

CONSOLIDATED STATE PERFORMANCE REPORT PART II

School Years 2019-20

DUE TBD

The Consolidated State Performance Report (CSPR) is the required annual reporting tool for each State, the Bureau of Indian Education, District of Columbia, and Puerto Rico as authorized under Section 8303¹ of the *Elementary and Secondary Education Act (ESEA)*, as amended by the *Every Student Succeeds Act of 2015(ESSA)*².

Paperwork Burden Statement

According to the Paperwork Reduction Act of 1995, no persons are required to respond to a collection of information unless such collection displays a valid OMB control number. The valid OMB control number for this information collection is 1810-0724. The time required to complete this information collection is estimated to average 35.00 hours per response, including the time to review instructions, search existing data resources, gather the data needed, and complete and review the information collection. The obligation to respond to this collection is required to obtain or retain a benefit under the Elementary and Secondary Education Act (ESEA), as amended by the Every Student Succeeds Act (ESSA). If you have any comments concerning the accuracy of the time estimate(s) or suggestions for improving this form, please write to: U.S. Department of Education, Washington, D.C. 20202-4537. If you have comments or concerns regarding the status of your individual submission of this form, write directly to: Office of Elementary and Secondary Education, U.S. Department of Education, 400 Maryland Avenue, S.W., Washington, D.C. 20202.

¹ SEC.8303. Consolidated Reporting – (a) In general: In order to simplify reporting requirements and reduce reporting burdens, the Secretary shall establish procedures and criteria under which a State educational agency, in consultation with the Governor of the State, may submit a consolidated State annual report. (b) Contents: The report shall contain information about the programs included in the report, including the performance of the State under those programs, and other matters as the Secretary determines are necessary, such as monitoring activities. (c) Replacement: The report shall replace separate individual annual reports for the programs included in the consolidated State annual report.

² All citations to the ESEA in this document are to the ESEA, as amended by the ESSA.

CONTENTS

CONSOLIDATED STATE PERFORMANCE REPORT..... 1

PART II..... 1

2.4 EDUCATION OF MIGRATORY CHILDREN..... 3

 2.4.1 Migratory Child Counts..... 3

 2.4.1.2 Category 1 Child Count Increases/Decreases..... 4

 2.4.2.1 Category 2 Child Count Increases/Decreases..... 5

 2.4.3 Child Count Calculation and Validation Procedures..... 5

 2.4.3.1 Methods Used to Count Children..... 5

 2.4.3.2 Quality Control Processes..... 6

 2.4.5 Academic Status..... 8

 2.4.5.2 HSED (High School Equivalency Diploma)..... 8

2.5 PREVENTION AND INTERVENTION PROGRAMS FOR CHILDREN AND YOUTH WHO ARE
NEGLECTED, DELINQUENT, OR AT RISK..... 8

 2.5.1 State Agency Title I, Part D Programs and Facilities – Subpart 1..... 9

 2.5.1.1 Programs and Facilities - Subpart 1..... 9

 2.5.1.2 Programs and Facilities That Reported - Subpart 1..... 10

 2.5.3 LEA Title I, Part D Programs and Facilities – Subpart 2..... 10

 2.5.3.1 Programs and Facilities – Subpart 2..... 10

 2.5.3.2 Programs and Facilities That Reported - Subpart 2..... 11

2.6 STUDENT SUPPORT AND ACADEMIC ENRICHMENT GRANTS (TITLE IV, PART A)..... 11

2.7 FUNDING TRANSFERABILITY FOR STATE AND LOCAL EDUCATIONAL AGENCIES (TITLE V,
PART A)..... 12

 2.7.1 State Transferability of Funds..... 12

 2.7.2 Local Educational Agency (LEA) Transferability of Funds..... 12

 2.7.3 LEA Funds Transfers..... 12

2.8 RURAL EDUCATION ACHIEVEMENT PROGRAM (REAP)..... 14

 2.8.1 LEA Use of Rural Low-Income Schools Program (RLIS) (Title V, Part B, Subpart 2) Grant
Funds 14

 2.8.2 RLIS Objectives and Outcomes..... 14

 2.8.3 RLIS Technical Assistance..... 14

 2.8.4 RLIS Subgrant Award Determination..... 15

 15

 2.8.5 RLIS State Administrative Funds..... 15

 2.8.6 RLIS LEAs Awarded Funds..... 15

2.4 EDUCATION OF MIGRATORY CHILDREN

This section collects data on the Migrant Education Program (MEP) (Title I, Part C) for the performance period of September 1, 2018 through August 31, 2019. This section is composed of the following subsections:

- Population data of eligible migratory children
- Academic data of eligible migratory students
- Data of migratory children served during the performance period
- School data
- Project data
- Personnel data

Report a child in the age/grade category in which the child spent the *majority of their time* while residing in the State during the performance period.

There are two exceptions to this rule:

1. A child who turns 3 during the performance period is reported as “Age 3 through 5 (not Kindergarten),” **only if the child’s residency in the state was verified after the child turned 3.**
2. A child who turns 22 years of age during the performance is reported at the appropriate age/grade category for the performance period.

2.4.1 Migratory Child Counts

This section collects the Title I, Part C, 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 performance period of September 1, 2018 through August 31, 2019. This section also collects a report on the procedures used by States to produce true, reliable, and valid child counts.

To provide the child counts, each State Education Agency (SEA) should have implemented sufficient procedures and internal controls 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 migratory children are counted for funding purposes and are served. If an SEA has reservations about the accuracy of its child counts, it must disclose known data limitations to the Department, and explain how and when it will resolve data quality issues through corrective actions in the box below, which precedes Section 2.3.1.1 *Category 1 Child Count*.

Note: In submitting this information, the Authorizing State Official must certify that, to the best of his/her knowledge, the State has taken action to ensure that the child counts and information contained in the report are true, reliable, and valid and that any false Statement provided is subject to fine or imprisonment pursuant to 18 U.S.C. §1001.

FAQs on Child Count:

- a. *How is “out-of-school” defined?* Out-of-school means children 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 term could include students who have dropped out of school, youth who are working on a high school equivalency diploma (HSED) outside of a K-12 institution, and youth who are “here-to-work” only. It would not include children in preschool, nor does it include temporary absences (e.g., summer/intersession, suspension or illness). Enrollment in school is not a condition affecting eligibility for the MEP. Therefore, out-of-school youth who meet the definition of a “migratory child” are eligible for the MEP.
- b. *How is “ungraded” defined?* Ungraded means the children are served in an educational unit that has no separate grades. For example, some schools have primary grade groupings that are not traditionally graded or ungraded groupings for children with learning disabilities (IDEA). In some cases, ungraded students may also include special education children (IDEA), transitional bilingual students, students working on a HSED through a K-12 institution, or those in a correctional setting. (Do not count students working on a HSED outside of a K-12 institution as ungraded; these students are counted as out-of-school youth.)
- c. *How is reporting a child “in the age/grade category in which s/he spent the majority of his/her time while residing in the State” defined?* A State must report a child in **only one** age/grade category in which the child spent the majority of his/her time **while residing in the State**. For example, a migratory child resided in State A for three months and in State B for nine months in SY2018-19. While in State A, the child enrolled in ninth grade for two months and in tenth grade for one month. Therefore, State A will report the child in the age/grade category of ninth grade, because the child spent the majority of his/her time in ninth grade in State A. In State B, the child enrolled in eighth grade for one month and in ninth grade for eight months. Therefore, State B will report the child in the age/grade category of ninth grade, because the child spent the majority of his/her time in ninth grade in State B.

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 and how and when these concerns will be resolved.

The response is limited to 8,000 characters

2.4.1.2 Category 1 Child Count Increases/Decreases

In the space below, explain any increases or decreases from last year in the number of students reported for Category 1 greater than 10 percent.

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

2.4.2.1 Category 2 Child Count Increases/Decreases

In the space below, explain any increases or decreases from last year in the number of students reported for Category 2 greater than 10 percent.

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

2.4.3 Child Count Calculation and Validation Procedures

The following questions request information on the State’s MEP child count calculation and validation procedures.

2.4.3.1 Methods Used to Count Children

In the space below, please describe the procedures and processes at the State level used to ensure all eligible children, ages 3-21 are reported. In particular, describe how the State includes and counts only:

- The unduplicated count of eligible migratory children, ages 3-21. Only include children two years of age whose residency in the state has been verified after turning three.
- Children who met the program eligibility criteria (e.g., were within 3 years of a qualifying move, engaged or had parents engage in migratory agricultural or fishing work, and were entitled to a free public education through grade 12 in the State, or preschool children below the age and grade level at which the agency provides free public education). Children who were resident in your State for at least 1 day during the performance period (September 1 through August 31).
- Children who graduated from high school or attained a High School Equivalency Diploma (HSED) *during the performance period* and ensures that these children are not counted in the subsequent performance period’s child count.
- Children who—in the case of Category 2—were served for one or more days in a MEP-funded project conducted during either the summer term or during intersession periods.
- Children once per age/grade level for each child count category.
- Children who had an SEA approved Certificate of Eligibility (COE) and were entered in the State’s migratory student database.

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

--

Does the State ensure that the system that transmits migrant data to the Department accurately accounts for all the migratory children in every *EDFacts* data file? See the Office of Migrant Education’s CSPR Rating Instrument for the criteria needed to address this question. Please respond in the table below.

Accuracy of <i>EDFacts</i> Data Files	Yes	No
The State deployed a process that ensured that it transmits accurate migrant data to the Department in every required <i>EDFacts</i> data file.	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes	<input type="checkbox"/> No

Use of MSIX to Verify Data Quality	Yes	No
Does the State use data in the Migrant Student Information Exchange (MSIX) to verify the quality of migrant data?	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes	<input type="checkbox"/> No

If MSIX is utilized, please explain how.

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

--

2.4.3.2 Quality Control Processes

In the space below, describe the results of any re-interview processes used by the SEA during the performance period to test the accuracy of the State’s MEP eligibility determinations.

Results	#
The number of eligibility determinations sampled.	
The number of eligibility determinations sampled for which a re-interview was completed.	
The number of eligibility determinations sampled for which a re-interview was completed and the child was found eligible.	

Procedures	
What was the most recent year that the MEP conducted independent prospective re-interviews (i.e., interviewers were neither SEA or LEA	<input type="checkbox"/> SY 2018-19 <input type="checkbox"/> SY 2017-18

Procedures	
staff members responsible for administering or operating the MEP, nor any other persons who worked on the initial eligibility determinations being tested)? If independent prospective re-interviews were not administered in any of the three performance periods, please provide an explanation in the “Comment” row at the end of this table.	<input type="checkbox"/> SY 2016-17
Comment:	

FAQ on independent prospective re-interviews:

- a. *What are independent prospective re-interviews?* Independent prospective re-interviews allow confirmation of your State’s eligibility determinations and the accuracy of the numbers of migratory children in your State reports. Independent prospective interviews should be conducted at least once every three years by an independent interviewer, performed on the current year’s identified migratory children.

Obtaining Data from Families	Yes	No
Check the applicable box to indicate how the re-interviews were conducted: <input type="checkbox"/> Face-to-face re-interviews <input type="checkbox"/> Phone Interviews <input type="checkbox"/> Both		
Was there a protocol for verifying all information used in making the original eligibility determination?	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes	<input type="checkbox"/> No
Were re-interviewers independent from the original interviewers?	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes	<input type="checkbox"/> No

If you did conduct independent re-interviews in this reporting period, describe how you ensured that the process was independent. Only enter a response if your State completed independent re-interviews in SY2018-19.

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

In the space below, refer to the results of **any** re-interview processes used by the SEA, and if any of the migratory children were found ineligible, describe those corrective actions or improvements that will be made by the SEA to improve the accuracy of its MEP eligibility determinations.

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

--

In the space below, please respond to the following question:

Does the state collect all the required data elements and data sections on the National Certificate of Eligibility (COE)?	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes	<input type="checkbox"/> No
---	------------------------------	-----------------------------

2.4.5 Academic Status

The following question collect data about the academic status of **eligible** migratory students.

2.4.5.2 HSED (High School Equivalency Diploma)

In the table below, provide the total unduplicated number of **eligible** migratory students who obtained a High School Equivalency Diploma (HSED) by passing a high school equivalency test that your state accepts (e.g. GED, HiSET, TASC).

Obtain HSED	#
Obtained a HSED in your State During the Performance Period	

2.5 PREVENTION AND INTERVENTION PROGRAMS FOR CHILDREN AND YOUTH WHO ARE NEGLECTED, DELINQUENT, OR AT RISK

This section collects data on programs and facilities that serve students who are neglected, delinquent, or at risk under Title I, Part D, and characteristics about and services provided to these students.

Throughout this section:

- Report data for the program year of July 1, 2018 through June 30, 2019.
- Count programs/facilities based on how the program was classified to ED for funding purposes.
- Do not include programs funded solely through Title I, Part A.
- Use the definitions listed below:
 - **Adult Corrections:** An adult correctional institution is a facility in which

persons, including persons 21 or under, are confined as a result of conviction for a criminal offense.

- **At-Risk Programs:** Programs operated (through LEAs) that target students who are at risk of academic failure, dependency adjudication, or delinquency adjudication, have a drug or alcohol problem, are pregnant or parenting, have been in contact with the juvenile justice or child welfare system in the past, are at least 1 year behind the expected age/grade level, are English learners, are gang members, have dropped out of school in the past, or have a high absenteeism rate at school.
- **Juvenile Corrections:** An institution for delinquent children and youth that is a public or private residential facility other than a foster home that is operated for the care of children and youth who have been adjudicated delinquent or in need of supervision. Include any programs serving adjudicated youth (including non-secure facilities and group homes) in this category.
- **Juvenile Detention Facilities:** Detention facilities are shorter-term institutions that provide care to children who require secure custody pending court adjudication, court disposition, or execution of a court order, or care to children after commitment.
- **Neglected Programs:** An institution for neglected children and youth is a public or private residential facility, other than a foster home, that is operated primarily for the care of children who have been committed to the institution or voluntarily placed under applicable State law due to abandonment, neglect, or death of their parents or guardians.
- **Other:** Any other programs, not defined above, that receive Title I, Part D funds and serve non-adjudicated children and youth.

2.5.1 State Agency Title I, Part D Programs and Facilities – Subpart 1

The following questions collect data on Title I, Part D, Subpart 1 programs and facilities.

2.5.1.1 Programs and Facilities - Subpart 1

In the table below, provide the number of State agency Title I, Part D, Subpart 1 programs and facilities that serve neglected and delinquent students and the average length of stay by program/facility type, for these students. Report only programs and facilities that received Title I, Part D, Subpart 1 funding during the reporting year. Count a facility once if it offers only one type of program. If a facility offers more than one type of program (i.e., it is a multipurpose facility), then count each of the separate programs. The total number of programs/facilities will be automatically calculated. Below the table is a FAQ about the data collected in this table.

State Program/Facility Type	# Programs/Facilities	Average Length of Stay in Days
Neglected programs		

State Program/Facility Type	# Programs/Facilities	Average Length of Stay in Days
Juvenile detention		
Juvenile corrections		
Adult corrections		
Other		
Total	(Auto calculated)	

FAQ on Programs and Facilities - Subpart I:

How is average length of stay calculated? The average length of stay should be weighted by number of students and should include the number of days, per visit, for each student enrolled during the reporting year, regardless of entry or exit date. Multiple visits for students who entered more than once during the reporting year can be included. The average length of stay in days should not exceed 365.

2.5.1.2 Programs and Facilities That Reported - Subpart 1

In the table below, provide the number of State agency Title I, Part D, Subpart 1 programs/facilities that reported data on neglected and delinquent students.

The total row will be automatically calculated.

State Program/Facility Type	# Reporting Data
Neglected programs	
Juvenile detention	
Juvenile corrections	
Adult corrections	
Other	
Total	((Auto calculated))

2.5.3 LEA Title I, Part D Programs and Facilities – Subpart 2

The following questions collect data on Title I, Part D, Subpart 2 programs and facilities.

2.5.3.1 Programs and Facilities – Subpart 2

In the table below, provide the number of LEA Title I, Part D, Subpart 2 programs and facilities that serve neglected and delinquent students and the yearly average length of stay by program/facility type for these students. Report only the programs and facilities that received Title I, Part D, Subpart 2 funding during the reporting year. Count a facility once if it offers only one type of program. If a facility offers more than one type of program (i.e., it is a multipurpose facility), then count each of the separate programs. The total number of programs/ facilities will be automatically calculated. Below the table is an FAQ about the data collected in this table.

LEA Program/Facility Type	# Programs/Facilities	Average Length of Stay (# days)
At-risk programs		
Neglected programs		
Juvenile detention		
Juvenile corrections		
Other		
Total	(Auto calculated)	

FAQ on average length of stay:

How is average length of stay calculated? The average length of stay should be weighted by number of students and should include the number of days, per visit for each student enrolled during the reporting year, regardless of entry or exit date. Multiple visits for students who entered more than once during the reporting year can be included. The average length of stay in days should not exceed 365.

2.5.3.2 Programs and Facilities That Reported - Subpart 2

In the table below, provide the number of LEA Title I, Part D, Subpart 2 programs and facilities that reported data on neglected and delinquent students.

The total row will be automatically calculated.

LEA Program/Facility Type	# Reporting Data
At-risk programs	
Neglected programs	
Juvenile detention	
Juvenile corrections	
Other	
Total	(Auto calculated)

2.6 STUDENT SUPPORT AND ACADEMIC ENRICHMENT GRANTS (TITLE IV, PART A)

2.6.1 Funds Spent Under Title IV, Part A

This section collects data on the amount of funds spent by LEAs on the three content areas under Title IV, Part A of the *ESEA*. The data are reported through the Annual Performance Reporting Tool.

Content Area	Amount of Funds Spent
Well-Rounded	
Safe and Healthy Students	

Effective Use of Technology	
-----------------------------	--

2.6.2 LEAs Who Spent Funds Under Title IV, Part A

This section collects data on the number of LEAs who spent funds by the content areas under Title IV, Part A of the *ESEA*. For the “Any” category, report the number of LEAs that spent funds in any of the three content areas. An LEA should be included in the count of each content area it spent funds on (i.e. an LEA may be represented in more than one content area in the table below). The data are reported through the Annual Performance Reporting Tool.

Content Area	Number of LEAs Spending Funds
Well-Rounded	
Safe and Healthy Students	
Effective Use of Technology	
Any Content Area	

2.7 FUNDING TRANSFERABILITY FOR STATE AND LOCAL EDUCATIONAL AGENCIES (TITLE V, PART A)

2.7.1 State Transferability of Funds

In the table below, indicate whether the State transferred funds under the state transferability authority.

Did the State transfer funds under the State Transferability authority of Section 5103(a) during SY2018-19?	YES	NO
	Yes	No

2.7.2 Local Educational Agency (LEA) Transferability of Funds

In the table below, indicate the number of LEAs that notified the State that they transferred funds under the LEA transferability authority.

LEA Transferability of Funds	#
LEAs that notified the State that they were transferring funds under the LEA Transferability authority of Section 5103(b).	

2.7.3 LEA Funds Transfers

In the table below, provide the total number of LEAs that transferred funds from an eligible program to another eligible program.

Program	# LEAs Transferring Funds <u>FROM</u> Eligible Program	# LEAs Transferring Funds <u>TO</u> Eligible Program
Supporting Effective Instruction (Title II, Part A)		
Student Support and Enrichment Grants (Title IV, Part A)		
Improving Basic Programs Operated by LEAs (Title I, Part A)		
Education of Migratory Children (Title I, Part C)		
Prevention and Intervention Programs for Children and Youth Who Are Neglected, Delinquent, or At-Risk (Title I, Part D)		
English Language Acquisition, Language Enhancement, and Academic Achievement Act (Title III, Part A)		
Rural Education Initiative (Title V, Part B)		

In the table below provide the total amount of FY 2018 appropriated funds transferred from and to each eligible program.

Program	Total Amount of Funds Transferred <u>FROM</u> Eligible Program	Total Amount of Funds Transferred <u>TO</u> Eligible Program
Supporting Effective Instruction (Title II, Part A)		
Student Support and Enrichment Grants (Title IV, Part A)		
Improving Basic Programs Operated by LEAs (Title I, Part A)		
Education of Migratory Children (Title I, Part C)		
Prevention and Intervention Programs for Children and Youth Who Are Neglected, Delinquent, or At-Risk (Title I, Part D)		
English Language Acquisition, Language Enhancement, and Academic Achievement		

Program	Total Amount of Funds Transferred <u>FROM</u> Eligible Program	Total Amount of Funds Transferred <u>TO</u> Eligible Program
Act (Title III, Part A)		
Rural Education Initiative (Title V, Part B)		

2.8 RURAL EDUCATION ACHIEVEMENT PROGRAM (REAP)

This section collects data on the Rural Education Achievement Program (REAP) Title V, Part B, Subparts 1 and 2.

2.8.1 LEA Use of Rural Low-Income Schools Program (RLIS) (Title V, Part B, Subpart 2) Grant Funds

In the table below, provide the number of eligible LEAs that used RLIS funds during SY2018-19 for each of the listed purposes.

Purpose	# LEAs
Activities authorized under Part A of Title I	
Activities authorized under Part A of Title II	
Activities authorized under Title III	
Activities authorized under Part A of Title IV	
Parental involvement activities	

2.8.2 RLIS Objectives and Outcomes

In the space below, describe the progress the State has made in meeting the objectives and outcomes for the Rural Low-Income School (RLIS) Program as described in the State’s most current Consolidated State Application. If providing quantitative data along with your narrative, please ensure all data is converted to text format.

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

2.8.3 RLIS Technical Assistance

In the space below, describe the progress the State has made in providing technical assistance for RLIS LEA sub-grantees as described in the State’s most current Consolidated State Application. If providing quantitative data along with your narrative, please ensure all data is converted to text format.

Response is limited to 8,000 characters.

2.8.4 RLIS Subgrant Award Determination

Please report the method the SEA used to award grants to eligible LEAs. If the SEA used a competitive process, please describe that process and include a description of the methods and criteria the SEA used to review applications, award funds to LEAs, and how the LEAs were notified of the process. If the SEA used a formula besides one based on the number of students in average daily attendance served by eligible LEAs in the State, please describe that formula, including an explanation of how this alternative formula enables the SEA to allot grant funds in a manner that serves equal or greater concentrations of children from families with incomes below the poverty line, relative to the concentration that would be served if the SEA used a formula based on the number of students in average daily attendance served by eligible LEAs in the State.

Response is limited to 8,000 characters.

2.8.5 RLIS State Administrative Funds

In the table below, provide information on state administrative funds.

Question	Percentage
What percentage of the RLIS grant funds were retained for State-level administration?	
What percentage of those funds retained for State-level administration were used specifically for technical assistance?	

2.8.6 RLIS LEAs Awarded Funds

Please list the NCES LEA ID and name of each LEA that received RLIS funds and the amount each received. This information will be collected from SEAs outside of the CSPR collection tool.

NCES LEA ID	LEA Name	RLIS Award Amount