

**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 2009-10**

**WISCONSIN**



**PART I DUE FRIDAY, DECEMBER 17, 2010**  
**PART II DUE FRIDAY, FEBRUARY 18, 2011**

**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) 2009-10 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 ED Facts 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 2009-10 must respond to this Consolidated State Performance Report (CSPR). Part I of the Report is due to the Department by **Friday, December 17, 2010**. Part II of the Report is due to the Department by **Friday, February 18, 2011**. Both Part I and Part II should reflect data from the SY 2009-10, 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 2009-10 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 2009-10 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-HLP-EDEN (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: <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Part I, 2009-10 <input type="checkbox"/> Part II, 2009-10		
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 16, 2011, 4:41:03 PM
Signature _____		

**CONSOLIDATED STATE PERFORMANCE REPORT  
PART I**

For reporting on  
**School Year 2009-10**



**PART I DUE DECEMBER 17, 2010  
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.

English Language Arts and Mathematics: State Superintendent Tony Evers adopted the Common Core State Standards as Wisconsin's standards for English language arts and mathematics on June 2, 2010 effective immediately. Each WI school district is required to adopt standards in reading and writing, geography and history, mathematics, and science, but the district may choose standards. In 1998, most adopted the WI Model Academic Standards. The Department of Public Instruction (DPI) recommends that districts review their policy on standards in the areas listed above. DPI encourages districts to take formal action to adopt new standards to signal that local curriculum, instruction, and assessment also need to change to reflect Common Core standards.

Science: WI is a member of the CCSSO state collaborative on assessment and student standards (SCASS) for science education assessment. Members of the CCSSO science SCASS will serve as reviewers in the development of Next Generation Standards for science, K-12, led by the National Research Council and Achieve, Inc. The timeline anticipates finalizing new science standards in the 2011-12 academic year.

Ongoing Review and Revision, including Other Subject Areas: WI's participation in the Common Core State Standards Initiative is the first step. In addition to science, work is underway at the national level to develop new common standards for social studies. WDPI has just published new WI Standards for Physical Education, and scheduled a seven-year cycle for review and potential revision the other content areas with academic.

WI Model Early Learning Standards:

Since 2003, the WI Model Early Learning Standards have helped all programs serving children under mandatory school age to identify what children from birth through age 5 should know and be able to do. The WI Model Early Learning Standards provide developmental expectations for young children from birth through kindergarten that are foundational to the WI Common Core State Standards for kindergarten through grade 12. WDPI has provided an alignment of the WI Common Core State Standards in English language arts and mathematics with the WI Model Early Learning Standards in the domains of 1) cognition and general knowledge and 2) language development and communication. School districts are encouraged to use both the WI Model Early Learning Standards and the WI Common Core State Standards as they move forward with their standards work in early childhood special education, four-year-old kindergarten, five-year-old kindergarten programs, and the primary school years.

Embedding Literacy in All Subject Areas: In addition to new standards specifically for English language arts and mathematics, WI is providing guidance to districts to implement the section of the Common Core State Standards for ELA titled "Literacy Standards for History/Social Studies, Science, and Technical Standards." DPI's guidance is that literacy is the responsibility of all teachers in all subject areas. All teachers teach students how to apply the literacy skills needed to comprehend the content and demonstrate their understanding of the respective subject. This message is reinforced by the creation of these explicit standards for grades 6-12, while for grades K-5 comparable standards are integrated into the K-5 reading standards. This section provides a framework for a focused, system-wide approach to literacy so that students face the same coordinated expectations around reading and writing in social studies, science, and technical subject areas.

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

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

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, reading/language arts and/or 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 the most 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.

The WI student assessment system is aligned with the 1998 WI Model Academic Standards. DPI is in transition to a new assessment system that will reflect the Common Core State Standards. DPI is developing a new assessment system aligned to the Common Core State Standards, as part of the federally-funded multi-state SMARTER Balanced Assessment Consortium (<http://dpi.wi.gov/oea/sbac.html>) and as part of a multi-state General Supervision Enhancement Grant (GSEG). WI will continue to administer the WKCE and the WI Alternative Assessment for Students with Disabilities (WAA-SwD) annually for the interim to meet federal accountability requirements, until the SMARTER Balanced Assessment system is available.

The projected timeline for moving from the current exam to a new state assessment is as follows:

- 2010-2015: Development of SMARTER Balanced Assessment Consortium's formative assessment resources plus benchmark and summative items
- 2010-2014: Development (through GSEG consortium) of new Extended Standards for students with significant cognitive disabilities taking the WAA-SwD; development and new standard setting, derived from the Common Core State Standards
- 2013-14: Piloting and field testing of the summative assessment
- 2014-15: New summative assessment system is fully operational, given across the state and the consortium, replacing the WKCE and the WAA-SwD

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

**1.1.3 Grants for State Assessments and Related Activities****1.1.3.1 Percentages of Funds Used for Standards and Assessment Development and Other Purposes**

For funds your State had available under ESEA section 6111 (Grants for State Assessments and Related Activities) during SY 2009-10, estimate what percentage of the funds your State used for the following (round to the nearest ten percent).

<b>Purpose</b>	<b>Percentage (rounded to the nearest ten percent)</b>
To pay the costs of the development of the State assessments and standards required by section 1111(b)	10.0
To administer assessments required by section 1111(b) or to carry out other activities described in section 6111 and other activities related to ensuring that the State's schools and local educational agencies are held accountable for the results	90.0
<b>Comments:</b>	

**1.1.3.2 Uses of Funds for Purposes Other than Standards and Assessment Development**

For funds your State had available under ESEA 6111 (Grants for State Assessments and Related Activities) during SY 2009-10 that were used for purposes other than the costs of the development of the State assessments and standards required by section 1111(b), for what purposes did your State use the funds? (Enter "yes" for all that apply and "no" for all that do not apply).

<b>Purpose</b>	<b>Used for Purpose (yes/no)</b>
Administering assessments required by section 1111(b)	<input type="checkbox"/> No
Developing challenging State academic content and student academic achievement standards and aligned assessments in academic subjects for which standards and assessments are not required by section 1111(b)	<input type="checkbox"/> No
Developing or improving assessments of English language proficiency necessary to comply with section 1111(b)(7)	<input type="checkbox"/> No
Ensuring the continued validity and reliability of State assessments, and/or refining State assessments to ensure their continued alignment with the State's academic content standards and to improve the alignment of curricula and instructional materials	<input type="checkbox"/> No
Developing multiple measures to increase the reliability and validity of State assessment systems	<input type="checkbox"/> No
Strengthening the capacity of local educational agencies and schools to provide all students the opportunity to increase educational achievement, including carrying out professional development activities aligned with State student academic achievement standards and assessments	<input type="checkbox"/> No
Expanding the range of accommodations available to students with limited English proficiency and students with disabilities (IDEA) to improve the rates of inclusion of such students, including professional development activities aligned with State academic achievement standards and assessments	<input type="checkbox"/> No
Improving the dissemination of information on student achievement and school performance to parents and the community, including the development of information and reporting systems designed to identify best educational practices based on scientifically based research or to assist in linking records of student achievement, length of enrollment, and graduation over time	<input type="checkbox"/> No
Other	<input type="checkbox"/> No
<b>Comments:</b>	

## 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	433,373		>97
American Indian or Alaska Native	6,406		>97
Asian or Pacific Islander	15,930		>97
Black, non-Hispanic	45,040		>97
Hispanic	35,852		>97
White, non-Hispanic	330,008		>97
Children with disabilities ( <i>IDEA</i> )	60,694		>97
Limited English proficient ( <i>LEP</i> ) students	25,949		>97
Economically disadvantaged students	166,383		>97
Migratory students	278		>97
Male	222,445		>97
Female	210,907		>97
<b>Comments:</b>			

### 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 ( <i>IDEA</i> ) Participating	Percentage of Children with Disabilities ( <i>IDEA</i> ) Participating, Who Took the Specified Assessment
Regular Assessment without Accommodations	17,853	29.7
Regular Assessment with Accommodations	36,948	61.5
Alternate Assessment Based on Grade-Level Achievement Standards		
Alternate Assessment Based on Modified Achievement Standards		
Alternate Assessment Based on Alternate Achievement Standards	5,317	8.8
Total	60,118	
<b>Comments:</b> WI did not administer Alternate Assessments based on grade level or modified achievement standards!		

### 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	433,373		>97
American Indian or Alaska Native	6,406		>97
Asian or Pacific Islander	15,930		>97
Black, non-Hispanic	45,040		>97
Hispanic	35,852		>97
White, non-Hispanic	330,008		>97
Children with disabilities ( <i>IDEA</i> )	60,694		>97
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	25,949	24,979	96.3
Economically disadvantaged students	166,383		>97
Migratory students	278	263	94.6
Male	222,445		>97
Female	210,907		>97
<b>Comments:</b> Due to small population size. Participation rate for Migratory students actually does meet criteria it rounds to 95%!			

### 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 ( <i>IDEA</i> ) Participating	Percentage of Children with Disabilities ( <i>IDEA</i> ) Participating, Who Took the Specified Assessment
Regular Assessment without Accommodations	19,659	32.8
Regular Assessment with Accommodations	34,997	58.3
Alternate Assessment Based on Grade-Level Achievement Standards		
Alternate Assessment Based on Modified Achievement Standards		
Alternate Assessment Based on Alternate Achievement Standards	5,336	8.9
Total	59,992	
<b>Comments:</b> WI did not administer Alternate Assessments based on grade level or modified achievement standards!		

### 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	190,825		>97
American Indian or Alaska Native	2,798		>97
Asian or Pacific Islander	7,004		>97
Black, non-Hispanic	19,535		>97
Hispanic	14,652		>97
White, non-Hispanic	146,765		>97
Children with disabilities ( <i>IDEA</i> )	26,541		>97
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	10,296		>97
Economically disadvantaged students	69,656		>97
Migratory students	127	123	96.9
Male	97,879		>97
Female	92,938		>97
<b>Comments:</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.

Type of Assessment	# Children with Disabilities ( <i>IDEA</i> ) Participating	Percentage of Children with Disabilities ( <i>IDEA</i> ) Participating, Who Took the Specified Assessment
Regular Assessment without Accommodations	8,459	32.5
Regular Assessment with Accommodations	15,210	58.5
Alternate Assessment Based on Grade-Level Achievement Standards	0	0.0
Alternate Assessment Based on Modified Achievement Standards	0	0.0
Alternate Assessment Based on Alternate Achievement Standards	2,337	9.0
Total	26,006	
<b>Comments:</b>		

### 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	60,477	46,271	76.5
American Indian or Alaska Native	881	575	65.3
Asian or Pacific Islander	2,373	1,817	76.6
Black, non-Hispanic	6,294	2,930	46.6
Hispanic	5,946	3,633	61.1
White, non-Hispanic	44,979	37,315	83.0
Children with disabilities ( <i>IDEA</i> )	8,481	4,675	55.1
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	4,982	3,039	61.0
Economically disadvantaged students	25,499	15,938	62.5
Migratory students	36	21	58.3
Male	31,145	24,074	77.3
Female	29,330	22,197	75.7
<b>Comments:</b> There are a very small number of Migratory students living in WI during the school year.			

**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	60,251	47,995	79.7
American Indian or Alaska Native	876	626	71.5
Asian or Pacific Islander	2,338	1,776	76.0
Black, non-Hispanic	6,290	3,633	57.8
Hispanic	5,771	3,715	64.4
White, non-Hispanic	44,972	38,245	85.0
Children with disabilities ( <i>IDEA</i> )	8,437	4,117	48.8
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	4,759	2,841	59.7
Economically disadvantaged students	25,294	17,019	67.3
Migratory students	34	23	67.6
Male	31,000	23,905	77.1
Female	29,249	24,090	82.4
<b>Comments:</b> There are a very small number of Migratory students living in WI during the school year.			

**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 ( <i>IDEA</i> )			
Limited English proficient (LEP) students			
Economically disadvantaged students			
Migratory students			
Male			
Female			
<b>Comments:</b> WI does NOT administer a science test at grade 3.			

**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	61,148	49,332	80.7
American Indian or Alaska Native	902	606	67.2
Asian or Pacific Islander	2,295	1,820	79.3
Black, non-Hispanic	6,494	3,435	52.9
Hispanic	5,507	3,756	68.2
White, non-Hispanic	45,947	39,713	86.4
Children with disabilities ( <i>IDEA</i> )	8,726	4,906	56.2
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	4,452	2,941	66.1
Economically disadvantaged students	25,168	17,217	68.4
Migratory students	39	18	46.2
Male	31,434	25,718	81.8
Female	29,712	23,612	79.5
<b>Comments:</b> There are a very small number of Migratory students living in WI during the school year.			

**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	61,014	49,861	81.7
American Indian or Alaska Native	902	634	70.3
Asian or Pacific Islander	2,269	1,768	77.9
Black, non-Hispanic	6,488	3,816	58.8
Hispanic	5,415	3,665	67.7
White, non-Hispanic	45,937	39,975	87.0
Children with disabilities ( <i>IDEA</i> )	8,699	4,266	49.0
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	4,320	2,658	61.5
Economically disadvantaged students	25,052	17,467	69.7
Migratory students	36	18	50.0
Male	31,353	25,071	80.0
Female	29,659	24,788	83.6
<b>Comments:</b> There are a very small number of Migratory students living in WI during the school year.			

## 1.3.3.2 Student Academic Achievement in Science - Grade 4

Grade 4	# 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	61,043	47,169	77.3
American Indian or Alaska Native	901	582	64.6
Asian or Pacific Islander	2,283	1,654	72.4
Black, non-Hispanic	6,475	2,959	45.7
Hispanic	5,458	3,444	63.1
White, non-Hispanic	45,923	38,527	83.9
Children with disabilities ( <i>IDEA</i> )	8,697	5,134	59.0
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	4,386	2,550	58.1
Economically disadvantaged students	25,080	15,867	63.3
Migratory students	38	18	47.4
Male	31,370	24,411	77.8
Female	29,671	22,756	76.7
<b>Comments:</b> There are a very small number of Migratory students living in WI during the school year.			

**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	60,320	47,254	78.3
American Indian or Alaska Native	919	591	64.3
Asian or Pacific Islander	2,199	1,777	80.8
Black, non-Hispanic	6,411	3,274	51.1
Hispanic	5,381	3,465	64.4
White, non-Hispanic	45,387	38,131	84.0
Children with disabilities ( <i>IDEA</i> )	8,710	4,283	49.2
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	3,899	2,327	59.7
Economically disadvantaged students	24,294	15,755	64.9
Migratory students	44	29	65.9
Male	31,006	24,174	78.0
Female	29,314	23,080	78.7
<b>Comments:</b> There are a very small number of Migratory students living in WI during the school year.			

**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	60,197	48,451	80.5
American Indian or Alaska Native	919	637	69.3
Asian or Pacific Islander	2,159	1,617	74.9
Black, non-Hispanic	6,412	3,689	57.5
Hispanic	5,299	3,481	65.7
White, non-Hispanic	45,385	39,008	85.9
Children with disabilities ( <i>IDEA</i> )	8,687	3,881	44.7
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	3,767	2,071	55.0
Economically disadvantaged students	24,191	16,288	67.3
Migratory students	44	30	68.2
Male	30,926	24,134	78.0
Female	29,271	24,317	83.1
<b>Comments:</b> There are a very small number of Migratory students living in WI during the school year.			

**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 ( <i>IDEA</i> )			
Limited English proficient (LEP) students			
Economically disadvantaged students			
Migratory students			
Male			
Female			
<b>Comments:</b> Wisconsin does NOT administer a Science test at Grade 5!			

**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	60,556	47,344	78.2
American Indian or Alaska Native	915	588	64.3
Asian or Pacific Islander	2,132	1,703	79.9
Black, non-Hispanic	6,425	3,142	48.9
Hispanic	5,011	3,194	63.7
White, non-Hispanic	46,051	38,701	84.0
Children with disabilities ( <i>IDEA</i> )	8,488	3,638	42.9
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	3,396	1,903	56.0
Economically disadvantaged students	23,878	15,294	64.1
Migratory students	40	23	57.5
Male	31,085	24,220	77.9
Female	29,466	23,121	78.5
<b>Comments:</b>			

**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	60,467	51,174	84.6
American Indian or Alaska Native	915	697	76.2
Asian or Pacific Islander	2,114	1,694	80.1
Black, non-Hispanic	6,433	3,970	61.7
Hispanic	4,942	3,625	73.4
White, non-Hispanic	46,041	41,169	89.4
Children with disabilities ( <i>IDEA</i> )	8,473	4,240	50.0
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	3,304	2,054	62.2
Economically disadvantaged students	23,806	17,515	73.6
Migratory students	38	26	68.4
Male	31,039	25,462	82.0
Female	29,423	25,708	87.4
<b>Comments:</b>			

## 1.3.3.4 Student Academic Achievement in Science - Grade 6

Grade 6	# 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			
American Indian or Alaska Native			
Asian or Pacific Islander			
Black, non-Hispanic			
Hispanic			
White, non-Hispanic			
Children with disabilities ( <i>IDEA</i> )			
Limited English proficient (LEP) students			
Economically disadvantaged students			
Migratory students			
Male			
Female			
<b>Comments:</b> Wisconsin does NOT administer a Science test at Grade 6!			

**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	60,693	49,279	81.2
American Indian or Alaska Native	884	622	70.4
Asian or Pacific Islander	2,203	1,803	81.8
Black, non-Hispanic	6,264	3,242	51.8
Hispanic	4,790	3,221	67.2
White, non-Hispanic	46,542	40,382	86.8
Children with disabilities ( <i>IDEA</i> )	8,275	3,738	45.2
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	3,313	1,966	59.3
Economically disadvantaged students	22,784	15,403	67.6
Migratory students	31	19	61.3
Male	31,022	24,922	80.3
Female	29,669	24,355	82.1
<b>Comments:</b>			

**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	60,616	52,464	86.6
American Indian or Alaska Native	885	697	78.8
Asian or Pacific Islander	2,185	1,793	82.1
Black, non-Hispanic	6,262	4,089	65.3
Hispanic	4,729	3,546	75.0
White, non-Hispanic	46,545	42,330	90.9
Children with disabilities ( <i>IDEA</i> )	8,263	4,285	51.9
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	3,229	2,031	62.9
Economically disadvantaged students	22,707	17,292	76.2
Migratory students	30	18	60.0
Male	30,974	26,177	84.5
Female	29,640	26,285	88.7
<b>Comments:</b>			

## 1.3.3.5 Student Academic Achievement in Science - Grade 7

Grade 7	# 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			
American Indian or Alaska Native			
Asian or Pacific Islander			
Black, non-Hispanic			
Hispanic			
White, non-Hispanic			
Children with disabilities ( <i>IDEA</i> )			
Limited English proficient (LEP) students			
Economically disadvantaged students			
Migratory students			
Male			
Female			
<b>Comments:</b> Wisconsin does NOT administer a Science test at Grade 7!			

**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	61,584	48,197	78.3
American Indian or Alaska Native	873	569	65.2
Asian or Pacific Islander	2,300	1,882	81.8
Black, non-Hispanic	6,306	3,027	48.0
Hispanic	4,605	2,885	62.6
White, non-Hispanic	47,441	39,790	83.9
Children with disabilities ( <i>IDEA</i> )	8,575	3,475	40.5
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	3,166	1,775	56.1
Economically disadvantaged students	22,340	14,071	63.0
Migratory students	51	22	43.1
Male	31,615	24,767	78.3
Female	29,965	23,427	78.2
<b>Comments:</b>			

**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	61,504	51,894	84.4
American Indian or Alaska Native	874	640	73.2
Asian or Pacific Islander	2,284	1,837	80.4
Black, non-Hispanic	6,308	3,960	62.8
Hispanic	4,527	3,265	72.1
White, non-Hispanic	47,451	42,142	88.8
Children with disabilities ( <i>IDEA</i> )	8,562	4,066	47.5
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	3,067	1,808	59.0
Economically disadvantaged students	22,273	16,139	72.5
Migratory students	47	28	59.6
Male	31,572	25,513	80.8
Female	29,928	26,378	88.1
<b>Comments:</b>			

**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	61,449	49,418	80.4
American Indian or Alaska Native	865	599	69.2
Asian or Pacific Islander	2,280	1,682	73.8
Black, non-Hispanic	6,275	3,047	48.6
Hispanic	4,553	2,858	62.8
White, non-Hispanic	47,418	41,183	86.9
Children with disabilities ( <i>IDEA</i> )	8,546	4,187	49.0
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	3,094	1,484	48.0
Economically disadvantaged students	22,240	14,482	65.1
Migratory students	49	30	61.2
Male	31,538	25,273	80.1
Female	29,907	24,141	80.7
<b>Comments:</b>			

**1.3.1.7 Student Academic Achievement in Mathematics - 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	67,089	47,326	70.5
American Indian or Alaska Native	988	524	53.0
Asian or Pacific Islander	2,367	1,638	69.2
Black, non-Hispanic	6,447	1,863	28.9
Hispanic	4,425	2,054	46.4
White, non-Hispanic	52,860	41,247	78.0
Children with disabilities ( <i>IDEA</i> )	8,863	2,462	27.8
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	2,610	916	35.1
Economically disadvantaged students	21,577	10,777	49.9
Migratory students	36	16	44.4
Male	34,221	24,061	70.3
Female	32,867	23,265	70.8
<b>Comments:</b>			

**1.3.2.7 Student Academic Achievement in Reading/Language Arts - 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	67,048	51,697	77.1
American Indian or Alaska Native	985	641	65.1
Asian or Pacific Islander	2,355	1,551	65.9
Black, non-Hispanic	6,473	2,768	42.8
Hispanic	4,363	2,467	56.5
White, non-Hispanic	52,870	44,268	83.7
Children with disabilities ( <i>IDEA</i> )	8,871	3,251	36.6
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	2,533	841	33.2
Economically disadvantaged students	21,534	12,850	59.7
Migratory students	34	14	41.2
Male	34,198	25,687	75.1
Female	32,849	26,009	79.2
<b>Comments:</b>			

## 1.3.3.7 Student Academic Achievement in Science - 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	66,743	48,504	72.7
American Indian or Alaska Native	973	550	56.5
Asian or Pacific Islander	2,350	1,541	65.6
Black, non-Hispanic	6,289	1,903	30.3
Hispanic	4,344	2,146	49.4
White, non-Hispanic	52,785	42,363	80.3
Children with disabilities ( <i>IDEA</i> )	8,763	3,339	38.1
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	2,546	818	32.1
Economically disadvantaged students	21,329	11,361	53.3
Migratory students	36	17	47.2
Male	34,019	25,302	74.4
Female	32,723	23,201	70.9
<b>Comments:</b>			

**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 2009-10. The percentage that made AYP will be calculated automatically.

Entity	Total #	Total # that Made AYP in SY 2009-10	Percentage that Made AYP in SY 2009-10
Schools	2,124	1,984	93.4
Districts	425	421	99.1
<b>Comments:</b>			

**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 2009-10 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 2009-10	Percentage of Title I Schools that Made AYP in SY 2009-10
All Title I schools	1,191	1,090	91.5
Schoolwide (SWP) Title I schools	513	432	84.2
Targeted assistance (TAS) Title I schools	678	658	97.1
<b>Comments:</b>			

**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 2009-10. The percentage that made AYP will be calculated automatically.

# Districts That Received Title I Funds in SY 2009-10	# Districts That Received Title I Funds and Made AYP in SY 2009-10	Percentage of Districts That Received Title I Funds and Made AYP in SY 2009-10
416	412	99.0
<b>Comments:</b>		

#### 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 2010-11 based on the data from SY 2009-10. 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 2010-11 (Use one of the following improvement status designations: School Improvement - Year 1, School Improvement - Year 2, Corrective Action, Restructuring Year 1 (planning), or Restructuring Year 2 (implementing)<sup>1</sup>)
- 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 \(Get MS Excel Viewer\)](#).

<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 2009-10 (based on SY 2008-09 assessments under Section 1111 of *ESEA*).

<b>Corrective Action</b>	<b># of Title I Schools in Corrective Action in Which the Corrective Action was Implemented in SY 2009-10</b>
Required implementation of a new research-based curriculum or instructional program	8
Extension of the school year or school day	0
Replacement of staff members relevant to the school's low performance	0
Significant decrease in management authority at the school level	2
Replacement of the principal	1
Restructuring the internal organization of the school	2
Appointment of an outside expert to advise the school	0
<b>Comments:</b> Level 3&4 T1 schools	

**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 2009-10 (based on SY 2008-09 assessments under Section 1111 of *ESEA*).

<b>Restructuring Action</b>	<b># of Title I Schools in Restructuring in Which Restructuring Action Is Being Implemented</b>
Replacement of all or most of the school staff (which may include the principal)	0
Reopening the school as a public charter school	0
Entering into a contract with a private entity to operate the school	0
Takeover the school by the State	0
Other major restructuring of the school governance	3
<b>Comments:</b> Level 5 T1 schools HR Complex & Metro HS were closed in SY2009-10.	

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.

<p>The Milwaukee Public Schools closed the Milwaukee Education Center (MEC). Students and staff opened a new school, Phillips Secondary School, to serve students in grades 6 through 12.</p> <p>Starting with the 2010-11 school year, Milwaukee Public Schools (MPS) will use 1003(g) funds to implement the transformation reform model in Pulaski and Bay View High Schools.</p>
--

## 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 2010-11 based on the data from SY 2009-10. 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 2010-11 (Use one of the following improvement status designations: Improvement or Corrective Action<sup>2</sup>)
- 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 \(Get MS Excel Viewer\)](#).

<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.

Under federal Title I law, the State Superintendent must identify for improvement any school district receiving Title I funds that for two consecutive years fails to make adequate yearly progress (AYP).

The State Superintendent must take corrective action with respect to any school district that fails to make AYP for four consecutive years. Milwaukee Public Schools (MPS) first missed AYP in 2004-2005 and first became subject to corrective action in 2008-2009. In 2010, the Wisconsin legislature strengthened the State Superintendent's authority to intervene to improve MPS.

Wis. Stat. §118.42(3)(a) and (b) authorizes the State Superintendent to direct MPS to do any or all of the following:

a. Implement or modify the required activities under Wis. Stat. §118.42(1)(a) to (d), which include:

(1) Employing a standard, consistent, research-based curriculum throughout the district;

(2) Using student achievement data to differentiate instruction;

(3) Implementing a system of academic and behavioral supports and early interventions for students; and

(4) Providing additional learning time.

b. Implement or modify a new instructional design;

c. Implement professional development programs that focus on improving student achievement;

d. Implement changes in administrative and personnel structures;

e. Adopt accountability measures to monitor the school district's finances or other interventions directed by the State Superintendent; and/or

f. Create school improvement councils in the persistently lowest performing schools.

The State Superintendent accordingly directs the MPS to complete corrective action requirements that follow.

**Part I: Ensuring Highly Qualified Teachers and Leaders in Every School**

Multiyear Goal: Ensure 100% of MPS teachers have teaching assignments that match their license(s).

School Year Goal: Assign appropriately licensed teachers to classes and, when necessary, apply for emergency licenses while ensuring that emergency licensed teachers are in an educator preparation program leading to licensure for their assignment.

Multiyear Goal: Ensure the equitable distribution of highly qualified and experienced MPS teachers and principals among schools.

School Year Goal: Measure, assess, and address any inequitable distribution of highly qualified teachers and principals among schools.

Multiyear Goal: Provide an induction support system for 100% of all first-year initial and emergency license/permit educators.

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

School Year Goal: Provide standards-based mentor training.

School Year Goal: Provide trained mentors for each initial and emergency license/permit educator who is new to MPS.

School Year Goal: Provide on-going orientation and support seminars for all initial and emergency license/permit educators including professional development plan (PDP) support for all initial educators.

**Part II: Improving Student Performance**

Multiyear Goal: Increase student achievement in literacy and numeracy demonstrated by using multiple measures that indicate positive student growth for each subgroup of students.

School Year Goal: Collect and analyze universal screening data K-8 at least 3 times per year and modify core instruction for those identified as at risk.

School Year Goal: Implement a universal screening system for students in grades 9-12 that identifies students at risk of failing courses required for graduation.

School Year Goal: Implement the Comprehensive Literacy Plan.

School Year Goal: Develop the districtwide Comprehensive Mathematics Plan for all schools.

School Year Goal: Increase by 5% the number of students who score at or above the grade level proficiency or cut score on the universal screening measure within the academic year.

School Year Goal: Directly involve parents in RtI implementation at each school, and provide training in all schools to parents on RtI including how to understand universal screening data.

School Year Goal: Provide training in all schools to teachers and administrators on RtI, how to understand and use universal screening data, descriptions of the RtI system, and any school-level data and intervention management system.

Multiyear Goal: Implement a successful RtI system; fully implement PBIS Tiers 1-3 in 100% of PK-12 schools by 2013-2014; and decrease suspensions and office referrals to state averages.

School Year Goal: Conduct universal screening for behavior in all schools throughout the school year.

School Year Goal: Develop and implement Rapid Compliance Plans for schools that do not show evidence for readiness to move to subsequent tiers of implementation.

School Year Goal: For Cohort 1 - Implement Tiers 1 and 2 throughout the 2010-2011 school year with fidelity to the national model

(pbis.org) for all schools meeting national guidelines for preparedness and complete all training for Tier 3, per the national model for all schools meeting national guidelines for preparedness.

School Year Goal: For Cohort 2 - Implement Tier 1 throughout the 2010-2011 school year with fidelity to the national model and complete all

training for Tier 2, per the national model for all schools meeting national guidelines for preparedness. School Year Goal: For Cohort 3 -Complete all training in Tier 1 per the national model.

Part III: Accountability at the District, School, and Student Levels

Multiyear Goal: Ensure a consistent, transparent, and high quality system of accountability in MPS for school improvement and teacher quality.

School Year Goal: Strengthen the district's Regional System of Support (SOS) structure to ensure that the Corrective Action Requirements are implemented in all MPS schools.

**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 2009-10 (based on SY 2008-09 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 2009-10</b>
Implemented 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	1
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 2008-09 and beginning of SY 2009-10 as a corrective action)	0
<b>Comments:</b> No comments for this section.	

**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 2009-10 data and the results of those appeals.

	<b># Appealed Their AYP Designations</b>	<b># Appeals Resulted in a Change in the AYP Designation</b>
Districts	0	0
Schools	8	5
<b>Comments:</b> Schools with successful appeals documented coding errors to demographics or exit types that impacted Reading proficiency or Graduation rates.		

Date (MM/DD/YY) that processing appeals based on SY 2009-10 data was complete	07/01/10
---	----------

### 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 2009-10.

Note: With the exception of 1.4.8.5.3, in section 1.4.8 references to 1003(g) mean refers to FY 2008 and/or FY 2007 1003(g) funds that may have been used to assist schools during SY 2009-10.

#### 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 2009-10.

Note: In section 1.4.8 references to 1003(g) mean FY 2008 and/or FY 2007 1003(g) funds that may have been used to assist schools during SY 2009-10

*Instructions for States that during SY 2009-10 administered assessments required under section 1116 of ESEA after fall 2009 (i.e., non fall-testing states):*

- In the **SY 2009-10 column**, provide the total number and percentage of students in schools receiving School Improvement funds in SY 2009-10 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 2009-10.
  - Proficient in reading/language arts as measured by your State's assessments required under section 1111(b)(3) of *ESEA* in SY 2009-10.
  - In SY 2008-09 column, provide the requested data for the same schools whose student proficiency data are reported for SY 2009-10.

*States that in SY 2009-10 administered assessments required under section 1116 of ESEA during fall 2009 (i.e., fall-testing states):*

- In the **SY 2009-10 column**, provide the total number and percentage of students in schools receiving School Improvement funds in SY 2009-10 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 2010.
  - 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 2010.
  - In the **SY 2008-09 column**, provide the requested data for the same schools whose student proficiency data are reported in the SY 2009-10 column.

Category	SY 2009-10	SY 2008-09
Total number of students who completed the <b>mathematics</b> 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 2009-10	29,471	29,859
Total number of students who were proficient or above in <b>mathematics</b> in schools that received assistance through Section 1003(a) and/or 1003(g) funds in SY 2009-10	15,620	14,900
Percentage of students who were proficient or above in <b>mathematics</b> in schools that received assistance through Section 1003(a) and/or 1003(g) funds in SY 2009-10	53.0	49.9
Total number of students who completed the <b>reading/language arts</b> 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 2009-10	29,184	29,493
Total number of students who were proficient or above in <b>reading/language arts</b> in schools that received assistance through Section 1003(a) and/or 1003(g) funds in SY 2009-10	17,852	17,628
Percentage of students who were proficient in <b>reading/language arts</b> in schools that received assistance through Section 1003(a) and/or 1003(g) funds in SY 2009-10	61.2	59.8
<b>Comments:</b> N/X132 and N/X075 were submitted to EDEN.		

#### 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 2009-10 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 2009-10 that <b>made adequate yearly progress</b> based on testing in SY 2009-10	86
Number of schools receiving assistance through Section 1003(a) and/or 1003(g) funds during SY 2009-10 that <b>exited improvement status</b> based on testing in SY 2009-10	0

Number of schools receiving assistance through Section 1003(a) and/or 1003(g) funds during SY 2009-10 that **did not make adequate yearly progress** based on testing in SY 2009-10

**Comments:** Wisconsin provided funding to all LEAs with Title I schools identified for improvement, corrective action, or restructuring in addition to LEAs with Title I schools that demonstrated a high need for school improvement support. It is important to note that many sub-grant recipients were not in improvement, corrective action or restructuring status for SY 2009-10.

**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 2010. For all other States the responses would be based on assessments administered during SY 2009-10.

Column 1	Column 2	Column 3	Column 4	Column 5	Column 6	Column 7
<b>Effective Strategy or Combination of Strategies Used</b>  (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>Description of "Other Strategies"</b>  This response is limited to 500 characters.	<b>Number of schools in which the strategy (strategies) was(were) used</b>	<b>Number of schools that used the strategy(strategies) and exited improvement status based on testing after the schools received this assistance</b>	<b>Number of schools that used the strategy (strategies), 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 (strategies)</b>  (See response options in "Column 6 Response Options Box" below)	<b>Description of "Other Positive Outcome" if Response for Column 6 is "D"</b>  This response is limited to 500 characters.
1	n/a	12	0	0	A	n/a
2	n/a	2	0	0	A	n/a
3	n/a	0	0	0	D	No school used this strategy alone.
4	n/a	3	0	0	A	n/a
5	n/a	3	0	0	A	n/a
6 = Combo 1	1, 2	14	0	2	A	n/a
7 = Combo 2	1, 2, 4	11	0	2	D	Increased teacher knowledge and student gains on local assessments.
8 = Combo 3	2, 5	8	0	0	D	Increased teacher knowledge and student gains on local assessments.
<p><b>Comments:</b> 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. The report only allows us to record a maximum of three combination when LEAs in Wisconsin used sixteen different combination of strategies. Furthermore, limiting us to list only the "most common" outcome does not allow us to document other outcomes reported for a single strategy or combination.</p> <p>It is also worth noting all LEAs with Title I schools identified for improvement, corrective action, or restructuring in Wisconsin received funding for school improvement activities. In addition to the funding LEAs with Title I schools identified for improvement, corrective action, or restructuring, Wisconsin was also able to award LEAs with Title I schools that demonstrated a high need for school improvement support. A significant number of the sub-grant recipients were not in improvement, corrective action, or restructuring status, therefore, the responses in columns 4 and 5 are low.</p> <p>Lastly, a significant portion of the funding was awarded to the Milwaukee Public Schools (MPS) to implement district-level strategies to improve school achievement. (The majority of Wisconsin's Title I SIFs are within MPS.) This report does not reflect the district-level strategies utilized to improve school achievement. The strategies implemented by MPS included ensuring that highly qualified teachers and leaders were in every school, implementing a comprehensive literacy program across the district, developing a district-wide comprehensive mathematics plan, conducting universal screening for behavior in all schools, and strengthening the district's system of support to ensure these initiatives were implemented.</p>						

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.

6 = Combination 1: Schools using a combination of strategies from above. Please use Column 2 to indicate which of the above strategies comprise this combination.

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

**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.

Every year Wisconsin hosts a state conference to share best practices and to provide networking opportunities for educators. In 2009-10, over 1,100 educators from across the state gathered to share best practices along four conference tracks: instruction and intervention; culturally responsive education; district and school improvement; and instructional leadership.

In June of 2010, Wisconsin hosted the Principals' Leadership Retreat (PLR) for principals of schools receiving 1003(a) and 1003(g) funds. The PLR showcased effective leadership strategies and provided an opportunity for principals to learn or enhance leadership skills. Approximately ninety principals attended the three day retreat.

In 2009-10, Wisconsin also developed the Statewide Title I Network (Network) to serve Title I schools across the state. As a part of the Network, DPI is funding a minimum of a .5 FTE in each Cooperative Educational Service Agency (CESA). (There are twelve CESAs in Wisconsin and collectively they serve all of the districts in the state.) DPI collaborates with the Network to provide free or reduced-cost resources and support that focuses on Title I implementation, Title I coordinator leadership, Title I related professional development, support to districts and schools identified for improvement, and additional Title I resources and collaboration.

**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 2009 (SY 2009-10) 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:** No comments for this section.

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

For SY 2009-10 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 ED Facts in Data Group 694, School improvement funds allocation table, from File Specification N/X132. You may review data submitted to ED Facts using the report named "Section 1003(a) and 1003(g) Allocations to LEAs and Schools- CSPR 1.4.8.5.2 (EDEN012)" from the ED Facts 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 2009-10.

This response is limited to 8,000 characters.

The Wisconsin Department of Public Instruction utilized staff to provide technical assistance to Title I SIFIs throughout the year. The 2009-10 school year was the first year of improvement status for many schools. DPI provided technical assistance to the LEAs regarding the requirements for schools identified for improvement. DPI hosted workshops, developed web-based tools, and provided individualized support as requested by each LEA or school identified for improvement.

**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 2009-10 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.

---

The Wisconsin Department of Public Instruction did not have any other funds available to support schools identified for improvement, corrective action, or restructuring.

---

### 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.

	<b># Students</b>
Eligible for public school choice	33,380
Applied to transfer	214
Transferred to another school under the Title I public school choice provisions	101
<b>Comments:</b> No comments for this section.	

**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.

	<b>Amount</b>
Dollars spent by LEAs on transportation for public school choice	\$ 6,260

**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.

	<b># LEAs</b>
LEAs Unable to Provide Public School Choice	5

**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.

**Comments:**

<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*.

	<b># Students</b>
Eligible for supplemental educational services	27,003
Applied for supplemental educational services	7,274
Received supplemental educational services	5,032
<b>Comments:</b> No comments for this section.	

**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*.

	<b>Amount</b>
Dollars spent by LEAs on supplemental educational services	\$ 8,420,495
<b>Comments:</b> No comments for this section.	

**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.

	<b>Number of Core Academic Classes (Total)</b>	<b>Number of Core Academic Classes Taught by Teachers Who Are Highly Qualified</b>	<b>Percentage of Core Academic Classes Taught by Teachers Who Are Highly Qualified</b>	<b>Number of Core Academic Classes Taught by Teachers Who Are <u>NOT</u> Highly Qualified</b>	<b>Percentage of Core Academic Classes Taught by Teachers Who Are <u>NOT</u> Highly Qualified</b>
All classes	208,577	205,614	98.6	2,963	1.4
All elementary classes	59,621	58,738	98.5	883	1.5
All secondary classes	148,956	146,876	98.6	2,080	1.4

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.

(March 16, 2011) per Data Verification Request: Our guidance to LEAs is to report self-contained elementary classes as one class. In past years, we reported based on FTE and 2009-2010 was the first time we specifically asked districts to report the number of classes per assignment, so the data is not comparable to prior years.
---

**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
Elementary School Classes	
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	33.5
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	23.2
Elementary school classes taught by teachers who are not fully certified (and are not in an approved alternative route program)	43.3
Other (please explain in comment box below)	
Total	100.0

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

	Percentage
Secondary School Classes	
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)	33.5
Secondary school classes taught by certified special education teachers who have not demonstrated subject-matter competency in those subjects	18.3
Secondary school classes taught by teachers who are not fully certified (and are not in an approved alternative route program)	48.2
Other (please explain in comment box below)	
Total	100.0

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
<b>Elementary Schools</b>			
High Poverty Elementary Schools	25,442	24,777	97.4
Low-poverty Elementary Schools	10,624	10,574	99.5
<b>Secondary Schools</b>			
High Poverty secondary Schools	31,902	30,513	95.6
Low-Poverty secondary Schools	44,041	43,826	99.5
1.5.3.1 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.			

**1.5.3.1** 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	(March 16, 2011) per Data Verification Request:  Eligible for subsidized lunch  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	(March 16, 2011) per Data Verification Request:  Eligible for subsidized lunch  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	51,837
<b>Comments:</b>	

**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.	39,491
<b>Comments:</b>	

**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	29,553
Hmong	9,846
Chinese	700
Russian	493
Arabic	460

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 group is Albanian. The remaining languages have fewer than 250 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 and not tested on annual State English language proficiency assessment (as defined in 1.6.2.1).

	#
Number tested on State annual ELP assessment	46,976
Number not tested on State annual ELP assessment	399
Total	47,375
<p><b>Comments:</b> ***Note: 46976 is less than 95%, greater than 105% of LEP population 51837 as reported in 1.6.2.1. 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 pre-kindergarten, 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></p>	

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

	#
Number attained proficiency on State annual ELP assessment	2,372
Percent attained proficiency on State annual ELP assessment	5.0
<p><b>Comments:</b> 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.</p>	

**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	40,052
Number not tested on State annual ELP assessment	289
Total	40,341
<b>Comments:</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 and whose results were not included in the calculation for AMAO1. 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 students who took the State annual ELP assessment for the first time whose progress cannot be determined and whose results were not included in the calculation for AMAO 1.	6,421

**1.6.3.2.2****Table 1.6.3.2.2 Definitions:**

- Annual Measureable Achievement Objectives (AMAOs)** = State targets for the number and percent of students making progress and attaining proficiency.
- Making Progress** = Number and percent 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.
- ELP Attainment** = Number and percent of Title III LEP students that meet the State definition of "Attainment" of English language proficiency submitted to ED in the State Consolidated Application (CSA), or as amended.
- 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	19,598	58.3	19,957	50.00
Attained proficiency	2,157	5.4	2,271	5.00
<b>Comments:</b> Note that Wisconsin uses an average growth target rather than a percent for making progress. In 2009 the target was .3. The target # for making progress is all students who made .3 growth or more. The target % for making progress is an estimate derived from the approved .3 growth rate based on dividing the number of students with a growth rate of .3 by all students included in making progress calculations. The target # for attained proficiency is the target rate of 5% (.05) multiplied by all the students included in attained proficiency calculations. The target % for attained proficiency is the target approved.				

**1.6.3.5 Native Language Assessments**

This section collects data on LEP students assessed in their native language (Section 1111(b)(6)) to be used for AYP determinations.

**1.6.3.5.1 LEP Students Assessed in Native Language**

In the table below, check "yes" if the specified assessment is used for AYP purposes.

State offers the State reading/language arts content tests in the students' native language(s).	No
State offers the State mathematics content tests in the students' native language(s).	No
State offers the State science content tests in the students' native language(s).	No
<b>Comments:</b>	

**1.6.3.5.2 Native Language of Mathematics Tests Given**

In the table below, report the language(s) in which native language assessments are given for *ESEA* accountability determinations for mathematics.

Language(s)
NA
<b>Comments:</b>



**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.
- 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
1,332	958	2,290
<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 out of language instruction educational programs 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.

# Tested	# At or Above Proficient	% Results	# Below Proficient
2,290	2,150	93.9	140
<b>Comments:</b>			

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

In the table below, report results MFLEP students who took the annual reading/language arts assessment. Please provide data only for those students who transitioned out of language instruction educational programs 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 in grades used for NCLB accountability determinations(3 through 8 and once in high school) 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
2,290	2,194	95.8	96
<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 out of language instruction educational programs 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.

# Tested	# At or Above Proficient	% Results	# Below Proficient
969	891	92.0	78
<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	80
# - Number of subgrantees that met all three Title III AMAOs	78
# - Number of subgrantees who met AMAO 1	80
# - Number of subgrantees who met AMAO 2	80
# - Number of subgrantees who met AMAO 3	78
# - 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 2008-09 and 2009-10)	0
# - Number of subgrantees implementing an improvement plan in SY 2009-10 for not meeting Title III AMAOs for two consecutive years	0
# - Number of subgrantees that have not met Title III AMAOs for four consecutive years (SYs 2006-07, 2007-08, 2008-09, and 2009-10)	0

Provide information on how the State counted consortia members in the total number of subgrantees and in each of the numbers in table 1.6.4.1.

The response is limited to 4,000 characters.

**Comments:** Each district within the consortia was evaluated separately according to WI's approved plan. Therefore, all subgrantees counted above districts.

WI subgrantees met all AMAOs in SY 2008-09.  
Two subgrantees missed AMAOs in SY 2009-10 for the first time.

(3/16/11) response per Data Verification Request:

Since all subgrantees met all AMAOs in 2008-09, there were no districts that missed AMAOs for two or four consecutive years. As per WI's Title IIIA plan, AMAOs are evaluated at the district level rather than by consortia.

**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 <u>or</u> activities terminated for failure to reach program goals?	<u>N</u>
If yes, provide the number of language instruction educational programs <u>or</u> 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
6,274	1,915	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.

## 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 as a second language.

	#
Number of all certified/licensed teachers currently working in Title III language instruction educational programs.	2,903
Estimate number of <b>additional</b> 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 Wisconsin: <a href="http://dpi.wi.gov/tepd/pdf/supdem07.pdf">http://dpi.wi.gov/tepd/pdf/supdem07.pdf</a>
---

\* 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	72	
Understanding and implementation of assessment of LEP students	64	
Understanding and implementation of ELP standards and academic content standards for LEP students	53	
Alignment of the curriculum in language instruction educational programs to ELP standards	31	
Subject matter knowledge for teachers	42	
Other (Explain in comment box)	30	
Participant Information	# Subgrantees	# Participants
PD provided to content classroom teachers	59	10,174
PD provided to LEP classroom teachers	69	1,781
PD provided to principals	47	444
PD provided to administrators/other than principals	52	279
PD provided to other school personnel/non-administrative	51	929
PD provided to community based organization personnel	8	291
Total	74	13,898

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:

Individual/small group support to teachers

Data analysis

Working with ELL in rural districts

Using technology (interactive whiteboard and intervention software)

Spanish language development for district staff - related to educational language

Best practices for modifying assessments for LEP students

CESA 5 ELL coordinator meetings

WIABE conference - Wisconsin Association for Bilingual Education

Title III ELL

Grade level curriculum development

Understanding RtI

Attended coordinator meeting through CESA #11

Literacy strategy training

WSRA conference

LAU plan development workshop

Engineering possibilities course

ELL data retreat

Revision of district ESL

Plan of service

Strategic planning

CESA 6

DPI conference

District-wide collaboration sessions

Technology training for use of instructional materials with LEP students

CESA 11 workshops

Smart board training

Response to Intervention application to ELL students

SIOF training

DPI sponsored meetings/workshops

Beginning of the year orientation and training

Literacy strategies

CESA 6 workshops  
kindergarten teacher training in creating a differentiated environment appropriate to ELLs  
Instructional strategies for developing English language skills  
Culturally responsive instruction  
Spanish literacy and dual language program training  
WIDA standards  
Working with ELL professional development  
CESA training and assistance  
Data retreat  
WIDA summer academy  
Fountas and Pinnell training  
ELL networking meeting  
ELL coordinator meetings through CESA 11  
Coordinator attended the ELL meeting conducted by CESA 7  
Family engagement and involvement  
Legal requirements/procedures  
Use of technology as a teaching tool  
Use of software to supplement instruction for ELL students  
CESA quarterly trainings/meetings  
Workshops through CESA #3  
Networking meetings with other ELL staff  
Consortium curriculum development  
Curriculum for paraprofessionals who assist LEP students  
SIOP professional development  
Professional development activities conducted by CESA 5 consortium  
Technology applications to assist in meeting the needs of ELLs  
Differentiation  
Content area training for paraprofessionals working with ELLs.  
Title III coordinators meeting

---

### 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 2009-10 funds July 1, 2009, and then made these funds available to subgrantees on August 1, 2009, for SY 2009-10 programs. Then the "# of days/\$\$ Distribution" is 30 days.

Date State Received Allocation	Date Funds Available to Subgrantees	# of Days/\$\$ Distribution
7/1/09	7/1/09	0
<b>Comments:</b> 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 website and districts are immediately notified via email. Allocations are available the same data as the notice.		

#### 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	

**Comments:** The number is Zero.

**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 2008-09). Below the table are FAQs about the data collected in this table.

Student Group	Graduation Rate
All Students	89.4
American Indian or Alaska Native	76.3
Asian or Pacific Islander	90.3
Black, non-Hispanic	66.4
Hispanic	76.7
White, non-Hispanic	93.4
Children with disabilities ( <i>IDEA</i> )	79.4
Limited English proficient	79.1
Economically disadvantaged	80.3
Migratory students	94.4
Male	87.4
Female	91.5
<b>Comments:</b>	

**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 2008-09). Below the table is a FAQ about the data collected in this table.

<b>Student Group</b>	<b>Dropout Rate</b>
All Students	<3
American Indian or Alaska Native	3.5
Asian or Pacific Islander	<3
Black, non-Hispanic	5.8
Hispanic	3.5
White, non-Hispanic	<3
Children with disabilities ( <i>IDEA</i> )	<3
Limited English proficient	3.0
Economically disadvantaged	<3
Migratory students	<3
Male	<3
Female	<3
<b>Comments:</b>	

**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 automatically calculated.

	#	# LEAs Reporting Data
LEAs without subgrants	412	411
LEAs with subgrants	30	30
Total	442	441
<b>Comments:</b> Charter schools, sponsored by a district or other agency, are included in the total number of LEAs. (3/10/11 Updated the number of LEAs w/out subgrants Reporting Data from 405 to 411.)		

**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:

<b>Age/Grade</b>	<b># of Homeless Children/Youths Enrolled in Public School in LEAs <u>Without</u> Subgrants</b>	<b># of Homeless Children/Youths Enrolled in Public School in LEAs <u>With</u> Subgrants</b>
Age 3 through 5 (not Kindergarten)	146	104
K	318	1,178
1	270	792
2	288	711
3	258	678
4	234	695
5	224	592
6	211	583
7	162	536
8	156	556
9	174	616
10	166	492
11	202	482
12	515	690
Ungraded		
Total	3,324	8,705

**Comments:** Wisconsin does not have ungraded classes. (3/10/11 Updated the # of homeless children/youths enrolled in public school in LEAs without subgrants.)

**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.

	<b># of Homeless Children/Youths - LEAs <u>Without</u> Subgrants</b>	<b># of Homeless Children/Youths - LEAs <u>With</u> Subgrants</b>
Shelters, transitional housing, awaiting foster care	449	1,649
Doubled-up (e.g., living with another family)	2,546	6,448
Unsheltered (e.g., cars, parks, campgrounds, temporary trailer, or abandoned buildings)	78	137
Hotels/Motels	251	471
Total	3,324	8,705

**Comments:** (3/10/11 Updated the # of homeless children/youths - LEAs without subgrants.)

**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.

<b>Age/Grade</b>	<b># Homeless Children/Youths Served by Subgrants</b>
Age 3 through 5 (not Kindergarten)	498
K	784
1	792
2	711
3	678
4	695
5	592
6	583
7	536
8	556
9	616
10	492
11	482
12	690
Ungraded	
Total	8,705

**Comments:** Wisconsin does not have ungraded classes.

**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.

	<b># Homeless Students Served</b>
Unaccompanied youth	1,088
Migratory children/youth	273
Children with disabilities ( <i>IDEA</i> )	2,036
Limited English proficient students	879

**Comments:**

**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.

	<b># McKinney-Vento Subgrantees That Offer</b>
Tutoring or other instructional support	26
Expedited evaluations	16
Staff professional development and awareness	30
Referrals for medical, dental, and other health services	29
Transportation	29
Early childhood programs	26
Assistance with participation in school programs	29
Before-, after-school, mentoring, summer programs	27
Obtaining or transferring records necessary for enrollment	29
Parent education related to rights and resources for children	29
Coordination between schools and agencies	30
Counseling	29
Addressing needs related to domestic violence	25
Clothing to meet a school requirement	26
School supplies	29
Referral to other programs and services	29
Emergency assistance related to school attendance	24
Other (optional – in comment box below)	1
Other (optional – in comment box below)	1
Other (optional – in comment box below)	1

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

Other support services provided include: acquisition of basic needs for families; absolutely any need that arises; community awareness, graduation mentors; and personnel needs items, food backpacks.

**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.

	<b># Subgrantees Reporting</b>
Eligibility for homeless services	5
School Selection	3
Transportation	30
School records	6
Immunizations	5
Other medical records	5
Other Barriers – in comment box below	1

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

Other barriers include: childcare, school records, history of truancy prior to homelessness, unable to locate family, parent medical and mental health issues, moved from shelter-no forwarding information, disability negatively impacted living arrangements, unemployment, no family support, limited funds, limited job skills, numerous foster care placements, no guardian, and deportation of parents.

**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*.

<b>Grade</b>	<b># Homeless Children/Youth Who Received a Valid Score and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned</b>	<b># Homeless Children/Youth Scoring at or Above Proficient</b>
3	482	246
4	477	245
5	461	250
6	412	239
7	395	241
8	424	226
High School	309	115
<b>Comments:</b>		

**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.

<b>Grade</b>	<b># Homeless Children/Youth Who Received a Valid Score and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned</b>	<b># Homeless Children/Youth Scoring at or Above Proficient</b>
3	496	228
4	482	235
5	448	222
6	438	198
7	407	198
8	429	176
High School	319	90
<b>Comments:</b>		

## 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, 2009 through August 31, 2010. 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:

*a. 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.

*b. How is "ungraded" defined?* Ungraded means the children are served in an educational unit that has no separate grades. For example, some schools have primary grade groupings that are not traditionally graded, or ungraded groupings for children with learning disabilities. 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, 2009 through August 31, 2010. 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)	139
K	73
1	70
2	73
3	51
4	72
5	57
6	63
7	50
8	65
9	70
10	58
11	61
12	31
Ungraded	
Out-of-school	14
Total	947
<b>Comments:</b>	

**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 2009-10 than the count submitted for 2008-09. 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.
- There were families that traditionally have traveled from Mexico to work in Wisconsin agriculture that opted not to do so due to fear about family security and safety as the problems related to immigration issues increased across the nation.

**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, 2009 through August 31, 2010. 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).

<b>Age/Grade</b>	<b>Summer/Intersession Count of Eligible Migrant Children Who Are Participants and Who Can Be Counted for Funding Purposes</b>
Age 3 through 5 (not Kindergarten)	13
K	31
1	36
2	32
3	22
4	29
5	28
6	23
7	11
8	10
9	7
10	7
11	N<6
12	N<6
Ungraded	
Out-of-school	N<6
Total	257
<b>Comments:</b>	

**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 2009-10 report confirms an increase in the Category 2 child count 1.10.1.1. An additional summer projects were operated during summer 2010. These were collaborative projects with a partnership agency and enabled more migrant students to attend a summer program from multiple areas. The local district in that area opted not to operate a project so the state migrant education program and the partnership agency collaborated to have services in the area. An additional 36 students were served over the number served the previous year in a special consortium funded program.

**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.

Wisconsin's 2009-10 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.

The same system was used for the 2008-09 child count. Student count data used for the 2008-09 and 2009-10 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.

How was the child count collected?

The 2008-09 Wisconsin Certificate of Eligibility (COE) 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) and generates specially-designed reports on the eligible child counts for each category.

How was the data collected?

Trained recruiters at the local project level and a statewide recruiter use the COE forms in face-to-face interviews with potential migrant families. A state sponsored recruiter conducts interviews with families in areas where no formal projects are operating when there is a lead that the family may possibly be engaged in migratory labor. The state and local projects have assigned staff for supervising the recruitment, reviewing the data, and signing off as part of the quality control process.

Efforts in 2009-10 were directed toward resolving problems through follow-up contacts to clarify information or remedy lack of information situations collected on the COE, prior to entry of the data into the New Generation System. (NGS). The array of information from the COE was used to make decisions on qualifying moves; qualifying arrival dates; residency dates; enrollment and withdrawal dates; student birth date; and the end of eligibility which increases the child count accuracy. The system has special built-in flags that ensure appropriate counting for termination, including students who have obtained a GED, graduated from high school, or are deceased. These flags designate the end of eligibility. A substantial amount of staff time is expended in reviewing information profiles for accuracy.

What data were collected?

Data needed for the required minimum data elements is collected on the new Wisconsin COE designed to include information components needed to establish the 2009-10 child counts. Included among these are Parent Data: 1A. Father's Name-Last/First; 1B. Mother's Name-Last/First; 2A. Current Male Guardian's Name-Last/First; 2B. Current Female Guardian's Name-Last/First; 3A. Current Address; 4A. Home Base Address; 5. Child Data: Names of Children-Last/First; 6. Sex; 7. Birth Date; 7a. Verification 7b. Age; 8. Race/ethnicity; 9. Birthplace City, State, Country; 10a. Date Enrolled in school; 10b. Grade; 10c. Check of Ed disrupted; 11a. NGS Student #; 11b. Eligibility Data; 12. Moved from: City, State, Country; 13. Moved to City, State, Country; 14. Qualifying Arrival Date (QAD); 15. The children made the move alone, as migrant workers, OR with parents, OR to join parents; 16. Relationship to parent, Guardian, Self, child, spouse; 17. Move to enable that person to obtain or seek seasonal or temporary employment; 18. In activity directly related to agriculture, or fishing related provide description; 19. Residency date; 20. Qualifying Activity at time of arrival, date in Item 4; 21. Name and location of last school attended; 22. Date of withdrawal; 23. Additional comments (e.g.) temporary employment, PASS, TAKS, ELL Assessment, Special Needs, GED-specify, Interviewer statement; 24. The above information was obtained from: parent, guardian, child, spouse, other responsible person; Certification check list; 25b. Signature of Parent; 26 Date Signed; 27. Interviewers signature; 28. Date Signed; 29. Certifying Signature; 30. Title of person certifying; 31. and Date Signed.

The state migrant program staff reviewed data from the special NGS Reports, Local Accounting Sheets, Continuing Enrollment Reports and Student Reporting Forms as a means of cross-checking district reporting on migrant students. The student reporting program identified specifically the MEP funded instructional or support services in which the students participated. These data were included in the Supplementary Services Report which was shared with local directors and staff to assist them in monitoring their accuracy in reporting. Residency dates, and withdrawal dates were carefully monitored during the regular term and summer enrollment periods. Follow-up is carried out for any missing elements.

When new local project staff came on board during 2009-10 the state MEP staff provided on-site individualized training and all appropriate staff had opportunities to be updated on data collection and reporting requirements. The state recruitment plan requires recruiters to make contact with the migrant family for interviews and data collection. The signature of the parent is obtained in a face-to-face meeting and the parent receives a copy of the information.

Specific practices utilized to ensure that recruiters find students new to the state include:

- Information obtained by MEP from the state Department of Workforce Development specifies new camps/ new growers and areas are provided to recruiters who make contact in their area.
- Families alert the recruiters that new families have arrived.
- Recruiters make return trips to areas as families arrive at different times.
- School districts and UMOS share information with recruiters. when new families arrive
- Some employers provide information on new workers to the recruiter.
- School districts find new students during summer school and regular year registration process.
- Other states sometimes send alerts that a migrant family is coming to the state and appropriate follow up is planned.
- School Food Nutrition personnel contact recruiters when a new family arrives to check migrant status, leading to follow-up.
- Recruiters follow up information leads on area work sites and make contacts, when migrant labor is involved.

What activities were conducted to collect the data?

A summary of the activities is displayed below:

- A COE was designed to be congruent with the required statutes related to migrant child eligibility.
- COE's are carefully screened on an on-going basis; emails are sent noting problem areas; or asking for clarification. COE's are obtained for all new families. This checking focuses on verification of enrollment, withdrawal, and residency dates on the COE.
- The state uses multiple checks and balances by comparing data reported on the COE, the Local Accounting Sheet (LAS) and the Continuing Enrollment Report (CER) for all other enrolled eligible students. The statewide recruiter is engaged in checking eligibility data and in re-interviewing families to cross-check accuracy of data.
- The state and local personnel with responsibilities for inputting data are in-serviced and kept abreast of requirements, and provided hands

on opportunities.

- Following the prospective re-interviewing special support and training is being provided for recruiters, and individual support to those contributing to the error rate.
- The new plan for prospective re-interviewing and the plan to analyze the accuracy of the temporary designation for workers are assisting with determining child eligibility accuracy.
- Provision of relevant training for all recruiters before they assume this role with opportunities for continuing professional development for Identification and Recruitment of eligible students.
- Training emphasizes the importance of having accurate and complete NGS data so that the MSIX information will be accurate and useful for helping migrant students.

When were data collected for use in the student information system?

Data were collected for the 2009-10 annual Category 1 counts within the established window of 9/1/09-8/31/10. The data for the state's Category 2 count were collected within the same window of time as the data for 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.

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. 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. Extra checking is done by staff 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. A 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.

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.

Note: 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.

### 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;
- 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.

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.

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)

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.

- While the data management system employs a query which counts a student only once, the state staff is active in reviewing enrollment and withdrawal dates and verifying residency dates are available for every student identified and reported for the reporting period.
- Training of local project staff includes focusing on the importance of reporting accurate data for enrollment, withdrawal and residency verification dates.

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

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 does careful additional cross-checking and reviews of the reporting on supplementary services that took place during the official summer program period.

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

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 explores 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 (SRFs). 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.

The count is generated from the NGS system in the same manner as the Category 1 count. Information from the Certificate of Eligibility and the Student Reporting Forms are entered into the system to capture unduplicated supplementary services per child served during the summer.

#### 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.

- Only trained personnel may enter data into the NGS system.
- Attendance at training to personnel is required to stay abreast of changes in regulations, requirements, and NGS procedures.
- Printing off of MGS Management Reports and having districts review data;
- Accuracy of records is checked by review and monitoring on Local Accounting Sheets (LAS); Student Reporting Forms; and Continuing Enrollment Reports with NGS data such as withdrawal, residency, and enrollment dates, with immediate follow-up on problem areas.
- State personnel assigned to review and enter data, spends extensive time reviewing COE data, clearing up any problems areas before proceeding with input of data.
- The report from NGS that validates 2 year olds turning 3 and special reports on residency verification are used by the state when checking accuracy of data for the counts.
- The End of Eligibility Report generated by NGS to flag students whose eligibility will end during the current term is used for establishing accurate counts of students with eligible migrant status.

Discrepancies found are resolved by the State through these approaches:

- The state contacts local project personnel through email memos explaining problems found to determine reporting problem, and works to clarify data; or explains the lack of needed information and works to remedy the situation.
- The state data MEP management personnel work with NGS help desk and programmers, technical assistance consultants when questions arrive if there are data problems to be resolved.
- The state provides extensive review and cross-checking of data reports and takes appropriate action when needed.
- The state provides input to the NGS contractor when issues arise and works to achieve a resolve. The state has been engaged with programmers at this entity to be sure NGS data will be compatible with the MSIX system.
- The state MEP personnel run NGS reports on an on-going basis to monitor progress and to spot any problem areas.

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.

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 on an on-going basis and with prospective re-interviewing within a three year period.

The state engaged in comprehensive prospective re-interviewing during 2009-10. External out of state consultants were employed to

conduct interviews with 129 families to verify the eligibility of 315 migrant children within those families. Out of the 315 children, 4 were not confirmed as eligible which is a 1.2 % error rate.

Re-interviewers provided the following suggestions for improvement of the recruitment process and these suggestions have been included in the professional development offerings for recruiters and directors in the annual recruiters' workshop and in ongoing individualized sessions with new recruiters.

The three external re-interviewers provided suggestions for recruiters to improve their preparation of the COEs and for improvement of their identification and recruitment efforts. These suggestions are being incorporated into the 2010-11 training for recruiters and directors who supervise their work. Additional opportunities will be provided to ensure recruiters are fully informed about the definitions of what constitutes temporary and seasonal agricultural work.

Non-eligible children will be removed from the program services and data base as appropriate.

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 for the staff and district personnel to use 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 has made a strong effort during 2009-10 to strengthen training to improve the quality of its data collections and local and state determinations of child eligibility. It will continue to pursue this goal during 2010-11. Recruiter training will focus on the new regulations and guidance issued by the federal government and practical case problems encountered by recruiters.

The state engaged in comprehensive prospective re-interviewing during 2009-10. Re-interviewers provided suggestions for improvement of the recruitment process and these suggestions have been included in the professional development offerings for recruiters and directors in the annual recruiters' workshop and in on-going individualized sessions with new recruiters. The three external re-interviewers provided suggestions for recruiters to improve their preparation of the COEs and for improvement of their identification and recruitment efforts to ensure all students were recruited. These suggestions are being incorporated into the 2010-11 training for recruiters and directors who supervise their work. Additional opportunities will be provided to ensure recruiters are fully informed about the definitions of what constitutes temporary and seasonal agricultural work. Non-eligible children are removed from the program services and data base as appropriate when cases of non-eligibility are determined.

The new national COE was developed and implemented during the 2009-10 program year and this will help with obtaining sufficient data for eligibility 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 2010-11 recruiter 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 data submitted has been thoroughly reviewed and as stated in this document earlier there are many checks and balances built into the process to review the data, train personnel at the project level and to resolve issues prior to reporting. The state believes it has submitted accurate data due to the intensity of the process.