

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

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

For reporting on
School Year 2006-07



**PART I DUE FRIDAY, DECEMBER 28, 2007
PART II DUE FRIDAY, FEBRUARY 22, 2008**

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

INTRODUCTION

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

The Consolidated State Application and Report includes the following *ESEA* programs:

- Title I, Part A – *Improving Basic Programs Operated by Local Educational Agencies*
- Title I, Part B, Subpart 3 – *William F. Goodling Even Start Family Literacy Programs*
- Title I, Part C – *Education of Migratory Children*
- Title I, Part D – *Prevention and Intervention Programs for Children and Youth Who Are Neglected, Delinquent, or At-Risk*
- Title I, Part F – *Comprehensive School Reform*
- Title II, Part A – *Improving Teacher Quality State Grants (Teacher and Principal Training and Recruiting Fund)*
- Title II, Part D – *Enhancing Education through Technology*
- 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 IV, Part B – *21st Century Community Learning Centers.*
- Title V, Part A – *Innovative Programs*
- Title VI, Section 6111 – *Grants for State Assessments and Related Activities*
- Title VI, Part B – *Rural Education Achievement Program*
- Title X, Part C – *Education for Homeless Children and Youths*

The *NCLB* Consolidated State Performance Report (CSPR) for school year (SY) 2006-07 consists of two information collections.

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.

Starting with SY 2005-06, collection of data for the Education of Homeless Children and Youths was added to Part I in order to provide timely data for the program's performance measures. This change allowed ED to retire OMB collection 1810-0650. For SY 2006-07, Migrant Education Program child count information that is used for funding purposes is now collected via Part I. This change allowed ED to retire OMB collection 1810-0519

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.
3. The information will provide valid evidence of program outcomes or results.
4. The CSPR is the best vehicle for collection of the data.

GENERAL INSTRUCTIONS AND TIMELINES

All States that received funding on the basis of the Consolidated State Application for the SY 2006-07 must respond to this Consolidated State Performance Report (CSPR). Part I of the Report is due to the Department by **Friday, December 28, 2007**. Part II of the Report is due to the Department by **Friday, February 22, 2008**. Both Part I and Part II should reflect data from the SY 2006-07, 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 2006-07 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 2006-07 CSPR will be found on the main CSPR page of the EDEN web site (<https://EDEN.ED.GOV/EDENPortal/>).

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

		OMB Number: 1810-0614
		Expiration Date: 10/31/2010
<p>Consolidated State Performance Report For State Formula Grant Programs under the Elementary And Secondary Education Act as amended by the No Child Left Behind Act of 2001</p>		
Check the one that indicates the report you are submitting: <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Part I, 2006-07 <input type="checkbox"/> Part II, 2006-07		
Name of State Educational Agency (SEA) Submitting This Report: Wisconsin Department of Public Instruction		
Address: 125 South Webster Street, P.O. Box 7841 Madison, WI 53707-7841		
Person to contact about this report:		
Name: Mary Jo Parman		
Telephone: 608-266-2158		
Fax: 608-266-5188		
e-mail: maryjo.parman@dpi.state.wi.us		
Name of Authorizing State Official: (Print or Type): Michael J. Thompson		
_____ Signature		_____ Date

This version (1.1) contains edits to the following sections: 1.1.4 1.1.5 1.4.5.3 1.4.9.1.2 1.6.2.1 1.6.3.1.1 1.6.3.1.2 1.6.3.2.2 1.6.3.4.3 1.6.3.6.2 1.6.4.1 1.6.5.1 1.6.7.1 1.8.1 1.10.3.2 1.10.3.3 1.10.3.4

**CONSOLIDATED STATE PERFORMANCE REPORT:
PART I**

For reporting on
School Year 2006-07



PART I DUE DECEMBER 28, 2007

1.1 STANDARDS AND ASSESSMENT DEVELOPMENT

This section requests descriptions of the State's implementation of the *NCLB* academic content standards, academic achievement standards and assessments to meet the requirements of Section 1111(b)(1) of *ESEA*.

1.1.1 Academic Content Standards

In the space below, provide a description and timeline of any actions the State has taken or is planning to take to make revisions to or change the State's academic content standards in mathematics, reading/language arts or science. Indicate specifically in what year your state expects the changes to be implemented.

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

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

No revisions or changes to Wisconsin Model Academic content standards was undertaken. The extended, alternate achievement standards for students with disabilities was undertaken and approved on August 27, 2007.

WI is in the process of reviewing academic standards in core areas as a part of the America Diploma Project and the Partnership for 21st Century Skills.

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

Note: Mathematics and Reading/Language Arts has been added to this data collection for the SY 2006-07 CSPR.

1.1.2 Assessments in Mathematics and Reading/Language Arts

In the space below, provide a description and timeline of any actions the State has taken or is planning to take to make revisions to or change the State's assessments in mathematics or reading/language arts required under Section 1111(b)(3) of *ESEA*. As applicable, include any assessment (e.g., alternate assessments based on alternate achievement standards, alternate assessments based on modified achievement standards, native language assessments, or others) implemented to meet the assessment requirements under Section 1111(b)(3) of *ESEA*. Indicate specifically in what year your state expects the changes to be implemented.

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

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

WDPI developed standardized accommodations for English language learners (ELL) to take the Wisconsin Knowledge and Concepts Examinations (WKCE) with side-by-side accommodations in Spanish or Hmong when needed. Beginning in 2006-07, all ELL students participate in the regular WKCE - there is no separate alternate assessment for ELL students.

WI has developed new alternate assessments for students with disabilities (WAA-SwD) based on based on alternate achievement standards. These standards-based instruments in Reading, Mathematics, and Science replace the portfolio assessments previously used. They were developed to increase the alignment, standardization, and technical quality of the WAA-SwD. The students with disabilities are administered the WAA-SwD are in an alternate curriculum through their Individual Education Program (IEP) and are taught the alternate standards extended from the WI Model Academic Standards.

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

Note: The subject of science has been removed from this data element.

1.1.3 Academic Achievement Standards in Mathematics and Reading/Language Arts

In the space below, provide a description and timeline of any actions the State has taken or is planning to take to make revisions to or change the State's academic achievement standards in mathematics or reading/language arts implemented to meet the requirements under Section 1111(b)(3) of *ESEA*. As applicable, include alternate achievement standards for students with significant cognitive disabilities and modified academic achievement standards implemented to meet the requirements of Section 1111(b)(3) of *ESEA*. Indicate specifically in what year your state expects the changes to be implemented.

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

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

WI Alternate Achievement Standards were developed and approved on August 27, 2007.

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

Note: The subject of science has been removed from this data element.

1.1.4 Assessments in Science

In the space below, provide a description of the State's progress in developing and implementing assessments in science that meet the requirements of Section 1111(b)(3) of ESEA in the required grade levels, including remaining major milestones (e.g., field testing) and a timeline for them. As applicable, include any assessment (e.g., alternate assessments based on alternate achievement standards, alternate assessments based on modified achievement standards, native language assessments, or others) implemented to meet the assessment requirements under Section 1111(b)(3) of *ESEA*.

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

No revisions or changes to Wisconsin Model Academic content standards was undertaken. The extended, alternate achievement standards for students with disabilities was undertaken and approved on August 27, 2007.

WI is in the process of reviewing academic standards in core areas as a part of the America Diploma Project and the Partnership for 21st Century Skills.

March 7, 2008 - Additional Comments per ED data verification process:

1.1.4 & 1.1.5 This edition of the Science WKCE & WAA with these achievement standards have been administered since 2002-03.

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

Note: This table was formerly part of Section 1.1.2 of the SY 2005-06 CSPR.

1.1.5 Academic Achievement Standards in Science

In the space below, provide a description of the State's progress in developing and implementing academic achievement standards in science that meet the requirements of Section 1111(b)(3) in the required grade levels, including remaining major milestones and a timeline for them. As applicable, include alternate achievement standards for students with significant cognitive disabilities implemented to meet the requirements of Section 1111(b)(3) of *ESEA*.

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

WDPI developed standardized accommodations for English language learners (ELL) to take the Wisconsin Knowledge and Concepts Examinations (WKCE) with side-by-side accommodations in Spanish or Hmong when needed. Beginning in 2006-07, all ELL students participate in the regular WKCE - there is no separate alternate assessment for ELL students.

WI has developed new alternate assessments for students with disabilities (WAA-SwD) based on based on alternate achievement standards. These standards-based instruments in Reading, Mathematics, and Science replace the portfolio assessments previously used. They were developed to increase the alignment, standardization, and technical quality of the WAA-SwD. The students with disabilities are administered the WAA-SwD are in an alternate curriculum through their Individual Education Program (IEP) and are taught the alternate standards extended from the WI Model Academic Standards.

March 7, 2008 - Additional Comments per ED data verification process:

1.1.4 & 1.1.5 This edition of the Science WKCE & WAA with these achievement standards have been administered since 2002-03.

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

Note: This table was formerly part of Section 1.1.3 of the SY 2005-06 CSPR.

1.2 PARTICIPATION IN STATE ASSESSMENTS

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

1.2.1 Participation of All Students in Mathematics Assessment

In the table below, provide the number of students enrolled during the State's testing window for *NCLB* 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 were tested in mathematics. The percentage of students who were tested for mathematics will be calculated automatically.

The student group "children with disabilities (*IDEA*)" includes children who were tested using regular assessments with or without accommodations and alternate assessments.

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

Student Group	# Students Enrolled	# Students Tested	Percent of Students Tested
All students	441979	439369	99.4
American Indian or Alaska Native	6491	6417	98.9
Asian or Pacific Islander	15948	15788	99.0
Black, non-Hispanic	46772	45977	98.3
Hispanic	31074	30715	98.8
White, non-Hispanic	341677	340467	99.6
Children with disabilities (<i>IDEA</i>)	62102	61288	98.7
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	23745	23394	98.5
Economically disadvantaged students	143419	141999	99.0
Migratory students	407	396	97.3
Male	226927	225432	99.3
Female	215040	213937	99.5
Comments: #Students Tested 439,372 is correct.			
# Students assigned proficiency levels includes No WSAS; equals Total Enrolled.			
LEP includes new in US.			

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

Note: This table was formerly Section 1.2.1.1 of the SY 2005-06 CSPR. For the SY 2006-07 CSPR, the total number of students enrolled has been added to this data collection.

1.2.2 Participation of Students with Disabilities in Mathematics Assessment

In the table below, provide the number of children with disabilities (IDEA) tested during the State's testing window for 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 were tested in mathematics for each type of assessment will be calculated automatically. The total number of children with disabilities (IDEA) tested will also be calculated automatically.

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

Type of Assessment	# Children with Disabilities (IDEA) Tested	Percentage of Children with Disabilities (IDEA) Tested, Who Took the Specified Assessment
Regular Assessment without Accommodations	28205	45.4
Regular Assessment with Accommodations	28425	45.8
Alternate Assessment Based on Grade-Level Achievement Standards	0	0.0
Alternate Assessment Based on Modified Achievement Standards	0	0.0
Alternate Assessment Based on Alternate Achievement Standards	5472	8.8
Total	62102	
Comments: 61,288 = N SwD Tested		
62,102 = N Total Enrolled; Total # Students assigned proficiency levels includes No WSAS.		
LEP includes new in US.		

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

Note: This table was formerly Section 1.2.2.1 of the SY 2005-06 CSPR.

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 *NCLB* reading/language arts assessment.

Student Group	# Students Enrolled	# Students Tested	Percent of Students Tested
All students	441979	437445	99.0
American Indian or Alaska Native	6491	6420	98.9
Asian or Pacific Islander	15948	15294	95.9
Black, non-Hispanic	46772	45979	98.3
Hispanic	31074	29244	94.1
White, non-Hispanic	341677	340503	99.7
Children with disabilities (<i>IDEA</i>)	62102	61088	98.4
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	23745	21384	90.1
Economically disadvantaged students	143419	140228	97.8
Migratory students	407	348	85.5
Male	226927	224397	98.9
Female	215040	213048	99.1
Comments: N tested in Reading = 437,449; N students w/ proficiency level = 441979 total enrolled (including No WSAS).			
A number of LEP students were new in US and exempt from participating in the Reading Assessment.			

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

Note: This table was formerly Section 1.2.1.2 of the SY 2005-06 CSPR. For the SY 2006-07 CSPR, the total number of students enrolled has been added to this data collection.

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 *NCLB* reading/language arts assessment.

The data provided should include reading/language arts participation results from all students with disabilities as defined under the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act and do not include results from students covered under Section 504 of the Rehabilitation Act of 1973.

Type of Assessment	# Children with Disabilities (IDEA) Tested	Percentage of Children with Disabilities (IDEA) Tested, Who Took the Specified Assessment
Regular Assessment without Accommodations	29091	46.8
Regular Assessment with Accommodations	27005	43.5
Alternate Assessment Based on Grade-Level Achievement Standards	0	0.0
Alternate Assessment Based on Modified Achievement Standards	0	0.0
Alternate Assessment Based on Alternate Achievement Standards	6006	9.7
Total	62102	
Comments: Reading SwD N Tested = 61,088.		
# Students with proficiency levels includes No WSAS; equals Total Enrolled N=62,102.		

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

Note: This table was formerly Section 1.2.2.2 of the SY 2005-06 CSPR.

1.3 STUDENT ACADEMIC ACHIEVEMENT

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

1.3.1 Student Academic Achievement in Mathematics

In the format of the table below, provide the number of students who completed the State *NCLB* 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 were tested using regular assessments with or without accommodations and alternate assessments.

The student group "limited English proficient students (LEP)" does not include recently arrived students who have attended schools in the United States for fewer than 12 months; and does not include monitored former LEP (MFLEP) students.

1.3.2 Student Academic Achievement in Reading/Language Arts

This section is similar to 1.3.1. The only difference is that this section collects data on the State's *NCLB* reading/language arts assessment.

1.3.1 Student Academic Achievement in Mathematics - Grade 3

Grade 3	# Students Who Completed the Assessment and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned	# Students Scoring at or Above Proficient	Percentage of Students Scoring at or Above Proficient
All students	59616	44026	73.8
American Indian or Alaska Native	853	527	61.8
Asian or Pacific Islander	2103	1511	71.8
Black, non-Hispanic	6594	2778	42.1
Hispanic	5011	2851	56.9
White, non-Hispanic	45050	36358	80.7
Children with disabilities (<i>IDEA</i>)	8088	4284	53.0
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	4088	2294	56.1
Economically disadvantaged students	21475	12373	57.6
Migratory students	70	38	54.3
Male	30565	22719	74.3
Female	29047	21306	73.4
Comments: # Students assigned proficiency levels includes No WSAS; equals Total Enrolled.			
Small N Migrant and Native American students.			
LEP includes new in US.			

Source – Initially prepopulated by ED*Facts* in file N/X075 that is data group 583, category sets A, B, C, D, E, and F. If the SEA has additional racial/ethnic groups or combinations of racial/ethnic groups in its accountability plan under *NCLB*, the SEA will report the above data for those groups through the online collection tool.

Note: The addition of the total number of students with an assigned proficiency level is a new data collection for the SY 2006-07 CSPR.

1.3.2 Student Academic Achievement in Reading/Language Arts - Grade 3

Grade 3	# Students Who Completed the Assessment and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned	# Students Scoring at or Above Proficient	Percentage of Students Scoring at or Above Proficient
All students	59616	48204	80.9
American Indian or Alaska Native	853	618	72.5
Asian or Pacific Islander	2103	1544	73.4
Black, non-Hispanic	6594	3984	60.4
Hispanic	5011	3146	62.8
White, non-Hispanic	45050	38911	86.4
Children with disabilities (<i>IDEA</i>)	8088	4096	50.6
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	4088	2276	55.7
Economically disadvantaged students	21475	14465	67.4
Migratory students	70	43	61.4
Male	30565	23676	77.5
Female	29047	24527	84.4
Comments: # Students assigned proficiency levels includes No WSAS; equals Total Enrolled.			
Small N Migrant and Native American students.			
LEP includes new in US.			

Source – Initially prepopulated by ED*Facts* in file N/X076, N/X077, or N/X078 that are data group 584, category sets A, B, C, D, E, and F. If the SEA has additional racial/ethnic groups or combinations of racial/ethnic groups in its accountability plan under *NCLB*, the SEA will report the above data for those groups through the online CSPR collection tool.

Note: The addition of the total number of students with an assigned proficiency level is a new data collection for the SY 2006-07

CSPR.

1.3.3 Student Academic Achievement in Mathematics - Grade 4

Grade 4	# Students Who Completed the Assessment and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned	# Students Scoring at or Above Proficient	Percentage of Students Scoring at or Above Proficient
All students	59450	45948	77.3
American Indian or Alaska Native	832	587	70.6
Asian or Pacific Islander	2160	1644	76.1
Black, non-Hispanic	6469	2982	46.1
Hispanic	4814	2972	61.7
White, non-Hispanic	45172	37763	83.6
Children with disabilities (<i>IDEA</i>)	8327	4431	53.2
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	3959	2380	60.1
Economically disadvantaged students	20734	12806	61.8
Migratory students	57	31	54.4
Male	30430	23917	78.6
Female	29017	22031	75.9
Comments: # Students assigned proficiency levels includes No WSAS; equals Total Enrolled.			
Small N Migrant and Native American students.			
LEP includes new in US.			

Source – Initially prepopulated by *EDFacts* in file N/X075 that is data group 583, category sets A, B, C, D, E, and F. If the SEA has additional racial/ethnic groups or combinations of racial/ethnic groups in its accountability plan under *NCLB*, the SEA will report the above data for those groups through the online collection tool.

Note: The addition of the total number of students with an assigned proficiency level is a new data collection for the SY 2006-07 CSPR.

1.3.4 Student Academic Achievement in Reading/Language Arts - Grade 4

Grade 4	# Students Who Completed the Assessment and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned	# Students Scoring at or Above Proficient	Percentage of Students Scoring at or Above Proficient
All students	59450	48693	81.9
American Indian or Alaska Native	832	629	75.6
Asian or Pacific Islander	2160	1574	72.9
Black, non-Hispanic	6469	3928	60.7
Hispanic	4814	3088	64.1
White, non-Hispanic	45172	39474	87.4
Children with disabilities (<i>IDEA</i>)	8327	4359	52.3
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	3959	2168	54.8
Economically disadvantaged students	20734	14131	68.2
Migratory students	57	23	40.4
Male	30430	24370	80.1
Female	29017	24323	83.8
Comments: # Students assigned proficiency levels includes No WSAS; equals Total Enrolled.			
Small N Migrant students.			

Source – Initially prepopulated by *EDFacts* in file N/X076, N/X077, or N/X078 that are data group 584, category sets A, B, C, D, E, and F. If the SEA has additional racial/ethnic groups or combinations of racial/ethnic groups in its accountability plan under *NCLB*, the SEA will report the above data for those groups through the online CSPR collection tool.

Note: The addition of the total number of students with an assigned proficiency level is a new data collection for the SY 2006-07 CSPR.

1.3.5 Student Academic Achievement in Mathematics - Grade 5

Grade 5	# Students Who Completed the Assessment and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned	# Students Scoring at or Above Proficient	Percentage of Students Scoring at or Above Proficient
All students	60306	45205	75.0
American Indian or Alaska Native	860	561	65.2
Asian or Pacific Islander	2244	1652	73.6
Black, non-Hispanic	6447	2737	42.5
Hispanic	4567	2588	56.7
White, non-Hispanic	46188	37667	81.6
Children with disabilities (<i>IDEA</i>)	8663	4032	46.5
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	3755	2010	53.5
Economically disadvantaged students	20518	11740	57.2
Migratory students	68	33	48.5
Male	31028	23259	75.0
Female	29278	21946	75.0
Comments: Students assigned proficiency levels includes No WSAS; equals Total Enrolled.			
Small N Migrant and Native American students.			
LEP includes new in US.			

Source – Initially prepopulated by ED*Facts* in file N/X075 that is data group 583, category sets A, B, C, D, E, and F. If the SEA has additional racial/ethnic groups or combinations of racial/ethnic groups in its accountability plan under *NCLB*, the SEA will report the above data for those groups through the online collection tool.

Note: The addition of the total number of students with an assigned proficiency level is a new data collection for the SY 2006-07 CSPR.

1.3.6 Student Academic Achievement in Reading/Language Arts - Grade 5

Grade 5	# Students Who Completed the Assessment and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned	# Students Scoring at or Above Proficient	Percentage of Students Scoring at or Above Proficient
All students	60306	50753	84.2
American Indian or Alaska Native	860	657	76.4
Asian or Pacific Islander	2244	1705	76.0
Black, non-Hispanic	6447	4041	62.7
Hispanic	4567	3089	67.6
White, non-Hispanic	46188	41261	89.3
Children with disabilities (<i>IDEA</i>)	8663	4569	52.7
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	3755	2170	57.8
Economically disadvantaged students	20518	14458	70.5
Migratory students	68	37	54.4
Male	31028	25418	81.9
Female	29278	25335	86.5
Comments: Students assigned proficiency levels includes No WSAS; equals Total Enrolled.			
Small N Migrant and Native American students.			
LEP includes new in US.			

Source – Initially prepopulated by ED*Facts* in file N/X076, N/X077, or N/X078 that are data group 584, category sets A, B, C, D, E, and F. If the SEA has additional racial/ethnic groups or combinations of racial/ethnic groups in its accountability plan under *NCLB*, the SEA will report the above data for those groups through the online CSPR collection tool.

Note: The addition of the total number of students with an assigned proficiency level is a new data collection for the SY 2006-07

CSPR.

1.3.7 Student Academic Achievement in Mathematics - Grade 6

Grade 6	# Students Who Completed the Assessment and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned	# Students Scoring at or Above Proficient	Percentage of Students Scoring at or Above Proficient
All students	61315	46600	76.0
American Indian or Alaska Native	873	535	61.3
Asian or Pacific Islander	2232	1706	76.4
Black, non-Hispanic	6657	2698	40.5
Hispanic	4472	2563	57.3
White, non-Hispanic	47079	39096	83.0
Children with disabilities (<i>IDEA</i>)	8559	3626	42.4
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	3396	1869	55.0
Economically disadvantaged students	20655	11913	57.7
Migratory students	70	41	58.6
Male	29821	23776	79.7
Female	31493	22823	72.5
Comments: # Students assigned proficiency levels includes No WSAS; equals Total Enrolled.			
Small N Migrant.			
LEP includes new in US.			

Source – Initially prepopulated by *EDFacts* in file N/X075 that is data group 583, category sets A, B, C, D, E, and F. If the SEA has additional racial/ethnic groups or combinations of racial/ethnic groups in its accountability plan under *NCLB*, the SEA will report the above data for those groups through the online collection tool.

Note: The addition of the total number of students with an assigned proficiency level is a new data collection for the SY 2006-07 CSPR.

1.3.8 Student Academic Achievement in Reading/Language Arts - Grade 6

Grade 6	# Students Who Completed the Assessment and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned	# Students Scoring at or Above Proficient	Percentage of Students Scoring at or Above Proficient
All students	61315	52147	85.0
American Indian or Alaska Native	873	681	78.0
Asian or Pacific Islander	2232	1696	76.0
Black, non-Hispanic	6657	4112	61.8
Hispanic	4472	3048	68.2
White, non-Hispanic	47079	42608	90.5
Children with disabilities (<i>IDEA</i>)	8559	4363	51.0
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	3396	1939	57.1
Economically disadvantaged students	20655	14774	71.5
Migratory students	70	40	57.1
Male	31493	25964	82.4
Female	29821	26182	87.8
Comments: # Students assigned proficiency levels includes No WSAS; equals Total Enrolled.			
Small N Migrant.			
LEP includes new in US.			

Source – Initially prepopulated by *EDFacts* in file N/X076, N/X077, or N/X078 that are data group 584, category sets A, B, C, D, E, and F. If the SEA has additional racial/ethnic groups or combinations of racial/ethnic groups in its accountability plan under *NCLB*, the SEA will report the above data for those groups through the online CSPR collection tool.

Note: The addition of the total number of students with an assigned proficiency level is a new data collection for the SY 2006-07

CSPR.

1.3.9 Student Academic Achievement in Mathematics - Grade 7

Grade 7	# Students Who Completed the Assessment and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned	# Students Scoring at or Above Proficient	Percentage of Students Scoring at or Above Proficient
All students	63932	50549	79.1
American Indian or Alaska Native	974	656	67.4
Asian or Pacific Islander	2260	1704	75.4
Black, non-Hispanic	7045	2992	42.5
Hispanic	4211	2609	62.0
White, non-Hispanic	49441	42588	86.1
Children with disabilities (<i>IDEA</i>)	9149	3893	42.6
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	3159	1853	58.7
Economically disadvantaged students	20785	12785	61.5
Migratory students	44	19	43.2
Male	32693	25732	78.7
Female	31238	24817	79.4
Comments: # Students assigned proficiency levels includes No WSAS; equals Total Enrolled.			
Small N Migrant.			
LEP includes new in US.			

Source – Initially prepopulated by ED*Facts* in file N/X075 that is data group 583, category sets A, B, C, D, E, and F. If the SEA has additional racial/ethnic groups or combinations of racial/ethnic groups in its accountability plan under *NCLB*, the SEA will report the above data for those groups through the online collection tool.

Note: The addition of the total number of students with an assigned proficiency level is a new data collection for the SY 2006-07 CSPR.

1.3.10 Student Academic Achievement in Reading/Language Arts - Grade 7

Grade 7	# Students Who Completed the Assessment and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned	# Students Scoring at or Above Proficient	Percentage of Students Scoring at or Above Proficient
All students	63932	53982	84.4
American Indian or Alaska Native	974	753	77.3
Asian or Pacific Islander	2260	1672	74.0
Black, non-Hispanic	7045	4024	57.1
Hispanic	4211	2813	66.8
White, non-Hispanic	49441	44720	90.5
Children with disabilities (<i>IDEA</i>)	9149	4526	49.5
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	3159	1771	56.1
Economically disadvantaged students	20785	14410	69.3
Migratory students	44	19	43.2
Male	32693	26929	82.4
Female	31238	27053	86.6
Comments: # Students assigned proficiency levels includes No WSAS; equals Total Enrolled.			
Small N Migrant.			
LEP includes new in US.			

Source – Initially prepopulated by ED*Facts* in file N/X076, N/X077, or N/X078 that are data group 584, category sets A, B, C, D, E, and F. If the SEA has additional racial/ethnic groups or combinations of racial/ethnic groups in its accountability plan under *NCLB*, the SEA will report the above data for those groups through the online CSPR collection tool.

Note: The addition of the total number of students with an assigned proficiency level is a new data collection for the SY 2006-07

CSPR.

1.3.11 Student Academic Achievement in Mathematics - Grade 8

Grade 8	# Students Who Completed the Assessment and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned	# Students Scoring at or Above Proficient	Percentage of Students Scoring at or Above Proficient
All students	65651	49176	74.9
American Indian or Alaska Native	1018	611	60.0
Asian or Pacific Islander	2358	1736	73.6
Black, non-Hispanic	6995	2679	38.3
Hispanic	4217	2331	55.3
White, non-Hispanic	51059	41817	81.9
Children with disabilities (<i>IDEA</i>)	9555	3501	36.6
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	2882	1490	51.7
Economically disadvantaged students	20859	11572	55.5
Migratory students	49	24	49.0
Male	33875	25489	75.2
Female	31773	23686	74.5
Comments: # Students assigned proficiency levels includes No WSAS; equals Total Enrolled.			
Small N Migrant and Native American students.			
LEP includes new in US.			

Source – Initially prepopulated by *EDFacts* in file N/X075 that is data group 583, category sets A, B, C, D, E, and F. If the SEA has additional racial/ethnic groups or combinations of racial/ethnic groups in its accountability plan under *NCLB*, the SEA will report the above data for those groups through the online collection tool.

Note: The addition of the total number of students with an assigned proficiency level is a new data collection for the SY 2006-07 CSPR.

1.3.12 Student Academic Achievement in Reading/Language Arts - Grade 8

Grade 8	# Students Who Completed the Assessment and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned	# Students Scoring at or Above Proficient	Percentage of Students Scoring at or Above Proficient
All students	65651	55185	84.1
American Indian or Alaska Native	1018	762	74.9
Asian or Pacific Islander	2358	1873	79.4
Black, non-Hispanic	6995	4285	61.3
Hispanic	4217	2822	66.9
White, non-Hispanic	51059	45441	89.0
Children with disabilities (<i>IDEA</i>)	9555	4572	47.8
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	2882	1612	55.9
Economically disadvantaged students	20859	14635	70.2
Migratory students	49	25	51.0
Male	33875	27607	81.5
Female	31773	27577	86.8
Comments: # Students assigned proficiency levels includes No WSAS; equals Total Enrolled.			
Small N Migrant and Native American students.			
LEP includes new in US.			

Source – Initially prepopulated by *EDFacts* in file N/X076, N/X077, or N/X078 that are data group 584, category sets A, B, C, D, E, and F. If the SEA has additional racial/ethnic groups or combinations of racial/ethnic groups in its accountability plan under *NCLB*, the SEA will report the above data for those groups through the online CSPR collection tool.

Note: The addition of the total number of students with an assigned proficiency level is a new data collection for the SY 2006-07

CSPR.

1.3.13 Student Academic Achievement in Mathematics - High School

High School	# Students Who Completed the Assessment and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned	# Students Scoring at or Above Proficient	Percentage of Students Scoring at or Above Proficient
All students	71709	50625	70.6
American Indian or Alaska Native	1081	544	50.3
Asian or Pacific Islander	2591	1585	61.2
Black, non-Hispanic	6565	1672	25.5
Hispanic	3782	1648	43.6
White, non-Hispanic	57688	45174	78.3
Children with disabilities (<i>IDEA</i>)	9761	2811	28.8
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	2506	906	36.2
Economically disadvantaged students	18393	8611	46.8
Migratory students	49	24	49.0
Male	36843	26096	70.8
Female	34866	24529	70.4
Comments: # Students assigned proficiency levels includes No WSAS; equals Total Enrolled.			
Small N Migrant and Native American students.			
LEP includes new in US.			

Source – Initially prepopulated by *EDFacts* in file N/X075 that is data group 583, category sets A, B, C, D, E, and F. If the SEA has additional racial/ethnic groups or combinations of racial/ethnic groups in its accountability plan under *NCLB*, the SEA will report the above data for those groups through the online collection tool.

Note: The addition of the total number of students with an assigned proficiency level is a new data collection for the SY 2006-07 CSPR.

1.3.14 Student Academic Achievement in Reading/Language Arts - High School

High School	# Students Who Completed the Assessment and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned	# Students Scoring at or Above Proficient	Percentage of Students Scoring at or Above Proficient
All students	71709	53705	74.9
American Indian or Alaska Native	1081	646	59.8
Asian or Pacific Islander	2591	1441	55.6
Black, non-Hispanic	6565	2486	37.9
Hispanic	3782	1802	47.6
White, non-Hispanic	57688	47328	82.0
Children with disabilities (<i>IDEA</i>)	9761	3260	33.4
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	2506	692	27.6
Economically disadvantaged students	18393	9666	52.6
Migratory students	49	19	38.8
Male	36843	26431	71.7
Female	34866	27274	78.2
Comments: # Students assigned proficiency levels includes No WSAS; equals Total Enrolled.			
Small N Migrant and Native American students.			
LEP includes new in US.			

Source – Initially prepopulated by *EDFacts* in file N/X076, N/X077, or N/X078 that are data group 584, category sets A, B, C, D, E, and F. If the SEA has additional racial/ethnic groups or combinations of racial/ethnic groups in its accountability plan under *NCLB*, the SEA will report the above data for those groups through the online CSPR collection tool.

Note: The addition of the total number of students with an assigned proficiency level is a new data collection for the SY 2006-07

CSPR.

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 and the total number of those schools and districts that made AYP based on data for the SY 2006-07 school year. The percentage that made AYP will be calculated automatically.

Entity	Total #	# That Made AYP in SY 2006-07	Percentage That Made AYP in SY 2006-07
Schools	2108	2016	95.6
Districts	425	423	99.5
Comments: 92 schools missed AYP 2 LEAs missed AYP			

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

1.4.2 Title I School Accountability

In the table below, provide the total number of public Title I schools by type and the total number of those schools that made AYP based on data for the SY 2006-07 school year. Include only public Title I schools. Do not include Title I programs operated by local educational agencies in private schools. The percentage that made AYP will be calculated automatically.

Title I School	# Title I Schools	# Title I Schools That Made AYP in SY 2006-07	Percentage of Title I Schools That Made AYP in SY 2006-07
All Title I schools	1073	1009	94.0
Schoolwide (SWP) Title I schools	367	307	83.6
Targeted assistance (TAS) Title I schools	706	702	99.4
Comments: K-12 = 1084 T1 schools			

Source – The table above is produced through *EDFacts*. The SEA submits the data in N/X101 for data group 22 and N/X103 for data group 32.

Note: New for the SY 2006-07 CSPR is the data collection requirement to report for public schools and to include data for schoolwide (SWP) and targeted assistance (TAS) Title I Schools.

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 2006-07. The percentage that made AYP will be calculated automatically.

# Districts That Received Title I Funds	# Districts That Received Title I Funds and Made AYP in SY 2006-07	Percentage of Districts That Received Title I Funds and Made AYP in SY 2006-07
395	392	99.2
Comments:		

Source – Initially, pre-populated by *EDFacts* file N/X103 that is data group 32 and 582. If necessary, it is updated through manual entry by the SEA into the online collection tool.

Note: This table was formerly part of Section 1.4.2 of the SY 2005-06 CSPR.

1.4.4 Title I Schools Identified for Improvement

1.4.4.1 List of Title I Schools Identified for Improvement

In the following table, provide a list of Title I schools identified for improvement, corrective action, or restructuring under Section 1116 for the SY 2007-08 based on the data from SY 2006-07. For each school on the list, provide the following:

- District Name and NCES ID Code
- School Name and NCES ID Code
- Whether the school missed the proficiency target in reading/language arts as outlined in the State's Accountability Plan
- Whether the school met the participation rate target for the reading/language arts assessment
- Whether the school missed the proficiency target in mathematics as outlined in the State's Accountability Plan
- Whether the school met the participation rate target for the mathematics assessment
- Whether the school missed the other academic indicator for elementary/middle schools (if applicable) as outlined in the State's Accountability Plan
- Whether the school missed the graduation rate for high schools (if applicable) as outlined in the State's Accountability Plan
- Improvement status for SY 2007-08 (Use one of the following improvement status designations: School Improvement – Year 1, School Improvement – Year 2, Corrective Action, Restructuring Year 1 (planning), or Restructuring Year 2 (implementing))¹
- Whether the school is a Title I school (This column is optional and is used only by States that choose to list all schools in improvement.)

See attached for blank template that can be used to enter School Data.

Download template: [Question 1.4.4.1_0607.xls](#) ([Get MS Excel Viewer](#))

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

Note: Identification as Title I school is a new data collection for the SY 2006-07 CSPR.

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

1.4.4.2 Actions Taken for Title I Schools Identified for Improvement

In the space below, describe the measures being taken to address the achievement problems of schools identified for improvement, corrective action, and restructuring. Include a discussion of the technical assistance provided by and supported by the State, including a description of the statewide systems of support under *NCLB* (e.g., the number of schools served, the nature and duration of assistance provided, etc.).

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

Support to Schools Identified for Improvement

Wisconsin's Statewide System of Support (SSOS) is predicated on the concept that the role of the DPI is to strengthen the capacity of local school districts to identify and effectively differentiate support to their lowest performing schools. To accomplish this, the DPI has sorted each of its 426 public school districts into one of three categories: High Priority Districts, Priority Districts, and All Other Districts (see Attachment). High Priority Districts are those which have missed Adequate Yearly Progress (AYP) as a district or been identified as a district in need of improvement (DIFI) and have Title I schools that are identified for improvement (SIFI) or missed AYP under No Child Left Behind (NCLB). Currently two Wisconsin districts, Milwaukee Public Schools (MPS) and Kenosha Unified (KUSD), are designated as High Priority.

In Wisconsin, high priority districts are required to assess the efficacy of their current district efforts to support school improvement using the Characteristics of Successful Districts framework or a comparable model (see Characteristics of Successful Districts booklet). Using 23 standard indicators within five characteristic areas, a team of district staff members conduct a Self-Assessment to evaluate the level and effectiveness of district support to high priority schools. The results of the self assessment are validated by a team of exemplary educators through an onsite peer review process. The peer review is meant to validate and add to the findings of the self assessment. As a result of these two processes, the DPI determines which school improvement strategies are working well for the district and where the district is in need of technical assistance to improve the effectiveness of its support system. A plan for technical assistance and monitoring is developed collaboratively between the DPI and the district.

A cross-agency coordinating committee has been formed at the Wisconsin DPI to monitor technical assistance and funding provided to MPS and its Title I SIFI. The composition of this team involves the Wisconsin DPI staff with the greatest responsibility for allocating and monitoring the use of state and federal entitlement and discretionary funds, including those monies awarded under ESEA and IDEA. This committee monitors the use of federal funding streams to reduce duplication of effort and to ensure that all allocated funds are utilized by the district(s).

The Department of Public Instruction is implementing the following strategies to support improvement in schools identified for improvement (SIFI) under No Child Left Behind:

Prioritization for funding through discretionary grant programs across the agency:

Schools identified for improvement are given priority for funding in discretionary grant programs:

- Reading First, a federally funded grant program designed to assist schools in establishing reading programs for students in kindergarten through third grade. These programs must be founded on scientifically-based reading

research and aid in ensuring every student can read well by the end of third grade.

- Community Learning Centers (CLC), a federal grant program to support the development of after school programs,

implemented through community partnerships, that provide tutoring and enrichment programs designed to complement the regular academic program. Community learning centers must also offer the families of participating

students literacy and educationally-related development.

- Reading Excellence and Demonstration of Success (READS), a federally funded grant program that increases the capacity of staff to provide evidence-based instruction to all students, and to implement progress monitoring systems

that provide a critical link to adjusting instruction to meet student needs. To this end, participating schools use

READS funds to increase universal, selected and targeted literacy instruction and intervention options made available

to students.

- Early and Ongoing Collaboration and Assistance (EOCA), supported by federal funding, this initiative provides leadership, coordination and technical assistance to help education communities increase the use, variety and quality

of general education options made available to all children, particularly those at greatest risk for school failure or being identified as having a disability.

All of these discretionary grant programs include intensive technical support from the DPI and other education consultants.

- Providing high priority districts with a liaison from the WIDPI to provide ongoing technical assistance as well as monitor the effective implementation of district and school improvement efforts.

Allocation of additional Title I funds:

Districts with schools identified for improvement are awarded supplemental Title I funds to support district level improvement efforts, as well as building level improvement efforts. Currently, every district and school identified for improvement receives these funds. Examples of strategies being implemented by schools and districts through utilization of these funds include, but are not limited to:

after school, intercession and summer school tutoring programs in reading and mathematics; curriculum development and alignment to Wisconsin model academic standards, particularly as it relates to reading instruction in middle and high schools; professional development for regular and special education staff to more effectively adapt instruction for the neediest students; development of benchmark assessments and data collection and analysis systems to monitor student progress; home visits to make connections with students' families and strengthen the home/school partnership; school community partnerships to enhance efforts to decrease truancy and professional development for school leaders to build the capacity of principals and lead teachers.

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

Note: The inclusion of the discussion of technical assistance provided by and supported by the State is a new data collection for the SY 2006-07 CSPR.

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 *NCLB* are being implemented.

Corrective Action	# of Schools in Corrective Action in Which the Corrective Action Is Being Implemented
Required implementation of a new research-based curriculum or instructional program	4
Extension of the school year or school day	
Replacement of staff members relevant to the school's low performance	
Significant decrease in management authority at the school level	
Replacement of the principal	
Restructuring the internal organization of the school	
Appointment of an outside expert to advise the school	
Comments:	

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

Note: New data collection for the SY 2006-07 CSPR.

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 *NCLB* are being implemented.

Restructuring Action	# of Schools in Restructuring in Which Restructuring Action Is Being Implemented
Replacement of all or most of the school staff (which may include the principal)	
Reopening the school as a public charter school	3
Entering into a contract with a private entity to operate the school	
Take over the school by the State	
Other major restructuring of the school governance	1
Comments:	

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

Note: New data collection for the SY 2006-07 CSPR.

1.4.5 Districts That Received Title I Funds Identified for Improvement

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

In the following table, provide a list of districts that received Title I funds and were identified for improvement or corrective action under Section 1116 for the SY 2007-08 based on the data from SY 2006-07. For each district on the list, provide the following:

- District Name and NCES ID Code
- Whether the district missed the proficiency target in reading/language arts as outlined in the State's Accountability Plan
- Whether the district met the participation rate target for the reading/language arts assessment
- Whether the district missed the proficiency target in mathematics as outlined in the State's Accountability Plan
- Whether the school met the participation rate target for the mathematics assessment
- Whether the district met the other academic indicator for elementary/middle schools (if applicable) as outlined in the State's Accountability Plan
- Whether the district met the graduation rate for high schools (if applicable) as outlined in the State's Accountability Plan
- Improvement status for SY 2007-08 (Use one of the following improvement status designations: Improvement or Corrective Action²)
- Whether the district is a district that received Title I funds (This column is optional and is used only by States that choose to list all districts in improvement.)

See attached for blank template that can be used to enter School Data.

Download template: [Question 1.4.5.1_0607.xls](#) ([Get MS Excel Viewer](#))

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

Note: Identification of a district as receiving Title I funds is a new data collection for the SY 2006-07 CSPR.

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

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

In the space below, 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.

Support to Districts Identified for Improvement

The Department of Public Instruction is implementing the following strategies to support improvement in districts identified for improvement (DIFI) under No Child Left Behind:

Allocation of additional Title I funds:

Districts with schools identified for improvement are awarded supplemental Title I funds to support district level improvement efforts, as well as building level improvement efforts. Currently, every district and school identified for improvement receives these funds totaling approximately five million dollars statewide. Examples of strategies being implemented by schools and districts through utilization of these funds include, but are not limited to: after school, intercession and summer school tutoring programs in reading and mathematics; curriculum development and alignment to Wisconsin model academic standards, particularly as it relates to reading instruction in middle and high schools; professional development for regular and special education staff to more effectively adapt instruction for the

neediest students; development of benchmark assessments and data collection and analysis systems to monitor student progress; home visits to make connections with students' families and strengthen the home/school partnership; school community partnerships to enhance efforts to decrease truancy and professional

development for school leaders to build the capacity of principals and lead

teachers.

The Alliance for Attendance:

Three districts with schools identified for improvement have been awarded funding to support the development of school and community-based strategies to promote student attendance and decrease truancy. The formation of

these partnerships is facilitated by staff from the DPI. The districts involved

are Milwaukee Public Schools, Menominee Indian and Green Bay Area. Funding supports collaborative planning between school and community partners, greater outreach to students and their families, and strategies to strengthen

student engagement and connectedness to school.

High School Task Force:

Teachers, principals, and district and community leaders from Milwaukee, Racine, Beloit, Menominee Indian and Madison school districts (districts that currently have SIFI) are among the many K-16 educators from across

Wisconsin that are examining the strengths and needs of high schools. The Task Force is identifying strategies to raise achievement, close the achievement gap, and promote post-secondary success and citizenship for all

students; embracing the strengths of our high schools and identifying where change is needed; examining new models of student learning and engagement; rethinking the roles and relationships that frame high schools; and

advancing best practices which promote equity, quality and accountability in the high school experience.

Assessment of district effectiveness in supporting SIFI:

The DPI, in partnership with staff from each district with schools identified for improvement and Cooperative Educational Service Agencies, is developing an evaluation process to help districts evaluate the effectiveness of the

services they target to SIFI. The evaluation consists of a self study of district efforts in five areas: Vision, Values and Culture;

Leadership and Governance; Decision Making and Accountability; Curriculum and Instruction; and

Professional Development. Results of the self study are reviewed and validated by exemplary educators from similar districts. Findings will be used to target future school improvement funding to the district's most effective support

strategies. A bank of technical assistance providers will be assembled by the DPI to work with districts to strengthen their support strategies for SIFI. Districts currently involved in this initiative are Milwaukee Public Schools, Kenosha Unified, Madison, Beloit, Racine, Green Bay Area and Menominee Indian.

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

Note: The inclusion of the discussion of technical assistance provided by the State is a new data collection for the SY 2006-07 CSPR.

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 *NCLB* are being implemented.

Corrective Action	# of Districts in Corrective Action in Which Corrective Action Is Being Implemented
Implementing a new curriculum based on State standards	
Authorized students to transfer from district schools to higher performing schools in a neighboring district	
Deferred programmatic funds or reduced administrative funds	
Replaced district personnel who are relevant to the failure to make AYP	
Removed one or more schools from the jurisdiction of the district	
Appointed a receiver or trustee to administer the affairs of the district	
Restructured the district	1
Abolished the district (list the number of districts abolished between the SYs 2005-06 and 2006-07 as a corrective action)	
Comments:	

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

Note: New data collection for the SY 2006-07 CSPR.

1.4.6 Dates of AYP and Identification Determinations

In the table below, provide the dates (MM/DD/YY) when your State provided final school and district AYP and identification for improvement, corrective action, or restructuring to schools and districts based on SY 2006-07 assessments. If applicable, also provide the dates for preliminary determinations provided to schools and districts.

	Districts	Schools
Final AYP and identification determinations	07/27/07	07/27/07
Preliminary school AYP and identification determinations (if applicable)	06/12/07	06/12/07
Comments:		

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

Note: New data collection for the SY 2006-07 CSPR.

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 2006-07 data and the results of those appeals.

	# Appealed Their AYP Designations	# Appeals Resulted in a Change in the AYP Designation
Districts	0	0
Schools	11	10
Comments:		

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

Note: New data collection for the SY 2006-07 CSPR.

Date (MM/DD/YY) that processing appeals based on SY 2006-07 data was complete	07/27/07
---	----------

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

Note: New data collection for the SY 2006-07 CSPR.

1.4.8 Section 1003(a) Funds

In the space below, describe your State's use of Section 1003(a) of ESEA funds. Specifically, address the following:

- Describe briefly any priorities the State uses in allocating these funds to schools.
- Describe briefly the State's methods for distributing these funds (e.g., formula, competitive, etc.).
- Describe briefly the types of activities supported by the Section 1003(a) funds.

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

A cross-agency coordinating committee has been formed at the Wisconsin DPI to monitor technical assistance and funding provided to MPS and its Title I SIFI. The composition of this team involves the Wisconsin DPI staff with the greatest responsibility for allocating and monitoring the use of state and federal entitlement and discretionary funds, including those monies awarded under ESEA and IDEA. This committee monitors the use of federal funding streams to reduce duplication of effort and to ensure that all allocated funds are utilized by the district(s).

Allocation of additional Title I funds:

Districts with schools identified for improvement are awarded supplemental Title I funds to support district level improvement efforts, as well as building level improvement efforts. Currently, every district and school identified for improvement receives these funds. Examples of strategies being implemented by schools and districts through utilization of these funds include, but are not limited to:

after school, intercession and summer school tutoring programs in reading and mathematics; curriculum development and alignment to Wisconsin model academic standards, particularly as it relates to reading instruction in middle and high schools; professional development for regular and special education staff to more effectively adapt instruction for the neediest students; development of benchmark assessments and data collection and analysis systems to monitor student progress; home visits to make connections with students' families and strengthen the home/school partnership; school community partnerships to enhance efforts to decrease truancy and professional development for school leaders to build the capacity of principals and lead teachers.

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

Note: New data collection for the SY 2006-07 CSPR.

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.

1.4.9.1.1 Schools Using Public School Choice

In the table below, provide the number of public schools *from which* and *to which* students transferred under the provisions for public school choice in Section 1116 of ESEA.

	# Schools
Title I schools <i>from which</i> students transferred for public school choice	18
Public Schools <i>to which</i> students transferred for public school choice	28
Comments:	

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

Note: This table was formerly part of section 1.4.5.1 of the SY 2005-06 CSPR.

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 for public school choice, and the number who transferred under the provisions for public school choice in Section 1116 of ESEA.

Students who are eligible for public school choice includes:

- (1) Students currently enrolled in a school identified for improvement
- (2) Students who transferred in the current school year under the public school choice provisions of section 1116, and
- (3) Students who previously transferred under section 1116 and are continuing to transfer for the current school year under section 1116.

	# Students
Eligible for public school choice	12500
Who applied to transfer	295
Who transferred to another school under Title I public school choice provisions	210

Indicate in the table below the categories of students that are included in the count of eligible students.

	Yes/No
1. Enrolled in a school identified for improvement	Yes_
2. Transferred in the current school year, only	No Response_
3. Transferred in a prior year and in the current year	No Response_
Comments: Questions 2 & 3---Not available	

Source – Initially, pre-populated by ED*Facts* file N/X010 that includes data groups 579, 574 and 544. If necessary, it is updated through manual entry by the SEA into the online CSPR collection tool.

Note: This table was formerly part of section 1.4.5.1 of the SY 2005-06 CSPR.

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 in Section 1116 of ESEA.

	Amount
Dollars spent by LEAs on transportation for public school choice	\$
Comments: Not Available	

Source – Initially, pre-populated by ED*Facts* file N/X102 that includes data group 652. If necessary, it is updated through manual entry by the SEA into the online CSPR collection tool.

Note: New data collection for the SY 2006-07 CSPR.

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 options to eligible students due to any of the following reasons:

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

	# LEAs
LEAs Unable to Provide Public School Choice	0
Comments:	

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

Note: New data collection for the SY 2006-07 CSPR.

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?* An LEA may consider a student as eligible for and participating in Title I public school choice, and may consider costs for transporting that student towards its funds spent on transportation for public school choice, if the student meets the following conditions:
 - Has a "home" or "neighborhood" school (to which the student would have been assigned, in the absence of a choice program) that receives Title I funds and has been identified, under the statute, as in need of improvement, corrective action, or restructuring; and
 - Has elected to enroll, at some point since July 1, 2002 (the effective date of the Title I choice provisions), and after the home school has been identified as in need of improvement, in a school that has not been so identified and is attending that school; and
 - Is using district transportation services to attend such a school.³
- b. *How do States report on public school choice for those LEAs that are not able to offer public school choice (e.g., LEAs in which all schools in a grade level are in school improvement, LEAs that have only a single school at that grade level, or LEAs whose schools are so remote from one another that choice is impracticable)?* For those LEAs, States should count as eligible all students who attend identified Title I schools. States should report that no eligible schools or students were provided the option to transfer and should provide an explanation why choice is not possible within the LEA in the Comment Section.

³ 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.

1.4.9.2.1 Schools with Students Eligible for Supplemental Educational Services

In the table below, provide the number of Title I schools identified as in need of improvement, corrective action, or restructuring whose students received supplemental educational services under Section 1116 of ESEA. A Frequently Asked Questions (FAQ) section related to supplemental educational services is below the table.

	# Schools
Title I schools whose students received supplemental educational services	14
Comments:	

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

Note: This table was formerly part of section 1.4.5.2 of the SY 2005-06 CSPR.

FAQ about supplemental education services

How should a State define the phrase "students who received supplemental educational services"? States should consider students who "received" supplemental educational services as those students who enrolled and participated in some hours of services. States have the discretion to determine the minimum number of hours of participation necessary for a student to have "received" services.

1.4.9.2.2 Supplemental Educational Services - Students

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

	# Students
Eligible for supplemental educational services	10100
Who applied for supplemental educational services	3661
Who received supplemental educational services	2279
Comments:	

Source – Initially, pre-populated by ED*Facts* file N/X102 that includes data groups 578, 575, and 546. If necessary, it is updated through manual entry by the SEA into the online CSPR collection tool.

Note: This table was formerly part of Section 1.4.5.2 of the SY 2005-06 CSPR.

1.4.9.2.3 Funds Spent on Supplemental Educational Services

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

	Amount
Dollars spent by LEAs on supplemental educational services	\$
Comments: Not available	

Source – Initially, pre-populated by ED*Facts* file N/X102, which includes data group 651. If necessary, it is updated through manual entry by the SEA into the online collection tool.

Note: New data collection for the SY 2006-07 CSPR.

1.5 TEACHER QUALITY

This section collects data on "highly qualified" teachers as the term is defined in Section 9101(23) of the *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 each of the school types listed and the number of those core academic classes taught by teachers who are highly qualified (as the term is defined in section 9101(23) of the *ESEA*) 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. The percentages used for high- and low-poverty schools and the poverty metric used to determine those percentages are reported in 1.5.3.

School Type	# of Core Academic Classes (Total)	# of Core Academic Classes Taught by Teachers Who Are Highly Qualified	Percentage of Core Academic Classes Taught by Teachers Who Are Highly Qualified	# of Core Academic Classes Taught by Teachers Who Are NOT Highly Qualified	Percentage of Core Academic Classes Taught by Teachers Who Are NOT Highly Qualified
All schools	50898	50084	98.4	814	1.6
Elementary level					
High-poverty schools	7100	6900	97.2	200	2.8
Low-poverty schools	6572	6527	99.3	45	0.7
All elementary schools	26971	26614	98.7	357	1.3
Secondary level					
High-poverty schools	4790	4560	95.2	230	4.8
Low-poverty schools	5464	5417	99.1	47	0.9
All secondary schools	23927	23470	98.1	457	1.9
Comments:					

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:

--

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.

The department currently reports elementary classroom teachers by FTE. We are in the process of revising our data collection system for the 2008-09 school year so that districts can report elementary teachers by "class."
--

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

Note: The data collection requirement to submit data for core classes taught by teachers who are NOT highly qualified has been added for the SY 2006-07 CSPR.

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 percent 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. See Question A-14 in the August 3, 2006, Non-Regulatory Guidance for additional information. 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 were 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 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. The poverty quartile breaks are reported later in this section.
- h. *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. The poverty quartile breaks are reported later in this section.

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

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

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

	Percentage
Elementary School Classes	
Elementary school classes taught by certified general education teachers who did not pass a subject-knowledge test or (if eligible) have not demonstrated subject-matter competency through HOUSSE	18.0
Elementary school classes taught by certified special education teachers who did not pass a subject-knowledge test or have not demonstrated subject-matter competency through HOUSSE	27.0
Elementary school classes taught by teachers who are not fully certified (and are not in an approved alternative route program)	55.0
Other (please explain)	0.0
Total	100.0

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

	Percentage
Secondary School Classes	
Secondary school classes taught by certified general education teachers who have not demonstrated subject-matter knowledge in those subjects (e.g., out-of-field teachers)	15.0
Secondary school classes taught by certified special education teachers who have not demonstrated subject-matter competency in those subjects	34.0
Secondary school classes taught by teachers who are not fully certified (and are not in an approved alternative route program)	51.0
Other (please explain)	0.0
Total	100.0
Comments:	

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

1.5.3 Poverty Quartiles and Metrics Used

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	48.4	16.0
Poverty metric used	Eligible for subsidized lunch 185% of federal poverty level.	
Secondary schools	36.2	12.5
Poverty metric used	Eligible for subsidized lunch 185% of federal poverty level.	
Comments:		

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

FAQs on poverty quartiles and metrics used to determine poverty

- a. *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.
- b. *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.

Throughout this section:

- "AYP grades" is sometimes used to reference grades used for accountability determinations (grades 3 through 8 and one year of high school)
- "Non-AYP grades" is used to reference grades not used for accountability determinations.

1.6.1 Language Instruction Educational Programs (formerly 1.1. of the Title III Biennial Collection)

In the table below, provide the number of Title III subgrantees that use each type of language instruction educational program, as defined in Section 3301(8).

Note: Numbers reflected in 1.6.1 can be duplicative due to subgrantees' use of more than one type of program. The number for each type of program should be equal to or less than the total number of subgrantees in 1.6.4.1.

Table 1.6.1 Definitions:

1. **# Using Program** = Number of subgrantees that reported using a specific type of language instruction educational program. Subgrantees may use multiple programs. **(a.)** If multiple programs are used, count one for each program type used. **(b.)** Consortium is always counted as **one if all members used the same type of program**. If consortium members used different types of programs, count all members using the same type of program as one for each type. Do not count the members of the consortium individually as one, unless each member used a different type of program (e.g., use the same method of counting as one subgrantee using multiple types of programs in **(a.)**)
2. **Type of Program** = Type 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/expert/glossary.html>.
3. **Other Language** = Name of the language of instruction, other than English, used in the program.
4. **% Language of Instruction** = Average percentages of English and the other language used as a language of instruction in the program or use the percentage of the most common practice in the State (applies **only** to the first five bilingual program types).
5. **OLOI** = Other Language of Instruction used in the bilingual language instruction educational program.

# Using Program	Type of Program	Other Language	% Language of Instruction	
			English	OLOI
19	Dual language	Spanish	50.0	50.0
16	Two-way immersion	Spanish	50.0	50.0
26	Transitional bilingual	Spanish	50.0	50.0
17	Developmental bilingual	Spanish	50.0	50.0
8	Heritage language	Spanish	50.0	50.0
44	Sheltered English instruction			
29	Structured English immersion			
0	Specially designed academic instruction delivered in English (SDAIE)			
47	Content-based ESL			
43	Pull-out ESL			
51	Other (explain)			

Comments: The % of language of instruction for the various bilingual programs is an estimate based on the SEA's knowledge of bilingual programs in Wisconsin. Because this is the first year these data have been requested, we were unable to collect them from the LEAs. These new data are now a part of the LEAs' end-of-year data collection for Title III.

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

Note: New data collection for the SY 2006-07 CSPR.

1.6.2 Student Demographic Data**1.6.2.1 Number of LEP Students Who Received Title III Language Instruction Educational Program Services**

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

	#
LEP students who received services in a Title III language instruction educational program in grades K through 12 for this reporting year.	33755
Comments: LEP Levels 1-5 Title III students w/ ACCESS composite scores.	
March 7, 2008 - Additional comments per ED concern through data verification process:	
Only ELL students without composite scores 1-5. Does not include ELL students from private schools.	

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

Note: New data collection for the SY 2006-07 CSPR.

1.6.2.2 Most Commonly Spoken Languages in the State

In the table below, provide the five most commonly spoken languages, other than English, in the State. The top five languages should be determined by the highest number of students speaking each of those languages listed.

Language	# LEP Students
Spanish	25011
Hmong	10878
Russian	453
Arabic, Standard	374
Chinese: Mandarin	366

For additional significant languages please use comment box.

Comments:

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

Note: This table was formerly in Section 1.6.3.2 of the SY 2005-06 CSPR.

1.6.3 Student Performance Data

This section collects data on LEP student English language proficiency and LEP academic content performance data (e.g., LEP tested in native language tables and MFLEP/AYP Grades results table).

1.6.3.1 Student English Language Proficiency Testing Status

This section collects data on the number of ALL LEP students and Title III-served LEP students in the State by testing status for English language proficiency.

1.6.3.1.1 ALL LEP Student English Language Proficiency Testing Status

In the table below, provide the unduplicated number of ALL LEP students in the State by testing status for English language proficiency. ALL LEP students includes the following students:

- Newly enrolled and continually enrolled LEP students in the State for the year of this report, whether or not they receive services in a Title III language Instruction educational program;
- All students assessed for English language proficiency (ELP) using an annual State English Language proficiency (ELP) assessment as required under Section 1111(b)(7) of the ESEA in the reporting year and who meet the LEP definition in Section 9101 (25).

Table 1.6.3.1.1. Definitions:

- **Tested/State Annual ELP** = Number of LEP students who took the annual State English language proficiency assessment as required under Section 1111(b)(7) of the *ESEA* in this reporting year.
- **Not Tested/State Annual ELP** = Number of LEP students enrolled at the time of testing but did not take the annual State English language proficiency assessment.
- **Subtotal** = Sum of "Tested/State Annual ELP" and "Not Tested/State Annual ELP" (i.e., the number of LEP students enrolled at the time of testing).
- **LEP/One Data Point** = Number of LEP students who took the annual State English language proficiency assessment as required under Section 1111(b)(7) for the first time in this reporting year. Note that "LEP/One Data Point" is a subset of those students reported as Tested on the annual State English Language proficiency assessment.

ALL LEP Testing Status	#
Tested/State annual ELP	42508
Not tested/State annual ELP	934
Subtotal	43442
LEP/One Data Point	13168
<p>Comments: All students Tested = ELP Levels 1-5 w/ ACCESS composite scores.</p> <p>Not Tested = not tested in all domains; no composite score.</p> <p>First time in program = 0.</p> <p>March 7, 2008 - Additional comments per ED concern through data verification process:</p> <p>Includes All students in WI that took ACCESS for ELLs including those exiting (Level 6), in private schools, and some who took only subtests w/o a composite score.</p>	

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

Note: New data collection for the SY 2006-07 CSPR.

1.6.3.1.2 Title III Student English Language Proficiency Testing Status

In the table below, provide the unduplicated number of Title III-served LEP students in the State by testing status for English language proficiency.

Table 1.6.3.1.2. Definitions:

- **Tested/State Annual ELP** = Number of LEP students in Title III language instruction educational programs who took the annual State English language proficiency assessment.
- **Not Tested/State Annual ELP** = Number of LEP students in Title III language instruction educational programs enrolled at the time of testing but did not take the annual State English language proficiency assessment.
- **Subtotal** = Sum of "Tested/State Annual ELP" and "Not Tested/State Annual ELP" (i.e., the number of LEP students in Title III language instruction educational programs enrolled at the time of testing).
- **LEP/One Data Point** = Number of LEP students in Title III language instructional programs who took the annual State English language proficiency assessment for the first time in this reporting year. Note that "LEP/One Data Point" is a subset of those students reported as Tested on the annual State English Language proficiency assessment.

Title III LEP Testing Status	#
Tested/State annual ELP	33755
Not tested/State annual ELP	305
Subtotal	34160
LEP/One Data Point	7916
Comments: Note tested = no composite score.	
March 7, 2008 - Additional comments per ED concern through data verification process:	
Matches 1.6.2.1	

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

Note: New data collection for the SY 2006-07 CSPR.

1.6.3.2 Student English Language Proficiency Results

This section collects data on the results from the annual State English language proficiency assessment(s) for LEP students. Before completing Table 1.6.3.2.2 or 1.6.3.2.3, please indicate your State's use of the flexibility to apply annual measurable achievement objectives (AMAOs) to all LEP students.

1.6.3.2.1 Application of Title III English Language Proficiency Annual Assessment and AMAOs (formerly 1.6.8 of the Title III Biennial Collection, reformatted)

In the table below, indicate the State application of the following:

State applied the Title III English language proficiency annual assessment to all LEP students in LEAs receiving Title III funds.	<u>Yes</u>
State applied the annual measurable achievement objectives (AMAOs) to ALL LEP students in LEAs receiving Title III funds.	<u>Yes</u>
Comments:	

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

Note: New data collection for the SY 2006-07 CSPR.

1.6.3.2.2 All LEP English Language Proficiency Results

Please report information in this section **ONLY** if the State checked "Yes" in section 1.6.3.2.1 (row 2), that annual measurable achievement objectives are applied to all LEP students in LEAs receiving Title III funds.

Report the results from the annual State English language proficiency assessment(s) for ALL LEP students in grades K through 12.

Table 1.6.3.2.2 Definitions:

1. **Making Progress** = Number of LEP students who met the definition of "Making Progress" as defined by the State and submitted to OELA in the State Consolidated Application (CSA), or as amended.
2. **No Progress** = Number of LEP students who did not meet the State definition of "Making Progress."
3. **ELP Attainment** = Number of LEP students who attained English language proficiency as defined by the State and submitted to OELA in the State Consolidated Application (CSA), or as amended.
4. **Target** = AMAO target for the year as established by the State and submitted to OELA in the CSA (September 2003 submission), or as amended, for each of "Making Progress" and "Attainment" of ELP.
5. **Results** = Number and percent of LEP students who met the State definition of "Making Progress" and the definition of "Attainment" of English language proficiency.
6. **Met/Y** = Met the annual target, "Met/N" = did not meet annual target. This cell will be automatically populated, based on the Target % and the Results %.

	Target	Results		Met
	%	#	%	Y/N
Making progress	50.0	18852	62.0	Y
No progress		11425		
ELP attainment	20.0	1151	31.0	Y

Comments: AMAO 1 Progress for Levels 1-4

AMAO 2 Attainment for Levels 5-6

for ELL students with two data points on ACCESS for ELLs

March 7, 2008 - Additional comments per ED concern through data verification process:

Only ELL students with composite scores that had two data points (matched records).

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

Note: New data collection for the SY 2006-07 CSPR.

If a State does not count "ELP attainment" students as also "Making Progress", the number for "No Progress" should be the "Subtotal" in 1.6.3.1.1 minus the number "Making Progress" and "Attainment." If a State counts "ELP attainment" students as also "Making Progress", the number for "No Progress" should be the "Subtotal" in 1.6.3.1.1 minus "Making Progress".

1.6.3.2.3 Title III LEP English Language Proficiency Results

Please report information in this section **ONLY** if the State checked "No" in section in 1.6.3.2.1 (row 2), reporting that annual measurable achievement objectives (AMAOs) are applied to LEP students served by Title III.

In the table below, provide the results from the annual State English language proficiency assessment for Title III LEP students who participated in a Title III language instruction educational program in grades K through 12.

Table 1.6.3.2.3 Definitions:

1. **Making Progress** = Number of Title III LEP students who met the definition of "Making Progress" as defined by the State and submitted to OELA in the State Consolidated Application (CSA), or as amended.
2. **No Progress** = Number of Title III LEP students who did not meet the State definition of "Making Progress."
3. **ELP Attainment** = Number of Title III LEP students who attained English language proficiency as defined by the State and submitted to OELA in the State Consolidated Application (CSA), or as amended.
4. **Target** = AMAO target for the year as established by the State and submitted to OELA in the CSA (September 2003 submission), or as amended, for each of "Making Progress" and "Attainment" of ELP.
5. **Results** = Number and percent of Title III LEP students who met the State definition of "Making Progress" and the definition of "Attainment" of English language proficiency.
6. **Met/Y** = Met the annual target, "Met/N" = did not meet annual target. This cell will be automatically populated, based on the Target % and the Results %.

	Target	Results		Met
	%	#	%	Yes/No
Making progress				
No progress				
ELP attainment				
Comments: N/A Yes to section 1.6.3.2.1				

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

Note: New data collection for the SY 2006-07 CSPR.

If a State does not count "ELP attainment" students as also "Making Progress", the number for "No Progress" should be the "Subtotal" in 1.6.3.1.2 minus the number "Making Progress" and "Attainment." If a State counts "ELP attainment" students as also "Making Progress", the number for "No Progress" should be the "Subtotal" in 1.6.3.1.2 minus "Making Progress".

1.6.3.4 LEP Subgroup Academic Content Assessment Results (formerly 3.2.3/MFLEP of the Title III Biennial Collection)

This section collects data on the academic content assessment results for LEP students.

1.6.3.4.1 LEP Subgroup Flexibility

In the table below, report whether the State exercises the LEP flexibility afforded States through the new regulation for monitored former LEP (MFLEP), in AYP determination.

MFLEP	<u>No</u>
Comments:	

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

Note: New data collection for the SY 2006-07 CSPR.

1.6.3.4.3 Status of Monitored Former LEP Students (MFLEP) (formerly 3.1 of the Title III Biennial Collection, modified)

In the table below, report the unduplicated count of MFLEP students in K-12 for each of the two years monitored during the SY 2006-07, which includes both MFLEP students in AYP grades and in non-AYP grades in row 1 and MFLEP students only in AYP grades in row 2.

Table 1.6.3.4.3 Definitions:**1. Monitored Former LEP (MFLEP) includes:**

- Students that have transitioned into classrooms that are not designed for LEP students;
- Students that are no longer receiving LEP services; and who are being monitored for academic content achievement for 2 years after transition.

2. Total MFLEP = State aggregated number of all MFLEP students in grades K through 12.**3. MFLEP/AYP Grades =** State aggregated number of MFLEP students in grades used for accountability determinations (3 through 8 and once in high school). These students may be included in the LEP subgroup AYP calculations.

	#
Total MFLEP	1348
MFLEP/AYP grades	1019
Comments: newly exited 2007 ACCESS Level 6	
March 7, 2008 - Additional comments per ED concern through data verification process:	
Only year 1 MFLEP that took ACCESS (Yr 2 no longer LEP)	

Source – Initially, pre-populated by ED*Facts* file N/X126, which contains data group 668, category set A. If necessary, it is updated through manual entry by the SEA into the online collection tool.

Note: New data collection for the SY 2006-07 CSPR.

1.6.3.4.4 LEP Students in Non-AYP Grades (formerly 2.3 of the Title III Biennial Collection)

In the table below, report the total number of LEP students in grade ranges that were not tested for AYP in SY 2006-07.

Table 1.6.3.4.4 Definitions:**1. LEP K-2 =** All LEP students in these grades. Do not include pre-K students.**2. LEP HS/Non-AYP =** High school students (grades 9 through 12 or 10 through 12 [State specific]) who are in the high school grades that are not tested for AYP in the State (e.g., if the State tested grade 10 for AYP, then the State should provide the aggregated number of LEP students in grades 9, 11 and 12).**3. LEP Other Grades =** Number of LEP students enrolled in public schools but not in grades K through 12. Students in non-graded grades or grade spans. Do not report LEP students in grades used for NCLB accountability determinations (3 through 8 and once in high school) in this row.

Grade	#
LEP K-2	14053
LEP HS/Non-AYP	19954
LEP other grades	0
Comments:	

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

Note: New data collection for the SY 2006-07 CSPR.

1.6.3.5 Native Language Assessments

This section collects data on LEP students assessed in their native language.

1.6.3.5.1 LEP Students Assessed in Native Language (formerly 2.4.1 of the Title III Biennial Collection)

State offers the State mathematics or reading/language arts content tests in the students' native language(s).	No
Comments: Provide accommodated administrations.	

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

Note: New data collection for the SY 2006-07 CSPR.

* If "No", proceed to 1.6.3.6.

1.6.3.5.2 Native Language of Mathematics Tests Given (formerly 2.4.2 of the Title III Biennial Collection)

In the table below, report the language(s) in which native language assessments are given at each grade used for NCLB accountability determinations for mathematics.

Grade	Language
3	0
4	0
5	0
6	0
7	0
8	0
HS	0
Comments: N/A	

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

Note: New data collection for the SY 2006-07 CSPR.

1.6.3.5.3 Native Language of Reading/Language Arts Tests Given (formerly 2.4.2 of the Title III Biennial Collection)

In the table below, report the language(s) in which native language assessments are given at each grade used for NCLB accountability determinations for reading/language arts.

Grade	Language
3	0
4	0
5	0
6	0
7	0
8	0
HS	0
Comments: N/A	

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

Note: New data collection for the SY 2006-07 CSPR.

1.6.3.5.4 Native Language Version of State NCLB Mathematics Assessment Results (formerly 2.4.3 of the Title III Biennial Collection)

In the table below, report the number of LEP students who took a mathematics assessment in their native language across all grades used for NCLB accountability determinations (3 through 8 and once in high school).

Table 1.6.3.5.4 Definitions:

1. **# Tested** = Number of LEP students in grades used for NCLB accountability determinations (3 through 8 and once in high school) who took the native language version of the mathematics assessment.
2. **# At or Above Proficient** = Number of students tested through the native language version of the mathematics assessment who scored at or above proficient.
3. **% Results** = Automatically calculated based on the number who scored at or above proficient divided by the number tested.

# Tested	# At or Above Proficient	% Results
Comments: N/A		

Source – Initially pre-populated by ED*Facts* file N/X049 that is data group 272, category set A. If necessary, it is updated through manual entry by the SEA into the online collection tool.

Note: New data collection for the SY 2006-07 CSPR.

1.6.3.5.5 Native Language Version of State NCLB Reading/Language Arts Assessment Results (formerly 2.4.3 of the Title III Biennial Collection)

In the table below, report the number of LEP students who took a reading/language arts assessment in their native language across all grades used for NCLB accountability determinations (3 through 8 and once in high school).

Table 1.6.3.5.5 Definitions:

1. **# Tested** = Number of LEP students in grades used for NCLB accountability determinations (3 through 8 and once in high school) who took the native language version of the reading/language arts assessment.
2. **# At or Above Proficient** = Number of students tested through the native language version of the reading/language arts assessment who scored at or above proficient.
3. **% Results** = Automatically calculated based on the number who scored at or above proficient divided by the number tested.

# Tested	# At or Above Proficient	% Results
Comments: N/A		

Source – Initially pre-populated by ED*Facts* file N/X049 that is data group 272, category set A. If necessary, it is updated through manual entry by the SEA into the online collection tool.

Note: New data collection for the SY 2006-07 CSPR.

1.6.3.6 Title III Served Monitored Former LEP Students

This section collects data on the performance of former LEP students.

1.6.3.6.1 Title III Served MFLEP Students by Year Monitored (formerly 3.1 of the Title III Biennial Collection)

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.

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
1348	802	2150
Comments: Grades k-12, Level 6 ACCESS for ELLs 2006 and 2007		

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

Note: New data collection for the SY 2006-07 CSPR.

1.6.3.6.2 Monitored Former LEP (MFLEP) Students in AYP Grades Results for Mathematics (formerly 3.2 of the Title III Biennial Collection)

In the table below, report the number of monitored former LEP (MFLEP) students who took the annual mathematics assessment.

Table 1.6.3.6.2 Definitions:

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

# Tested	# At or Above Proficient	% Results	# Below Proficient
1620	1230	75.9	390

The number tested should be the same or near the total in 1.6.3.4.3 row 2, if not explain the difference in the comment box below.

Comments: N = AYP grades 3-8, 10 in this table. Table 1.6.3.4.3 is K-12.

WKCE only 2006-07 Level 6 MFLEPs

March 7, 2008 - Additional comments per ED concern through data verification process:

All MFLEP students in AYP tested grades, 3-8,10.

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

Note: New data collection for the SY 2006-07 CSPR.

1.6.3.6.3 Monitored Former LEP (MFLEP) Students in AYP Grades Results for Reading/Language Arts (formerly 3.2 of the Title III Biennial Collection)

In the table below, provide the number of monitored former LEP (MFLEP) students who took the annual reading/language arts assessment.

Table 1.6.3.6.3 Definitions:

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

# Tested	# At or Above Proficient	% Results	# Below Proficient
1620	1359	83.9	261

The number tested should be the same or near the total in 1.6.3.4.3 row 2, if not explain the difference in the comment box below.

Comments: N = AYP grades 3-8, 10 in this table. Table 1.6.3.4.3 is K-12.

WKCE only 2006-07 Level 6 MFLEPs

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

Note: New data collection for the SY 2006-07 CSPR.

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 (formerly 4.1 of the Title III Biennial Collection)

In the table below, report the number of Title III subgrantees meeting the criteria described in the table. Use the same method of counting consortia as in 1.6.1 (consortia regardless of number of members is only counted as one). 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. The total of the # met all three AMAOs + # met 2 AMAOs only + # Met one AMAO + # Met zero AMAOs=total # of subgrantees for the year.

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

	#
Total number of subgrantees for the year	77
Number of subgrantees that met all three Title III AMAOs	75
Number of subgrantees that met only 2 AMAOs	2
Number of subgrantees that met AMAOs of Making Progress and ELP Attainment	0
Number of subgrantees that met AMAOs of Making Progress and AYP	0
Number of subgrantees that met AMAOs of ELP Attainment and AYP	2
Number of subgrantees that met only 1 AMAO	0
Number of subgrantees that met AMAO of Making Progress	0
Number of subgrantees that met AMAO of Attainment of ELP	0
Number of subgrantees that met AMAO AYP	0
Number of subgrantees that did not meet any AMAOs	0
Number of subgrantees that did not meet AMAOs for two consecutive years	0
Number of subgrantees with an improvement plan for not meeting Title III AMAOs	0
Number of subgrantees who have not met Title III AMAOs for four consecutive years (beginning in SY 2007-08)	0
Comments: AMAOsFinal07 EDEN.xls	
March 7, 2008 - Data shown above is revised data, per ED concern through data verification process.	

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

Note: This table was formerly in section 1.6.10 of the SY 2005-06 CSPR.

1.6.4.2 State Accountability (formerly 4.2 of the Title III Biennial Collection)

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.

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

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

Note: This table was formerly in Section 1.6.10 of the SY 2005-06 CSPR.

1.6.4.3 Termination of Title III Language Instruction Educational Programs (formerly 6.1 of the Title III Biennial Collection)

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

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

Note: New data collection for the SY 2006-07 CSPR.

1.6.5 Education Programs and Activities for Immigrant Students (formerly 5.1 of the Title III Biennial Collection)

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

1.6.5.1 Immigrant Students

In the table below, report the unduplicated number of immigrant students enrolled in the State and 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 in Section 3301 (6) and enrolled in the elementary or secondary schools in the State.
- 2. Students in 3114(d)(1) Program** = Number of immigrant students who participated in programs for immigrant children and youth funded under Section 3114(d)(1), using the funds reserved for immigrant education programs/activities. This number should not include immigrant students who receive services in Title III LIEPs under Sections 3114(a) & 3115(a) ONLY.
- 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 LIEP subgrants made under Sections 3114(a) & 3115(a) that have immigrant students enrolled in them.

# Immigrant Students Enrolled	# Students in 3114(d)(1) Program	# of 3114(d)(1) Subgrants
6757	2070	14

If state reports zero (0) students in programs or zero (0) subgrants, explain in comment box below.

Comments: March 7, 2008 - Comments per ED concern through data verification process:

In Wisconsin, Immigrant Children and Youth Grants are discretionary, therefore districts choose whether to apply. While the number of immigrant students has increased, there was a decrease in the number of subgrants for immigrant students because districts did not apply. The WDPI is working on increasing the number of applications among eligible districts.

Source – Initially, the first column of the table is pre-populated by ED Facts file N/X045 that contains data group 519, grand total. The second and third columns are manual entry by the SEA.

Note: This table was formerly in section 1.6.4 of the SY 2005-06 CSPR.

1.6.5.2 Distribution of Immigrant Funds (formerly 5.3 of the Title III Biennial Collection, reformatted)

In the table below, report how the State distributes the funds reserved for the education of immigrant children and youth to subgrantees.

Subgrant award cycle			
Annual	<u>Yes</u>	Multi-year	<u>No</u>
Type of subgrant awarded			
Competitive	<u>Yes</u>	Formula	<u>No</u>

If the State checked more than one item in each category, explain in the comment box.

Comments:

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

Note: New data collection for the SY 2006-07 CSPR.

1.6.6 Teacher Information and Professional Development

This section collects data on teachers in Title III language instruction education programs.

1.6.6.1 Teacher Information (formerly 7.1 of the Title III Biennial Collection, modified)

In the table below, report the number of teachers who are working in the Title III language instruction educational programs as defined in Section 3301(8) and reported in table 1.6.1 (Types of language instruction educational programs).

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

	#
Number of all certified/licensed teachers currently working in Title III language instruction educational programs.	2640
Number of certified/licensed/endorsed ESL/BE teachers in the state currently working with LEP students (e.g., ESL/BE teachers for ALL LEP students), if the State has such requirements. <u>Or</u> number of teachers with professional development points or course work in ESL/BE, if the State does not require such certification/licensure/endorsement.	2124
Estimate number of additional certified/licensed teachers that will be needed for Title III language instruction educational programs in the next 5 years*.	3300

Explain in the comment box below if there is a zero for any item in the table above.

Comments:

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

Note: New data collection for the SY 2006-07 CSPR.

* 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 (PD) Activities of Subgrantees Related to the Teaching and Learning of LEP Students
(formerly 7.4 of the Title III Biennial Collection)

In the table below, provide the number of professional development activities that specifically address only the teaching of LEP students or are related to the learning of LEP students. These professional development activities must meet the requirements of the Title III subgrantee required activities.

Table 1.6.6.2 Definitions:

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

Type of Professional Development Activity	# Subgrantees	
Instructional strategies for LEP students	65	
Understanding and implementation of assessment of LEP students	67	
Understanding and implementation of ELP standards and academic content standards for LEP students	50	
Alignment of the curriculum in language instruction educational programs to ELP standards	0	
Subject matter knowledge for teachers	40	
Other (Explain in comment box)	28	
Participant Information	# Subgrantees	# Participants
PD provided to content classroom teachers	67	6186
PD provided to LEP classroom teachers	67	1773
PD provided to principals	67	541
PD provided to administrators/other than principals	67	250
PD provided to other school personnel/non-administrative	67	1258
PD provided to community-based organization personnel	67	179
Total		10187
Comments:		

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

Note: New data collection for the SY 2006-07 CSPR.

1.6.7 State Subgrant Activities

This section collects data on State grant activities.

1.6.7.1 State Subgrant Process

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

Table 1.6.7.1 Definitions:

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

Example: State received SY 2006-07 funds July 1, 2006, and then made these funds available to subgrantees on August 1, 2006, for SY 2006-07 programs. Then the "# of days/\$\$ Distribution" is 30 days.

Date State Received Allocation	Date Funds Available to Subgrantees	# of Days/\$\$ Distribution
7/1/06	7/1/06	0
Comments: March 7, 2008 - Comments per ED concern through data verification process: Prior to receiving allocations under NCLB, the WDPI gives districts/subgrantees an estimate based on the number of eligible ELLs in each district. There is a consolidated online application for all title funding, and districts are allowed to complete their applications prior to when the WDPI receives the final allocations. As soon as the final allocation is received, Title III subgrants for each district are calculated and posted on the WDPI's web pages, and an e-mail is sent immediately to each district. Once subgrants are posted and districts are notified, those allocations are available to the districts. Districts then may make any needed modifications and submit their application that same day. In this way, WI makes Title III funds available to subgrantees in zero days.		

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

Note: New data collection for the SY 2006-07 CSPR.

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.

LEAs are given preliminary estimates to build their budgets with. As soon as the SEA receives its allocations, final LEA budgets are determined and are immediately available to LEAs. Budgets are then "fine tuned" once final funding is determined.
--

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

Note: New data collection for the SY 2006-07 CSPR.

1.7 PERSISTENTLY DANGEROUS SCHOOLS

In the table below, provide the number of schools identified as persistently dangerous, as determined by the State, by the start of the school year. For further guidance on persistently dangerous schools, refer to section B "Identifying Persistently Dangerous Schools" in the Unsafe School Choice Option Non-Regulatory Guidance, available at:

<http://www.ed.gov/policy/elsec/guid/unsafeschoolchoice.pdf>.

Persistently Dangerous Schools	0
Comments:	

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

1.8 GRADUATION RATES AND DROPOUT RATES

This section collects graduation and dropout rates.

1.8.1 Graduation Rates

In the table below, provide the graduation rates calculated using the methodology that was approved as part of the State's accountability plan for the **previous school year** (SY 2005-06). Below the table are FAQs about the data collected in this table.

Student Group	Graduation Rate
All Students	89.3
American Indian or Alaska Native	74.6
Asian or Pacific Islander	89.3
Black, non-Hispanic	65.0
Hispanic	76.2
White, non-Hispanic	92.9
Children with disabilities (<i>IDEA</i>)	81.4
Limited English proficient	
Economically disadvantaged	
Migratory students	
Male	87.4
Female	91.3

Comments: We are not yet able to calculate graduation rates for LEP and economically disadvantaged subgroups. Since multiple years of disaggregated data are required, graduation rates for these subgroups will not be available until 2007-08 graduation rates are reported. Migrant data will be available 2009-10 at the earliest.

March 7, 2008 - Comment per ED concern through data verification process:

See above comment explaining why we are not yet able to calculate graduation rates for LEP and economically disadvantaged subgroups.

Source – Initially, pre-populated by EDFacts file N/X041 that is data group 563, category sets A, B, C, D, E, and F. If necessary, it is updated through manual entry by the SEA into the online collection tool. If the SEA has additional racial/ethnic groups or combinations of racial/ethnic groups in its accountability plan under *NCLB*, the SEA will report the above data for those groups through the online CSPR collection tool.

FAQs on graduation rates:

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

1.8.2 Dropout Rates

In the table below, provide the dropout rates calculated using the annual event school dropout rate for students leaving a school in a single year determined in accordance with the National Center for Education Statistic's (NCES) Common Core of Data (CCD) for the **previous school year** (SY 2005-06). Below the table is an FAQ about the data collected in this table.

Student Group	Dropout Rate
All Students	1.6
American Indian or Alaska Native	4.0
Asian or Pacific Islander	1.7
Black, non-Hispanic	5.8
Hispanic	3.6
White, non-Hispanic	1.0
Children with disabilities (<i>IDEA</i>)	2.1
Limited English proficient	2.6
Economically disadvantaged	2.7
Migratory students	
Male	1.9
Female	1.3
Comments: Migrant data will be available in 2007-08 at the earliest.	

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

FAQ on dropout rates:

What is a dropout? A dropout is an individual who: 1) was enrolled in school at some time during the previous school year; and 2) was not enrolled at the beginning of the current school year; and 3) has not graduated from high school or completed a State- or district-approved educational program; and 4) does not meet any of the following exclusionary conditions: a) transfer to another public school district, private school, or State- or district-approved educational program (including correctional or health facility programs); b) temporary absence due to suspension or school-excused illness; or c) death.

1.9 EDUCATION FOR HOMELESS CHILDREN AND YOUTHS PROGRAM

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

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

	#	# LEAs Reporting Data
LEAs without subgrants	428	427
LEAs with subgrants	12	12
Total	440	439
Comments: Independent charter schools are being counted as LEAs for USDE homeless reporting requirements only.		

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

Note: This table was formerly Section 1.9.1.2 of the SY 2005-06 CSPR.

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

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

1.9.1.1 Homeless Children And Youths

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

Age/Grade	# of Homeless Children/Youths Enrolled in Public School in LEAs <u>Without</u> Subgrants	# of Homeless Children/Youths Enrolled in Public School in LEAs <u>With</u> Subgrants
Age 3 through 5 (not Kindergarten)	63	68
K	227	687
1	236	561
2	213	512
3	186	507
4	171	450
5	188	426
6	173	434
7	153	395
8	147	435
9	106	444
10	121	269
11	143	309
12	240	239
Ungraded	0	0
Total	2367	5736
Comments: Kindergarten numbers are being reported as K4 and K5. Wisconsin does not have any "ungraded" classes		

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

Note: This table was formerly section 1.9.1.3 of the SY 2005-06 CSPR.

1.9.1.2 Primary Nighttime Residence of Homeless Children and Youths

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

	# of Homeless Children/Youths - LEAs <u>Without</u> Subgrants	# of Homeless Children/Youths - LEAs <u>With</u> Subgrants
Shelters, transitional housing, awaiting foster care	599	1596
Doubled-up (e.g., living with another family)	1462	3686
Unsheltered (e.g., cars, parks, campgrounds, temporary trailer, or abandoned buildings)	59	48
Hotels/Motels	247	406
Total	2367	5736
Comments:		

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

Note: This table was formerly section 1.9.1.4 of the SY 2005-06 CSPR.

1.9.2 LEAs with McKinney-Vento Subgrants

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

1.9.2.1 Homeless Children and Youths Served by McKinney-Vento Subgrants

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

Age/Grade	# Homeless Children/Youths Served by Subgrants
Age 3 through 5 (not Kindergarten)	64
K	595
1	479
2	435
3	427
4	382
5	374
6	357
7	326
8	364
9	373
10	230
11	274
12	219
Ungraded	0
Total	4899

Comments:

Source – Initially, pre-populated by EDFacts file N/X043 that is data group 560, category set A. If necessary, it is updated through manual entry by the SEA into the online collection tool.

1.9.2.2 Subpopulations of Homeless Students Served

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

	# Homeless Students Served
Unaccompanied youth	512
Migratory children/youth	6
Children with disabilities (<i>IDEA</i>)	1209
Limit English proficient students	503

Comments:

Source – Initially, pre-populated by EDFacts file N/X043 that is data group 560, category sets B, C, D, and E. If necessary, it is updated through manual entry by the SEA into the online collection tool.

Note: This table was formerly Sections 1.9.2.3, 1.9.2.4, and 1.9.2.5 of the SY 2005-06 CSPR. For the SY 2006-07 CSPR, the data collection has been changed to show the total number of students served.

1.9.2.3 Educational Support Services Provided by Subgrantees

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

	# McKinney-Vento Subgrantees That Offer
1. Tutoring or other instructional support	12
2. Expedited evaluations	9
3. Staff professional development and awareness	11
4. Referrals for medical, dental, and other health services	12
5. Transportation	12
6. Early childhood programs	11
7. Assistance with participation in school programs	12
8. Before-, after-school, mentoring, summer programs	12
9. Obtaining or transferring records necessary for enrollment	11
10. Parent education related to rights and resources for children	12
11. Coordination between schools and agencies	12
12. Counseling	12
13. Addressing needs related to domestic violence	11
14. Clothing to meet a school requirement	12
15. School supplies	12
16. Referral to other programs and services	12
17. Emergency assistance related to school attendance	10
18. Other (optional)	
19. Other (optional)	
20. Other (optional)	
Comments:	

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

Note: This table was formerly Section 1.9.2.6 of the SY 2005-06 CSPR.

1.9.2.4 Barriers To The Education Of Homeless Children And Youth

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

	# Subgrantees Reporting
1. Eligibility for homeless services	0
2. School Selection	0
3. Transportation	0
4. School records	0
5. Immunizations	0
6. Other medical records	0
7. Other Barriers	1
Comments: other barriers-obtaining out of state records	

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

Note: This table was formerly Section 1.9.2.7 of the SY 2005-06 CSPR. Immunizations and Other Medical Records have been changed to two separate data collections for the SY 2006-07 CSPR.

1.9.2.5 Academic Progress of Homeless Students

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

1.9.2.5.1 Reading Assessment

In the table below, provide the number of homeless children and youths served who were tested on the State *NCLB* 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 *NCLB*.

Grade	# Homeless Children/Youths Served by McKinney-Vento Taking Reading Assessment Test	# Homeless Children/Youths Served by McKinney-Vento Who Scored At or Above Proficient
3	341	173
4	293	175
5	267	151
6	259	139
7	252	140
8	243	129
High School	135	52
Comments:		

Source – Initially, pre-populated by EDFacts file N/X076, N/X077, or N/X078 that are data group 584, category set G. If necessary, it is updated through manual entry by the SEA into the online collection tool.

Note: This table was formerly part of section 1.9.2.9 of the SY 2005-06 CSPR. Grades 9 through 12 have been changed to High School for the SY 2006-07 CSPR.

1.9.2.5.2 Mathematics Assessment

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

Grade	# Homeless Children/Youths Served by McKinney-Vento Taking Mathematics Assessment Test	# Homeless Children/Youths Served by McKinney-Vento Who Scored At or Above Proficient
3	356	122
4	309	129
5	282	100
6	268	94
7	259	100
8	260	106
High School	142	39
Comments:		

Source – Similar to 1.9.2.5.1 but the file specification is N/X075 that is data group 583, category set G.

Note: This table was formerly part of section 1.9.2.9 of the SY 2005-06 CSPR. Grades 9 through 12 have been changed to High School for the SY 2006-07 CSPR.

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, 2006 through August 31, 2007. 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 in Section 1.10.3.4 *Quality Control Processes*.

Please note that in submitting this information, the Authorizing State Official must certify that, to the best of his/her knowledge, the child counts and information contained in the report are true, reliable, and valid and that any false statement provided is subject to fine or imprisonment pursuant to 18 U.S.C. 1001.

FAQs on Child Count:

How is "out-of-school" defined? Out-of-school means youth up through age 21 who are entitled to a free public education in the State but are not currently enrolled in a K-12 institution. This could include students who have dropped out of school, youth who are working on a GED outside of a K-12 institution, and youth who are "here-to-work" only. It does not include preschoolers, who are counted by age grouping.

How is "ungraded" defined? Ungraded means the children are served in an educational unit that has no separate grades. For example, some schools have primary grade groupings that are not traditionally graded, or ungraded groupings for children with learning disabilities. In some cases, ungraded students may also include special education children, transitional bilingual students, students working on a GED through a K-12 institution, or those in a correctional setting. (Students working on a GED outside of a K-12 institution are counted as out-of-school youth.)

1.10.1 Category 1 Child Count

In the table below, enter the unduplicated statewide number by age/grade of **eligible** migrant children age 3 through 21 who, within 3 years of making a qualifying move, resided in your State for one or more days during the reporting period of September 1, 2006 through August 31, 2007. 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)	145
K	63
1	73
2	66
3	79
4	70
5	74
6	73
7	74
8	84
9	87
10	67
11	74
12	53
Ungraded	0
Out-of-school	27
Total	1109
Comments:	

Source – Initially, pre-populated by EDFacts file N/X121 that is data group 634, Subtotal 1. If necessary, it is updated through manual entry by the SEA into the online collection tool.

Note: New data collection for the SY 2006-07 CSPR.

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%.

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

The reported migrant student counts for Category 1 were lower than those submitted for 2005-06. The following are some of the contributing factors:

1. As was true for the previous reporting year the severe rise in gasoline prices continues to prevent some of the migrant families from coming to the state. This included families that have come to the state for work in agriculture for many years.
2. The work season for this reporting period was significantly more irregular this time causing families to come and go before recruitment efforts got underway. Workers moved around a lot and often left the state for work in other parts of the country. Also specifically in the vegetable processing industry, the season ended much earlier than before and many schools that would have otherwise been helpful in making referrals to the SEA could not do it before the families' departures.
3. Problems with immigration issues also continue to be a huge concern. In fact things have become worse since last year. The Department of Homeland Security crackdown on the undocumented has had its toll on agricultural workers. Report after report of immigration raids in the state and nationally have resulted in some families not making the trip north for work this year. Recent media reports have created fear in some migrant families. Apparently people are being stopped for immigration checks even on their way to church on weekends. The overall culture of the immigration debate has been altogether hurtful.
4. Finding adequate housing has also been an issue as in the past. As growers/employers seek to hire more and more single adult workers, families with children often find themselves stranded, resulting in them moving out of the area and going to other states.
5. Growers/Employers continue to seek more and more single workers instead of families for the labor force. And workers are also shared and bussed between the different employers and employment sites, reducing the overall number of workers as well.
6. Agricultural trends also continue to decline in the state with some farmers abandoning their growing practices and their hiring of migrants. Other state agencies that work with migrants have recorded a decrease in workers as well. And some of the agencies that we collaborate with have, in fact, stopped doing on site visits to employers with less than 50 workers. These are visits we would have participated in as in previous years. This gives employers more control of what kind of orientations to have for their employees and who to invite. This has had an impact on the number of contacts we are able to make with the employers and the employees, resulting in fewer referrals for identification and recruitment.
7. The trend of bringing in foreign workers under different VISA programs continues in Wisconsin. Most of these individuals are adult workers without families and in many cases are individuals who already have college degrees.

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

Note: New data collection for the SY 2006-07 CSPR.

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, 2006 through August 31, 2007. Count a child who moved from one age/grade level to another during the reporting period only once in the highest age/grade that he/she attained during the reporting period. Count a child who moved to different schools within the State and who was served in both traditional summer and year-round school intersession programs only once. The unduplicated statewide total count is calculated automatically.

Do not include:

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

Age/Grade	Summer/Intersession Count of Eligible Migrant Children Who Are Participants and Who Can Be Counted for Funding Purposes
Age 3 through 5 (not Kindergarten)	14
K	18
1	20
2	30
3	29
4	23
5	24
6	24
7	21
8	9
9	16
10	11
11	9
12	3
Ungraded	0
Out-of-school	0
Total	251
Comments:	

Source – Initially, pre-populated by EDFacts file N/X122 that is data group 635, Subtotal 1. If necessary, it is updated through manual entry by the SEA into the online collection tool.

Note: New data collection for the SY 2006-07 CSPR.

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%.

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

The Category 2 child count was also impacted by the factors listed under 1.10.1.

1. In addition to those factors another cooperating agency that routinely provides day care services to migrant students experienced a drop in their numbers for some of the reasons identified above. Their funding also suffered a cut for this service period. The collaborative agreements that had been in place for a number of years to provide day care only after the MEP academic program ended worked satisfactorily in a few locations. In one instance a regional center was closed due to lack of funding, and Title I funded staff were not able to supplement the program offered by the agency as a result. The fact that families were scattered over a large area did not allow for a migrant education program due to those logistics.

2. For the first time in several years parents kept older siblings home to care for their younger brothers and sisters. Parents expressed great disappointment in the shortened service periods offered by that agency and in some cases elected to keep secondary level students at home to care for them or took their entire families to the work site with them. As a result, many of those students in turn were unable to follow through with their recommended coursework.

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

Note: New data collection for the SY 2006-07 CSPR.

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 child count reported for Category 1 and Category 2 were determined through reports generated from data inputted into the New Generation System (NGS) along with multiple cross-checking procedures by state and local migrant education staff.

Were child counts for the last reporting period generated using the same system(s)?

Yes the last reporting period of 2005-06 Child Count was also generated from the NGS system.

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

Note: New data collection for the SY 2006-07 CSPR.

1.10.3.2 Data Collection and Management Procedures

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

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

(a) How was the child count data collected and what data was collected?

Trained recruiters at the local project level and a statewide recruiter obtain needed information to establish child eligibility for the count through WI's Certificate of Eligibility (COE) forms. The state NGS data entry management specialist, the state migrant education consultant, and other state staff contribute greatly to child eligibility accuracy. The COE yields a substantial amount of student demographic information necessary for the purpose of accurate determinations of migrant child eligibility.

Information collected through the COE and entered into NGS permits decisions to be made on qualifying moves, qualifying arrival dates, residency dates, enrollment and withdrawal dates, and student birthdates. In addition to these categories of information, the NGS system also provides data on end of eligibility, which increases the child count accuracy. Special built in flags ensure proper accounting for termination, including students who have obtained a GED graduated from high school or are deceased, all of which designate the end of eligibility.

All of these data elements were necessary in order to establish the 2006-07 child counts on the basis of eligibility within the window of September 1 2006 -August 31 2007.

WI is a member of the multi-state consortium that uses NGS. Opportunities are offered each year for input on data needs and ways to enhance reports that assist with reporting accurately on the child eligibility counts. Add'l opportunities for creating reports that are customized to match our needs.

In state training for state and migrant staff continues to focus on the process for proper reporting on enrollment and withdrawal of students from the NGS system. Migrant staff engaged in recruitment and the staff entering data into the NGS system receive special training.

The state reviews data from the Local Accounting Sheets, Continuing Enrollment Reports, and Student Reporting Forms as a means of cross-checking district reporting for migrant students. The student reporting program identifies specifically the MEP-funded instructional or support services in which the students participated. These data are included in the Supplementary Services Report, which is shared with local projects to assist them in monitoring their accuracy in reporting. Residency dates, withdrawal dates, and enrollment dates are carefully monitored for the regular term and summer enrollment periods. Follow-up is carried out for any missing elements. Special reports printed off for each district are shared with districts throughout the year.

(b) What activities were conducted to collect the data?

The state MEP staff provided an annual training to local recruiters and state staff, along with periodic updates on an ongoing basis. It is required that there be a supervisor assigned to support and review the COEs' completed and other work of the recruiters and records clerks. The individual completing the COE and entering data to NGS is required to attend training. Personnel taking new positions for recruitment at other times during the year receive an individualized training from the state recruiter and the state migrant education consultant. The state NGS data entry management specialist and the state migrant education consultant provided training and substantial technical assistance to individuals new to assignments as records clerks. This included phone e-mail and on-site training sessions. These positions are key in spotting reporting issues and in helping to clarify data reporting requirements through technical assistance.

The state recruitment plan requires that the recruiter make contact with the migrant family for interviews and data collection. The signature of the parent is obtained in the face-to-face meeting.

The COEs completed by recruiters at the local project level were reviewed by trained supervisory personnel prior to submission to the state migrant program office. The state migrant program manager reviews and approves all COEs completed by the statewide recruiter who carries out recruitment across the state where leads are received but there is no active project at the time. The state staff identify any questionable data and engage in desk accountability through phone and e-mail contacts to rectify data problems. Recruitment is ongoing throughout the school year and summer period.

During 2006-07 the state continued to place a major emphasis on the importance of residency verification dates on the COE by established timelines. Additional technical assistance was provided to districts with assigned personnel that enter data to the NGS system. The state NGS data entry management specialist supports local and state MEP program staff in the ongoing effort to

improve data collection, reporting on a timely basis, reporting accurate enrollment and withdrawal dates, and careful monitoring of the ages of children in the annual count that are ages 0-2 with residency to identify movements that may have occurred from age 2-3 thus enabling them to be included in the count.

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

As stated in (a) the migrant child count submitted was taken for elig. established during the window of 9/1/06-8/31/07. The data for the State's Category 2 count were collected and maintained in the same manner as the data for the Category 1 count. Timely submittal of all required forms helps ensure accurate tracking of student moves.

March 7, 2008 - Additional comments per ED concern through data verification process:

34 elements of data are collected: We summarized them in the second line of the para. They will be listed here for your perusal. Parent Data: 1. A. Fathers Name-Last/First; 1B. Mother's Name-Last, First. 2A. Current Male Guardian's Name -Last? First; 2B. Current Female Guardian's Name -Last, First; 3A. Current Address; 4A. Home Base Add. II. 5. Child Data- Names of children-Last, First, Middle; 6. Sex; 7. Birthdate; 7a. ver; 7b. Age 8. Race; 9 Birthplace-city, state-county; 10. Name/Code of School; 10a, Date enrolled in school; 10b. Gr. 10c. Check If Edu interrupted; 11. NGS Student #; III. Eligibility Data; 12 Moved. From City, State, Country; 13. To City, To State, LEA; 14, Qualifying Arrival Date (QAD) 15. The children made this move with alone as the migrant worker; OR with parents, or to join parents; 16. Relationship to Parent, Guardian, Self, Child, Spouse; 17. To enable that person to Obtain or Seek Seasonal employment, Temporary employment-Comments in # 24 required; 18. In activity that directly is Agriculturally related, Fishing related; 19. Residency Date; 20. Qualifying Activity at time of arrival date in Item # 14; 21. Name and location of last school district attended; 22. Date of withdrawal; 23. UMOS Service-yes; no; 24. Additional comments (eg., Temporary Employment, PASS, TAKS, ELL Assessment, Special Needs, GED-specify date; Interviewer's Statement: 25. The above information was obtained from: parent, Guardian, Child, Spouse, Other Resp. person; Comment: & the Principal Means of Livelihood (PMOL) was established because____. 26 FERPA verif.; 27V. Certif. I certify that the information given is correct to the the best of my knowledge. 27. Sig. of Parent/Guardian/child/ Spouse/ other; 28. Date signed; 29. Interviewer's Sig. 30. Date Signed; 31. Certifying Sig. 32. Title of Person Certifying; 33. Date Signed; 34 Parental Permission/Certification; Yes No responses to: 1. I give perm. for my children to be given any necessary medical or dental exam and treatment; 2. I give permission for my children to participate in school-supervised field trips; 3. I give perm. for the local & state migrant ed progs to use my child's name & pic(s) to publicize prog. activities.

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

Note: New data collection for the SY 2006-07 CSPR.

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

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

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

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

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

The NGS system has been programmed to set a query to ensure a student is counted only once statewide for the count yield in Category 1 and Category 2. The NGS system creates a unique student identification number for each student. There is extra checking for potential duplication when names are the same or similar to rule out duplicity in the counts.

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

Wisconsin strictly adheres to the parameters and timelines established for the entry of data used for the child count that corresponded to the legal eligibility reporting window of September 1, 2006 through August 31, 2007.

As student count reports become available through NGS, substantial cross-checking of paper documentation is made by state staff prior to finalization of the report for the Office of Migrant Education.

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.

Refer to previous response which includes the Category 2 child count description.

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

Note: New data collection for the SY 2006-07 CSPR.

1.10.3.3 Methods Used To Count Children

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

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

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

The Category 1 count is obtained from the NGS data base, which was programmed to check data entered by states for withdrawal date fields, enrollment date fields, and residency verification date field which documents residency during the applicable period and permits inclusion in the eligible student count.

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

Response:

The 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 parent's signature on that date.

Questionable situations discovered regarding Principal Means of Livelihood (PMOL), qualifying work, qualifying arrival, and withdrawal issues are scheduled for follow-up reviews. State MEP staff review and offer guidance per federal definitions and relevant guidelines to local project recruiters and program directors seeking guidance prior to making a final determination on the family's eligibility status. Communications are carried out through e-mail, phone calls, and at times, personal meetings with local staff.

A special report available from NGS helps local personnel followup on 2 year olds that will turn 3 within the eligibility window. Recruiters then take action to ensure continuing residency verification can be documented.

* Children who were resident in your state for at least one day during the eligible period (9/1-8/31);

Response:

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

* Children who in the case of category 2--received an MEP-funded service during the summer or intersession term; and

Response:

The NGS system has set programming to include only eligible children who received either MEP funded instructional and/or support services under a summer enrollment flag of "summer". Only students receiving a supplemental instructional or support service are included in the count.

* Children once per child count category.

Response:

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

If your state's 2006-2007 Category 2 count was generated using a different system than the Category 1 count please describe each system separately.

March 7, 2008 - Additional comments per ED concern through data verification process:

The state has multiple systems of checking and verifying residency. Data from the COE is checked against the Certified Enrollment Report (CER) and student reporting forms SRF. COEs are completed for summer and regular terms, and CER is completed by district for children not leaving the state. A SRF is submitted for every student verifying school enrollment and dates. ISES calculates from date of enrollment.

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.

See above explanation for a description of how the Category 2 child count is calculated.

March 7, 2008 - Additional comments per ED concern through data verification process:

No, we were making a point that we consider the training of staff at local projects to be of key importance and that we do not permit recruitment without appropriate staff being trained. Thus, regularly scheduled training is provided for recruiters and supervisors, and when there is a vacancy that occurs SEA staff goes to the site to provide the training. However, in the interim there is a possibility that some children might not be recruited resulting in a lower number than actual.

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

Note: New data collection for the SY 2006-07 CSPR.

1.10.3.4 Quality Control Processes

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

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

The State Wisconsin's Migrant Program manager attends 3 or more meetings annually to participate in the Consortium sponsored by the NGS system. This participation ensures full information on new developments and enhancements in NGS along with opportunities to address national data requests relevant to child count and performance reporting. Consortium members are also given the opportunity to make recommendations for improving services through the use of NGS.

Federal Migrant Education guidance and policy documents on legal requirements are reviewed in annual training meetings with other state migrant personnel and in local training meetings with project directors recruiters and records clerks. Sessions related to improvement of identification and recruitment practices, collection of data to verify eligibility, and procedures for reporting correctly, and means of documenting project information are provided. Hands-on training engages participants in real life migrant program identification and recruitment issues and problems that they may confront in their jobs. This training also keeps them abreast of necessary legal considerations.

A careful screening of data during the year on multiple data sources 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 migrant education consultant, the statewide recruiter, and MEP program assistant work collaboratively to strengthen data collection and analyze processes that impact the quality of the data that yield the Category 1 unique student count and the Category 2 count of summer program enrolled participants. Staff plan for strategies that provide special technical assistance targeted to projects that need extra guidance on data quality record keeping and reporting per timelines.

COEs are obtained for all new families. Districts report on the Local Accounting Sheet (LAS) and submit a Continuing Enrollment Report (CER) for all other enrolled eligible students. The statewide recruiter engages in checking eligibility data and in re-interviewing families to assist local recruiters that have problems with determining eligibility.

The extensive use of many of the NGS management reports has also improved the total quality of Wisconsin's accurate data collection on migrant children. Some of the most frequently used reports include the District Report, the End of Eligibility Report, the COE Family Report, the Continuation of Services Report, the Priority for Services Report, and others.

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

Note: New data collection for the SY 2006-07 CSPR.

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.

As part of the quality control procedures established by the MEP, we have informally re-interviewed families soon after the Certificates of Eligibility (COEs) have come into the SEA. But as of this point we have not formally conducted statewide re-interviewing for eligibility determination based on a random sampling of all our students. We are waiting for formal feedback on the results of the previous re-interviewing process and for final directions on how to proceed this year before sampling the students whose families would need to be re-interviewed.

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

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

Note: New data collection for the SY 2006-07 CSPR.

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

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

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

As mentioned above, special reports available for the NGS database were printed off periodically during this service period, 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. Duplicate records were resolved using the prescribed procedures. NGS reports were also used 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 and the legal parameters that define eligibility. This included large group and one-on-one training and support to project directors, recruiters, data entry, and other records clerk personnel with responsibilities for the migrant education program assignments.

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

Note: New data collection for the SY 2006-07 CSPR.

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.

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

State and local project personnel are 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.

State staff continue to engage district migrant project personnel in study of definitions, statutory requirements, and decision-making on Principal Means of Livelihood (PMOL), determinations of qualifying work, intent to seek or obtain work, and acceptable means of documenting work histories for the migrant families moving into the state, or from one school district to another within the state. These efforts, along with the comprehensive review of available paper documentation that support the counts and/or problem-solving in the final steps, contribute to accurate documentation of child counts.

State staff members work closely with NGS technical assistance consultants at the central national office to take every precaution in closely studying all relevant reports to ensure accuracy is maintained prior to submittal of the final count.

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

Note: New data collection for the SY 2006-07 CSPR.

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.

Upon receipt of Certificates of Eligibility (COEs) from the local projects and the statewide recruiter, the state migrant education consultant and the state NGS data entry management specialist review the COEs for completeness, accuracy, and compliance with eligibility requirements. In cases of incomplete COEs, they are referred to the interviewer for completion or clarification, as needed. In cases when eligibility cannot be definitively determined based on the information provided on the COE, recruiters, and possibly employers, are contacted to clarify qualifying agricultural activities. Temporary employment activities require additional clarifying comments to explain the reason for the short duration of the work.

COEs are not entered into the NGS database system until complete and satisfactory information is gathered and verified. To further ensure accuracy, all updates after receipt of COEs are documented and dated directly on the COE. Additional e-mail communications are attached to the COE. Even after all of these precautions are taken, it may be necessary to further follow up on information elements in the data entry process where discrepancies in line items exist. In such cases the appropriate individual or school/district contact person is notified and the problems are resolved.

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

Note: New data collection for the SY 2006-07 CSPR.

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 major concerns noted at this time relate to staff training and turnover at the local district level and the learning curve that is needed to reach highly effective practices. First of all, migrant grants are very limited and the role of recruiter is almost always only one of the major responsibilities held by individuals in the districts. The challenges of ensuring sufficient specialized training are many, especially given the amount of detail required and the limited amount of time recruiters actually have to spend carrying out their essential role in the program. The characteristics of the job are also unique, and include cultural and language barriers, ability to establish a trusting rapport with migrant parents, flexibility, and persistence when families are hard to reach. In summary, child counts are inevitably affected by gaps in employment of recruiters at the local level and subsequent training needed when new positions are filled.

As described in the previous section, it is frequently necessary to request additional information from recruiters. Direct and detailed communication with recruiters via e-mail and telephone helps ensure speedy resolution of problems. However, due to their many other job demands and the schedules of migrant parents, it can be difficult to bring closure to issues that require follow-up in a timely efficient manner. The ideal scenario includes almost immediate feedback and follow-up whenever questions arise. It remains a challenge at both the state and the local levels to bring this goal to fruition.

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

Note: New data collection for the SY 2006-07 CSPR.