

# **CONSOLIDATED STATE PERFORMANCE REPORT: Parts I and II**

**for  
STATE FORMULA GRANT PROGRAMS  
under the  
ELEMENTARY AND SECONDARY EDUCATION ACT  
As amended in 2001**

**For reporting on  
School Year 2011-12**



**PART I DUE THURSDAY, DECEMBER 20, 2012  
PART II DUE FRIDAY, FEBRUARY 15, 2013**

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

## INTRODUCTION

Sections 9302 and 9303 of the *Elementary and Secondary Education Act (ESEA)*, as amended in 2001 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 *ESEA* Consolidated State Performance Report (CSPR) for school year (SY) 2011-12 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 2011-12 must respond to this Consolidated State Performance Report (CSPR). Part I of the Report is due to the Department by **Thursday, December 20, 2012**. Part II of the Report is due to the Department by **Friday, February 15, 2013**. Both Part I and Part II should reflect data from the SY 2011-12, 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 2011-12 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 2011-12 CSPR will be found on the main CSPR page of the EDEN web site (<https://EDEN.ED.GOV/EDENPortal/>).



**CONSOLIDATED STATE PERFORMANCE REPORT  
PART I**

For reporting on  
**School Year 2011-12**



**PART I DUE DECEMBER 20, 2012  
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**

Indicate below whether your state has made or is planning to make revisions to or change the State's academic content standards in mathematics, reading/language arts or science since the State's content standards were most recently approved through ED's peer review process for State assessment systems. If yes, indicate specifically in what school year your State implemented or will implement the revisions or changes.

<p>State has revised or change</p>	<p>No revisions or changes to academic content standards in mathematics,reading/language arts or science made or planned.</p>
	<p>State has revised or changed its academic content standards in mathematics, reading/language arts or science or is planning to make revisions to or change its academic content standards in mathematics, reading/language arts or science. Indicate below the year these changes were or will be implemented or GÇ£Not ApplicableGÇ¥ to indicate that changes were not made or will not be made in the subject area.</p>

Acceptable responses are a school year (e.g., 2011-12) or Not Applicable.

<p>Academic Content Standards</p>	<p>Mathematics</p>	<p>Reading/Language Arts</p>	<p>Science</p>
	<p>June 2010</p>	<p>June 2010</p>	<p>Spring 2013</p>

If the responses above do not fully describe revisions or changes to your State's academic achievement standards, describe the revisions or changes below.

The response is limited to 1,000 characters

Common Core State Standards adopted June 2010

Next Generation Science Standards will be completed and considered for adoption spring 2013

Implementing the Common Core in Wisconsin?see: [standards.dpi.wi.gov/stn\\_ccss](http://standards.dpi.wi.gov/stn_ccss)

**1.1.1.1 Academic Achievement Standards in Mathematics, Reading/Language Arts and Science**

Indicate below whether your state has changed or is planning to change the State's academic achievement standards in mathematics, reading/language arts or science since the State's academic achievement standards were most recently approved through ED's peer review process for State assessment systems. If yes, indicate specifically in what school year your State implemented or will implement the changes.

As applicable, include changes to academic achievement standards based on any assessments (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.

<p>State has revised or changed</p>	<p>No revisions or changes to academic content standards in mathematics, reading/language arts or science made or planned.</p>
	<p>State has changed its academic achievement standards or is planning to change its academic achievement standards in mathematics, reading/language arts or science. Indicate below either the school year in which these changes were or will be implemented or GÇ£Not ApplicableGÇ¥ to indicate that changes were not made or will not be made in the subject area.</p>

Acceptable responses are a school year (e.g., 2011-12) or Not Applicable.

Academic Achievement Standards for	Mathematics	Reading/Language Arts	Science
Regular Assessments in Grades 3-8	2011-12	2011-12	2014-15
Regular Assessments in High School	2011-12	2011-12	2014-15
Alternate Assessments Based on Grade-Level Achievement Standards (if applicable)			
Alternate Assessments Based on Modified Achievement Standards (if applicable)			
Alternate Assessments Based on Alternate Achievement Standards	2014-15	2014-15	2014-15

If the responses above do not fully describe revisions or changes to your State's academic achievement standards, describe the revisions or changes below.

The response is limited to 1,000 characters

WI has begun work toward a new balanced assessment system as a governing state within the multi-state Smarter Balanced Assessment Consortium (SBAC), and the Dynamic Learning Maps (DLM) Consortium (4-year IDEA grant) to create an online adaptive system similar to SBAC for students with significant cognitive disabilities and replace the Wisconsin Alternate Assessment for Students with Disabilities (WAA-SwD). See: [dynamiclearningmaps.org/](http://dynamiclearningmaps.org/).

WI implemented new College & Career Ready Cut Scores based on NAEP-like College & Career Readiness Benchmarks for the 2011-12 Accountability School Report Card. See: [acct.dpi.wi.gov/files/oea/pdf/impactdata.pdf](http://acct.dpi.wi.gov/files/oea/pdf/impactdata.pdf)

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

Indicate below whether your state has changed or is planning to change the State's academic assessments in mathematics, reading/language arts or science since the State's academic assessments were most recently approved through ED's peer review process for State assessment systems. If yes, indicate specifically in what school year your State implemented or will implement the changes.

As applicable, include any assessments (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.

<p style="text-align: center;">State has revised or changed</p>	<p>No changes to assessments in mathematics, reading/language arts or science made or planned.</p>
	<p>State has changed or is planning to change its assessments in mathematics, reading/language arts or science. Indicate below the year these changes were implemented or GÇ£Not ApplicableGÇ¥ to indicate that changes were not made or will not be made in the subject area.</p>

Acceptable responses are a school year (e.g., 2011-12) or Not Applicable.

Academic Assessments	Mathematics	Reading/Language Arts	Science
Regular Assessments in Grades 3-8	2014-15	2014-15	2015-16
Regular Assessments in High School	2014-15	2014-15	2015-16
Alternate Assessments Based on Grade-Level Achievement Standards (if applicable)			
Alternate Assessments Based on Modified Achievement Standards (if applicable)			
Alternate Assessments Based on Alternate Achievement Standards	2014-15	2014-15	2015-16

If the responses above do not fully describe revisions or changes to your State's academic achievement standards, describe the revisions or changes below.

The response is limited to 1,000 characters

The new Smarter Balanced Assessments (SBAC), and the Dynamic Learning Maps (DLM) adaptive system for students with significant cognitive disabilities will replace the current WI Knowledge & Concepts Examinations (WKCE) WI Alternate Assessment for Students with Disabilities (WAA-SwD).

### 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 2011-12, estimate what percentage of the funds your State used for the following (round to the nearest ten percent).

Purpose	Percentage (rounded to the nearest ten percent)
To pay the costs of the development of the State assessments and standards required by section 1111(b)	10.00
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	90.00
<b>Comments:</b> The response is limited to 4,000 characters.	

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

For funds your State had available under *ESEA* section 6111 (Grants for State Assessments and Related Activities) during SY 2011-12 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).

Purpose	Used for Purpose (yes/no)
Administering assessments required by section 1111(b)	Yes
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)	Yes
Developing or improving assessments of English language proficiency necessary to comply with section 1111(b)(7)	Yes
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	Yes
Developing multiple measures to increase the reliability and validity of State assessment systems	Yes
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	Yes
Expanding the range of accommodations available to students with limited English proficiency and students with disabilities ( <i>IDEA</i> ) to improve the rates of inclusion of such students, including professional development activities aligned with State academic achievement standards and assessments	Yes
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	Yes
Other	Yes
<b>Comments:</b> The response is limited to 4,000 characters.	

## 1.2 PARTICIPATION IN STATE ASSESSMENTS

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

Note: States are not required to report these data by the seven (7) racial/ethnic groups; instead, they are required to report these data by the major racial and ethnic groups that are identified in their Accountability Workbooks. The charts below display racial/ethnic data that has been mapped back from the major racial and ethnic groups identified in their workbooks, to the 7 racial/ethnic groups to allow for the examination of data across states.

### 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	S	429,528	>=99
American Indian or Alaska Native	S	7,037	>=99
Asian	S	16,991	>=99
Black or African American	S	45,714	>=99
Hispanic or Latino	S	41,051	>=99
Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander			
White	S	318,692	>=99
Two or more races			
Children with disabilities ( <i>IDEA</i> )	S	59,871	>=99
Limited English proficient ( <i>LEP</i> ) students	S	25,456	>=99
Economically disadvantaged students	S	177,911	>=99
Migratory students	S	215	96
Male	S	220,392	>=99
Female	S	209,104	>=99
<b>Comments:</b> The response is limited to 4,000 characters. Five major racial/ethnic categories in WI are reported using bridging rules for Pacific Islander (combined with Asian) and Two or More.			

**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.

<b>Type of Assessment</b>	<b># Children with Disabilities (<i>IDEA</i>) Participating</b>	<b>Percentage of Children with Disabilities (<i>IDEA</i>) Participating, Who Took the Specified Assessment</b>
Regular Assessment without Accommodations	17,640	29.46
Regular Assessment with Accommodations	36,503	60.97
Alternate Assessment Based on Grade-Level Achievement Standards		
Alternate Assessment Based on Modified Achievement Standards		
Alternate Assessment Based on Alternate Achievement Standards	5,728	9.57
Total	59,871	////////////////////////////////////
<b>Comments:</b> The response is limited to 4,000 characters.		

### 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	S	428,572	>=99
American Indian or Alaska Native	S	7,043	>=99
Asian	S	16,772	>=99
Black or African American	S	45,675	>=99
Hispanic or Latino	S	40,411	>=99
Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander			
White	S	318,628	>=99
Two or more races			
Children with disabilities ( <i>IDEA</i> )	S	59,636	98
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	S	24,474	97
Economically disadvantaged students	S	177,175	>=99
Migratory students	S	205	94
Male	S	219,854	>=99
Female	S	208,687	>=99

**Comments:** The response is limited to 4,000 characters. Migratory students are a tiny group in WI and 13 students were not tested. Many are new in US schools and may be exempt from participating in the Reading portion of the state assessments. The five major racial/ethnic categories in WI are reported.

#### 1.2.3.1 Recently Arrived LEP Students Taking ELP Assessments in Lieu of Reading/Language Arts Assessment

In the table below, provide the number of recently arrived LEP students (as defined in 34 C.F.R. Part 200.6(b)(4)) included in the participation counts in 1.2.3 and 1.3.2.1 who took an assessment of English language proficiency in lieu of the State's reading/language arts assessment, as permitted under 34 C.F.R. Part 200.20.

Recently arrived LEP students who took an assessment of English language proficiency in lieu of the State's reading/language arts assessment	402
--	-----

**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.

Note: For this question only, report on students with disabilities (*IDEA*) who are also LEP students in the U.S. less than 12 months who took the ELP in lieu of the statewide reading/language arts assessment.

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	19,506	32.70
Regular Assessment with Accommodations	34,396	57.66
Alternate Assessment Based on Grade-Level Achievement Standards		
Alternate Assessment Based on Modified Achievement Standards		
Alternate Assessment Based on Alternate Achievement Standards	5,734	9.61
LEP < 12 months, took ELP	19	0.03
Total	59,655	////////////////////

**Comments:** The response is limited to 4,000 characters. 59,636 are the total N SwD participating in the Regular/Alternate Assessments. The 19 SwD LEP<12 months that took ELP exams are included in accountability determinations for ESEA school report cards.

**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	S	185,145	>=99
American Indian or Alaska Native	S	3,043	98
Asian	S	7,163	>=99
Black or African American	S	19,106	98
Hispanic or Latino	S	16,608	98
Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander			
White	S	139,194	>=99
Two or more races			
Children with disabilities (IDEA)	S	25,280	98
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	S	9,789	98
Economically disadvantaged students	S	73,089	>=99
Migratory students	S	95	94
Male	S	94,716	>=99
Female	S	90,411	>=99

**Comments:** The response is limited to 4,000 characters. Migratory students are very sparse in WI. There were only 6 of the 101 migratory students in grades 4, 8, 10 combined in all of WI's 424 school districts that did not participate in WKCE/WAA testing.

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 (IDEA) Participating	Percentage of Children with Disabilities (IDEA) Participating, Who Took the Specified Assessment
Regular Assessment without Accommodations	8,076	31.95
Regular Assessment with Accommodations	14,788	58.50
Alternate Assessment Based on Grade-Level Achievement Standards		
Alternate Assessment Based on Modified Achievement Standards		
Alternate Assessment Based on Alternate Achievement Standards	2,416	9.56
Total	25,280	////////////////////

**Comments:** The response is limited to 4,000 characters.

### 1.3 STUDENT ACADEMIC ACHIEVEMENT

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

Note: States are not required to report these data by the seven (7) racial/ethnic groups; instead, they are required to report these data by the major racial and ethnic groups that are identified in their Accountability Workbooks. The charts below display racial/ethnic data that has been mapped back from the major racial and ethnic groups identified in their workbooks, to the 7 racial/ethnic groups to allow for the examination of data across states.

#### 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	60,067	S	51
American Indian or Alaska Native	1,001	S	36
Asian	2,502	S	51
Black or African American	6,654	S	22
Hispanic or Latino	6,453	S	32
Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander			
White	43,452	S	59
Two or more races			
Children with disabilities ( <i>IDEA</i> )	8,188	S	32
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	4,873	S	30
Economically disadvantaged students	26,721	S	35
Migratory students	27	S	<=10
Male	30,907	S	53
Female	29,153	S	50
<b>Comments:</b> The response is limited to 4,000 characters. WI re-set cut scores on the WKCE Reading & Mathematics assessments based on College & Career-ready Benchmarks in Spring 2012. The new proficiency rates are lower and AMOs reflect more stringent, NAEP-like standards. Gender code is missing for 8 students. Two or more races and Pacific Islander are included in bridged five categories.			

**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	59,817	S	33
American Indian or Alaska Native	1,005	S	22
Asian	2,456	S	30
Black or African American	6,645	S	14
Hispanic or Latino	6,251	S	17
Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander			
White	43,455	S	39
Two or more races			
Children with disabilities ( <i>IDEA</i> )	8,144	S	17
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	4,601	S	11
Economically disadvantaged students	26,516	S	20
Migratory students	25	S	<=10
Male	30,767	S	31
Female	29,043	S	36
<b>Comments:</b> The response is limited to 4,000 characters. WI re-set cut scores on the WKCE Reading & Mathematics assessments based on College & Career-ready Benchmarks in Spring 2012. The new proficiency rates are lower and AMOs reflect more stringent, NAEP-like standards. Gender code is missing for 8 students. Two or more races and Pacific Islander are included in bridged five categories.			

**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			
Black or African American			
Hispanic or Latino			
Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander			
White			
Two or more races			
Children with disabilities ( <i>IDEA</i> )			
Limited English proficient (LEP) students			
Economically disadvantaged students			
Migratory students			
Male			
Female			
<b>Comments:</b> The response is limited to 4,000 characters. WI only tests Science at Grades 4, 8, and 10.			

**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	59,930	S	52
American Indian or Alaska Native	1,023	S	36
Asian	2,414	S	52
Black or African American	6,604	S	22
Hispanic or Latino	6,332	S	33
Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander			
White	43,543	S	60
Two or more races			
Children with disabilities ( <i>IDEA</i> )	8,597	S	30
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	4,422	S	27
Economically disadvantaged students	26,596	S	36
Migratory students	30	S	33
Male	30,680	S	54
Female	29,240	S	50
<b>Comments:</b> The response is limited to 4,000 characters. WI re-set cut scores on the WKCE Reading & Mathematics assessments based on College & Career-ready Benchmarks in Spring 2012. The new proficiency rates are lower and AMOs reflect more stringent, NAEP-like standards. Gender code is missing for 10 students. Two or more races and Pacific Islander are included in bridged five categories.			

**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	59,773	S	35
American Indian or Alaska Native	1,021	S	22
Asian	2,372	S	32
Black or African American	6,602	S	13
Hispanic or Latino	6,221	S	17
Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander			
White	43,543	S	42
Two or more races			
Children with disabilities ( <i>IDEA</i> )	8,549	S	17
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	4,242	S	8
Economically disadvantaged students	26,462	S	21
Migratory students	27	S	15
Male	30,594	S	34
Female	29,169	S	37
<b>Comments:</b> The response is limited to 4,000 characters. WI re-set cut scores on the WKCE Reading & Mathematics assessments based on College & Career-ready Benchmarks in Spring 2012. The new proficiency rates are lower and AMOs reflect more stringent, NAEP-like standards. Gender code is missing for 10 students. Two or more races and Pacific Islander are included in bridged five categories.			

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

<b>Grade 4</b>	<b># Students Who Received a Valid Score and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned</b>	<b># Students Scoring at or Above Proficient</b>	<b>Percentage of Students Scoring at or Above Proficient</b>
All students	59,935	S	76
American Indian or Alaska Native	1,020	S	67
Asian	2,412	S	75
Black or African American	6,598	S	45
Hispanic or Latino	6,348	S	62
Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander			
White	43,543	S	84
Two or more races			
Children with disabilities ( <i>IDEA</i> )	8,586	S	51
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	4,428	S	56
Economically disadvantaged students	26,599	S	63
Migratory students	30	S	50
Male	30,681	S	76
Female	29,244	S	77

**Comments:** The response is limited to 4,000 characters. Gender code is missing for 10 students. Two or more races and Pacific Islander are included in bridged five categories.

**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	60,797	S	52
American Indian or Alaska Native	997	S	37
Asian	2,498	S	55
Black or African American	6,479	S	23
Hispanic or Latino	6,282	S	32
Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander			
White	44,536	S	59
Two or more races			
Children with disabilities ( <i>IDEA</i> )	8,903	S	26
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	3,959	S	24
Economically disadvantaged students	26,454	S	35
Migratory students	30	S	20
Male	31,324	S	52
Female	29,469	S	51
<b>Comments:</b> The response is limited to 4,000 characters. WI re-set cut scores on the WKCE Reading & Mathematics assessments based on College & Career-ready Benchmarks in Spring 2012. The new proficiency rates are lower and AMOs reflect more stringent, NAEP-like standards. Gender code is missing for 4 students. Two or more races and Pacific Islander are included in bridged five categories.			

**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	60,675	S	33
American Indian or Alaska Native	999	S	21
Asian	2,468	S	31
Black or African American	6,473	S	13
Hispanic or Latino	6,213	S	16
Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander			
White	44,517	S	39
Two or more races			
Children with disabilities ( <i>IDEA</i> )	8,858	S	15
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	3,829	S	5
Economically disadvantaged students	26,376	S	18
Migratory students	29	S	<=10
Male	31,251	S	31
Female	29,420	S	36
<b>Comments:</b> The response is limited to 4,000 characters. WI re-set cut scores on the WKCE Reading & Mathematics assessments based on College & Career-ready Benchmarks in Spring 2012. The new proficiency rates are lower and AMOs reflect more stringent, NAEP-like standards. Gender code is missing for 4 students. Two or more races and Pacific Islander are included in bridged five categories.			

**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			
Black or African American			
Hispanic or Latino			
Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander			
White			
Two or more races			
Children with disabilities ( <i>IDEA</i> )			
Limited English proficient (LEP) students			
Economically disadvantaged students			
Migratory students			
Male			
Female			
<b>Comments:</b> The response is limited to 4,000 characters. WI tests Science only at grades 4, 8, 10.			

**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	61,701	S	46
American Indian or Alaska Native	988	S	26
Asian	2,445	S	50
Black or African American	6,711	S	17
Hispanic or Latino	5,892	S	27
Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander			
White	45,665	S	53
Two or more races			
Children with disabilities ( <i>IDEA</i> )	8,738	S	20
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	3,384	S	16
Economically disadvantaged students	26,055	S	29
Migratory students	28	S	29
Male	31,678	S	47
Female	30,021	S	46
<b>Comments:</b> The response is limited to 4,000 characters. WI re-set cut scores on the WKCE Reading & Mathematics assessments based on College & Career-ready Benchmarks in Spring 2012. The new proficiency rates are lower and AMOs reflect more stringent, NAEP-like standards. Gender code is missing for 2 students. Two or more races and Pacific Islander are included in bridged five categories.			

**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	61,603	S	36
American Indian or Alaska Native	989	S	21
Asian	2,424	S	30
Black or African American	6,708	S	13
Hispanic or Latino	5,836	S	17
Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander			
White	45,646	S	42
Two or more races			
Children with disabilities ( <i>IDEA</i> )	8,708	S	14
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	3,301	S	4
Economically disadvantaged students	25,990	S	20
Migratory students	27	S	11
Male	31,627	S	32
Female	29,975	S	40
<b>Comments:</b> The response is limited to 4,000 characters. WI re-set cut scores on the WKCE Reading & Mathematics assessments based on College & Career-ready Benchmarks in Spring 2012. The new proficiency rates are lower and AMOs reflect more stringent, NAEP-like standards. Gender code is missing for 2 students. Two or more races and Pacific Islander are included in bridged five categories.			

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

<b>Grade 6</b>	<b># Students Who Received a Valid Score and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned</b>	<b># Students Scoring at or Above Proficient</b>	<b>Percentage of Students Scoring at or Above Proficient</b>
All students			
American Indian or Alaska Native			
Asian			
Black or African American			
Hispanic or Latino			
Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander			
White			
Two or more races			
Children with disabilities ( <i>IDEA</i> )			
Limited English proficient (LEP) students			
Economically disadvantaged students			
Migratory students			
Male			
Female			
<b>Comments:</b> The response is limited to 4,000 characters. WI only tests Science at Grades 4, 8, 10.			

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

<b>Grade 7</b>	<b># Students Who Received a Valid Score and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned</b>	<b># Students Scoring at or Above Proficient</b>	<b>Percentage of Students Scoring at or Above Proficient</b>
All students	61,314	S	48
American Indian or Alaska Native	995	S	32
Asian	2,353	S	50
Black or African American	6,571	S	18
Hispanic or Latino	5,696	S	29
Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander			
White	45,697	S	55
Two or more races			
Children with disabilities ( <i>IDEA</i> )	8,593	S	18
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	3,335	S	15
Economically disadvantaged students	25,217	S	30
Migratory students	33	S	15
Male	31,488	S	47
Female	29,825	S	49
<b>Comments:</b> The response is limited to 4,000 characters. WI re-set cut scores on the WKCE Reading & Mathematics assessments based on College & Career-ready Benchmarks in Spring 2012. The new proficiency rates are lower and AMOs reflect more stringent, NAEP-like standards. Gender code is missing for 1 student. Two or more races and Pacific Islander are included in bridged five categories.			

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

<b>Grade 7</b>	<b># Students Who Received a Valid Score and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned</b>	<b># Students Scoring at or Above Proficient</b>	<b>Percentage of Students Scoring at or Above Proficient</b>
All students	61,189	S	39
American Indian or Alaska Native	993	S	26
Asian	2,328	S	33
Black or African American	6,563	S	14
Hispanic or Latino	5,618	S	20
Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander			
White	45,685	S	45
Two or more races			
Children with disabilities ( <i>IDEA</i> )	8,562	S	14
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	3,224	S	4
Economically disadvantaged students	25,113	S	23
Migratory students	31	S	<=10
Male	31,416	S	36
Female	29,772	S	42
<b>Comments:</b> The response is limited to 4,000 characters. WI re-set cut scores on the WKCE Reading & Mathematics assessments based on College & Career-ready Benchmarks in Spring 2012. The new proficiency rates are lower and AMOs reflect more stringent, NAEP-like standards. Gender code is missing for 1 student. Two or more races and Pacific Islander are included in bridged five categories.			

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

<b>Grade 7</b>	<b># Students Who Received a Valid Score and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned</b>	<b># Students Scoring at or Above Proficient</b>	<b>Percentage of Students Scoring at or Above Proficient</b>
All students			
American Indian or Alaska Native			
Asian			
Black or African American			
Hispanic or Latino			
Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander			
White			
Two or more races			
Children with disabilities ( <i>IDEA</i> )			
Limited English proficient (LEP) students			
Economically disadvantaged students			
Migratory students			
Male			
Female			
<b>Comments:</b> The response is limited to 4,000 characters. WI only tests Science at grades 4, 8, 10.			

**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	61,223	S	45
American Indian or Alaska Native	1,015	S	29
Asian	2,280	S	49
Black or African American	6,537	S	16
Hispanic or Latino	5,441	S	25
Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander			
White	45,946	S	51
Two or more races			
Children with disabilities ( <i>IDEA</i> )	8,548	S	16
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	3,123	S	15
Economically disadvantaged students	24,540	S	27
Migratory students	33	S	12
Male	31,350	S	46
Female	29,870	S	44
<b>Comments:</b> The response is limited to 4,000 characters. WI re-set cut scores on the WKCE Reading & Mathematics assessments based on College & Career-ready Benchmarks in Spring 2012. The new proficiency rates are lower and AMOs reflect more stringent, NAEP-like standards. Gender code is missing for 3 students. Two or more races and Pacific Islander are included in bridged five categories.			

**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	61,106	S	33
American Indian or Alaska Native	1,017	S	20
Asian	2,239	S	32
Black or African American	6,536	S	13
Hispanic or Latino	5,367	S	17
Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander			
White	45,943	S	38
Two or more races			
Children with disabilities ( <i>IDEA</i> )	8,519	S	11
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	2,998	S	5
Economically disadvantaged students	24,450	S	19
Migratory students	32	S	<=10
Male	31,282	S	28
Female	29,821	S	38
<b>Comments:</b> The response is limited to 4,000 characters. WI re-set cut scores on the WKCE Reading & Mathematics assessments based on College & Career-ready Benchmarks in Spring 2012. The new proficiency rates are lower and AMOs reflect more stringent, NAEP-like standards. Gender code is missing for 3 students. Two or more races and Pacific Islander are included in bridged five categories.			

**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	61,047	S	80
American Indian or Alaska Native	1,010	S	71
Asian	2,266	S	74
Black or African American	6,485	S	49
Hispanic or Latino	5,389	S	64
Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander			
White	45,893	S	87
Two or more races			
Children with disabilities ( <i>IDEA</i> )	8,493	S	42
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	3,074	S	47
Economically disadvantaged students	24,409	S	66
Migratory students	32	S	69
Male	31,253	S	79
Female	29,791	S	81
<b>Comments:</b> The response is limited to 4,000 characters. Gender code is missing for 3 students. Two or more races and Pacific Islander are included in bridged five categories.			

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

High School	# Students Who Received a Valid Score and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned	# Students Scoring at or Above Proficient	Percentage of Students Scoring at or Above Proficient
All students	64,496	S	44
American Indian or Alaska Native	1,018	S	26
Asian	2,499	S	45
Black or African American	6,158	S	10
Hispanic or Latino	4,955	S	20
Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander			
White	49,853	S	51
Two or more races			
Children with disabilities ( <i>IDEA</i> )	8,304	S	14
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	2,360	S	8
Economically disadvantaged students	22,328	S	24
Migratory students	34	S	<=10
Male	32,965	S	45
Female	31,526	S	43
<b>Comments:</b> The response is limited to 4,000 characters. WI re-set cut scores on the WKCE Reading & Mathematics assessments based on College & Career-ready Benchmarks in Spring 2012. The new proficiency rates are lower and AMOs reflect more stringent, NAEP-like standards. Gender code is missing for 7 students. Two or more races and Pacific Islander are included in bridged five categories.			

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

High School	# Students Who Received a Valid Score and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned	# Students Scoring at or Above Proficient	Percentage of Students Scoring at or Above Proficient
All students	64,409	S	42
American Indian or Alaska Native	1,019	S	27
Asian	2,485	S	37
Black or African American	6,148	S	14
Hispanic or Latino	4,905	S	23
Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander			
White	49,839	S	48
Two or more races			
Children with disabilities ( <i>IDEA</i> )	8,296	S	14
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	2,279	S	5
Economically disadvantaged students	22,268	S	25
Migratory students	34	S	15
Male	32,917	S	40
Female	31,487	S	44
<b>Comments:</b> The response is limited to 4,000 characters. WI re-set cut scores on the WKCE Reading & Mathematics assessments based on College & Career-ready Benchmarks in Spring 2012. The new proficiency rates are lower and AMOs reflect more stringent, NAEP-like standards. Gender code is missing for 7 students. Two or more races and Pacific Islander are included in bridged five categories.			

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

<b>High School</b>	<b># Students Who Received a Valid Score and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned</b>	<b># Students Scoring at or Above Proficient</b>	<b>Percentage of Students Scoring at or Above Proficient</b>
All students	64,163	S	73
American Indian or Alaska Native	1,013	S	61
Asian	2,485	S	67
Black or African American	6,023	S	32
Hispanic or Latino	4,871	S	51
Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander			
White	49,758	S	80
Two or more races			
Children with disabilities ( <i>IDEA</i> )	8,201	S	31
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	2,287	S	25
Economically disadvantaged students	22,081	S	54
Migratory students	33	S	48
Male	32,782	S	73
Female	31,376	S	72

**Comments:** The response is limited to 4,000 characters. Gender code is missing for 7 students. Two or more races and Pacific Islander are included in bridged five categories.

## 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 SY 2011-12. The percentage that made AYP will be calculated automatically.

Entity	Total #	Total # that Made AYP in SY 2011-12	Percentage that Made AYP in SY 2011-12
Schools	2,243		
Districts	462		
<b>Comments:</b> The response is limited to 4,000 characters. WI set new college benchmarked cut-scores and new AMOs under the ESEA Waiver resulting in a big change in the number and % of schools that made AYP in SY 2011-			

### 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 SY 2011-12. 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 2011-12	Percentage of Title I Schools that Made AYP in SY 2011-12
All Title I schools	1,179		
Schoolwide (SWP) Title I schools	578		
Targeted assistance (TAS) Title I schools	601		
<b>Comments:</b> The response is limited to 4,000 characters. Under WI's ESEA Waiver, AYP components were reported, but not overall determinations. WI set new college benchmarked cut-scores and new AMOs under the ESEA Waiver resulting in a big change in the number and % of schools that made AYP in SY 2011-12.			

### 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 2011-12. The percentage that made AYP will be calculated automatically.

# Districts That Received Title I Funds in SY 2011-12	# Districts That Received Title I Funds and Made AYP in SY 2011-12	Percentage of Districts That Received Title I Funds and Made AYP in SY 2011-12
437		
<b>Comments:</b> The response is limited to 4,000 characters. No comments at this time.		

**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 2011-12 (based on SY 2010-11 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 2011-12</b>
Required implementation of a new research-based curriculum or instructional program	6
Extension of the school year or school day	1
Replacement of staff members relevant to the school's low performance	1
Significant decrease in management authority at the school level	1
Replacement of the principal	3
Restructuring the internal organization of the school	4
Appointment of an outside expert to advise the school	1
<b>Comments:</b> The response is limited to 4,000 characters. No comments at this time.	

**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 2011-12 (based on SY 2010-11 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	5
<b>Comments:</b> The response is limited to 4,000 characters. No comments at this time.	

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.

The schools implemented state mandated reforms in curriculum and staffing.

#### 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.

The Wisconsin Department of Public Instruction (WDPI) is required by the Elementary and Secondary Education Act (ESEA) to annually identify schools and districts that did not make adequate yearly progress (AYP) toward meeting the state's established objectives in four areas. These objectives include: testing 95 percent of their enrolled students in the statewide reading and mathematics assessments; meeting state established targets in reading, based on Wisconsin's statewide standardized test; meeting state established targets in mathematics, based on Wisconsin's statewide standardized test; and maintaining either a high school graduation rate of at least 85 percent or show growth of two percentage points each year and elementary and middle school attendance rates of at least 85 percent of the statewide average, or show growth.

Under the ESEA, WDPI has required Milwaukee Public Schools (MPS) to take corrective action designed to meet the goal of having all students achieve at the proficient and advanced student academic achievement levels. Previous corrective action requirements have created a strong foundation, and the district has made progress in achieving many of these requirements. However, further work is needed to successfully address the immediate needs of MPS' students. MPS is a district identified for improvement and subject to corrective action, therefore, all MPS schools, which include contracted sites (charter and partnership), are held accountable to the Corrective Action Requirements.

MPS continues to focus their efforts in three strategic areas: student success through academic achievement; high performing schools and classrooms; and district and community support. Like MPS, the WDPI remains committed to the goal of improving student achievement in MPS and has maintained that focus as the department developed the Corrective Action Requirements for Milwaukee Public Schools District in Need of Improvement 2011-2012 (CAR). The CAR promotes a consistent, well-designed set of classroom-focused structures that will encourage MPS students to be successful academically and will focus on the following three goals: ensuring highly qualified teachers and leaders are in every school; improving student performance; and ensuring accountability at the district, school, and student levels.

The 2012-2013 CAR builds on work the district has begun in recent years. In 2009-2010, MPS began developing a system of early intervening services (SEIS), which includes academic support through a Response to Intervention (Rtl) system and behavior support through a Positive Behavior Intervention and Supports (PBIS) system.

The SEIS is designed to provide early academic and behavioral supports to struggling students rather than waiting for a child to fail before offering help. The essential elements of a SEIS include: 1) scientific, research-based instructional delivery; 2) differentiated instruction; 3) curricula and instructional materials aligned to state standards; 4) scientific, research-based classroom management; 5) system of behavioral support; 6) reliable and valid universal screening of literacy for all students; 7) reliable and valid universal screening of numeracy for all students; 8) universal screening for all students taking content area courses required for graduation; 9) reliable and valid universal screening for behavior; 10) effective school leadership that supports instructional decisions based on data; 11) system of instructional support (professional development); 12) system of classroom observations to determine integrity of implementation; 13) follow-up procedures for instructional staff who have not met minimal criteria; and 14) parental/family and community involvement.

Rtl is a process for achieving higher levels of academic and behavioral success for all students. This systematic process will provide teachers with an organized framework for selection and implementation of interventions, and monitoring of student interventions. Also, the district has expanded PBIS, an Rtl approach to behavior, to create a framework to support positive student behavior in all schools.

Finally, the district has developed structures to address specific areas of concern under former corrective action requirements, such as adopting an action team for partnership model, which engages families and communities with the schools to focus on student achievement. The district has developed a 2010-2011 action plan for partnerships and a district action team that will work with the Regional Home-School staff to support the school governance councils and the action teams for partnerships.

MPS and the WDPI will work throughout the 2012-2013 school year in successfully achieving the School Year goals of the CAR. To better ensure the district meets these School Year goals, the CAR goals have been divided into quarterly indicators with the stated evidence submitted to the department by the date specified. These quarters are divided into the following time periods:

Quarter 1 : July 1, 2012—September 30, 2012

Quarter 2 : October 1, 2012-December 31, 2012

Quarter 3 : January 1, 2013-March 31, 2013

Quarter 4: April1, 2013-June 15, 2013

The CAR was developed with a multiyear perspective, which recognizes that improving learning for MPS students is an ongoing effort. The WDPI will work collaboratively with MPS as it implements these corrective action requirements.

**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 2011-12 (based on SY 2010-11 assessments under Section 1111 of ESEA).

Corrective Action	# of Districts receiving Title I funds in Corrective Action in Which Corrective Action was Implemented in SY 2011-12
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	0
Replaced district personnel who are relevant to the failure to make AYP	0
Removed one or more schools from the jurisdiction of the district	0
Appointed a receiver or trustee to administer the affairs of the district	0
Restructured the district	1
Abolished the district (list the number of districts abolished between the end of SY 2010-11 and beginning of SY 2011-12 as a corrective action)	0
<b>Comments:</b> The response is limited to 4,000 characters. No comments at this time.	

**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 2011-12 data and the results of those appeals.

Entity	# Appealed Their AYP Designations	# Appeals Resulted in a Change in the AYP Designation
Districts	0	0
Schools	0	0
<b>Comments:</b> The response is limited to 4,000 characters. Under WI's ESEA Waiver, AYP components were reported, but not overall determinations.		

Date (MM/DD/YY) that processing appeals based on SY 2011-12 data was complete	
---	--

**1.4.8 Sections 1003(a) and (g) School Improvement Funds**

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 2011-12.

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

In the space provided, enter the percentage of the FY 2011 (SY 2011-12) 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*: 4.00%

**Comments:** The response is limited to 4,000 characters. No comments at this time.

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

For SY 2011-12 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 2011-12.

This response is limited to 8,000 characters.

The Wisconsin Department of Public Instruction utilized staff to provide technical assistance and to monitor progress of Tier I and Tier II SIG schools. DPI provided individualized support as requested by each LEA and SIG School.
---

**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 2011-12 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>Public School Choice</b>	<b># Students</b>
Eligible for public school choice	25,704
Applied to transfer	375
Transferred to another school under the Title I public school choice provisions	356
<b>Comments:</b> The response is limited to 4,000 characters. No comments at this time.	

**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>Transportation for Public School Choice</b>	<b>Amount</b>
Dollars spent by LEAs on transportation for public school choice	\$ 16,327

**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>Unable to Provide Public School Choice</b>	<b># LEAs</b>
LEAs Unable to Provide Public School Choice	2

**FAQs about public school choice:**

- a. How should States report data on Title I public school choice for those LEAs that have open enrollment and other choice programs? For those LEAs that implement open enrollment or other school choice programs in addition to public school choice under Section 1116 of *ESEA*, the State may consider a student as having applied to transfer if the student meets the following:
  - o 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
  - o 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
  - o 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:** The response is limited to 4,000 characters. No comments at this time.

<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>Supplemental Educational Services</b>	<b># Students</b>
Eligible for supplemental educational services	16,067
Applied for supplemental educational services	4,730
Received supplemental educational services	3,923
<b>Comments:</b> The response is limited to 4,000 characters. No comments at this time.	

**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>Spending on Supplemental Educational Services</b>	<b>Amount</b>
Dollars spent by LEAs on supplemental educational services	\$ 6,685,709
<b>Comments:</b> The response is limited to 4,000 characters. No comments at this time.	

**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	226,831	223,527	98.54	3,304	1.46
All elementary classes	68,118	67,018	98.39	1,100	1.61
All secondary classes	158,713	156,509	98.61	2,204	1.39

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.

n/a
-----

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.

LEAs are advised to report self-contained full-day elementary classes as one class.
---

**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.

<b>Elementary School Classes</b>	<b>Percentage</b>
Elementary school classes taught by certified general education teachers who did not pass a subject-knowledge test or (if eligible) have not demonstrated subject-matter competency through HOUSSE	22.70
Elementary school classes taught by certified special education teachers who did not pass a subject-knowledge test or have not demonstrated subject-matter competency through HOUSSE	19.00
Elementary school classes taught by teachers who are not fully certified (and are not in an approved alternative route program)	58.30
Other (please explain in comment box below)	0.00
Total	100.00

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

<b>Secondary School Classes</b>	<b>Percentage</b>
Secondary school classes taught by certified general education teachers who have not demonstrated subject-matter knowledge in those subjects (e.g., out-of-field teachers)	38.70
Secondary school classes taught by certified special education teachers who have not demonstrated subject-matter competency in those subjects	11.30
Secondary school classes taught by teachers who are not fully certified (and are not in an approved alternative route program)	50.00
Other (please explain in comment box below)	0.00
Total	100.00

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.

**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).

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 a different category in 1.5.3 than it would be in 1.5.1.

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	30,076	29,318	97.48
Low-poverty Elementary Schools	12,178	12,106	99.41
<b>Secondary Schools</b>			
High Poverty secondary Schools	36,410	35,054	96.28
Low-Poverty secondary Schools	46,065	45,779	99.38

#### 1.5.3.1 Poverty Quartile Breaks

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	60.00	26.00
Poverty metric used	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  Schools without ISES data get set to neither high nor low poverty.	
Secondary schools	51.00	26.00
Poverty metric used	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. Schools without ISES data get set to neither high nor low poverty.	

**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/rcd/BE021775/Glossary\\_of\\_Terms.pdf](http://www.ncela.gwu.edu/files/rcd/BE021775/Glossary_of_Terms.pdf).
2. **Other Language** = Name of the language of instruction, other than English, used in the programs.

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.

Other: Content Area Tutoring, 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	48,164
<b>Comments:</b> The response is limited to 4,000 characters.	

**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.

<b>LEP Students Receiving Services</b>	<b>#</b>
LEP students who received services in a Title III language instruction educational program in grades K through 12 for this reporting year.	47,985
<b>Comments:</b> The response is limited to 4,000 characters. LEP students who received services in a Title III receiving district grades k-12.	

**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.

<b>Language</b>	<b># LEP Students</b>
Spanish; Castilian	31,003
Hmong	9,032
Chinese	617
Arabic	519
Albanian	423

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

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

--

### 1.6.3 Student Performance Data

This section collects data on LEP students' 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 (ELP) assessment (as defined in 1.6.2.1).

All LEP Testing	#
Number tested on State annual ELP assessment	47,188
Number not tested on State annual ELP assessment	376
Total	47,564
<b>Comments:</b> The response is limited to 4,000 characters. A total of 376 students did not participate in the ELP assessment and were coded as NPART in the EdFacts file 137. Reasons include: 249 were absent during testing and 127 did not participate due to reasons valid in Wisconsin.	

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

All LEP Results	#
Number attained proficiency on State annual ELP assessment	11,370
Percent attained proficiency on State annual ELP assessment	24.16
<b>Comments:</b> The response is limited to 4,000 characters.	

**1.6.3.2.1 Title III LEP Students Tested on the State Annual English Language Proficiency Assessment**

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

<b>Title III LEP Testing</b>	<b>#</b>
Number tested on State annual ELP assessment	47,065
Number not tested on State annual ELP assessment	376
Total	47,441
<b>Comments:</b> The response is limited to 4,000 characters. A total of 376 students did not participate in the ELP assessment and were coded as NPART in the EdFacts file 137. Reasons include: 249 were absent during testing and 127 did not participate due to reasons valid in Wisconsin. The number of students who were not included in AMAO 1 calculations reported below includes students who took the assessment for the first time, students who did not have a prior composite score within the past two years, and students who participated in a portion of the assessment but did not receive a composite score.	

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 AMAO 1. Report this number ONLY if the State did not include these students in establishing AMAO 1/ making progress target and did not include them in the calculations for AMAO 1/ making progress (# and % making progress).

<b>Title III First Time Tested</b>	<b>#</b>
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.	13,583

**1.6.3.2.2 Title III LEP English Language Proficiency Results**

This section collects information on Title III LEP students' development of English and attainment of English proficiency.

**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 Consolidated State Application (CSA), or as amended.
- Attained Proficiency** = Number and percent of Title III LEP students that met the State definition of "Attainment" of English language proficiency submitted to ED in the Consolidated State 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 percent of students 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%).

<b>Title III Results</b>	<b>Results #</b>	<b>Results %</b>	<b>Targets #</b>	<b>Targets %</b>
Making progress	17,607	52.59	12,388	37.00
Attained proficiency	11,370	24.16	3,376	8.00
<b>Comments:</b> The response is limited to 4,000 characters.				

**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).	<input type="checkbox"/> No
State offers the State mathematics content tests in the students' native language(s).	<input type="checkbox"/> No
State offers the State science content tests in the students' native language(s).	<input type="checkbox"/> No
<b>Comments:</b> The response is limited to 4,000 characters. WI provides a Spanish and Hmong side-by-side translation accommodation for all WKCE EXCEPT the Reading (in English) examinations.	

**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)
<b>Comments:</b> The response is limited to 4,000 characters. N/A



**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 (MFLEP) 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
2,132	1,311	3,443

**Comments:** The response is limited to 4,000 characters.

**1.6.3.6.2 MFLEP Students Results for Mathematics**

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 who did not score proficient on the State annual mathematics assessment. This will be automatically calculated.

# Tested	# At or Above Proficient	% Results	# Below Proficient
3,443	S	63	S

**Comments:** The response is limited to 4,000 characters.

**1.6.3.6.3 MFLEP Students Results for Reading/Language Arts**

In the table below, report results for 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. This will be automatically calculated.
4. **# Below proficient** = State-aggregated number MFLEP students who did not score proficient on the State annual reading/language arts assessment.

# Tested	# At or Above Proficient	% Results	# Below Proficient
3,443	S	44	S
<b>Comments:</b> The response is limited to 4,000 characters.			

**1.6.3.6.4 MFLEP Students Results for Science**

In the table below, report results for MFLEP 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 MFLEP 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. This will be automatically calculated.
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
1,283	S	89	S
<b>Comments:</b> The response is limited to 4,000 characters.			

**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.)

<b>Title III Subgrantees</b>	<b>#</b>
# - Total number of subgrantees for the year	158
////////////////////////////////////	
# - Number of subgrantees that met all three Title III AMAOs	126
# - Number of subgrantees who met AMAO 1	158
# - Number of subgrantees who met AMAO 2	158
# - Number of subgrantees who met AMAO 3	126
////////////////////////////////////	
# - 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 2010-11 and 2011-12)	0
# - Number of subgrantees implementing an improvement plan in SY 2011-12 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 2008-09, 2009-10, 2010-11, and 2011-12)	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:** The response is limited to 4,000 characters. Consortium fiscal agents plus member districts that do not have 20 ELLs in the current and prior year and receive AMAO 1 and AMAO 2 determinations based on the combined results of all ELLs in the consortium. Districts that have 20 or more ELLs in both the current and prior year and are not the consortium fiscal agent receive individual district determinations. AMAO 3 determination is based on district ELLs only, following Title I Accountability Workbook AYP for ELLs without consortium consideration.

**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	Yes
<b>Comments:</b> The response is limited to 4,000 characters.	

**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?	No
If yes, provide the number of language instruction educational programs <u>or</u> activities for immigrant children and youth terminated	
<b>Comments:</b> The response is limited to 4,000 characters	

**1.6.5 Education Programs and Activities for Immigrant Students**

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

**Note: All immigrant students are not LEP 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 only 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
5,429	1,876	14

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.

Of the 17 grant applications, 14 met the eligibility criteria.

## 1.6.6 Teacher Information and Professional Development

This section collects data on teachers in Title III language instruction educational 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) v The term 'Language instruction educational program' means an instruction course v (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.

Title III Teachers	#
Number of all certified/licensed teachers currently working in Title III language instruction educational programs.	2,265
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*.	1,030

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.

Supply and demand studies 2000-2008: <a href="http://tepd.dpi.wi.gov/resources/supply-and-demand">tepd.dpi.wi.gov/resources/supply-and-demand</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 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 and 1.6.4.)
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	187	////////////////////////////////////
Understanding and implementation of assessment of LEP students	162	////////////////////////////////////
Understanding and implementation of ELP standards and academic content standards for LEP students	119	////////////////////////////////////
Alignment of the curriculum in language instruction educational programs to ELP standards	68	////////////////////////////////////
Subject matter knowledge for teachers	81	////////////////////////////////////
Other (Explain in comment box)	60	////////////////////////////////////
Participant Information	# Subgrantees	# Participants
PD provided to content classroom teachers	145	9,206
PD provided to LEP classroom teachers	115	2,082
PD provided to principals	88	575
PD provided to administrators/other than principals	75	248
PD provided to other school personnel/non-administrative	90	1,531
PD provided to community based organization personnel	9	115
<b>Total</b>	<b>522</b>	<b>13,757</b>

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

A TOTAL of 209 Districts provided PD Activity for 13,757 Participants information.

## 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 submitted using the MM/DD/YY format.

#### 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 2011-12 funds July 1, 2011, and then made these funds available to subgrantees on August 1, 2011, for SY 2011-12 programs. Then the "# of days/\$\$ Distribution" is 30 days.

Date State Received Allocation	Date Funds Available to Subgrantees	# of Days/\$\$ Distribution
07/01/11	07/01/11	87
<b>Comments:</b> The response is limited to 4,000 characters. Allocations are available the same date as the public 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.

WDPI provides estimates based on the number of eligible ELLs in each district/subgrantee in early June prior to receiving funds.
--

**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>.

<b>Persistently Dangerous Schools</b>	<b>#</b>
Persistently Dangerous Schools	0
<b>Comments:</b> The response is limited to 4,000 characters.	

**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.

<b>LEAs</b>	<b>#</b>	<b># LEAs Reporting Data</b>
LEAs without subgrants	427	426
LEAs with subgrants	16	16
Total	443	442
<b>Comments:</b> The response is limited to 4,000 characters. 3/8/13 WI Response per ED data verification request: LEAs without subgrants had 0 counts.		

**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)	393	568
K	615	833
1	581	798
2	577	780
3	496	691
4	507	697
5	476	628
6	420	594
7	379	568
8	385	559
9	324	622
10	314	446
11	355	551
12	706	628
Ungraded		
Total	6,528	8,963

**Comments:** The response is limited to 4,000 characters. Wisconsin submitted 0 students in UG ungraded in ED Facts file C043 because Wisconsin does not report UG school grades in ED Facts. The student count is 0.

**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>Primary Nighttime Residence</b>	<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	839	1,381
Doubled-up (e.g., living with another family)	4,984	5,786
Unsheltered (e.g., cars, parks, campgrounds, temporary trailer, or abandoned buildings)	176	1,241
Hotels/Motels	529	555
Total	6,528	8,963

**Comments:** The response is limited to 4,000 characters. No comments at this time.

## 1.9.2 LEAs with McKinney-Vento Subgrants

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

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

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

Age/Grade	# Homeless Children/Youths Served by Subgrants
Age Birth Through 2	0
Age 3 through 5 (not Kindergarten)	636
K	860
1	825
2	799
3	714
4	720
5	655
6	617
7	587
8	580
9	643
10	461
11	570
12	665
Ungraded	0
Total	9,332

**Comments:** The response is limited to 4,000 characters. Wisconsin submitted 0 students in birth to age 3 (UNDER3) in EDFacts file C043 because Wisconsin does not collect or report data on students under age 3 in EDFacts. The student count is 0.

### 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.

Subgroup	# Homeless Students Served
Unaccompanied homeless youth	1,318
Migratory children/youth	7
Children with disabilities ( <i>IDEA</i> )	1,592
Limited English Proficient (LEP) students	546

**Comments:** The response is limited to 4,000 characters. No comments at this time.

**1.9.3 Academic Achievement of Homeless Students**

The following questions collect data on the academic achievement of enrolled homeless children and youths.

**1.9.3.1 Reading Assessment**

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

Grade	# Homeless Children/Youth Who Received a Valid Score and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned	# Homeless Children/Youth Scoring at or above Proficient
3	500	50
4	520	54
5	486	55
6	449	54
7	452	53
8	418	40
High School	310	32
<b>Comments:</b> The response is limited to 4,000 characters. *****03/08/13 Amended Response***** # Homeless Children/Youth Scoring at or above Proficient appears lower this year due to the flexibility adjustments to cut scores. All proficiency scores for all subjects have seen some decrease		

**1.9.3.2 Mathematics Assessment**

This section is similar to 1.9.3.1. The only difference is that this section collects data on the State mathematics assessment.

Grade	# Homeless Children/Youth Who Received a Valid Score and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned	# Homeless Children/Youth Scoring at or above Proficient
3	505	93
4	527	103
5	489	110
6	448	77
7	459	62
8	424	56
High School	314	27
<b>Comments:</b> The response is limited to 4,000 characters. *****03/08/13 Amended Response***** # Homeless Children/Youth Scoring at or above Proficient appears lower this year due to the flexibility adjustments to cut scores. All proficiency scores for all subjects have seen some decrease		

**1.9.3.3 Science Assessment**

This section is similar to 1.9.3.1. The only difference is that this section collects data on the State science assessment.

Grade	# Homeless Children/Youth Who Received a Valid Score and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned	# Homeless Children/Youth Scoring at or above Proficient
3		
4	265	123
5		
6		
7		
8	201	95
High School	154	51
<b>Comments:</b> The response is limited to 4,000 characters. No comments at this time.		

## 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, 2011 through August 31, 2012. 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, 2011 through August 31, 2012. 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).

Age/Grade	12-Month Count of Eligible Migrant Children Who Can Be Counted for Funding Purposes
Age 3 through 5 (not Kindergarten)	133
K	63
1	76
2	67
3	63
4	52
5	51
6	47
7	51
8	49
9	55
10	62
11	59
12	29
Ungraded	0
Out-of-school	18
Total	875
<b>Comments:</b> The response is limited to 4,000 characters. No comments at this time.	

**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 2010-11 Category 1 count was 865. The 2011-12 count was 875. This reflects an increase of the Category 1 count by 10, which is less than 10% variance.

**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, 2011 through August 31, 2012. 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	25
1	37
2	36
3	30
4	31
5	24
6	13
7	15
8	15
9	8
10	5
11	9
12	1
Ungraded	0
Out-of-school	0
Total	262
<b>Comments:</b> The response is limited to 4,000 characters. No comments at this time.	

**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.

There was an increase of 39 eligible Category 2 students served in the 2012 summer migrant education programs. The count for 2010-11 was 223. The 2011-12 Category 2 count was 262. Two additional summer projects were in operation for the Math Master's consortium grant program. The combined use of regular migrant grant funds and the consortium grant funds permitted more students to be served.

### 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 2011-12 counts reported for Category 1 and Category 2 were determined through the New Generation System (NGS) generated reports from data entered by the state into the system. These reports were subjected to multiple cross-checking procedures for validation by state and local staff. The same system and procedures were used for the 2010-11 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 Wisconsin Certificate of Eligibility (COE) modeled from the national COE requirements, was used to collect a substantial amount of student demographic information necessary for determining migrant child eligibility. This data was entered into the New Generation System (NGS) and is used to generate specially-designed reports on the eligible child counts for each category.

How was the data collected?

Trained recruiters from the local sites and the state program used the COE forms while completing face-to-face interviews with potential migrant families. The state recruiter does the recruitment in areas of the state without migrant projects. The state and local project sites have assigned staff for supervising the recruitment, reviewing the data and signing off as part of the quality control process. The array of information from the completed COE was used to make decisions on qualifying moves; qualifying arrival dates; residency dates; enrollment and withdrawal dates, student birth dates; and the end of eligibility, for the purpose of ensuring 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.

What data were collected?

The COE is designed to yield data on the required minimum data elements. The COE was designed to meet all national COE requirements, and undergoes revision when the regulations change to modify or add minimum data elements. In addition to a review of the NGS reports, the state staff reviews Local Accounting Sheets, Continuing Enrollment Reports, and Student Reporting Forms as a means of cross-checking district reporting on migrant students. The Student Reporting Form identifies the specific supplementary MEP funded instructional or support services. Residency and withdrawal dates are carefully monitored during the regular term and summer enrollment period. Follow up is carried out for any missing or questionable elements. Parental signatures are obtained on the COEs after they are well informed and they are provided a copy.

What activities were conducted to collect the data?

In summary, these activities were conducted to collect the data:

- \* Information was obtained from state Workforce Development specifying new camps/growers location of migrant work and workers in the state.
- \* Families alert recruiters that new families have arrived.
- \* School districts and UMOS share information with recruiters when new families arrive.
- \* Employers provide information on new workers to the recruiters.
- \* School districts find new students during the summer and regular year registration process.
- \* Other states send notices via MSIX on new families coming to the state and follow up takes place.
- \* School Food Nutrition personnel contact recruiters when a new family arrives to check migrant status which leads to follow up.
- \* Recruiters follow up on information leads on area work sites and make contacts, when migrant labor is involved.
- \* On-going re-interviewing checks are made and guidance provided.
- \* Provision of relevant training for all recruiters and directors related to having accurate and complete NGS data and also related to the quality of the MSIX data...A COE was designed to be congruent with the required statues related to migrant child eligibility.
- \* COEs are screened on an on-going basis, emails are sent noting program areas requesting clarification.
- \* COEs are obtained for all new families. This checking focuses on verification of enrollment, withdrawal, and residency dates on the COE.
- \* The COE form is congruent with the required legislation and federal guidance.
- \* 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) and the Student Reporting Forms. The state recruiter, consultant, state coordinator and data manager are engaged in checking eligibility data for all enrolled eligible students and as necessary they cross-check the accuracy of the data.
- \* Local staff with responsibilities are kept abreast of data quality requirements and provided hands on training.

\* The state recruiter conducts visits to migrant labor sites, potential community sites and agencies to interview migrant workers, and growers. The state recruiter also conducts visits to interview other direct service providers to migrant farm workers; cannery workers; and follows up on leads from districts and citizens.

When were the data collected for the student information system?

\* The data collection activities gathered data within the appropriate window; from September 1, 2011 to August 31, 2012.

\*\*\*\*\*03/08/13 - WI Amended Response\*\*\*\*\*

How does the State collect and maintain Category 2 data? For example, who is responsible for recording student participation in a MEP summer program? How is this participation tracked? When is this information collected? Who enters this information into NGS?

\*\*\*\*\*

There are many individuals involved in the collection of Category 1 and Category 2 Data, and in maintaining appropriate records, including local district recruiters, records clerks, local project directors, and trained state agency personnel. Only trained records clerks at the local and state level enter the data from the COE, and other state data collection reports into the system. The data identifies eligible students participating in the summer program who received a supplemental instructional or support service funded partially or in whole from migrant funds. The NGS system is coded to yield reports from this data which identifies those children served in the summer program and who received an educational or supportive supplemental service that was funded by migrant funds.

The data is collected annually within the Spring-August window. The peak time is usually June-July for the summer period. The trained records clerks or state terminal operator enters the data into the NGS.

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 specialist and selected locally trained personnel with proper authorization enter data into the NGS. Wisconsin compiles a new COE for every student that arrives in the district from another district or state, or appropriate out of country location. A Local Accounting Sheet (LAS) and a Continuing Enrollment Report (CER) identifies those students in residence that did not move out of state and were enrolled in school for the regular or summer term. NGS was updated regularly to reflect new demographic enrollment course history and assessment data. Project personnel must verify continuing residency of students through established options of home visits, school records, or other credible agency records.

Careful scrutiny by state staff affirmed that the NGS query included: only students ages 3 through 21; students eligible within the 36 month period; students that had residency 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 has been programmed to set up a query to ensure a student is counted only once statewide for the count yielded in Category 1 and Category 2. The NGS creates a unique student identification number for each student. Extra checking is done by staff for potential duplications when names are the same or similar to rule out duplicity in the counts. NGS is programmed to exclude children under 3 years of age from the funding counts.

Special NGS reports unique to districts were printed and shared with them to help eliminate problems with reported data and to ensure data accuracy and quality. The End of Eligibility Report is generated by NGS to flag students whose eligibility will end during the current term. This report helps to avoid inaccurate counts due to including students that no longer have eligible migrant status.

\*\*\*\*\*03/08/13 - WI Amended Response\*\*\*\*\*

Do the NGS Specialists enter all data into NGS (e.g., COE data, course history data, summer service data, etc.)? How does the State update student information in NGS? For example, what is the process for updating addresses, or updating if a

child graduates? Does the SEA require project staff to meet with families, gather updates, and then submit a form with updated information to the NGS data specialist for entry/change in NGS?

\*\*\*\*\*

Yes, NGS trained records clerks and data specialists enter all data from hard copies into NGS, including COE data,

course history data, summer service data and data collected through state forms. The State does check manually and extensively for duplicates and through the use of NGS/ MSIX reports identifies duplicates, and takes necessary action. To make the changes, The Help Desk for NGS is contacted where data support personnel make requested changes. Recruiters provide updated information to the records clerks.

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.

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 programmed to report out the number of eligible students receiving supplemental services during the summer term.

\*\*\*\*\*03/08/13 - Amended response\*\*\*\*\*

### 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 a 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.. 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 on the Student Reporting Forms and COEs.

\* 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 take 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 for checking and verifying residency. Data from the COE is checked against the state designed 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 date of school enrollment and withdrawal. The state MEP data management team works on a continuous basis all year 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 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 programmed to report out the number of eligible students receiving supplemental services during the summer term.

\*\*\*\*\*03/08/13 WI Amended Response\*\*\*\*\*

the State says that it does extra checking on the report that validates 2 turning threes. Describe the States process for verifying residency on a child after he /she turns 3 years old. How does the state ensure, for the Category 2 count, that it includes only those children from the Category 1 count that received a service? In 1.10.3.2 box 2, the State says that different enrollment lines are created for different types of enrollments. Does the State's query for the Category 2 only allow certain types of enrollment codes? Does someone from the State manually intervene when NGS and or MSIX reports show potential duplicates? Does this person look at original COE information and call families to if the record is a duplicate of another record or if, in fact, there really should be two records? Please describe further the process for eliminating duplicates.

\*\*\*\*\*

2 Year olds are not included in the count for funding, however, we want projects to be aware of the 2 year olds turning 3, and to ensure proper recording of residency status for them as well as other students.

The State has a special form that districts must complete to show all students enrolled in school, and all students in residency only. Verification of this data, including residency is done by one of three methods: Face to Face interviews, school records, use of other agencies documented information. As stated before, the state student reporting form yields eligible children receiving a migrant funded supplemental service. This data is inputted to NGS. NGS is coded to yield the eligible students who received a summer supplemental education/instruction or supportive service.

The State does check manually and extensively for duplicates and through the use of NGS/MSIX reports identifies duplicates, and takes necessary action. Families are contacted when necessary to clarify information. To make the changes, The Help Desk for NGS is contacted where data support personnel make requested changes. Recruiters provide updated information to the records clerks, The state terminal operator is trained to follow through on issues related to duplicates.

### 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 to training by 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, spend extensive time reviewing COE data and clearing up any problem 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 the following 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 MEP personnel run NGS reports on an on-going basis to monitor progress and to spot any problem areas.
- \* On-going re-interviewing process.

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 designs and provides 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 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 manager, 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, and works actively to avoid missed enrollments.

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, and the Priority for Services Report, and other special reports available from NGS unique to the state.

\*\*\*\*\*03/08/13 WI Amended Response\*\*\*\*\*

Does the SEA provide recruiters with written eligibility guidance (e.g., a handbook)? Does the SEA review eligibility documentation as part of regular monitoring? Does the SEA review student attendance at summer/inter-session projects. What is the SEA's process for resolving eligibility questions. How does the SEA periodically evaluate the effectiveness of recruitment efforts and revise procedures. Are written procedures provided to summer/inter-session personnel on how to collect and report pupil enrollment and attendance data. Are records/data entry personnel provided training at least annually on how to review summer/inter-session site records, input data, and run reports used for child count purposes?

Yes, written eligibility guidance is provided from the federal government and state developed packets and specific relevant handouts. Eligibility is reviewed during summer and regular term monitoring visits. Issues are discussed with the director, and recruiter. Correct procedures are modeled to help them strengthen the local quality control plan.

COEs /other data reports are selected and reviewed from each project on an ongoing basis with needed follow through. Annual training is made available in specially designed workshops and this includes regular term and summer term records clerks and data managers on procedures for entering and reviewing migrant student data and management of on site records.

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 continuous ongoing re-interviewing plan is carried on an on-going basis. Within a three year cycle, a comprehensive prospective re-interviewing process is conducted. During the interim years, state staff engage in this activity. When the comprehensive prospective process is carried out, external personnel knowledgeable about the migrant education program and eligibility requirements are employed to test the accuracy of the COEs and generate reports on strengths and/or errors found that need attention. A sample of 100 COEs are tested during the comprehensive review, while 60-70 are reviewed and tested by the migrant team during the interim years. Of the 70 reviewed during the 2011-12 program year, there were 2 findings as stated below:

- \* A COE lacked sufficient comments to justify eligibility on the basis of work history and documentation could not be obtained.
- \* A Child under 3 was not listed on the COE from a family that had made a qualifying move.

Out of 60 reviews, the error rate was 2.01%. Technical assistance was provided to the project staff, and the problem areas will be incorporated into the 2012-13 recruiters' training plan.

The 2012-13 comprehensive prospective re-interviewing will begin in late spring, continue through summer 2013 and be completed by the fall of 2013. A random sample of 100 COEs will be tested by the external re-interviewers.

\*\*\*\*\*03/08/13 WI Amended Response\*\*\*\*\*

Did the State review 60 or 70 in 2011-12? In one location the text says that 70 were reviewed, but in another it says that out of 60 reviews, the error rate was 2.01%. Please clarify. How many students did the State have to sample in order to "test"

60 (or 70) cases? Please clarify if the State's reinterview sample was random or not. Was the sample statewide or was it stratified by group/area? From its sample, how did the State replace kids that it couldn't find? Please clarify the following about the State's process for re-interviewing: Were re-interviews conducted systematically (face to face, phone, both)? Did the State use a standard instrument for re-interviewing? Does the protocol require verifying all pieces of information used to make the original eligibility determination? Were re-interviewers trained and/or provided guidance on eligibility and re-interviewing? Were re-interviewers the individuals who conducted the original interviews?

\*\*\*\*\*

The state reviewed 70 in 2011-12 with 2 errors, and an error rate of 2.8%. The state starts with a random list of 100 from all projects, knowing that some students do not return each year, and families cannot always be found by phone. The sample was stratified The data that generated the original status of eligibility is tested. During the comprehensive review, a statewide sample will be generated. Recruiters and Directors at projects with the errors were provided guidance to address the corrective action. The type of problems encountered were integrated into the annual training sessions.

Both face to face and phone interviews were conducted. The state has an instrument that it uses for re-interviewing. Yes, the same criteria is checked that generated the original eligibility determination. Re-interviews are trained and provided guidance. The reviewers are looking at the accuracy of COEs completed by local recruiters. When kids are not found, you go to the next one on the list. That is why you have a larger sample than you intend to review.

When the comprehensive review is done for 2013-14- external re-interviewers will be brought in to do the re-interviewing. In the interim years, state staff knowledgeable about eligibility do this .

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. This open communication results in both long standing and new data collection requirements being 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. These individuals have responsibilities for the migrant education program data collection and eligibility determinations and reporting. Monitoring visits during the summer and regular term projects yield important information on technical assistance needs.

The state director holds biweekly meetings with the data management specialist to review quality and accuracy of the data processing. Expectations for confidentiality of migrant student records are reviewed periodically with the state staff and at local project training events.

\*\*\*\*\*03/08/13 WI Amended Response\*\*\*\*\*

Does the State have written procedures for inputting and updating child count data? For example, does the State have a handbook or protocols that NGS specialists to understand what processes must be followed when inputting and updating data?

\*\*\*\*\*

Yes, the state has written procedures for inputting and updating child count data? All new Users must take training before doing this work. The NGS protocols are review with full users and Read Only users of the data and training is offered periodically from state staff and at times from the NGS specialist from Texas Education Agency.

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 database for submittal of verified counts to the national data base. Snapshot data is carefully screened to ensure any issues with duplication are resolved. Any questionable data is reexamined.

The state MEP staff takes a serious approach to the verification of the accuracy of the two categories of 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 works with EDEN staff to ensure proper reporting.

Multiple staff personnel are involved in review of data and issue resolving prior to the final submission of data into the system. Strict follow-through guidelines are followed when problem areas are found to ensure errors are corrected.

\*\*\*\*\*03/08/13 WI Amended Response\*\*\*\*\*

Does the State director/State staff review the child counts comparing them to previous years, expectations for the current year, and/or other data tables in the Performance Report to assess reasonableness of the counts?

\*\*\*\*\*

Yes, the state director does review the child counts and compares them to previous years, and expectations for the current year, and explores the data generated for the Performance report to assess reasonableness of counts. This goes on for a substantial amount of time prior to completing the Performance Report tables. Other state staff are involved in review of data for this purpose also.

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 2011-12 to strengthen training to improve the quality of its data collections and local and state determinations of child eligibility. State staff continued to engage district migrant project personnel in study of definitions, statutory requirements and related determinations of qualifying work, intent to see or obtain work, and acceptable means of documenting work histories for the migrant families moving into or within the state. New and continuing project staff is trained on the proper completion of the COE, and other necessary reports.

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. The state program staff will continue to pursue this goal during 2012-13. Recruiter training will focus on the regulations and guidance issued by the federal government and practical case problems encountered by recruiters. Recruiters and records clerks new to their position will receive intensive induction and follow up hands on training.

Through participation in the Solutions for Out of School Youth Consortium, the state has been improving its practices for the identification and recruitment of out of school youth and is building more training into the 2012- 13 recruiters and directors training plan to strengthen state and local efforts to identify and address needs of out of school youth.

Emphasis will be placed on the need for changes on the COE to be initialed by the recruitment personnel or project staff making any changes on the form. Training will provide guidance on content of comments needed when justifying work history for families seeking but not obtaining qualifying work. The need to ensure children under three are included in the COE prepared by recruiters will be reviewed.

COEs are not entered into the NGS database system until complete and satisfactory information is gathered to verify temporary status. Based on the re-interview team members' suggestions, and 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 is 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 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 has made a thorough effort and believes it has submitted accurate data due to the intensity of the process.