged students			
Migratory students			
Male			
Female			
<b>Comments: Science is only tested at grades 4, 8, 10!</b>			

Source – Manual input by the SEA using the online collection tool. If the SEA has additional racial/ethnic groups or combinations of racial/ethnic groups in its accountability plan under NCLB, the SEA will report the above data for those groups through the online CSPR collection tool.

**1.3.1.4 Student Academic Achievement in Mathematics -Grade 6**

<b>Grade 6</b>	<b># Students Who Received a Valid Score and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned</b>	<b># Students Scoring at or Above Proficient</b>	<b>Percentage of Students Scoring at or Above Proficient</b>
All students	60,156	46,115	76.7
American Indian or Alaska Native	848	514	60.6
Asian or Pacific Islander	2,184	1,687	77.2
Black, non-Hispanic	6,305	2,801	44.4
Hispanic	4,773	2,829	59.3
White, non-Hispanic	46,040	38,283	83.2
Children with disabilities (IDEA)	8,228	3,433	41.7
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	3,447	1,789	51.9
Economically disadvantaged students	21,261	12,718	59.8
Migratory students	110	65	59.1
Male	30,743	23,383	76.1
Female	29,412	22,732	77.3
<b>Comments:</b>			

Source – Initially populated from EDFacts. See Attachment D: CSPR & EDFacts Data Crosswalk. If the SEA has additional racial/ethnic groups or combinations of racial/ethnic groups in its accountability plan under NCLB, the SEA will report the above data for those groups through the online collection tool.

### 1.3.2.4 Student Academic Achievement in Reading/Language Arts -Grade 6

<b>Grade 6</b>	<b># Students Who Received a Valid Score and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned</b>	<b># Students Scoring at or Above Proficient</b>	<b>Percentage of Students Scoring at or Above Proficient</b>
All students	59,996	50,218	83.7
American Indian or Alaska Native	849	635	74.8
Asian or Pacific Islander	2,146	1,658	77.3
Black, non-Hispanic	6,304	3,742	59.4
Hispanic	4,658	3,211	68.9
White, non-Hispanic	46,033	40,970	89.0
Children with disabilities (IDEA)	8,208	3,866	47.1
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	3,278	1,857	56.6
Economically disadvantaged students	21,134	14,781	69.9
Migratory students	101	64	63.4
Male	30,673	24,737	80.6
Female	29,322	25,480	86.9
<b>Comments:</b>			

Source – Initially populated from EDFacts. See Attachment D: CSPR & EDFacts Data Crosswalk. If the SEA has additional racial/ethnic groups or combinations of racial/ethnic groups in its accountability plan under NCLB, the SEA will report the above data for those groups through the online collection tool.

### 1.3.3.4 Student Academic Achievement in Science -Grade 6

<b>Grade 6</b>	<b># Students Who Received a Valid Score and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned</b>	<b># Students Scoring at or Above Proficient</b>	<b>Percentage of Students Scoring at or Above Proficient</b>
All students			
American Indian or Alaska Native			
Asian or Pacific Islander			
Black, non-Hispanic			
Hispanic			
White, non-Hispanic			
Children with disabilities (IDEA)			
Limited English proficient (LEP) students			
Economically disadvantaged students			
Migratory students			
Male			
Female			
<b>Comments:</b>			

Source – Manual input by the SEA using the online collection tool. If the SEA has additional racial/ethnic groups or combinations of racial/ethnic groups in its accountability plan under NCLB, the SEA will report the above data for those groups through the online CSPR collection tool.

### 1.3.1.5 Student Academic Achievement in Mathematics -Grade 7

<b>Grade 7</b>	<b># Students Who Received a Valid Score and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned</b>	<b># Students Scoring at or Above Proficient</b>	<b>Percentage of Students Scoring at or Above Proficient</b>
All students	61,472	48,150	78.3
American Indian or Alaska Native	880	563	64.0
Asian or Pacific Islander	2,299	1,841	80.1
Black, non-Hispanic	6,339	2,820	44.5
Hispanic	4,594	2,889	62.9
White, non-Hispanic	47,359	40,037	84.5
Children with disabilities (IDEA)	8,505	3,529	41.5
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	3,373	1,932	57.3
Economically disadvantaged students	20,809	12,770	61.4
Migratory students	77	43	55.8
Male	31,554	24,474	77.6
Female	29,917	23,676	79.1
<b>Comments:</b>			

Source – Initially populated from EDFacts. See Attachment D: CSPR & EDFacts Data Crosswalk. If the SEA has additional racial/ethnic groups or combinations of racial/ethnic groups in its accountability plan under NCLB, the SEA will report the above data for those groups through the online collection tool.

### 1.3.2.5 Student Academic Achievement in Reading/Language Arts -Grade 7

<b>Grade 7</b>	<b># Students Who Received a Valid Score and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned</b>	<b># Students Scoring at or Above Proficient</b>	<b>Percentage of Students Scoring at or Above Proficient</b>
All students	61,322	52,785	86.1
American Indian or Alaska Native	881	681	77.3
Asian or Pacific Islander	2,270	1,786	78.7
Black, non-Hispanic	6,338	4,092	64.6
Hispanic	4,485	3,283	73.2
White, non-Hispanic	47,347	42,943	90.7
Children with disabilities (IDEA)	8,487	4,297	50.6
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	3,223	1,951	60.5
Economically disadvantaged students	20,676	15,297	74.0
Migratory students	70	45	64.3
Male	31,473	26,345	83.7
Female	29,848	26,440	88.6
<b>Comments:</b>			

Source – Initially populated from EDFacts. See Attachment D: CSPR & EDFacts Data Crosswalk. If the SEA has additional racial/ethnic groups or combinations of racial/ethnic groups in its accountability plan under NCLB, the SEA will report the above data for those groups through the online collection tool.

**1.3.3.5 Student Academic Achievement in Science -Grade 7**

<b>Grade 7</b>	<b># Students Who Received a Valid Score and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned</b>	<b># Students Scoring at or Above Proficient</b>	<b>Percentage of Students Scoring at or Above Proficient</b>
All students			
American Indian or Alaska Native			
Asian or Pacific Islander			
Black, non-Hispanic			
Hispanic			
White, non-Hispanic			
Children with disabilities (IDEA)			
Limited English proficient (LEP) students			
Economically disadvantaged students			
Migratory students			
Male			
Female			
<b>Comments:</b>			

Source – Manual input by the SEA using the online collection tool. If the SEA has additional racial/ethnic groups or combinations of racial/ethnic groups in its accountability plan under NCLB, the SEA will report the above data for those groups through the online CSPR collection tool.

**1.3.1.6 Student Academic Achievement in Mathematics -Grade 8**

<b>Grade 8</b>	<b># Students Who Received a Valid Score and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned</b>	<b># Students Scoring at or Above Proficient</b>	<b>Percentage of Students Scoring at or Above Proficient</b>
All students	62,037	48,781	78.6
American Indian or Alaska Native	870	565	64.9
Asian or Pacific Islander	2,285	1,806	79.0
Black, non-Hispanic	6,477	3,003	46.4
Hispanic	4,529	2,741	60.5
White, non-Hispanic	47,876	40,666	84.9
Children with disabilities (IDEA)	8,510	3,539	41.6
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	3,159	1,698	53.8
Economically disadvantaged students	20,547	12,668	61.6
Migratory students	83	39	47.0
Male	31,786	24,998	78.6
Female	30,251	23,783	78.6
<b>Comments:</b>			

Source – Initially populated from ED Facts. See Attachment D: C SPR & ED Facts Data Crosswalk. If the SEA has additional racial/ethnic groups or combinations of racial/ethnic groups in its accountability plan under NCLB, the SEA will report the above data for those groups through the online collection tool.

### 1.3.2.6 Student Academic Achievement in Reading/Language Arts -Grade 8

<b>Grade 8</b>	<b># Students Who Received a Valid Score and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned</b>	<b># Students Scoring at or Above Proficient</b>	<b>Percentage of Students Scoring at or Above Proficient</b>
All students	61,887	52,741	85.2
American Indian or Alaska Native	872	665	76.3
Asian or Pacific Islander	2,254	1,834	81.4
Black, non-Hispanic	6,473	4,049	62.6
Hispanic	4,417	3,188	72.2
White, non-Hispanic	47,871	43,005	89.8
Children with disabilities (IDEA)	8,485	4,142	48.8
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	3,008	1,840	61.2
Economically disadvantaged students	20,415	14,756	72.3
Migratory students	79	48	60.8
Male	31,707	26,044	82.1
Female	30,180	26,697	88.5
<b>Comments:</b>			

Source – Initially populated from EDFacts. See Attachment D: CSPR & EDFacts Data Crosswalk. If the SEA has additional racial/ethnic groups or combinations of racial/ethnic groups in its accountability plan under NCLB, the SEA will report the above data for those groups through the online collection tool.

### 1.3.3.6 Student Academic Achievement in Science -Grade 8

<b>Grade 8</b>	<b># Students Who Received a Valid Score and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned</b>	<b># Students Scoring at or Above Proficient</b>	<b>Percentage of Students Scoring at or Above Proficient</b>
All students	61,868	47,145	76.2
American Indian or Alaska Native	868	520	59.9
Asian or Pacific Islander	2,267	1,579	69.6
Black, non-Hispanic	6,416	2,759	43.0
Hispanic	4,476	2,496	55.8
White, non-Hispanic	47,841	39,791	83.2
Children with disabilities (IDEA)	8,459	3,802	45.0
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	3,095	1,362	44.0
Economically disadvantaged students	20,419	11,823	57.9
Migratory students	76	34	44.7
Male	31,689	23,977	75.7
Female	30,179	23,168	76.8
<b>Comments:</b>			

Source – Manual input by the SEA using the online collection tool. If the SEA has additional racial/ethnic groups or combinations of racial/ethnic groups in its accountability plan under NCLB, the SEA will report the above data for those groups through the online CSPR collection tool.

### 1.3.1.7 Student Academic Achievement in Mathematics -High School

High School	# Students Who Received a Valid Score and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned	# Students Scoring at or Above Proficient	Percentage of Students Scoring at or Above Proficient
All students	67,923	47,585	70.1
American Indian or Alaska Native	1,033	545	52.8
Asian or Pacific Islander	2,454	1,614	65.8
Black, non-Hispanic	6,223	1,719	27.6
Hispanic	4,101	1,887	46.0
White, non-Hispanic	54,110	41,820	77.3
Children with disabilities (IDEA)	8,890	2,503	28.2
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	2,407	786	32.6
Economically disadvantaged students	19,301	9,151	47.4
Migratory students	41	15	36.6
Male	34,872	24,695	70.8
Female	33,051	22,890	69.3
<b>Comments:</b>			

Source – Initially populated from EDFacts. See Attachment D: CSPR & EDFacts Data Crosswalk. If the SEA has additional racial/ethnic groups or combinations of racial/ethnic groups in its accountability plan under NCLB, the SEA will report the above data for those groups through the online collection tool.

### 1.3.2.7 Student Academic Achievement in Reading/Language Arts -High School

High School	# Students Who Received a Valid Score and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned	# Students Scoring at or Above Proficient	Percentage of Students Scoring at or Above Proficient
All students	67,751	51,497	76.0
American Indian or Alaska Native	1,038	617	59.4
Asian or Pacific Islander	2,415	1,558	64.5
Black, non-Hispanic	6,243	2,678	42.9
Hispanic	3,981	2,221	55.8
White, non-Hispanic	54,072	44,422	82.2
Children with disabilities (IDEA)	8,887	3,128	35.2
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	2,240	735	32.8
Economically disadvantaged students	19,181	10,908	56.9
Migratory students	35	21	60.0
Male	34,792	25,468	73.2
Female	32,959	26,029	79.0
<b>Comments:</b>			

Source – Initially populated from EDFacts. See Attachment D: CSPR & EDFacts Data Crosswalk. If the SEA has additional racial/ethnic groups or combinations of racial/ethnic groups in its accountability plan under NCLB, the SEA will report the above data for those groups through the online collection tool.

### 1.3.3.7 Student Academic Achievement in Science -High School

<b>High School</b>	<b># Students Who Received a Valid Score and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned</b>	<b># Students Scoring at or Above Proficient</b>	<b>Percentage of Students Scoring at or Above Proficient</b>
All students	67,599	49,339	73.0
American Indian or Alaska Native	1,027	565	55.0
Asian or Pacific Islander	2,432	1,572	64.6
Black, non-Hispanic	6,106	1,851	30.3
Hispanic	4,008	1,922	48.0
White, non-Hispanic	54,025	43,428	80.4
Children with disabilities (IDEA)	8,796	3,336	37.9
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	2,319	682	29.4
Economically disadvantaged students	19,077	9,776	51.2
Migratory students	35	16	45.7
Male	34,693	25,771	74.3
Female	32,906	23,568	71.6
<b>Comments:</b>			

Source – Manual input by the SEA using the online collection tool. If the SEA has additional racial/ethnic groups or combinations of racial/ethnic groups in its accountability plan under NCLB, the SEA will report the above data for those groups through the online CSPR collection tool.

#### 1.4 SCHOOL AND DISTRICT ACCOUNTABILITY

This section collects data on the Adequate Yearly Progress (AYP) status of schools and districts.

##### 1.4.1 All Schools and Districts Accountability

In the table below, provide the total number of public elementary and secondary schools and districts in the State, including charters, and the total number of those schools and districts that made AYP based on data for the SY 2008-09. The percentage that made AYP will be calculated automatically.

Entity	Total #	Total # that Made AYP in SY 2008-09	Percentage that Made AYP in SY 2008-09
Schools	2,156	2,011	93.3
Districts	426	422	99.1
<b>Comments: Schools with Enrollment in any grades K-12.</b>			

Source – The table above is produced through ED Facts. The SEA submits the data in N/X103 for data group 32.

##### 1.4.2 Title I School Accountability

In the table below, provide the total number of public Title I schools by type and the total number of those schools that made AYP based on data for the SY 2008-09 school year. Include only public Title I schools. Do not include Title I programs operated by local educational agencies in private schools. The percentage that made AYP will be calculated automatically.

Title I School	# Title I Schools	# Title I Schools that Made AYP in SY 2008-09	Percentage of Title I Schools that Made AYP in SY 2008-09
All Title I schools	1,152	1,048	91.0
Schoolwide (SWP) Title I schools	375	287	76.5
Targeted assistance (TAS) Title I schools	777	761	97.9
<b>Comments:</b>			

Source – The table above is produced through ED Facts. The SEA submits the data in N/X129 for data group 22 and N/X103 for data group 32.

##### 1.4.3 Accountability of Districts That Received Title I Funds

In the table below, provide the total number of districts that received Title I funds and the total number of those districts that made AYP based on data for SY 2008-09. The percentage that made AYP will be calculated automatically.

# Districts That Received Title I Funds	# Districts That Received Title I Funds and Made AYP in SY 2008-09	Percentage of Districts That Received Title I Funds and Made AYP in SY 2008-09
416	412	99.0
<b>Comments: Only 10 of 426 districts don't receive Title I funds.</b>		

Source – Initially populated from ED Facts. See Attachment D: CSPR & ED Facts Data Crosswalk.

Note: DG 582 is not collected from the SEA, rather it comes from the Title I funding data.

## 1.4.4 Title I Schools Identified for Improvement

### 1.4.4.1 List of Title I Schools Identified for Improvement

In the following table, provide a list of Title I schools identified for improvement, corrective action, or restructuring under Section 1116 for the SY 2009-10 based on the data from SY 2008-09. For each school on the list, provide the following:

- District Name
- District NCES ID Code
- School Name
- School NCES ID Code
- Whether the school met the proficiency target in reading/language arts as outlined in the State's Accountability Plan
- Whether the school met the participation rate target for the reading/language arts assessment
- Whether the school met the proficiency target in mathematics as outlined in the State's Accountability Plan
- Whether the school met the participation rate target for the mathematics assessment
- Whether the school met the other academic indicator for elementary/middle schools (if applicable) as outlined in the State's Accountability Plan
  
- Whether the school met the graduation rate for high schools (if applicable) as outlined in the State's Accountability Plan
- Improvement status for SY <> (Use one of the following improvement status designations: School Improvement <sup>1</sup> Year 1, School Improvement <sup>1</sup> Year 2, Corrective Action, Restructuring Year 1 (planning), or Restructuring Year 2 (implementing))
- Whether (yes or no) the school is or is not a Title I school (This column must be completed by States that choose to list all schools in improvement. Column is optional for States that list only Title I schools.)
- Whether (yes or no) the school was provided assistance through 1003(a).
- Whether (yes or no) the school was provided assistance through 1003 (g).

See attached for blank template that can be used to enter school data.

Download template: [Question 1.4.4.1 \(Get MS Excel Viewer\)](#)

Source – Manual entry by SEA into the online collection tool.

<sup>1</sup> The school improvement statuses are defined in LEA and School Improvement Non-Regulatory Guidance. This document may be found on the Department's Web page at <http://www.ed.gov/policy/elsec/guid/schoolimprovementguid.doc>.

#### 1.4.4.3 Corrective Action

In the table below, for schools in corrective action, provide the number of schools for which the listed corrective actions under ESEA were implemented in SY 2008-09 (based on SY 2007-08 assessments under Section 1111 of ESEA).

Corrective Action	# of Title I Schools in Corrective Action in Which the Corrective Action was Implemented in SY 2008-09
Required implementation of a new research-based curriculum or instructional program	7
Extension of the school year or school day	0
Replacement of staff members relevant to the school's low performance	1
Significant decrease in management authority at the school level	7
Replacement of the principal	1
Restructuring the internal organization of the school	4
Appointment of an outside expert to advise the school	2
<b>Comments: levels 3/4.</b>	

#### 1.4.4.4 Restructuring – Year 2

In the table below, for schools in restructuring – year 2 (implementation year), provide the number of schools for which the listed restructuring actions under ESEA were implemented in SY 2008-09 (based on SY 2007-08 assessments under Section 1111 of ESEA).

Restructuring Action	# of Title I Schools in Restructuring in Which Restructuring Action Is Being Implemented
Replacement of all or most of the school staff (which may include the principal)	2
Reopening the school as a public charter school	0
Entering into a contract with a private entity to operate the school	0
Take over the school by the State	0
Other major restructuring of the school governance	0
<b>Comments: Three SIFI schools in restructuring-year 2 (implementation) have implemented First Things First</b>	

In the space below, list specifically the "other major restructuring of the school governance" action(s) that were implemented.

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

## 1.4.5 Districts That Received Title I Funds Identified for Improvement

### 1.4.5.1 List of Districts That Received Title I Funds and Were Identified for Improvement

In the following table, provide a list of districts that received Title I funds and were identified for improvement or corrective action under Section 1116 for the SY 2009-10 based on the data from SY 2008-09. For each district on the list, provide the following:

- District Name
- District NCES ID Code
- Whether the district met the proficiency target in reading/language arts as outlined in the State's Accountability Plan
- Whether the district met the participation rate target for the reading/language arts assessment
- Whether the district met the proficiency target in mathematics as outlined in the State's Accountability Plan
- Whether the school met the participation rate target for the mathematics assessment
- Whether the district met the other academic indicator for elementary/middle schools (if applicable) as outlined in the State's Accountability Plan
  
- Whether the district met the graduation rate for high schools (if applicable) as outlined in the State's Accountability Plan
- Improvement status for SY 2009-10 (Use one of the following improvement status designations: Improvement or Corrective Action )
- Whether the district is a district that received Title I funds. Indicate "Yes" if the district received Title I funds and "No" if the district did not receive Title I funds. (This column **must be completed by States that choose to list all districts or all districts in improvement. This column is optional for States that list only** districts in improvement that receive Title I funds.)

See attached for blank template that can be used to enter district data.

Download template: [Question 1.4.5.1 \(Get MS Excel Viewer\)](#)

Source – Manual entry by SEA into the online collection tool.

<sup>2</sup> The district improvement statuses are defined in LEA and School Improvement Non-Regulatory Guidance. This document may be found on the Department's Web page at <http://www.ed.gov/policy/elsec/guid/schoolimprovementguid.doc>.

#### 1.4.5.2 Actions Taken for Districts That Received Title I Funds and Were Identified for Improvement

In the space below, briefly describe the measures being taken to address the achievement problems of districts identified for improvement or corrective action. Include a discussion of the technical assistance provided by the State (e.g., the number of districts served, the nature and duration of assistance provided, etc.).

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

Wisconsin has one district Identified for Improvement and one district in Corrective Action. The district Identified for Improvement received telephone technical assistance in completing the district improvement plan, required set-asides for professional development and parent notification.

The district in Corrective Action must implement the following.

To raise achievement, close achievement gaps, and ensure that every MPS student graduates from high school, specific corrective actions are required to:

I. Increase Student Attendance through Collaborative Community-wide Solutions.

A. Form school and district parent action teams that build upon current efforts by using the nine cluster infrastructure to focus on regular attendance for all students in all MPS schools.

1. Coordinate with the DPI VISTA project to use resources, including VISTA members assigned to the Milwaukee-based Parents Plus of Wisconsin, to support each cluster.

2. Coordinate support for parent engagement with the Milwaukee Innovation and Improvement Advisory Council.

B. Collaborate and partner with the Milwaukee Innovation and Improvement Advisory Council to involve community organizations and non-

profits in efforts to raise regular school attendance.

C. Coordinate the work of City Year mentors with other efforts to improve attendance.

D. Sustain and improve current Community Learning Centers, employing highly qualified teachers to provide academic tutoring in reading and mathematics to students with greatest needs.

E. Implement before-and/or after-school tutoring in English/language arts and mathematics in all Title I SIFI schools.

F. Implement a 9th grade support program in all high schools to ensure successful transition to high school.

G. Implement a credit recovery program in all high schools for all students who are credit-deficient.

II. Ensure a System of Quality and Consistency in Curriculum, Instruction, and Assessment Using a System of Early Intervening Services (EIS) PK-12 for All Students. The system must be approved by the independent expert appointed by the federal district court to carry out the Jamie S. settlement and must include the following:

A. Instruction in reading, mathematics, and positive behaviors for all students based on state standards, maximizing instructional time, using scientific research-based curricula provided by effective teachers, and monitored for implementation integrity.

1. Implement 90-minute reading block and 60-minute mathematics block for grades K-3, 60 minute blocks in reading and mathematics in grades 4-8, and reading intervention courses for grades 9-12 in all schools.

2. Implement the comprehensive district-wide plan for literacy that is standards-based, articulated across levels, and uses a limited number

of programs which was part of the 2008-09 Corrective Action Requirements.

3. Continue implementation of a district-wide plan for mathematics instruction that uses a limited number of programs.

4. Develop a district-wide assessment policy and system which includes standards-based formative, benchmark, and summative assessment that allows analysis and reporting at the student, classroom, and school levels.

B. Universal screening of all students on reading, mathematics, and behavior, conducted at least three times a year, to determine levels of need, and progress in performance in core instruction.

C. Scientific research-based interventions (small group and customized) for reading, mathematics, and positive behavior provided to students based on measured relative need and implemented with integrity.

1. Summer school with mathematics and reading focus in all Title I schools identified for improvement (SIFI).

2. Extended calendars of a minimum of 30 additional days of instruction in one or two Title I SIFI schools must be implemented by the beginning of the 2010-11 school year.

D. Progress monitoring (two measures -performance and implementation integrity) for interventions that yield reliable and valid measures used by the school to determine the needed level of intensity of service, degree of implementation, and effectiveness of each specific intervention.

E. Parent/family/community involvement efforts of school personnel that inform about specific services being provided, solicits input for continuous improvement, actively involves the community in the operation of EIS, and measures the involvement of families over time. F.

Professional development for educators based on National Staff Development Council Standards including measured needs of the school

that ensure improvement in student performance. G. Educational leadership that effectively manages all components of a system of early intervening services, maximizes instructional time, uses problem-solving approaches, and periodically involves all stakeholders in evaluating the results of EIS using current data.

III. Ensure a Consistent, Transparent, and High Quality System of Accountability in Milwaukee Public Schools for School Improvement, Teacher Quality, and Financial and Operational Management. A. Meet, in accordance with federal law, all agreed-upon timelines and ESEA requirements for DIFI, SIFI, and the ESEA Consolidated Application. B. Continue the restructuring of the district and coordination of services through the MPS District and School Accountability Model, using the system of nine support clusters of MPS schools to ensure consistent implementation of the corrective action requirements. C. Use the nine support clusters to ensure accountability for school improvement through development, monitoring, and technical assistance related to implementation of school improvement plans in all MPS schools. D. Ensure all educators are appropriately licensed for their assignments, are highly qualified under ESEA, and are receiving professional development as specified by the Wisconsin Quality Educator Initiative (PI 34), state statute, and ESEA.

E. Require induction support, including mentors, for all initial educators and educators with emergency permits or licenses beginning on the first day of school.

F. Provide highly skilled and experienced teachers in schools categorized as high need and with low student achievement.

G. Provide individually tailored support for principals in all Title I SIFI schools.

H. Coordinate the use of federal funds with the DPI federal funds trustee.

I. Design, implement, and use a data warehouse that meets the business, human resource, and education accountability needs of the school district.

J. Transfer student records in a timely manner, between and among all MPS (including charter and partnership) schools and from all MPS schools to other schools, including parental choice schools, and aggressively pursue the receipt of student records from schools outside MPS.

Technical assistance is provided to this district via numerous meetings with district staff responsible for complements of corrective action. The Wisconsin Department of Public Instruction has a .5 FTE dedicated to providing support and monitoring compliance with Corrective Action as well as a cross-agency workgroup of administrators who also provide assistance to their counterparts in the district.

#### 1.4.5.3 Corrective Action

In the table below, for districts in corrective action, provide the number of districts in corrective action in which the listed corrective actions under ESEA were implemented in SY 2008-09 (based on SY 2007-08 assessments under Section 1111 of ESEA).

<b>Corrective Action</b>	<b># of Districts receiving Title I funds in Corrective Action in Which Corrective Action was Implemented in SY 2008-09</b>
Implementing a new curriculum based on State standards	1
Authorized students to transfer from district schools to higher performing schools in a neighboring district	0
Deferred programmatic funds or reduced administrative funds	0
Replaced district personnel who are relevant to the failure to make AYP	0
Removed one or more schools from the jurisdiction of the district	0
Appointed a receiver or trustee to administer the affairs of the district	0
Restructured the district	1
Abolished the district (list the number of districts abolished between the end of SY 2007-08 and beginning of SY 2008-09 as a corrective action)	0
<b>Comments:</b>	

#### 1.4.7 Appeal of AYP and Identification Determinations

In the table below, provide the number of districts and schools that appealed their AYP designations based on SY 2008-09 data and the results of those appeals.

	# Appealed Their AYP Designations	# Appeals Resulted in a Change in the AYP Designation
Districts	2	2
Schools	11	9
<b>Comments: Most schools found corrections to graduation rates due to incomplete Exit and HS Completion codes.</b>		

Date (MM/DD/YY) that processing appeals based on SY 2008-09 data was complete	7/16/09
---	---------

### 1.4.8 School Improvement Status

In the section below, "Schools in Improvement" means Title I schools identified for improvement, corrective action, or restructuring under Section 1116 of ESEA for SY 2008-09.

#### 1.4.8.1 Student Proficiency for Schools Receiving Assistance Through Section 1003(a) and 1003(g) Funds

The table below pertains only to schools that received assistance through section 1003(a) and/or 1003(g) funds during SY 2008-09.

*Instructions for States that during SY 2008-09 administered assessments required under section 1116 of ESEA after fall 2008 (i.e., non fall-testing states):*

- In the SY 2008-09 column, provide the total number and percentage of students in schools receiving School Improvement funds in SY 2008-09 who were:
  - Proficient in mathematics as measured by your State's assessments required under section 1111(b)(3) of ESEA that were administered in SY 2008-09.
  - Proficient in reading/language arts as measured by your State's assessments required under section 1111(b)(3) of ESEA in SY 2008-09.
  - In SY 2007-08 column, provide the requested data for the same schools whose student proficiency data are reported for SY 2008-09.

*States that in SY 2008-09 administered assessments required under section 1116 of ESEA during fall 2008 (i.e., fall-testing states):*

- In the SY 2008-09 column, provide the total number and percentage of students in schools receiving School Improvement funds in SY 2008-09 who were:
  - Proficient in mathematics as measured by your State's assessments required under section 1111(b)(3) of ESEA that were administered in fall 2009.
  - Proficient in reading/language arts as measured by your State's assessments required under section 1111(b)(3) of ESEA that were administered in fall 2009.
  - In the SY 2007-08 column, provide the requested data for the same schools whose student proficiency data are reported in the SY 2008-09 column.

Category	SY 2008-09	SY 2007-08
Total number of students who completed the mathematics assessment and for whom proficiency level was assigned and were enrolled in schools that received assistance through Section 1003(a) and/or 1003(g) funds in SY 2008-09	29,016	29,317
Total number of students who were proficient or above in mathematics in schools that received assistance through Section 1003(a) and/or 1003(g) funds in SY 2008-09	15,514	14,420
Percentage of students who were proficient or above in mathematics in schools that received assistance through Section 1003(a) and/or 1003(g) funds in SY 2008-09	53.5	49.2
Total number of students who completed the reading/language arts assessment and for whom proficiency level was assigned and were enrolled in schools that received assistance through Section 1003(a) and/or 1003(g) funds in SY 2008-09	28,738	29,019
Total number of students who were proficient or above in reading/language arts in schools that received assistance through Section 1003(a) and/or 1003(g) funds in SY 2008-09	17,990	18,055
Percentage of students who were proficient in reading/language arts in schools that received assistance through Section 1003(a) and/or 1003(g) funds in SY 2008-09	62.6	62.2
<b>Comments:</b>		

Source – Manual input by the SEA using the online collection tool.

#### 1.4.8.2 School Improvement Status and School Improvement Assistance

In the table below, indicate the number of schools receiving assistance through section 1003(a) and/or 1003(g) funds during SY 2008-09 that:

- Made adequate yearly progress
- Exited improvement status
- Did not make adequate yearly progress

Category	# of Schools
Number of schools receiving assistance through Section 1003(a) and/or 1003(g) funds during SY 2008-09 that made adequate yearly progress based on testing in SY 2008-09	80
Number of schools receiving assistance through Section 1003(a) and/or 1003(g) funds during SY 2008-09 that exited improvement status based on testing in SY 2008-09	4
Number of schools receiving assistance through Section 1003(a) and/or 1003(g) funds during SY 2008-09 that did not make adequate yearly progress based on testing in SY 2008-09	41
<b>Comments: Previously SIFI schools the exited improvement status based on testing in SY 2008-09:</b>	

LEA SchI DISTRICT SCHOOL NAME  
3619 0414 Milwaukee Lady Pitts  
3619 0008 Milwaukee Marshall Hi  
3619 0240 Milwaukee Project STAY  
3619 1079 Milwaukee Sixth Street Academy

Source – Manual input by the SEA using the online collection tool.

### 1.4.8.3 Effective School Improvement Strategies

In the table below, indicate the effective school improvement strategies used that were supported through Section 1003(a) and/or 1003(g) funds.

For fall-testing States, responses for this item would be based on assessments administered in fall 2009. For all other States the responses would be based on assessments administered during SY 2008-09.

Column 1	Column 2	Column 3	Column 4	Column 5	Column 6	Column 7
<b>Effective Strategy or Combination of Strategies Used (See response options in "Column 1 Response Options Box" below.) If your State's response includes a "5" (other strategies), identify the specific strategy(s) in Column 2.</b>	<b>Description of "Other Strategies" This response is limited to 500 characters.</b>	<b>Number of schools in which the strategy(s) was used</b>	<b>Number of schools that used the strategy (s), made AYP, and exited improvement status based on testing after the schools received this assistance</b>	<b>Number of schools that used the strategy (s), made AYP based on testing after the schools received this assistance, but did not exit improvement status</b>	<b>Most common other Positive Outcome from the Strategy (See response options in "Column 6 Response Options Box" below)</b>	<b>Description of "Other Positive Outcome" if Response for Column 6 is "D" This response is limited to 500 characters.</b>
1		12	0	0	A	
2		5	0	0	A	
4		3	1	0	A	
6 = Combo 1	1, 2, & 4	37	0	1	A	Increased student achievement on benchmarks and improved school support through paraprofessional.
7 = Combo 2	1 & 5 below	6	2	0	D	Increased student achievement on benchmarks and improved school support through paraprofessionals.
8 = Combo 3	4 & 5	8	0	2	A	

**Comments: This report format does not accurately reflect the strategies the LEAs in Wisconsin used. An LEA in Wisconsin was more likely to use a combination of strategies rather than just one strategy. Unfortunately, the report only allows us to report three combinations of strategies when LEAs in Wisconsin used thirteen (13) different combinations of strategies. Furthermore, limiting us to list only the "most common" outcome does not allow us to document the other outcomes reported that may be just as important as the "most common" outcome. Lastly, it is worth noting that the majority of the 1003(a) and 1003 (g) recipients in Wisconsin were not in improvement status (for 2008-09, Wisconsin only had 38 SIFs). Therefore the numbers in columns 4 and 5 are low because there Wisconsin did not have that many Title I schools in improvement status.**

Column 1 Response Options Box

1 = Provide customized technical assistance and/or professional development that is designed to build the capacity of LEA and school staff to improve schools and is informed by student achievement and other outcome-related measures.

2 = Utilize research-based strategies or practices to change instructional practice to address the academic achievement problems that caused the school to be identified for improvement, corrective action, or restructuring.

3 = Create partnerships among the SEA, LEAs and other entities for the purpose of delivering technical assistance, professional development, and management advice.

4 = Provide professional development to enhance the capacity of school support team members and other technical assistance providers who are part of the Statewide system of support and that is informed by student achievement and other outcome-related measures.

5 = Implement other strategies determined by the SEA or LEA, as appropriate, for which data indicate the strategy is likely to result in improved teaching and learning in schools identified for improvement, corrective action, or restructuring.

7 = Combination 2: Schools using a combination of strategies from above. Please use Column 2 to indicate which of the above strategies comprise this combination.

8 = Combination 3: Schools Using a combination of strategies from above. Please use Column 2 to indicate which of the above strategies comprise this combination.

Column 6 Response Options Box

A = Improvement by at least five percentage points in two or more AYP reporting cells

B = Increased teacher retention

C = Improved parental involvement

D = Other

Source – Manual input by the SEA using the online collection tool.

#### 1.4.8.4 Sharing of Effective Strategies

In the space below, describe how your State shared the effective strategies identified in item 1.4.8.3 with its LEAs and schools. Please exclude newsletters and handouts in your description.

This response is limited to 8,000 characters.

In October of 2009, the SEA hosted a District Network Meeting for all districts receiving Title I Supplemental Funds. Outcomes of this meeting were to develop an understanding of the key components of a district balanced assessment system, to learn from colleagues about district assessment practices, to learn new information about the Title I Supplemental Grants, and to network with district teams around district assessment practices.

Additionally, the SEA hosted a networking meeting for districts with Title I schools identified for improvement in January 2010. Outcomes of this meeting were to learn about effective practices that impact student learning and achievement, and learn about the DPI's support to districts.

Finally, our annual state conference, the New Wisconsin Promise Conference brought together over 1,300 educators from across the state to share best practice along three conference strands: 21st Century Skills, District and School Improvement, and Engagement in Learning.

Source – Manual input by the SEA using the online collection tool.

#### 1.4.8.5 Use of Section 1003(a) and (g) School Improvement Funds

##### 1.4.8.5.1 Section 1003(a) State Reservations

In the space provided, enter the percentage of the FY 2008 (SY 2008-09) Title I, Part A allocation that the SEA reserved in accordance with Section 1003(a) of ESEA and §200.100(a) of ED's regulations governing the reservation of funds for school improvement under Section 1003(a) of ESEA: 4.0 %

**Comments:**

Source – Manual input by the SEA using the online collection tool.

##### 1.4.8.5.2 Section 1003(a) and 1003(g) Allocations to LEAs and Schools

For SY 2008-09 there is no need to upload a spreadsheet to answer this question in the CSPR.

1.4.8.5.2 will be answered automatically using data submitted to EDFacts in Data Group 694, School improvement funds allocation table, from File Specification N/X132. You may review data submitted to EDFacts using the report named "Section 1003(a) and 1003(g) Allocations to LEAs and Schools -CSPR 1.4.8.5.2 (EDEN012)" from the EDFacts Reporting System.

##### 1.4.8.5.3 Use of Section 1003(g)(8) Funds for Evaluation and Technical Assistance

Section 1003(g)(8) of ESEA allows States to reserve up to five percent of Section 1003(g) funds for administration and to meet the evaluation and technical assistance requirements for this program. In the space below, identify and describe the specific Section 1003(g) evaluation and technical assistance activities that your State conducted during SY 2008-09.

This response is limited to 8,000 characters.

<p>The SEA has used these funds to support the statewide training and technical assistance for the Student Intervention Monitoring System (SIMS) software program. SIMS is designed to monitor interventions and help educators provide additional support for children who are not learning. This electronic tool contains interventions selected to individualize support for students, and assists educators in evaluating the effectiveness of interventions with students.</p>
---

Source – Manual input by the SEA using the online collection tool.

**1.4.8.6 Actions Taken for Title I Schools Identified for Improvement Supported by Funds Other than Those of Section 1003(a) and 1003(g).**

In the space below, describe actions (if any) taken by your State in SY 2008-09 that were supported by funds other than Section 1003(a) and 1003(g) funds to address the achievement problems of schools identified for improvement, corrective action, or restructuring under Section 1116 of ESEA.

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

No funds were available for this type of support.

Source – Manual input by the SEA using the online collection tool.

#### 1.4.9 Public School Choice and Supplemental Educational Services

This section collects data on public school choice and supplemental educational services.

##### 1.4.9.1 Public School Choice

This section collects data on public school choice. FAQs related to the public school choice provisions are at the end of this section.

##### 1.4.9.1.2 Public School Choice – Students

In the table below, provide the number of students who were eligible for public school choice, the number of eligible students who applied to transfer, and the number who transferred under the provisions for public school choice under Section 1116 of ESEA. The number of students who were eligible for public school choice should include:

1. All students currently enrolled in a school Title I identified for improvement, corrective action or restructuring.
2. All students who transferred in the current school year under the public school choice provisions of Section 1116, and
3. All students who previously transferred under the public school choice provisions of Section 1116 and are continuing to transfer for the current school year under Section 1116.

The number of students who applied to transfer should include:

1. All students who applied to transfer in the current school year but did not or were unable to transfer.
2. All students who transferred in the current school year under the public school choice provisions of Section 1116; and
3. All students who previously transferred under the public school choice provisions of Section 1116 and are continuing to transfer for the current school year under Section 1116.

For any of the respective student counts, States should indicate in the Comment section if the count does not include any of the categories of students discussed above.

	# Students
Eligible for public school choice	16,076
Applied to transfer	199
Transferred to another school under the Title I public school choice provisions	139

##### 1.4.9.1.3 Funds Spent on Public School Choice

In the table below, provide the total dollar amount spent by LEAs on transportation for public school choice under Section 1116 of ESEA.

	Amount
Dollars spent by LEAs on transportation for public school choice	\$ 0

##### 1.4.9.1.4 Availability of Public School Choice Options

In the table below provide the number of LEAs in your State that are unable to provide public school choice to eligible students due to any of the following reasons:

1. All schools at a grade level in the LEA are in school improvement, corrective action, or restructuring.
2. LEA only has a single school at the grade level of the school at which students are eligible for public school choice.
3. LEA's schools are so remote from one another that choice is impracticable.

	# LEAs
LEAs Unable to Provide Public School Choice	2

## FAQs about public school choice:

- a. How should States report data on Title I public school choice for those LEAs that have open enrollment and other choice programs? For those LEAs that implement open enrollment or other school choice programs in addition to public school choice under Section 1116 of ESEA, the State may consider a student as having applied to transfer if the student meets the following:
- Has a "home" or "neighborhood" school (to which the student would have been assigned, in the absence of a school choice program) that receives Title I funds and has been identified, under the statute, as in need of improvement, corrective action, or restructuring; and
  - Has elected to enroll, at some point since July 1, 2002 (the effective date of the Title I choice provisions), and after the home school has been identified as in need of improvement, in a school that has not been so identified and is attending that school; and
  - Is using district transportation services to attend such a school.
- In addition, the State may consider costs for transporting a student meeting the above conditions towards the funds spent by an LEA on transportation for public school choice if the student is using district transportation services to attend the non-identified school.
- b. How should States report on public school choice for those LEAs that are not able to offer public school choice? In the count of LEAs that are not able to offer public school choice (for any of the reasons specified in 1.4.9.1.4), States should include those LEAs that are unable to offer public school choice at one or more grade levels. For instance, if an LEA is able to provide public school choice to eligible students at the elementary level but not at the secondary level, the State should include the LEA in the count. States should also include LEAs that are not able to provide public school choice at all (i.e., at any grade level). States should provide the reason(s) why public school choice was not possible in these LEAs at the grade level(s) in the Comment section. In addition, States may also include in the Comment section a separate count just of LEAs that are not able to offer public school choice at any grade level.

For LEAs that are not able to offer public school choice at one or more grade levels, States should count as eligible for public school choice (in 1.4.9.1.2) all students who attend identified Title I schools regardless of whether the LEA is able to offer the students public school choice.

<sup>3</sup> Adapted from OESE/OII policy letter of August 2004. The policy letter may be found on the Department's Web page at <http://www.ed.gov/policy/elsec/guid/stateletters/choice/choice081804.html>.

### 1.4.9.2 Supplemental Educational Services

This section collects data on supplemental educational services.

#### 1.4.9.2.2 Supplemental Educational Services – Students

In the table below, provide the number of students who were eligible for, who applied for, and who received supplemental educational services under Section 1116 of ESEA.

	# Students
Eligible for supplemental educational services	9,798
Applied for supplemental educational services	3,886
Received supplemental educational services	2,607
<b>Comments:</b>	

Source – Initially populated from ED Facts. See Attachment D: CSPR & ED Facts Data Crosswalk.

#### 1.4.9.2.3 Funds Spent on Supplemental Educational Services

In the table below, provide the total dollar amount spent by LEAs on supplemental educational services under Section 1116 of ESEA.

	Amount
Dollars spent by LEAs on supplemental educational services	\$ 4,230,444
<b>Comments:</b>	

**1.5 TEACHER QUALITY**

This section collects data on "highly qualified" teachers as the term is defined in Section 9101(23) of ESEA.

**1.5.1 Core Academic Classes Taught by Teachers Who Are Highly Qualified**

In the table below, provide the number of core academic classes for the grade levels listed, the number of those core academic classes taught by teachers who are highly qualified, and the number taught by teachers who are not highly qualified. The percentage of core academic classes taught by teachers who are highly qualified and the percentage taught by teachers who are not highly qualified will be calculated automatically. Below the table are FAQs about these data.

School Type	Number of Core Academic Classes (Total)	Number of Core Academic Classes Taught by Teachers Who Are Highly Qualified	Percentage of Core Academic Classes Taught by Teachers Who Are Highly Qualified	Number of Core Academic Classes Taught by Teachers Who Are NOT Highly Qualified	Percentage of Core Academic Classes Taught by Teachers Who Are NOT Highly Qualified
All classes	51,751	50,871	98.3	880	1.7
All elementary classes	27,495	27,134	98.7	361	1.3
All secondary classes	24,256	23,737	97.9	519	2.1

Do the data in Table 1.5.1 above include classes taught by special education teachers who provide direct instruction core academic subjects?

Data table includes classes taught by special education teachers who provide direct instruction core academic subjects.	<u>Yes</u>
---	------------

If the answer above is no, please explain below. The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

Does the State count elementary classes so that a full-day self-contained classroom equals one class, or does the State use a departmentalized approach where a classroom is counted multiple times, once for each subject taught?

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

<p>WI Response to Data Verification request dated February 22, 2010:</p> <p>Teachers in a full day self-contained classroom equals one FTE. One FTE in an elementary classroom means a teacher teaches all the core academic subjects of math, social studies, science, language arts, and reading. It would be coded "elementary all subjects," count as one FTE, and count as one class for reporting purposes.</p>
---

## FAQs about highly qualified teachers and core academic subjects:

- a. *What are the core academic subjects? English, reading/language arts, mathematics, science, foreign languages, civics and government, economics, arts, history, and geography [Title IX, Section 9101(11)]. While the statute includes the arts in the core academic subjects, it does not specify which of the arts are core academic subjects; therefore, States must make this determination.*
- b. *How is a teacher defined? An individual who provides instruction in the core academic areas to kindergarten, grades 1 through 12, or ungraded classes, or individuals who teach in an environment other than a classroom setting (and who maintain daily student attendance records) [from NCES, CCD, 2001-02]*
- c. *How is a class defined? A class is a setting in which organized instruction of core academic course content is provided to one or more students (including cross-age groupings) for a given period of time. (A course may be offered to more than one class.) Instruction, provided by one or more teachers or other staff members, may be delivered in person or via a different medium. Classes that share space should be considered as separate classes if they function as separate units for more than 50% of the time [from NCES Non-fiscal Data Handbook for Early Childhood, Elementary, and Secondary Education, 2003].*
- d. *Should 6th-, 7th-, and 8th-grade classes be reported in the elementary or the secondary category? States are responsible for determining whether the content taught at the middle school level meets the competency requirements for elementary or secondary instruction. Report classes in grade 6 through 8 consistent with how teachers have been classified to determine their highly qualified status, regardless of whether their schools are configured as elementary or middle schools.*
- e. *How should States count teachers (including specialists or resource teachers) in elementary classes? States that count self-contained classrooms as one class should, to avoid over-representation, also count subject-area specialists (e.g., mathematics or music teachers) or resource teachers as teaching one class. On the other hand, States using a departmentalized approach to instruction where a self-contained classroom is counted multiple times (once for each subject taught) should also count subject-area specialists or resource teachers as teaching multiple classes.*
- f. *How should States count teachers in self-contained multiple-subject secondary classes? Each core academic subject taught for which students are receiving credit toward graduation should be counted in the numerator and the denominator. For example, if the same teacher teaches English, calculus, history, and science in a self-contained classroom, count these as four classes in the denominator. If the teacher is Highly Qualified to teach English and history, he/she would be counted as Highly Qualified in two of the four subjects in the numerator.*
- g. *What is the reporting period? The reporting period is the school year. The count of classes must include all semesters, quarters, or terms of the school year. For example, if core academic classes are held in summer sessions, those classes should be included in the count of core academic classes. A state determines into which school year classes fall.*

### 1.5.2 Reasons Core Academic Classes Are Taught by Teachers Who Are Not Highly Qualified

In the tables below, estimate the percentages for each of the reasons why teachers who are not highly qualified teach core academic classes. For example, if 900 elementary classes were taught by teachers who are not highly qualified, what percentage of those 900 classes falls into each of the categories listed below? If the three reasons provided at each grade level are not sufficient to explain why core academic classes at a particular grade level are taught by teachers who are not highly qualified, use the row labeled "other" and explain the additional reasons. The total of the reasons is calculated automatically for each grade level and must equal 100% at the elementary level and 100% at the secondary level.

**Note: Use the numbers of core academic classes taught by teachers who are not highly qualified from 1.5.1 for both elementary school classes (1.5.2.1) and for secondary school classes (1.5.2.2) as your starting point.**

	Percentage
<b>Elementary School Classes</b>	
Elementary school classes taught by certified general education teachers who did not pass a subject-knowledge test or (if eligible) have not demonstrated subject-matter competency through HOUSSE	26.0
Elementary school classes taught by certified special education teachers who did not pass a subject-knowledge test or have not demonstrated subject-matter competency through HOUSSE	19.0
Elementary school classes taught by teachers who are not fully certified (and are not in an approved alternative route program)	55.0
Other (please explain in comment box below)	
<b>Total</b>	<b>100.0</b>

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

	Percentage
<b>Secondary School Classes</b>	
Secondary school classes taught by certified general education teachers who have not demonstrated subject-matter knowledge in those subjects (e.g., out-of-field teachers)	15.0
Secondary school classes taught by certified special education teachers who have not demonstrated subject-matter competency in those subjects	25.0
Secondary school classes taught by teachers who are not fully certified (and are not in an approved alternative route program)	60.0
Other (please explain in comment box below)	
<b>Total</b>	<b>100.0</b>

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

### 1.5.3 Poverty Quartiles and Metrics Used

In the table below, provide the number of core academic classes for each of the school types listed and the number of those core academic classes taught by teachers who are highly qualified. The percentage of core academic classes taught by teachers who are highly qualified will be calculated automatically. The percentages used for high-and low-poverty schools and the poverty metric used to determine those percentages are reported in the second table. Below the tables are FAQs about these data.

This means that for the purpose of establishing poverty quartiles, some classes in schools where both elementary and secondary classes are taught would be counted as classes in an elementary school rather than as classes in a secondary school in 1.5.3. This also means that such a 12th grade class would be in different category in 1.5.3 than it would be in 1.5.1.

**NOTE: No source of classroom-level poverty data exists, so States may look at school-level data when figuring poverty quartiles. Because not all schools have traditional grade configurations, and because a school may not be counted as both an elementary and as a secondary school, States may include as elementary schools all schools that serve children in grades K through 5 (including K through 8 or K through 12 schools).**

School Type	Number of Core Academic Classes (Total)	Number of Core Academic Classes Taught by Teachers Who Are Highly Qualified	Percentage of Core Academic Classes Taught by Teachers Who Are Highly Qualified
Elementary Schools			
High Poverty Elementary Schools	7,541	7,247	96.1
Low-poverty Elementary Schools	6,633	6,587	99.3
Secondary Schools			
High Poverty secondary Schools	4,503	4,087	90.8
Low-Poverty secondary Schools	7,373	7,319	99.3

**1.5.4** In the table below, provide the poverty quartiles breaks used in determining high-and low-poverty schools and the poverty metric used to determine the poverty quartiles. Below the table are FAQs about the data collected in this table.

	High-Poverty Schools (more than what %)	Low-Poverty Schools (less than what %)
Elementary schools	51.0	18.0
Poverty metric used	Eligible for subsidized lunch WI Response to Data Verification request dated February 22, 2010: They are either schools that had no enrollment or they are a DOC/DHFS school or a County Disability Board school. For those agencies, the data the teacher quality data (N063 and N064) is reported at the district level and not at the school level, so the fact that they were not assigned a quartile should not affect the counts in section 1.5.2.	
Secondary schools	40.0	23.0
Poverty metric used	Eligible for subsidized lunch WI Response to Data Verification request dated February 22, 2010: They are either schools that had no enrollment or they are a DOC/DHFS school or a County Disability Board school. For those agencies, the data the teacher quality data (N063 and N064) is reported at the district level and not at the school level, so the fact that they were not assigned a quartile should not affect the counts in section 1.5.2.	

## FAQs on poverty quartiles and metrics used to determine poverty

- a. *What is a "high-poverty school"? Section 1111(h)(1)(C)(viii) defines "high-poverty" schools as schools in the top quartile of poverty in the State.*
- b. *What is a "low-poverty school"? Section 1111(h)(1)(C)(viii) defines "low-poverty" schools as schools in the bottom quartile of poverty in the State.*
- c. *How are the poverty quartiles determined? Separately rank order elementary and secondary schools from highest to lowest on your percentage poverty measure. Divide the list into four equal groups. Schools in the first (highest group) are high-poverty schools. Schools in the last group (lowest group) are the low-poverty schools. Generally, States use the percentage of students who qualify for the free or reduced-price lunch program for this calculation.*
- d. *Since the poverty data are collected at the school and not classroom level, how do we classify schools as either elementary or secondary for this purpose? States may include as elementary schools all schools that serve children in grades K through 5 (including K through 8 or K through 12 schools) and would therefore include as secondary schools those that exclusively serve children in grades 6 and higher.*

## 1.6 TITLE III AND LANGUAGE INSTRUCTIONAL PROGRAMS

This section collects annual performance and accountability data on the implementation of Title III programs.

### 1.6.1 Language Instruction Educational Programs

In the table below, place a check next to each type of language instruction educational programs implemented in the State, as defined in Section 3301(8), as required by Sections 3121(a)(1), 3123(b)(1), and 3123(b)(2).

#### Table 1.6.1 Definitions:

1. **Types of Programs = Types of programs described in the subgrantee's local plan (as submitted to the State or as implemented) that is closest to the descriptions in [http://www.ncela.gwu.edu/files/uploads/5/Language\\_Instruction\\_Educational\\_Programs.pdf](http://www.ncela.gwu.edu/files/uploads/5/Language_Instruction_Educational_Programs.pdf).**
2. **Other Language = Name of the language of instruction, other than English, used in the program.**

Check Types of Programs	Type of Program	Other Language
Yes	Dual language	Spanish
Yes	Two-way immersion	Spanish
Yes	Transitional bilingual programs	Spanish
Yes	Developmental bilingual	Spanish
Yes	Heritage language	Spanish
Yes	Sheltered English instruction	
Yes	Structured English immersion	
Yes	Specially designed academic instruction delivered in English (SDAIE)	
Yes	Content-based ESL	
Yes	Pull-out ESL	
Yes	Other (explain in comment box below)	

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

Content Area Tutoring (CAT): Self-Contained:

## 1.6.2 Student Demographic Data

### 1.6.2.1 Number of ALL LEP Students in the State

In the table below, provide the unduplicated number of ALL LEP students in the State who meet the LEP definition under Section 9101(25).

- Include newly enrolled (recent arrivals to the U.S.) and continually enrolled LEP students, whether or not they receive services in a Title III language instruction educational program
- Do not include Former LEP students (as defined in Section 200.20(f)(2) of the Title I regulation) and monitored Former LEP students (as defined under Section 3121(a)(4) of Title III) in the ALL LEP student count in this table.

Number of ALL LEP students in the State	51,182
<b>Comments:</b> Wisconsin had 47,866 ELL students in the ISES 2008-09 school year collection in grades K-12.	

### 1.6.2.2 Number of LEP Students Who Received Title III Language Instruction Educational Program Services

In the table below, provide the unduplicated number of LEP students who received services in Title III language instructional education programs.

	#
LEP students who received services in a Title III language instruction educational program in grades K through 12 for this reporting year.	40,939
<b>Comments:</b>	

Source – The SEA submits the data in file N/X116 that contains data group ID 648, category set A.

### 1.6.2.3 Most Commonly Spoken Languages in the State

In the table below, provide the five most commonly spoken languages, other than English, in the State (for all LEP students, not just LEP students who received Title III Services). The top five languages should be determined by the highest number of students speaking each of the languages listed.

Language	# LEP Students
Spanish; Castilian	28,614
Hmong	10,817
Chinese	653
Russian	481
Albanian	436

Report additional languages with significant numbers of LEP students in the comment box below.

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

The next most frequent language group is Arabic. The remaining languages groups have about 250 or fewer students statewide.
---

### 1.6.3 Student Performance Data

This section collects data on LEP student English language proficiency, as required by Sections 1111(h)(4)(D) and 3121(a)(2).

#### 1.6.3.1.1 All LEP Students Tested on the State Annual English Language Proficiency Assessment

In the table below, please provide the number of ALL LEP students tested on annual State English language proficiency assessment (as defined in 1.6.2.1).

	#
Number tested on State annual ELP assessment	46,494
Number not tested on State annual ELP assessment	4,801
Total	51,295
<b>Comments: ACCESS for ELLs, the WI ELP exam is only administered in grades K-12. The EDEN LEP count includes ELL students including those eligible to Exit when they score proficient(6.0) on the state ELP exam or qualify for manual exiting. ELL students that are not counted as tested are in preKindergarten, plus those students without composite scores (didn't complete all four domains -reading, writing, speaking, and listening) due to their IDEA disability; ELLs enrolled before/after but not during the ELP testing (Dec-Feb); and students that have demonstrated ELP proficiency and will Exit via procedures specified in ESEA Update Bulletin 7.02 section on "Manual Reclassification" see: <a href="http://www.dpi.wi.gov/esea/pdf/bul_0702.pdf">http://www.dpi.wi.gov/esea/pdf/bul_0702.pdf</a></b>	

#### 1.6.3.1.2 ALL LEP Student English Language Proficiency Results

	#
Number proficient or above on State annual ELP assessment	1,765
Percent proficient or above on State annual ELP assessment	3.8
<b>Comments: It is very difficult to score a 6.0 on ACCESS for ELLs, the state's ELP exam. Districts evaluate students scoring above 5.0 for eligibility to Exit through alternate measures.</b>	

#### 1.6.3.2.1 Title III LEP Students Tested on the State Annual English Language Proficiency (ELP) Assessment

In the table below, provide the number of Title III LEP students tested on annual State English language proficiency assessment.

	#
Number tested on State annual ELP assessment	34,603
Number not tested on State annual ELP assessment	4,607
Total	39,210
<b>Comments: To count as tested on the WI ELP exam for Title III ELLs must complete all subdomains and receive a composite score. The ELLs in this table includes only Title III LEP students. Some of the Proficient LEP students do not complete the annual ELP exam because they have reached a composite of 5.0, have attained English proficiency, and are being manually exited from ELL services via additional evidence per procedures specified in ESEA Update Bulletin 7.02 section on "Manual Reclassification" see: <a href="http://www.dpi.wi.gov/esea/pdf/bul_0702.pdf">http://www.dpi.wi.gov/esea/pdf/bul_0702.pdf</a>. PreK students are assessed using a "screener" and do not participate in formal ACCESS for ELLs testing until they enter Kindergarten (therefore they do not have a composite score). The remainder of ELLs not tested either were not enrolled during the December-February test window or were unable to complete one of the subtests and did not receive a composite score. Only students completing all four tested domains can be counted as participants in testing for Title III purposes.</b>	
In the table below, provide the number of Title III Students who took the State annual ELP assessment for the first time and whose progress cannot be determined. Report this number ONLY if the State did not include these students in establishing AMAO1/making progress target and did not include them in the calculations for AMAO1/making progress(# and % making progress).	
	#
Number of Title III LEP with one data point whose progress can not be determined and whose results were not included in the calculation for AMAO1.	6,186

1.6.3.2.2

**Table 1.6.3.2.2 Definitions:**

1. **Annual Measureable Achievement Objectives (AMAOs) = State targets for the percent of students making progress and attaining proficiency.**
2. **Making Progress = Number of Title III LEP students that met the definition of Making Progress as defined by the State and submitted to ED in the State Consolidated Application (CSA), or as amended.**
3. **ELP Attainment = Number of Title III LEP students that meet the State defined English language proficiency submitted to ED in the State Consolidated Application (CSA), or as amended.**
4. **Results = Number and percent of Title III LEP students that met the State definition of Making Progress and the number and percent that met the State definition of Attainment of English language proficiency.**

In the table below, provide the State targets for the number and percentage of States making progress and attaining English proficiency for this reporting period. Additionally, provide the results from the annual State English language proficiency assessment for Title III-served LEP students who participated in a Title III language instruction educational program in grades K through 12. If your State uses cohorts, provide us with the range of targets, (i.e., indicate the lowest target among the cohorts, e.g., 10% and the highest target among a cohort, e.g., 70%).

	Results		Targets	
	#	%	#	%
Making progress	18,040	48.0	17,999	50.00
ELP attainment	1,565	4.2	1,500	20.00

**Comments: Title III Annual Measurable Achievement Objectives (AMAOs) include all Limited English Proficient (LEP) students (not just students tested on the annual ELL assessment) in all LEAs in Wisconsin (two notable differences with the data presented in the above table). The AMAO results and targets for Wisconsin this year are as follows. WI uses unduplicated counts for progress and attainment measures in AMAO 1 & 2. AMAO1 (Progress): Percent of Title IIIA students ELP 1-4 progressing in English language acquisition = (28,692/35,997) = 80%; target = 50%. AMAO2 (Acquisition): Percent of Title IIIA students ELP 5-6 exiting or reaching English language proficiency = (2,128/5,711 eligible to exit) = 37%; target = 20%.**



### 1.6.3.6 Title III Served Monitored Former LEP (MFLEP) Students

This section collects data on the performance of former LEP students as required by Sections 3121(a)(4) and 3123(b)(8).

#### 1.6.3.6.1 Title III Served MFLEP Students by Year Monitored

In the table below, report the unduplicated count of monitored former LEP students during the two consecutive years of monitoring, which includes both MFLEP students in AYP grades and in non-AYP grades.

Monitored Former LEP students include:

- Students who have transitioned out of a language instruction educational program funded by Title III into classrooms that are not tailored for LEP students.
- Students who are no longer receiving LEP services and who are being monitored for academic content achievement for 2 years after the transition.

#### Table 1.6.3.6.1 Definitions:

1. **# Year One = Number of former LEP students in their first year of being monitored.**
2. **# Year Two = Number of former LEP students in their second year of being monitored.**
3. **Total = Number of monitored former LEP students in year one and year two. This is automatically calculated.**

# Year One	# Year Two	Total
1,258	532	1,790
<b>Comments:</b>		

**1.6.3.6.2** In the table below, report the number of MFLEP students who took the annual mathematics assessment. Please provide data only for those students who transitioned into classrooms not designed for LEP students and who no longer received services under Title III in this reporting year. These students include both students who are monitored former LEP students in their first year of monitoring, and those in their second year of monitoring.

#### Table 1.6.3.6.2 Definitions:

1. **# Tested = State-aggregated number of MFLEP students who were tested in mathematics in all AYP grades.**
2. **# At or Above Proficient = State-aggregated number of MFLEP students who scored at or above proficient on the State annual mathematics assessment.**
3. **% Results = Automatically calculated based on number who scored at or above proficient divided by the number tested.**
4. **# Below proficient = State-aggregated number of MFLEP students in grades used for NCLB accountability determinations (3 through 8 and once in high school) who did not score proficient on the State NCLB mathematics assessment. This will be automatically calculated.**

# Tested	# At or Above Proficient	% Results	# Below Proficient
1,785	1,635	91.6	150
<b>Comments:</b>			

### 1.6.3.6.3 Monitored Former LEP (MFLEP) Students Results for Reading/Language Arts

In the table below, report the number of MFLEP students who took the annual mathematics assessment. Please provide data only for those students who transitioned into classrooms not designed for LEP students and who no longer received services under Title III in this reporting year. These students include both students who are monitored former LEP students in their first year of monitoring, and those in their second year of monitoring.

#### Table 1.6.3.6.3 Definitions:

1. **# Tested = State-aggregated number of MFLEP students who were tested in reading/language arts in all AYP grades.**
2. **# At or Above Proficient = State-aggregated number of MFLEP students who scored at or above proficient on the State annual reading/language arts assessment.**
3. **% Results = Automatically calculated based on number who scored at or above proficient divided by the total number tested.**
4. **# Below proficient = State-aggregated number MFLEP students who did not score proficient on the State annual reading/language arts assessment. This will be automatically calculated.**

# Tested	# At or Above Proficient	% Results	# Below Proficient
1,786	1,676	93.8	110
<b>Comments:</b>			

### 1.6.3.6.4 Monitored Former LEP (MFLEP) Students Results for Science

In the table below, report results for monitored former LEP students who took the annual science assessment. Please provide data only for those students who transitioned into classrooms not designed for LEP students and who no longer received services under Title III in this reporting year. These students include both students who are monitored former LEP students in their first year of monitoring, and those in their second year of monitoring.

#### Table 1.6.3.6.4 Definitions:

1. **# Tested = State-aggregated number of MFLEP students who were tested in science.**
2. **# At or Above Proficient = State-aggregated number of MFLEP students who scored at or above proficient on the State annual science assessment.**
3. **% Results = Automatically calculated based on number who scored at or above proficient divided by the total number tested.**
4. **# Below proficient = State-aggregated number MFLEP students who did not score proficient on the State annual science assessment. This will be automatically calculated.**

# Tested	# At or Above Proficient	% Results	# Below Proficient
846	740	87.5	106
<b>Comments:</b>			

### 1.6.4 Title III Subgrantees

This section collects data on the performance of Title III subgrantees.

#### 1.6.4.1 Title III Subgrantee Performance

In the table below, report the number of Title III subgrantees meeting the criteria described in the table. Do not leave items blank. If there are zero subgrantees who met the condition described, put a zero in the number (#) column. Do not double count subgrantees by category.

**Note:** Do not include number of subgrants made under Section 3114(d)(1) from funds reserved for education programs and activities for immigrant children and youth. (Report Section 3114(d)(1) subgrants in 1.6.5.1 ONLY.)

	#
# -Total number of subgrantees for the year	76
# -Number of subgrantees that met all three Title III AMAOs	76
# -Number of subgrantees who met AMAO 1	76
# -Number of subgrantees who met AMAO 2	76
# -Number of subgrantees who met AMAO 3	76
# -Number of subgrantees that did not meet any Title III AMAOs	0
# -Number of subgrantees that did not meet Title III AMAOs for two consecutive years (SYs 2007-08 and 2008-09)	0
# -Number of subgrantees implementing an improvement plan in SY 2008-09 for not meeting Title III AMAOs	0
# -Number of subgrantees who have not met Title III AMAOs for four consecutive years (SYs 2005-06, 2006-07, 2007-08, and 200809)	0
<b>Comments:</b>	

#### 1.6.4.2 State Accountability

In the table below, indicate whether the State met all three Title III AMAOs.

**Note:** Meeting all three Title III AMAOs means meeting each State-set target for each objective: Making Progress, Attaining Proficiency, and Making AYP for the LEP subgroup. This section collects data that will be used to determine State AYP, as required under Section 6161.

State met <u>all</u> three Title III AMAOs	<u>Yes</u>
<b>Comments:</b>	

#### 1.6.4.3 Termination of Title III Language Instruction Educational Programs

This section collects data on the termination of Title III programs or activities as required by Section 3123(b)(7).

Were any Title III language instruction educational programs or activities terminated for failure to reach program goals?	No
If yes, provide the number of language instruction educational programs or activities for immigrant children and youth terminated.	
<b>Comments:</b>	

## 1.6.5 Education Programs and Activities for Immigrant Students

This section collects data on education programs and activities for immigrant students.

### 1.6.5.1 Immigrant Students

In the table below, report the unduplicated number of immigrant students enrolled in schools in the State and who participated in qualifying educational programs under Section 3114(d)(1).

#### **Table 1.6.5.1 Definitions:**

1. **Immigrant Students Enrolled = Number of students who meet the definition of immigrant children and youth under Section 3301(6) and enrolled in the elementary or secondary schools in the State.**
2. **Students in 3114(d)(1) Program = Number of immigrant students who participated in programs for immigrant children and youth funded under Section 3114(d)(1), using the funds reserved for immigrant education programs/activities. This number should not include immigrant students who receive services in Title III language instructional educational programs under Sections 3114(a) and 3115(a).**
3. **3114(d)(1)Subgrants = Number of subgrants made in the State under Section 3114(d)(1), with the funds reserved for immigrant education programs/activities. Do not include Title III Language Instruction Educational Program (LIEP) subgrants made under**

Sections 3114(a) and 3115(a) that serve immigrant students enrolled in them.

# Immigrant Students Enrolled	# Students in 3114(d)(1) Program	# of 3114(d)(1) Subgrants
9,194	2,252	17

If state reports zero (0) students in programs or zero (0) subgrants, explain in comment box below. The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

2008-09 is the first year the the WI Individual Student Enrollment System (ISES) collected the Title III Immigrant Student count.
---

Source – Initially populated from EDFacts. See Attachment D: CSPR & EDFacts Data Crosswalk.

## 1.6.6 Teacher Information and Professional Development

This section collects data on teachers in Title III language instruction education programs as required under Section 3123(b)(5).

### 1.6.6.1 Teacher Information

This section collects information about teachers as required under Section 3123 (b)(5).

In the table below, report the number of teachers who are working in the Title III language instruction educational programs as defined under Section 3301(8) and reported in 1.6.1 (Types of language instruction educational programs) even if they are not paid with Title III funds.

**Note: Section 3301(8) - The term 'Language instruction educational program' means an instruction course (A) in which a limited English proficient child is placed for the purpose of developing and attaining English proficiency, while meeting challenging State academic content and student academic achievement standards, as required by Section 1111(b)(1); and (B) that may make instructional use of both English and a child's native language to enable the child to develop and attain English proficiency and may include the participation of English proficient children if such course is designed to enable all participating children to become proficient in English and a second language.**

	#
Number of all certified/licensed teachers currently working in Title III language instruction educational programs.	2,891
Estimate number of additional certified/licensed teachers that will be needed for Title III language instruction educational programs in the next 5 years*.	750

Explain in the comment box below if there is a zero for any item in the table above. The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

source of teacher Supply/Demand in WI <http://dpi.wi.gov/tepd/pdf/supdem07.pdf>

\* This number should be the total additional teachers needed for the next 5 years, not the number needed for each year. Do not include the number of teachers currently working in Title III English language instruction educational programs.

### 1.6.6.2 Professional Development Activities of Subgrantees Related to the Teaching and Learning of LEP Students

In the tables below, provide information about the subgrantee professional development activities that meet the requirements of Section 3115(c)(2).

#### **Table 1.6.6.2 Definitions:**

1. **Professional Development Topics = Subgrantee activities for professional development topics required under Title III.**
2. **#Subgrantees = Number of subgrantees who conducted each type of professional development activity. A subgrantee may conduct more than one professional development activity. (Use the same method of counting subgrantees, including consortia, as in 1.6.1.1 and 1.6.4.1.)**
3. Total Number of Participants = Number of teachers, administrators and other personnel who participated in each type of the professional development activities reported.
4. Total = Number of all participants in professional development (PD) activities

Type of Professional Development Activity	# Subgrantees	
Instructional strategies for LEP students	68	
Understanding and implementation of assessment of LEP students	62	
Understanding and implementation of ELP standards and academic content standards for LEP students	49	
Alignment of the curriculum in language instruction educational programs to ELP standards	35	
Subject matter knowledge for teachers	41	
Other (Explain in comment box)	33	
Participant Information	# Subgrantees	# Participants
PD provided to content classroom teachers	59	6,102
PD provided to LEP classroom teachers	59	1,845
PD provided to principals	51	486
PD provided to administrators/other than principals	49	374
PD provided to other school personnel/non-administrative	46	867
PD provided to community based organization personnel	11	210
Total	71	9,884

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

Above data based on ESEA Title 3 End of Year Report as of December 16, 2009. Other Professional Development Activities: credit classes -Teaching the English Lang. Learner and Foundation for ELL ACCESS data retreat; professional references CESA #4 ACCESS Testing and ELL Literacy Skills and Content Training Computer-aided teacher instruction in working with children from other cultures. Attendance at ELL conferences best practices in teaching vocabulary CESA training, assistance, and ELL Coordinator Networking Meetings CESA materials regarding ELL instruction were distributed to all staff Coaching regular education teachers & administrators in public and parochial schools Collaboration with mainstream teachers Collegial dialogue with ELL Coordinator Consortium ELL teacher / coordinator meetings cultural competence Data Retreat: ACCESS Testing Results sponsored by DPI/CESA sponsored programs for ELL Data retreat, ongoing ESL meetings, summer collaboration, cultural classes Developed Tool Kit for ELL "for general education teachers" Differentiation in Instruction/Layered Curriculum ESL Conference on Instruction Methods in ESL ESL teacher mentoring new ESL teacher Gifted/Talented alignment with ELP standards: Training for G/T school advocates Modifying assignments, Program Plan training Professional Development on inclusive models and program models Professional Development on using ACCESS data to improve instruction Response to Intervention Process Training Sheltered Instruction Observation Protocol or SIOP Model Spanish immersion course for Bilingual teachers speaker for staff, parents, and families at a family/school event Special Education and ELL Strategic planning/CESA District-wide collaboration sessions Technology inservice for ELL teachers Training on ACCESS testing by our psychologists who will administer the tests

## 1.6.7 State Subgrant Activities

This section collects data on State grant activities.

### 1.6.7.1 State Subgrant Process

In the table below, report the time between when the State receives the Title III allocation from ED, normally on July 1 of each year for the upcoming school year, and the time when the State distributes these funds to subgrantees for the intended school year. Dates must be in the format MM/DD/YY.

#### Table 1.6.7.1 Definitions:

1. **Date State Received Allocation = Annual date the State receives the Title III allocation from US Department of Education (ED).**
2. **Date Funds Available to Subgrantees = Annual date that Title III funds are available to approved subgrantees.**
3. **# of Days/\$\$ Distribution = Average number of days for States receiving Title III funds to make subgrants to subgrantees beginning from July 1 of each year, except under conditions where funds are being withheld.**

Example: State received SY 2008-09 funds July 1, 2008, and then made these funds available to subgrantees on August 1, 2008, for SY 2008-09 programs. Then the "# of days/\$\$ Distribution" is 30 days.

Date State Received Allocation	Date Funds Available to Subgrantees	# of Days/\$\$ Distribution
7/1/08	7/1/08	0
<b>Comments: Prior to receiving allocations, WDPI gives districts/subgrantees an estimate based on the number of eligible ELLs in each district. WI uses a consolidated online application for all ESEA Title funding, and districts are allowed to complete their applications prior to the date WDPI receives final allocations. Title III subgrants for each district are posted on WDPI's web site and districts are immediately notified via e-mail. Allocations are available the same date as the notice.</b>		

### 1.6.7.2 Steps To Shorten the Distribution of Title III Funds to Subgrantees

In the comment box below, describe how your State can shorten the process of distributing Title III funds to subgrantees. The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

LEAs are given preliminary estimates to build their budgets. Final district budgets are determined and provided to LEAs. Budgets are then "fine tuned" once funding is determined.

### 1.7 PERSISTENTLY DANGEROUS SCHOOLS

In the table below, provide the number of schools identified as persistently dangerous, as determined by the State, by the start of the school year. For further guidance on persistently dangerous schools, refer to Section B "Identifying Persistently Dangerous Schools" in the Unsafe School Choice Option Non-Regulatory Guidance, available at: <http://www.ed.gov/policy/elsec/guid/unsafeschoolchoice.pdf>.

	#
Persistently Dangerous Schools	
<b>Comments: Number is "0"</b>	

## 1.8 GRADUATION RATES AND DROPOUT RATES

This section collects graduation and dropout rates.

### 1.8.1 Graduation Rates

In the table below, provide the graduation rates calculated using the methodology that was approved as part of the State's accountability plan for the previous school year (SY 2007-08). Below the table are FAQs about the data collected in this table.

Student Group	Graduation Rate
All Students	89.0
American Indian or Alaska Native	74.9
Asian or Pacific Islander	89.6
Black, non-Hispanic	66.6
Hispanic	74.9
White, non-Hispanic	92.9
Children with disabilities (IDEA)	79.2
Limited English proficient	79.1
Economically disadvantaged	78.2
Migratory students	
Male	86.7
Female	91.3

**Comments: Data for migratory students are not available due to the lack of complete disaggregated information about dropouts over the four high school years. 4-year Adjusted Cohort Graduation rates will available for migratory students with publication of 2011-12 rates.**

Source – Initially populated from EDFacts. See Attachment D: CSPR & EDFacts Data Crosswalk. If the SEA has additional racial/ethnic groups or combinations of racial/ethnic groups in its accountability plan under NCLB, the SEA will report the above data for those groups through the online CSPR collection tool.

#### FAQs on graduation rates:

- a. *What is the graduation rate? Section 200.19 of the Title I regulations issued under the No Child Left Behind Act on December 2, 2002, defines graduation rate to mean:*
  - The percentage of students, measured from the beginning of high school, who graduate from public high school with a regular diploma (not including a GED or any other diploma not fully aligned with the State's academic standards) in the standard number of years; or,
  - Another more accurate definition developed by the State and approved by the Secretary in the State plan that more accurately measures the rate of students who graduate from high school with a regular diploma; and
  - Avoids counting a dropout as a transfer.
- b. *What if the data collection system is not in place for the collection of graduate rates? For those States that are reporting transitional graduation rate data and are working to put into place data collection systems that will allow the State to calculate the graduation rate in accordance with Section 200.19 for all the required subgroups, please provide a detailed progress report on the status of those efforts.*

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

## 1.8.2 Dropout Rates

In the table below, provide the dropout rates calculated using the annual event school dropout rate for students leaving a school in a single year determined in accordance with the National Center for Education Statistic's (NCES) Common Core of Data (CCD) for the previous school year (SY 2007-08). Below the table is a FAQ about the data collected in this table.

Student Group	Dropout Rate
All Students	1.7
American Indian or Alaska Native	4.0
Asian or Pacific Islander	1.4
Black, non-Hispanic	5.6
Hispanic	3.7
White, non-Hispanic	1.0
Children with disabilities (IDEA)	2.6
Limited English proficient	2.9
Economically disadvantaged	2.8
Migratory students	
Male	1.9
Female	1.4
Comments:	

### FAQ on dropout rates:

*What is a dropout? A dropout is an individual who: 1) was enrolled in school at some time during the previous school year; and 2) was not enrolled at the beginning of the current school year; and 3) has not graduated from high school or completed a State-or district-approved educational program; and 4) does not meet any of the following exclusionary conditions: a) transfer to another public 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.*

## 1.9 EDUCATION FOR HOMELESS CHILDREN AND YOUTHS PROGRAM

This section collects data on homeless children and youths and the McKinney-Vento grant program.

In the table below, provide the following information about the number of LEAs in the State who reported data on homeless children and youths and the McKinney-Vento program. The totals will be will be automatically calculated.

	#	# LEAs Reporting Data
LEAs without subgrants	430	430
LEAs with subgrants	12	12
Total	442	442
<b>Comments: The total of 442 LEAs includes 425 LEAs and 17 independent charter schools. Please note that 24 Wisconsin districts have not yet reported homeless data as of 12/10/09. NOTE: Numbers above revised as of 3/10/10.</b>		

### 1.9.1 All LEAs (with and without McKinney-Vento subgrants)

The following questions collect data on homeless children and youths in the State.

#### 1.9.1.1 Homeless Children And Youths

In the table below, provide the number of homeless children and youths by grade level enrolled in public school at any time during the regular school year. The totals will be automatically calculated:

Age/Grade	# of Homeless Children/Youths Enrolled in Public School in LEAs Without Subgrants	# of Homeless Children/Youths Enrolled in Public School in LEAs With Subgrants
Age 3 through 5 (not Kindergarten)	137	373
K	361	645
1	362	689
2	360	591
3	357	549
4	325	498
5	304	492
6	220	438
7	222	450
8	229	440
9	185	505
10	212	352
11	253	406
12	496	504
Ungraded		
Total	4,023	6,932
<b>Comments: In the past we had added K4 and K5 counts together in the Kindergarten category, this year we have included K4 in the Age 3 to 5 category to be more consistent with other public and EDEN reporting. NOTE: Numbers above revised as of 3/10/10. Wisconsin has no schools with ungraded classes. Every student must be assigned a grade.</b>		

### 1.9.1.2 Primary Nighttime Residence of Homeless Children and Youths

In the table below, provide the number of homeless children and youths by primary nighttime residence enrolled in public school at any time during the regular school year. The primary nighttime residence should be the student's nighttime residence when he/she was identified as homeless. The totals will be automatically calculated.

	# of Homeless Children/Youths -LEAs Without Subgrants	# of Homeless Children/Youths -LEAs With Subgrants
Shelters, transitional housing, awaiting foster care	659	1,425
Doubled-up (e.g., living with another family)	2,936	5,129
Unsheltered (e.g., cars, parks, campgrounds, temporary trailer, or abandoned buildings)	96	76
Hotels/Motels	332	302
Total	4,023	6,932
<b>Comments:</b>		

### 1.9.2 LEAs with McKinney-Vento Subgrants

The following sections collect data on LEAs with McKinney-Vento subgrants.

#### 1.9.2.1 Homeless Children and Youths Served by McKinney-Vento Subgrants

In the table below, provide the number of homeless children and youths by grade level who were served by McKinney-Vento subgrants during the regular school year. The total will be automatically calculated.

Age/Grade	# Homeless Children/Youths Served by Subgrants
Age 3 through 5 (not Kindergarten)	417
K	671
1	703
2	606
3	568
4	510
5	505
6	455
7	468
8	461
9	533
10	368
11	423
12	522
Ungraded	
Total	7,210

**Comments: In the past we had added K4 and K5 counts together in the Kindergarten category, this year we have included K4 in the Age 3 to 5 category to be more consistent with other public and EDEN reporting. Historically, Wisconsin has reported EHCY data of students who were enrolled and served. In Wisconsin, a student who is identified as homeless and enrolled in school receives services required under McKinney-Vento. This is the first year that Wisconsin has collected data for students who were "served but not enrolled." Because the collection of "served only" data is new to subgrant districts, the numbers reflected in this section are lower than they should be. Subgrantees are now collecting "served only" data more accurately.**

Source – Initially populated from EDfacts. See Attachment D: CSPR & EDfacts Data Crosswalk.

### 1.9.2.2 Subgroups of Homeless Students Served

In the table below, please provide the following information about the homeless students served during the regular school year.

	# Homeless Students Served
Unaccompanied youth	979
Migratory children/youth	129
Children with disabilities (IDEA)	1,645
Limited English proficient students	678
<b>Comments: This data includes "enrolled and served" students only. Students who were "served but not enrolled" is not included in this data.</b>	

Source – Initially populated from EDFacts. See Attachment D: CSPR & EDFacts Data Crosswalk.

### 1.9.2.3 Educational Support Services Provided by Subgrantees

In the table below, provide the number of subgrantee programs that provided the following educational support services with McKinney-Vento funds.

	# McKinney-Vento Subgrantees That Offer
Tutoring or other instructional support	12
Expedited evaluations	10
Staff professional development and awareness	12
Referrals for medical, dental, and other health services	12
Transportation	12
Early childhood programs	12
Assistance with participation in school programs	12
Before-, after-school, mentoring, summer programs	12
Obtaining or transferring records necessary for enrollment	12
Parent education related to rights and resources for children	12
Coordination between schools and agencies	12
Counseling	12
Addressing needs related to domestic violence	11
Clothing to meet a school requirement	12
School supplies	12
Referral to other programs and services	12
Emergency assistance related to school attendance	11
Other (optional – in comment box below)	
Other (optional – in comment box below)	
Other (optional – in comment box below)	

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

Other support services comments: "Absolutely any need that arises." "Enrollment Assistance, free meals."

Source – Manual input by SEA into the online collection tool.

#### 1.9.2.4 Barriers To The Education Of Homeless Children And Youth

In the table below, provide the number of subgrantees that reported the following barriers to the enrollment and success of homeless children and youths.

	# Subgrantees Reporting
Eligibility for homeless services	1
School Selection	2
Transportation	3
School records	2
Immunizations	1
Other medical records	0
Other Barriers – in comment box below	1

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

Other barriers include: "unable to receive prescription medications-3"

### 1.9.2.5 Academic Progress of Homeless Students

The following questions collect data on the academic achievement of homeless children and youths served by McKinney-Vento subgrants.

#### 1.9.2.5.1 Reading Assessment

In the table below, provide the number of homeless children and youths served who were tested on the State ESEA reading/language arts assessment and the number of those tested who scored at or above proficient. Provide data for grades 9 through 12 only for those grades tested for ESEA.

Grade	# Homeless Children/Youths Served by McKinney-Vento Taking Reading Assessment Test	# Homeless Children/Youths Served by McKinney-Vento Who Scored At or Above Proficient
3	415	202
4	369	194
5	359	186
6	317	164
7	323	179
8	317	181
High School	240	96
<b>Comments: Wisconsin tests student reading assessment in the 10th grade. In Wisconsin, students who score "Advanced" or "Proficient" on the Wisconsin Knowledge and Concepts Exam are considered "proficient" or "above proficient".</b>		

Source – Initially populated from EDFacts. See Attachment D: CSPR & EDFacts Data Crosswalk.

#### 1.9.2.5.2 Mathematics Assessment

This section is similar to 1.9.2.5.1. The only difference is that this section collects data on the State ESEA mathematics assessment.

Grade	# Homeless Children/Youths Served by McKinney-Vento Taking Mathematics Assessment Test	# Homeless Children/Youths Served by McKinney-Vento Who Scored At or Above Proficient
3	386	137
4	357	190
5	366	167
6	301	107
7	301	114
8	293	126
High School	240	66
<b>Comments: Wisconsin tests student math assessment in the 10th grade. In Wisconsin, students who score "Advanced" or "Proficient" on the Wisconsin Knowledge and Concepts Exam are considered "proficient" or "above proficient".</b>		

Source – Initially populated from EDFacts. See Attachment D: CSPR & EDFacts Data Crosswalk.

## 1.10 MIGRANT CHILD COUNTS

This section collects the Title I, Part C, Migrant Education Program (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 reporting period of September 1, 2008 through August 31, 2009. This section also collects a report on the procedures used by States to produce true, accurate, and valid child counts.

To provide the child counts, each SEA should have sufficient procedures in place 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 migrant children are counted for funding purposes and are served. If an SEA has reservations about the accuracy of its child counts, it must inform the Department of its concerns and explain how and when it will resolve them under Section 1.10.3.4 Quality Control Processes.

**Note: In submitting this information, the Authorizing State Official must certify that, to the best of his/her knowledge, 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:

*How is "out-of-school" defined? Out-of-school means youth 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 could include students who have dropped out of school, youth who are working on a GED outside of a K-12 institution, and youth who are "here-to-work" only. It does not include preschoolers, who are counted by age grouping.*

*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. In some cases, ungraded students may also include special education children, transitional bilingual students, students working on a GED through a K-12 institution, or those in a correctional setting. (Students working on a GED outside of a K-12 institution are counted as out-of-school youth.)*

### 1.10.1 Category 1 Child Count

In the table below, enter the unduplicated statewide number by age/grade of eligible migrant 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 reporting period of September 1, 2008 through August 31, 2009. This figure includes all eligible migrant children who may or may not have participated in MEP services. Count a child who moved from one age/grade level to another during the reporting period only once in the highest age/grade that he/she attained during the reporting period. The unduplicated statewide total count is calculated automatically.

Do not include:

- Children age birth through 2 years
- Children served by the MEP (under the continuation of services authority) after their period of eligibility has expired when other services are not available to meet their needs
- Previously eligible secondary-school children who are receiving credit accrual services (under the continuation of services authority).

<b>Age/Grade</b>	<b>12-Month Count of Eligible Migrant Children Who Can be Counted for Funding Purposes</b>
Age 3 through 5 (not Kindergarten)	127
K	79
1	66
2	58
3	72
4	70
5	64
6	58
7	75
8	65
9	63
10	58
11	59
12	53
Ungraded	
Out-of-school	31
Total	998
<b>Comments:</b>	

Source – Initially populated from ED Facts. See Attachment D: CSPR & ED Facts Data Crosswalk.

### 1.10.1.1 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.

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

The reported migrant student counts for Category 1 were lower for 2008-09 than the count submitted for 2007-07. Contributing factors are stated below:

A trend continues that growers and employers are increasingly recruiting and hiring single workers instead of families. There has been an increase in arrangements between employers and employment sites to share workers and bussing costs/expenses are then absorbed by the entities which This practice is reducing the overall number of workers as well. Inadequate housing for families is still a reality in some parts of the state resulting in some migrant families opting to travel on to other states for work. There is a continuing practice in this state of bringing in foreign worker under VISA programs. These individuals are mostly adult workers without families and in many cases already have college degrees.

### 1.10.2 Category 2 Child Count

In the table below, enter by age/grade the unduplicated statewide number of eligible migrant 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 reporting period of September 1, 2008 through August 31, 2009. Count a child who moved from one age/grade level to another during the reporting period only once in the highest age/grade that he/she attained during the reporting 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 served by the MEP (under the continuation of services authority) after their period of eligibility has expired when other services are not available to meet their needs
- Previously eligible secondary-school children who are receiving credit accrual services (under the continuation of services authority).

Age/Grade	Summer/Intersession Count of Eligible Migrant Children Who Are Participants and Who Can Be Counted for Funding Purposes
Age 3 through 5 (not Kindergarten)	8
K	24
1	24
2	27
3	24
4	23
5	23
6	14
7	11
8	5
9	9
10	N<5
11	5
12	5
Ungraded	
Out-of-school	
Total	205
<b>Comments:</b>	

Source – Initially populated from EDFacts. See Attachment D: CSPR & EDFacts Data Crosswalk.

### 1.10.2.1 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.

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

The decrease in Category 2 child count was also impacted by the factors listed under 1.10.1.1. Additional, influencing factors included:

Due to the worsening economic situation, and a substantial increase in the hours migrant family members worked on a daily basis, it was increasingly difficult to be successful in scheduling migrant youth into needed secondary classes during the summer to meet credit accrual needs.

A large urban district opted not to operate a summer project as it had the previous summer.

### 1.10.3 Child Count Calculation and Validation Procedures

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

#### 1.10.3.1 Student Information System

In the space below, respond to the following questions: What system(s) did your State use to compile and generate the Category 1 and Category 2 child count for this reporting period (e.g., NGS, MIS 2000, COEStar, manual system)? Were child counts for the last reporting period generated using the same system(s)? If the State's category 2 count was generated using a different system from the category 1 count, please identify each system.

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

1.10.3.1 Student information systems used for Category 1 and Category 2 counts.

Response:

Wisconsin's 2007-08 child counts reported for Category 1 and Category 2 were determined through reports generated from data inputted into the New Generation System (NGS), along with multiple cross-checking procedures and validation of data by state and local staff.

1.10.3.1 Were Child Counts for the last reporting period generated using the same systems?

Response:

Yes, the same system was used for the 2006-07 child count. Student count data used for the 2006-07 child counts was reported from the New Generation System (NGS) for the Category 1 and Category 2 counts.

### 1.10.3.2 Data Collection and Management Procedures

In the space below, respond to the following questions: How was the child count data collected? What data were collected? What activities were conducted to collect the data? When were the data collected for use in the student information system? If the data for the State's category 2 count were collected and maintained differently from the category 1 count, please describe each set of procedures.

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

(a) A state trained state recruiter and local project recruiters used the 2008-09 Wisconsin Certificate of Eligibility (COE) in face-to-face interviews with potential migrant families, which was designed to yield a substantial amount of student demographic information necessary for accurately determining migrant child eligibility. The data is inputted into the New Generation System (NGS). The NGS system is programmed to set a query to ensure a student aged 3-21 is counted only once statewide for the child counts yielded for Category 1 and Category 2 counts. All data elements required by the federal legislation for determination of child eligibility for the counts is included.

(b) The data was collected within the allowable window of September 1, 2008-August 31, 2009.

(c) Category 2 data was collected with the same procedures as Category 1

In the space below, describe how the child count data are inputted, updated, and then organized by the student information system for child count purposes at the State level

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

The state NGS data entry management specialist and some locally trained personnel with proper authorization enter data into the NGS system. Wisconsin compiles a new COE for every student that arrives in the district from another district or state, or from Canada or Mexico. Also, a Continuing Enrollment report (CER) and Local Accounting Sheet (LAS) were prepared for those students not moving out of state who were enrolled in school for the regular term or summer term. NGS was updated regularly to reflect new demographic enrollment course history and assessment data. A careful checking of residency verification is completed by the designated November date per the parameters agreed on by NGS consortium members.

Careful scrutiny by state staff affirmed that the NGS query included only students ages 3-21 and those eligible within the 36 month period, that residency had been verified, and that the unique student count for funding purposes included students of the appropriate age range.

As described last year, the type of each enrollment is included on every enrollment history line. An "R" identifies students as reenrolled in a school or project during the regular school year, while an "S" or "I" identifies summer or intercession enrollments. However, Wisconsin does not have programming on the intercession basis. A "P" shows eligible migrants who are presently residing in the district but are not enrolled in a school or project.

The NGS system has been programmed to set a query to ensure a student is counted only once statewide for the count yield in Category 1 and Category 2. The NGS system creates a unique student identification number for each student. There was extra checking for potential duplication when names are the same or similar to rule out duplicity in the counts. The checks done on NGS data that was tested in MSIX assisted with strengthening a few problem areas. The analysis of snapshot data prior to authorizing data entry into EDEN also has been useful in validating the data accuracy.

Special NGS reports unique to districts were printed and shared to help eliminate problems with reported data and to ensure data accuracy and quality. The report available from NGS that validates 2 year olds turning 3 and special reports on residency verification are proving to be very important tools for local and state efforts to ensure accurate data for the child count. The End of Eligibility Report is generated by NGS to flag students whose eligibility will end during the current term. This report helps avoid inaccurate counts due to including students that no longer have eligible migrant status.

Wisconsin strictly adhered to the parameters and timelines established for the entry of data used for the child count that meets the legal eligibility reporting window of September 1, 2008 through August 31, 2009.

The data for the State's category 2 count were collected and maintained through NGS in the same manner as for the Category 1 Count. The NGS system is set to report out the number of eligible students receiving supplemental services during the summer term.

If the data for the State's category 2 count were collected and maintained differently from the category 1 count, please describe each set of procedures.

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

### 1.10.3.3 Methods Used To Count Children

In the space below, respond to the following question: How was each child count calculated? Please describe the compilation process and edit functions that are built into your student information system(s) specifically to produce an accurate child count. In particular, describe how your system includes and counts only:

- children who were between age 3 through 21;
- children who met the program eligibility criteria (e.g., were within 3 years of a last qualifying move, had a qualifying activity);
- children who were resident in your State for at least 1 day during the eligibility period (September 1 through August 31);
- children who—in the case of Category 2—received a MEP-funded service during the summer or intersession term; and
- children once per age/grade level for each child count category.

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

•Children who met the program eligibility criteria (e.g.,) were between 3-21 years-of-age and were within 3 years of a last qualifying move with a qualifying activity.

Response:

The Category 1 count was obtained from the NGS data base, which was programmed to check data entered by the state for withdrawal date fields, enrollment date fields, and residency verification date field which documented residency during the applicable reporting period and permits inclusion in the eligible student count. Substantial steps are taken by the state staff to build data quality prior to this step. Snapshot data is reviewed for accuracy prior to requesting the final run that generates the counts.

Children who met the program eligibility criteria were within 3 years of a last qualifying move and had a qualifying activity.

Response:

The NGS query has been set to include only children who were at least 3 and under 22 years of age. Local recruiters and the statewide recruiter verify residency by the face-to-face recruitment interviews with the family to obtain appropriate information to make necessary judgments on eligibility and by obtaining the parents' signature on that same date.

Questionable situations discovered regarding qualifying work, qualifying arrival, and withdrawal issues were scheduled for follow-up reviews. State MEP staff reviewed and offered guidance per federal definitions and relevant regulations and guidelines to local project recruiters and program directors prior to final determination of eligibility status. Communications were carried out through email, phone calls, and at times, at on-site meetings for local staff.

•Children who were resident in your State for at least 1 day during the eligibility period (September 1 through August 31.)

Response:

The NGS data management system employs a query which counts a student only once as described earlier. For all new or updated COEs, history lines were created for Category 1 count which permitted enrollment, withdrawal and residency verification dates to be entered for every student identified and reported for the reporting period, and this procedure also produces the Category 2 count.

•Children who—in the case of Category 2—received a MEP-funded service during the summer or intersession term;

Response:

The NGS system query has set programming to include only eligible children who received either MEP funded instruction and/or support services in the Category 2 count. Staff do careful additional cross-checking and reviews of the reporting on supplementary services that took place during the official summer program period. (323)

Children counted once per age/grade level for each child count category.

Response: The NGS system query has been programmed to count a student only once in the Category 1 and Category 2 counts. The unique student ID number for each new student is registered in the NGS centralized data base. Prior to a student record being created, there is a system of built-in-checks with screening for potential duplications by similarity or same names. This checking System explored other fields of data. Any problems discovered were resolved before the NGS snapshot was taken and any duplicity problems were cleared up as the fields of data elements were reviewed and issues clarified.

The state employs multiple systems of checking and verifying residency. Data from the COE is checked against the Continuing Enrollment Report (CER) and student reporting forms (SRF). COEs are completed for summer and regular terms, and a CER is completed by district for children not leaving the state between summer and the regular term. A SRF is submitted for every student verifying school enrollment and dates. The state MEP data management team works on a continuous basis to analyze and improve data quality.

If your State's category 2 count was generated using a different system from the category 1 count, please describe each system separately.

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

### 1.10.3.4 Quality Control Processes

In the space below, respond to the following question: What steps are taken to ensure your State properly determines and verifies the eligibility of each child included in the child counts for the reporting period of September 1 through August 31 before that child's data are included in the student information system(s)?

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

The state's Migrant program manager attends meetings or phone conferences annually to participate in the Consortium sponsored by the NGS system. The NGS data management specialist participates in Advisory Council meetings with data entry specialists from the other states to focus on data quality issues, and to recommend improvements of the reports available to the states. The meetings engage the participants in reviewing needed new developments or enhancements in NGS along with opportunities to address national data requests relevant to child count and performance reporting. Consortium members are given the opportunity to make recommendations for improving services through the use of NGS.

The state staff design and provide quality training to local project personnel. During state sponsored training meetings substantial time is spent on the federal migrant education guidance and policy documents emphasizing legal requirements pertaining to data collection and reporting. Participants include project directors, recruiters, and records clerks. Sessions related to the improvement of identification and recruitment practices, collection of data to verify eligibility, procedures for reporting correctly, and acceptable means of documenting project information were provided. Several modules were covered in state training focused on beneficial the key responsibilities for identification and recruitment practices and reporting of accurate data. The training was designed to ensure these individuals are kept abreast of the legal considerations to be considered when identifying eligible migrant students.

Data was carefully screened during the program year from multiple data sources which helped to verify withdrawal and enrollment and residency dates on the Certificates of Eligibility (COE) The state team comprised of the state program manger, the NGS data entry management specialist, the MEP consultant, the statewide recruiter, and MEP program assistant worked collaboratively to strengthen data collection and to analyze and modify procedures as needed to impact the quality of the data that yields the Category 1 unique student count and the Category 2 summer program enrolled participants .Local project personnel provide training to others at the local site after receiving specialized training on determining and reporting eligibility.

COE's were obtained for all new families and families traveling out of state . Districts reported on the Local Accounting Sheet (LAS) and submitted a Continuing Enrollment Report (CER) for all other enrolled eligible students. The statewide recruiter engaged in checking eligibility data and in re-interviewing families to assist local recruiters that had problems with determination of eligibility.

The increased use of many of the NGS management reports has improved Wisconsin's data quality and accuracy when carrying out the data collection on migrant students. These included the District Report, the End of Eligibility Report, the COE Family Report, the Continuation of Services Report, the Priority for Services Report, and other special reports available from NGS unique to the state.

WI Response to Data Verification request dated 2/22/10:

#### Annual Re-interviewing

2008-09 re-interviewing focused on two urban districts where issues had been identified, and one of these had a high number of families found eligible on temporary status.

The 2008-09 annual re-interviewing began in follow--up to new definition of temporary not to exceed 12 months, District (A) had qualified a high number of families on temporary status. Data was reviewed for 106 students . Due to the worker employment period exceeding 12 months, 60 students were dropped from the role. (non-comprehensive re-interviewing)

In annual re-interviewing analysis completed for 2008-09, 25 students from 13 families in District B were included in the examination of eligibility status. 8 students were removed from the rolls due to the inability to confirm eligibility. Eligibility had run out for 7 other students and enrollment was not renewed. (non-comprehensive re-interviewing.) 10 students remained eligible.

#### Comprehensive Prospective Re-interviewing

External re-interviewers will be employed starting in June 2010 to begin the comprehensive prospective re-interviewing process during the time when families are back in the state and will be continued through the fall 2010 months that families remain. A random sample from each project area in the state will be included in the test for eligibility.

In the space below, describe specifically the procedures used and the results of any re-interview processes used by the SEA during the reporting period to test the accuracy of the State's MEP eligibility determinations. In this description, please include the number of eligibility determinations sampled, the number for which a test was completed, and the number found eligible.

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

A re-interviewing plan has been developed for the state which will have the eligibility of a number of students from each project reviewed.

The plan allowed for a selected number of migrant students' eligibility to be reviewed during 2008-09. When completed, in 2009-10 it will have re-interviewed the workers reported to be engaged in temporary work to see if any workers were employed at the same place after a 12 months period. The larger urban districts were scheduled to be completed first, with those re-interviewed first on the basis of dairying or Major problems found in the first round of re-interviewing was the length of time before children joined their parents, insufficient explanation on work that was being sought to make a determination of eligibility; need to look at the length of work period for those qualified as doing temporary work. Training for local project personnel has focused on the new regulations and recommended time lines in these situations.

Re-interviews also take place when questions arise in the completion of the COE at the local level and the statewide recruiter re-contacts the family for clarification of information relevant to their move. Questions are thus resolved prior to entering the data into NGS. In the rare case a child is found to be ineligible, the parents are informed and the recommended procedures are again followed for removing that child from the migrant child count. The thorough examination of COE's by multiple trained staff is contributing to improving of the recruitment efforts to have accurate data prior to submission to the NGS system.

In the space below, respond to the following question: Throughout the year, what steps are taken by staff to check that child count data are inputted and updated accurately (and—for systems that merge data—consolidated accurately)?

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

The state NGS Data Entry Management Specialist runs periodic reports to monitor progress and to spot problem areas. These reports include the District Report, which shows residency verification, enrollment status, withdrawal of students, duplication in names or numbers for the same individual, and other details related to accurate reporting. The District Reports, along with others are used in working with LEAs needing guidance on procedures for correcting or completing data entries that impact accuracy of student counts. Extensive technical assistance is given by phone and in e-mail communications on an ongoing basis through this position as well as through the MEP education consultant position. Persistent problems are worked into professional development training agendas. Periodic NGS updates in the form of Quick Reference Sheets are also forwarded to all projects as needed throughout the year. In this manner open communication is maintained with all individuals whose responsibilities involve child count issues and both long standing, as well as new data collection requirements are met.

Special reports available from the NGS database were periodically reviewed by state staff, and shared to assist districts in assessing the status of their identification and recruitment procedures that impact eligibility determination for the child counts and levels of accuracy when reporting progress. The MEP education consultant and the statewide recruiter also used the reports as an integral part of the review process in their formal ESEA monitoring visits. Monitoring of the migrant programs during the consolidated plan on site visits also provides an opportunity for the state migrant consultant to review data collection and reporting procedures.

There is an ongoing process which utilizes reports from NGS data collection to provide technical assistance sessions to districts to assist them in strengthening the quality of data and to emphasize the importance of meeting reporting timelines. This includes the legal parameters that define eligibility This has included large group and one-on-one training and support to project directors, recruiters, data entry, and other records clerk personnel with responsibilities for the migrant education program data collection and eligibility determinations and reporting.

In the space below, respond to the following question: What final steps are taken by State staff to verify the child counts produced by your student information system(s) are accurate counts of children in Category 1 and Category 2 prior to their submission to ED?

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

State staff members work closely with NGS technical assistance consultants at the Texas contractor's office to take every precaution in closely studying all relevant reports to ensure accuracy is maintained prior to submittal of the final count. State staff works closely with EDEN staff to exchange reports from the data base for submittal of verified counts to the national data base.

The state MEP staff takes a serious approach to the verification of the accuracy of the two child counts. These efforts are going on all year and contribute to the goal of meeting the legal eligibility criteria as set forth in 34 CFR 200.40. In the final steps strong efforts were made to have state and local project personnel fully aware of what constitutes accurate data for child count reporting, and the importance of maintaining clear documentation supporting eligibility of students entered into the migrant child counts.

State and local project personnel were engaged in the use of all available data for cross-checking on data displayed on district specific-related reports throughout the year, however this effort is intensified as preliminary counts become available and a thorough study of accuracy of the two counts is conducted before the final clearance for submittal to the education department. MEP staff work with EDEN staff to ensure proper reporting.

State staff continued to engage district migrant project personnel in study of definitions, statutory requirements and decision-making on Principal Means of Livelihood (PMOL), determinations of qualifying work, intent to see or obtain work, and acceptable means of documenting work histories for the migrant families moving into the state, or from one school district to another within the state. The comprehensive review of available paper documentation that supports the counts and/or spots problems to be solved in the final steps, contributes to accurate documentation of child counts.

In the space below, describe those corrective actions or improvements that will be made by the SEA to improve the accuracy of its MEP eligibility determinations in light of the prospective re-interviewing results.

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

The state will continue to include in its re-interviewing plan cases that were qualified by temporary status for monitoring congruency the new regulations. The new national COE is being implemented during the 2009-10 program year and this will help with determinations. Upon receipt of Certificates of Eligibility (COEs) from the local projects and statewide recruiter the data management specialist, and education consultant will review them for completeness, accuracy, and compliance with the new regulations. In cases of incomplete COEs, they will be referred to the assigned interviewer for completion or clarification, as needed. In cases when eligibility cannot be definitively determined based on the information provided on the COE, recruiters and possibly employers will be contacted to clarify qualifying agricultural activities. A major part of the 2009-10 training agenda will need to continue to be reserved for training on the changes in the new regulations, and what constitutes seasonal and temporary work. The results of the re-interviewing process at each site will be used to provide feedback to project personnel on strengths and areas needing improvement in the data collection and reporting.

COEs will not be entered into the NGS database system until complete and satisfactory information is gathered to verify temporary status. To further ensure accuracy, all updates after receipt of COEs will be documented and dated directly on the COE. Additional e-mail communications will be attached to the COE. Even after all of these precautions are taken, it is realized that it may be necessary at times to follow up on information elements in the data entry process where discrepancies in the items exist. In such cases, the appropriate individual or school person will be notified and worked with to rectify the problem.

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.

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

The state has made a strong effort during 2008-09 to strengthen the quality of its data collections and local and state determinations of child eligibility. It will continue to pursue this goal during 2009-10. The state believes it has reported accurate data from its careful analysis and extensive training but realizes it must continue to develop and conduct quality training for new and experienced local project personnel and to advise all parties of consequences when regulations are not met. Extensive efforts have been directed toward developing the new national COE, with a set of clear instructions, along with training for staff. The state believes investing quality time in designing training that is delivered in scheduled meetings, individually with new migrant education staff at their site is necessary to have continuous improvement in the quality of data inputted into the system and will be ensuring this is available during the 2009-10 program year.