

# **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 2005-2006**



**PART I DUE DECEMBER 1, 2006  
PART II DUE FEBRUARY 1, 2007**

**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 – *21<sup>st</sup> 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.*

In addition to the programs cited above, the Title X, Part C - *Education for Homeless Children and Youths* program data will be incorporated in the CSPR for 2005-2006.

The NCLB Consolidated State Performance Report for the 2005-2006 school year consists of two information collections. Part I of this report is due to the Department by December 1, 2006 . Part II is due to the Department by February 1, 2007.

## PART I

Part I of the Consolidated State Report, which States must submit to the Department by **December 1, 2006**, 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 ESEA. The five ESEA Goals established in the June 2002 Consolidated State Application are as follows:

- **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.

## PART II

Part II of the Consolidated State Performance Report consists of information related to State activities and outcomes of specific ESEA programs for the 2005-2006 school year. Part II of the Consolidated State Performance Report is due to the Department by **February 1, 2007**. The information requested in Part II of the Consolidated State Performance Report for the 2005-2006 school year necessarily varies from program to program. However, for all programs, 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 Consolidated State Performance Report is the best vehicle for collection of the data.

The Department is continuing to work with the Performance-Based Data Management Initiative (PBDMI) to streamline data collections for the 2005-2006 school year and beyond.

## GENERAL INSTRUCTIONS AND TIMELINES

All States that received funding on the basis of the Consolidated State Application for the 2005-2006 school year must respond to this Consolidated State Performance Report (CSPR). Part I of the Report is due to the Department by **December 1, 2007**. Part II of the Report is due to the Department by **February 1, 2007**. Both Part I and Part II should reflect data from the 2005-2006 school year, unless otherwise noted.

The format states will use to submit the Consolidated State Performance Report has changed to an online submission. 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 "2005-06 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 2005-2006 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).



**CONSOLIDATED STATE PERFORMANCE REPORT: PART I**

For reporting on  
**School Year 2005-2006**



**PART I DUE DECEMBER 1, 2006**

## **1.1 STANDARDS AND ASSESSMENT DEVELOPMENT**

Section 1111(b)(1) of ESEA requires States to adopt challenging academic content and achievement standards in mathematics, reading/language arts, and science and to develop assessments in mathematics, reading/language arts, and science that meet the requirements of section 1111(b)(3) in the required grade levels. In the following sections, States are asked to provide a detailed description of their progress in meeting the NCLB standards and assessments requirements.

**1.1.1** Please provide a detailed description of the State's progress in adopting challenging academic content standards in science that meet the requirements of section 1111(b)(1).

**State Response**

The Texas Essential Knowledge and Skills were adopted by the State Board of Education in 1997 to be effective in the school year 1998-1999, they include Science, Math, Language Arts, Reading etc. The TEKS are scheduled to undergo a refinement and alignment process, concurrent with the state textbook adoption cycle. The purpose of the review process is to provide better vertical alignment, precision and clarity in the TEKS. The process begins when the State Board of Education nominates teachers in their districts who are asked to serve on educator work groups in order to review initial feedback solicited from the field on proposed TEKS refinements. The educator work groups convenes to review the feedback and use their expertise to make additional proposed refinements as needed. These recommendations are then compiled and posted using an online survey providing another opportunity for all interested stakeholders to give input.

Math was first in the cycle and those changes were adopted for secondary in February 2005 and elementary October 2005 to be implemented in the 2006-2007 school year. The process of revision of the English Language Arts and Reading TEKS began in 2006 and is anticipated to be adopted in 2007. Science is next in queue for this revision process.

**1.1.2** Please provide a detailed description of the State's progress in developing and implementing, in consultation with LEAs, assessments in mathematics, reading/language arts, and science that meet the requirements of section 1111(b)(3) in the required grade levels. Please provide in your response a description of the State's progress in developing alternate assessments for students with disabilities, including alternate assessments aligned to alternate achievement standards and those aligned to grade-level achievement standards.

### State Response

Texas has fully implemented, in consultation with LEAs, assessments that meet the requirements of section 1111(b)(3) in reading at grades 3-9; in writing at grades 4 and 7; in English Language Arts at grades 10 and 11; in mathematics at Grades 3-11; in science at grades 5, 8, 10, 11; and social studies at grades 8, 10, and 11. The alternative assessment component includes the State-Developed Alternative Assessment II and is offered in mathematics and reading grades 3 - 10, and writing grades 4, 7 and 10. The alternative assessment component also includes TAKS Inclusive in science at grades 5, 8, 10, 11; social studies at grades 8, 10, 11; and mathematics and English Language Arts at grade 11. Texas follows a rigorous test development process for all of its assessments. The procedures described below outline the steps used to develop a framework for the tests and provide for ongoing development of test items.

- Committees of Texas educators review the state-mandated curriculum to develop appropriate assessment objectives for a specific grade and/or subject test. Educators provide advice on a model or structure for assessing the particular subject that aligns with good classroom instruction.
- Educator committees work with TEA to prepare draft test objectives, which are distributed widely for review by teachers, curriculum specialists, assessment specialists, and administrators.
- A draft of the objectives and the student expectations to be assessed is refined based on input from Texas educators.
- Prototype test items are written to measure each objective and, when necessary, are piloted by Texas students from volunteer classrooms. (See 'Pilot Testing' later in this chapter.)
- Educator committees assist in developing guidelines for assessing each objective. These guidelines outline the eligible test content and test-item formats and include sample items.
- With educator input, a preliminary test blueprint is developed that sets the length of the test and the number of test items measuring each objective.
- Professional item writers, many of whom are former or current Texas teachers, develop items based on the objectives and the item guidelines.
- TEA curriculum and assessment specialists review and revise the proposed test items.
- Item-review committees composed of Texas educators review the revised items to judge the appropriateness of item content and difficulty and to eliminate potential bias.
- Items are revised again based on input from Texas educator committee meetings and are field-tested with large representative samples of Texas students.
- Field-test data are analyzed for reliability, validity, and possible bias.
- Data-review committees composed of Texas educators are trained in statistical analysis of field-test data and review each item and its associated data. The committees determine whether items are appropriate for inclusion in the bank of items from which test forms are built.
- A final blueprint is developed that establishes the length of the test and the number of test items measuring each objective.

- All field-test items and data are entered into a computerized item bank. Tests are built from the item bank and are designed to be equivalent in difficulty from one administration to the next.
- Tests are administered to Texas students, and results are reported at the student, campus, district, regional, and state levels.
- Stringent quality control measures are applied to all stages of printing, scanning, scoring, and reporting.
- Texas Assessment of Knowledge and Skills (TAKS), Reading Proficiency Tests In English (RPTE), and State-Developed Alternative Assessment (SDAA) tests are released to the public in accordance with state law.
- The State Board of Education uses impact data and the statewide opportunity-to-learn study, along with additional information, to set a passing standard for each new test.
- A technical digest that provides verified technical information about the tests to schools and the public is developed annually.

As applicable, certain steps are repeated annually to ensure that tests of the highest quality are developed.

The state is in the process of redesigning and developing additional assessments for students with disabilities under a flexibility agreement signed with the United States Department of Education.

TAKS-Inclusive (TAKS-I) is an alternate assessment based on grade-level achievement standards. TAKS-I contains the same test items and uses the same passing standard as TAKS. It is currently available in science, social studies, and exit level English language arts and mathematics (grades and subjects where SDAA II is not available). Beginning in spring 2008, TAKS-I will be available in all grades and subjects tested by TAKS. TAKS-I includes format accommodations such as larger font, more white space, fewer items per page, and does not include field-test items. TAKS-I also allows for the use of expanded accommodations with advance written permission from TEA through the submission and approval of an Accommodation Request Form that states why the student requires expanded accommodations.

TAKS-Alternate (TAKS-Alt) is an alternate assessment based on alternate achievement standards. TAKS-Alt is an assessment designed for students with the most significant cognitive disabilities. The TAKS-Alt is an authentic instrument for teachers to use in assessing and documenting their students skills, knowledge, and academic accomplishments linked to the grade-level Texas Essential Knowledge and Skills (TEKS) curriculum. The development process for TAKS-Alt followed, as closely as possible, the same procedures used for all statewide assessments in Texas, coupled with additional requirements specific to TAKS-Alt. In spring 2007, TAKS-Alt is being field tested and all students who meet the TAKS-Alt participation criteria will participate in the universal field test. TAKS-Alt will be fully operational in spring 2008 in all grades and subjects tested by TAKS.

**1.1.3** Please provide a detailed description of the State's progress in setting, in consultation with LEAs, academic achievement standards in mathematics, reading/language arts, and science that meet the requirements of section 1111(b)(1). If applicable, please provide in your response a description of the State's progress in developing alternate achievement standards for students with the most significant cognitive disabilities.

**State Response**

In November 2002 the State Board of Education formally adopted challenging academic achievement standards for the Texas Assessment of Knowledge and Skills (TAKS) in reading/English language arts, mathematics, and science that are specific for each subject and grade assessed. Reading is assessed at grades 3 through 9. English language arts, which is an integrated reading/writing assessment, is assessed at grades 10 and 11. Mathematics is assessed at grades 3-11. Science is assessed at grades 5, 10, and 11. Spanish versions of TAKS are available for all subjects assessed in Grades 3-6. A grade 8 science test was added in spring 2006. The State Board of Education formally adopted challenging academic standards for this TAKS test in October 2005.

The state is in the process of redesigning and developing additional assessments for students with disabilities under a flexibility agreement signed with the United States Department of Education.

**1.2 PARTICIPATION IN STATE ASSESSMENTS****Participation of All Students in 2005-2006 State Assessments**

In the following tables, please provide the total number and percentage for each of the listed subgroups of students who participated in the State's 2005-2006 school year academic assessments.

The data provided below for students with disabilities should include 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.

**1.2.1 Student Participation in 2005-2006 School Year Test Administration****1.2.1.1 2005-2006 School Year Mathematics Assessment**

	<b>Total Number of Students Tested</b>	<b>Percent of Students Tested</b>
All Students	2287062	99.00
American Indian or Alaska Native	7919	99.00
Asian or Pacific Islander	72694	100.00
Black, non-Hispanic	323607	99.00
Hispanic	1022177	99.00
White, non-Hispanic	858101	100.00
Students with Disabilities	286092	99.00
Limited English Proficient	300507	99.00
Economically Disadvantaged	1237177	99.00
Migrant	30769	99.00
Male	1168426	99.00
Female	1117246	99.00

**Comments:** The totals for racial/ethnic group and sex do not equal All Students due to missing values being counted in All Students that are not in either racial/ethnic or sex subgroups.

The percentage of students tested (participants) in each of the three categories is reported independently. The denominator is not the grand total of the students in each category.

- Additional racial/ethnic groups or combinations of racial/ethnic groups may be reported that are consistent with the major racial/ethnic categories that you use under NCLB.

**1.2.1.2 2005-2006 School Year Reading/Language Arts Assessment**

	<b>Total Number of Students Tested</b>	<b>Percent of Students Tested</b>
All Students	2302862	100.00
American Indian or Alaska Native	7981	99.00
Asian or Pacific Islander	73086	100.00
Black, non-Hispanic	325158	99.00
Hispanic	1032707	100.00
White, non-Hispanic	861031	100.00
Students with Disabilities	288117	99.00
Limited English Proficient	308729	100.00
Economically Disadvantaged	1249531	99.00
Migrant	31510	100.00
Male	1177026	99.00
Female	1124358	100.00

**Comments:** The totals for racial/ethnic group and sex do not equal All Students due to missing values being counted in All Students that are not in either racial/ethnic or sex subgroups.

The percentage of students tested (participants) in each of the three categories is reported independently. The denominator is not the grand total of the students in each category.

- Additional racial/ethnic groups or combinations of racial/ethnic groups may be reported that are consistent with the major racial/ethnic categories that you use under NCLB.

### 1.2.2 Participation of Students with Disabilities in State Assessment System

Students with disabilities (as defined under IDEA) participate in the State's assessment system either by taking the regular State assessment, with or without accommodations, by taking an alternate assessment aligned to grade-level standards, or by taking an alternate assessment aligned to alternate achievement standards. In the following table, please provide the total number and percentage of students with disabilities who participated in these various assessments.

The data provided below should include 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.

#### 1.2.2

##### 1.2.2.1 Participation of Students with Disabilities the in 2005-2006 School Year Test Administration -- Math Assessment

	Total Number of Students with Disabilities Tested	Percent of Students with Disabilities Tested
Regular Assessment, with or without accommodations	93550	99.00
Alternate Assessment Aligned to Grade-Level Achievement Standards	59834	99.00
Alternate Assessment Aligned to Alternate Achievement Standards	132708	99.00
<b>Comments:</b> The percentage of students tested (participants) in each of the three categories is reported independently. The denominator is not the grand total of the students in each category.		

##### 1.2.2.2 Participation of Students with Disabilities the in 2005-2006 School Year Test Administration -- Reading/Language Arts Assessment

	Total Number of Students with Disabilities Tested	Percent of Students with Disabilities Tested
Regular Assessment, with or without accommodations	91618	99.00
Alternate Assessment Aligned to Grade-Level Achievement Standards	56902	99.00
Alternate Assessment Aligned to Alternate Achievement Standards	139597	99.00
<b>Comments:</b> The percentage of students tested (participants) in each of the three categories is reported independently. The denominator is not the grand total of the students in each category.		

### **1.3 STUDENT ACADEMIC ACHIEVEMENT**

In the following charts, please provide student achievement data from the 2005-2006 school year test administration. Charts have been provided for each of grades 3 through 8 and high school to accommodate the varied State assessment systems in mathematics and reading/language arts during the 2005-2006 school year. States should provide data on the total number of students tested as well as the percentage of students scoring at the proficient or advanced levels for those grades in which the State administered mathematics and reading/language arts assessments during the 2005-2006 school year.

The data for students with disabilities should include participation results from all students with disabilities as defined under the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act, including results from alternate assessments, and do not include results from students covered under Section 504 of the Rehabilitation Act of 1973.

**1.3.1 Grade 3 - Mathematics**

	<b>Total Number of Students Tested</b>	<b>Percent of Students Proficient or Advanced School Year 2005-2006</b>
All Students	316642	80.00
American Indian or Alaska Native	1067	82.00
Asian or Pacific Islander	10447	94.00
Black, non-Hispanic	42393	69.00
Hispanic	150522	75.00
White, non-Hispanic	112209	90.00
Students with Disabilities	36048	66.00
Limited English Proficient	85247	73.00
Economically Disadvantaged	186341	73.00
Migrant	4177	68.00
Male	162093	80.00
Female	154546	80.00

**Comments:** For the migrant student group, the decrease in the number tested reflects the decrease in the statewide count of migrant students enrolled in Texas public schools from the prior year due to changes in eligibility for migrant services.

Section 1.2.1 represents Student Participation while Section 1.3.1 represents Student Academic Achievement. TEA interprets the term "tested" as "participants." Certain students are counted as participants but do not have a scorable test (students who are mobile, do not complete the test, etc.) and therefore are not included in the performance calculation.

- Additional racial/ethnic groups or combinations of racial/ethnic groups may be reported that are consistent with the major racial/ethnic categories that you use under NCLB.

**1.3.2 Grade 3 - Reading/Language Arts**

	<b>Total Number of Students Tested</b>	<b>Percent of Students Proficient or Advanced School Year 2005-2006</b>
All Students	313329	92.00
American Indian or Alaska Native	1056	93.00
Asian or Pacific Islander	10432	97.00
Black, non-Hispanic	41904	87.00
Hispanic	148287	89.00
White, non-Hispanic	111645	96.00
Students with Disabilities	34331	68.00
Limited English Proficient	83511	87.00
Economically Disadvantaged	183564	88.00
Migrant	4088	84.00
Male	160326	90.00
Female	153000	93.00

**Comments:** For the migrant student group, the decrease in the number tested reflects the decrease in the statewide count of migrant students enrolled in Texas public schools from the prior year due to changes in eligibility for migrant services.

For the special education student group, the decrease in the number tested reflects the decrease in the number of special education students taking the grade 3 reading alternate assessment between 2005 and 2006.

Section 1.2.1 represents Student Participation while Section 1.3.2 represents Student Academic Achievement. TEA interprets the term "tested" as "participants." Certain students are counted as participants but do not have a scorable test (students who are mobile, do not complete the test, etc.) and therefore are not included in the performance

calculation.

- Additional racial/ethnic groups or combinations of racial/ethnic groups may be reported that are consistent with the major racial/ethnic categories that you use under NCLB.

**1.3.3 Grade 4 - Mathematics**

	<b>Total Number of Students Tested</b>	<b>Percent of Students Proficient or Advanced School Year 2005-2006</b>
All Students	307248	82.00
American Indian or Alaska Native	1003	84.00
Asian or Pacific Islander	10117	95.00
Black, non-Hispanic	40998	71.00
Hispanic	142719	77.00
White, non-Hispanic	112388	90.00
Students with Disabilities	38391	67.00
Limited English Proficient	76650	75.00
Economically Disadvantaged	176516	75.00
Migrant	3938	70.00
Male	156751	82.00
Female	150487	81.00

**Comments:** For the migrant student group, the decrease in the number tested reflects the decrease in the statewide count of migrant students enrolled in Texas public schools from the prior year due to changes in eligibility for migrant services.

Section 1.2.1 represents Student Participation while Section 1.3.3 represents Student Academic Achievement. TEA interprets the term "tested" as "participants." Certain students are counted as participants but do not have a scorable test (students who are mobile, do not complete the test, etc.) and therefore are not included in the performance calculation.

- Additional racial/ethnic groups or combinations of racial/ethnic groups may be reported that are consistent with the major racial/ethnic categories that you use under NCLB.

**1.3.4 Grade 4 - Reading/Language Arts**

	<b>Total Number of Students Tested</b>	<b>Percent of Students Proficient or Advanced School Year 2005-2006</b>
All Students	307426	80.00
American Indian or Alaska Native	1001	84.00
Asian or Pacific Islander	10126	91.00
Black, non-Hispanic	40965	71.00
Hispanic	143070	75.00
White, non-Hispanic	112243	90.00
Students with Disabilities	38429	62.00
Limited English Proficient	77115	71.00
Economically Disadvantaged	176817	73.00
Migrant	3969	65.00
Male	156852	78.00
Female	150565	83.00

**Comments:** For the migrant student group, the decrease in the number tested reflects the decrease in the statewide count of migrant students enrolled in Texas public schools from the prior year due to changes in eligibility for migrant services.

Section 1.2.1 represents Student Participation while Section 1.3.4 represents Student Academic Achievement. TEA interprets the term "tested" as "participants." Certain students are counted as participants but do not have a scorable test (students who are mobile, do not complete the test, etc.) and therefore are not included in the performance calculation.

- Additional racial/ethnic groups or combinations of racial/ethnic groups may be reported that are consistent with the major racial/ethnic categories that you use under NCLB.



**1.3.5 Grade 5 - Mathematics**

	<b>Total Number of Students Tested</b>	<b>Percent of Students Proficient or Advanced School Year 2005-2006</b>
All Students	315183	88.00
American Indian or Alaska Native	1106	90.00
Asian or Pacific Islander	9876	96.00
Black, non-Hispanic	43403	80.00
Hispanic	145837	84.00
White, non-Hispanic	114951	94.00
Students with Disabilities	41743	72.00
Limited English Proficient	71423	80.00
Economically Disadvantaged	180686	83.00
Migrant	4174	78.00
Male	160937	88.00
Female	154238	88.00

**Comments:** For the migrant student group, the decrease in the number tested reflects the decrease in the statewide count of migrant students enrolled in Texas public schools from the prior year due to changes in eligibility for migrant services.

For the American Indian or Alaska Native student group, since there are a small number of students tested, relatively small increases in student enrollment from year to year contributes to larger fluctuations in percentages of students tested.

Section 1.2.1 represents Student Participation while Section 1.3.5 represents Student Academic Achievement. TEA interprets the term "tested" as "participants." Certain students are counted as participants but do not have a scorable test (students who are mobile, do not complete the test, etc.) and therefore are not included in the performance calculation.

- Additional racial/ethnic groups or combinations of racial/ethnic groups may be reported that are consistent with the major racial/ethnic categories that you use under NCLB.

**1.3.6 Grade 5 - Reading/Language Arts**

	<b>Total Number of Students Tested</b>	<b>Percent of Students Proficient or Advanced School Year 2005-2006</b>
All Students	313017	86.00
American Indian or Alaska Native	1098	91.00
Asian or Pacific Islander	9838	95.00
Black, non-Hispanic	43190	79.00
Hispanic	144300	81.00
White, non-Hispanic	114584	94.00
Students with Disabilities	41579	67.00
Limited English Proficient	70228	75.00
Economically Disadvantaged	178929	80.00
Migrant	4111	72.00
Male	159869	85.00
Female	153142	87.00

**Comments:** For the migrant student group, the decrease in the number tested reflects the decrease in the statewide count of migrant students enrolled in Texas public schools from the prior year due to changes in eligibility for migrant services.

For the American Indian or Alaska Native student group, since there are a small number of students tested, relatively small increases in student enrollment from year to year contributes to larger fluctuations in percentages of students tested.

Section 1.2.1 represents Student Participation while Section 1.3.6 represents Student Academic Achievement. TEA interprets the term "tested" as "participants." Certain students are counted as participants but do not have a scorable test (students who are mobile, do not complete the test, etc.) and therefore are not included in the performance calculation.

- Additional racial/ethnic groups or combinations of racial/ethnic groups may be reported that are consistent with the major racial/ethnic categories that you use under NCLB.
-

**1.3.7 Grade 6 - Mathematics**

	<b>Total Number of Students Tested</b>	<b>Percent of Students Proficient or Advanced School Year 2005-2006</b>
All Students	302165	79.00
American Indian or Alaska Native	966	82.00
Asian or Pacific Islander	9598	93.00
Black, non-Hispanic	41983	67.00
Hispanic	134950	73.00
White, non-Hispanic	114658	88.00
Students with Disabilities	40875	64.00
Limited English Proficient	49051	64.00
Economically Disadvantaged	165846	71.00
Migrant	3917	67.00
Male	154727	78.00
Female	147429	79.00

**Comments:** For the migrant student group, the decrease in the number tested reflects the decrease in the statewide count of migrant students enrolled in Texas public schools from the prior year due to changes in eligibility for migrant services.

For the LEP student group, additional training and staff development resources for the administration of the linguistically accommodated mathematics assessments contributed to the performance gains between 2005 and 2006.

Section 1.2.1 represents Student Participation while Section 1.3.7 represents Student Academic Achievement. TEA interprets the term "tested" as "participants." Certain students are counted as participants but do not have a scorable test (students who are mobile, do not complete the test, etc.) and therefore are not included in the performance calculation.

- Additional racial/ethnic groups or combinations of racial/ethnic groups may be reported that are consistent with the major racial/ethnic categories that you use under NCLB.

**1.3.8 Grade 6 - Reading/Language Arts**

	<b>Total Number of Students Tested</b>	<b>Percent of Students Proficient or Advanced School Year 2005-2006</b>
All Students	302129	89.00
American Indian or Alaska Native	965	91.00
Asian or Pacific Islander	9593	96.00
Black, non-Hispanic	41960	85.00
Hispanic	135042	85.00
White, non-Hispanic	114557	94.00
Students with Disabilities	40898	69.00
Limited English Proficient	49195	76.00
Economically Disadvantaged	165907	84.00
Migrant	3926	78.00
Male	154712	87.00
Female	147408	91.00

**Comments:** For the migrant student group, the decrease in the number tested reflects the decrease in the statewide count of migrant students enrolled in Texas public schools from the prior year due to changes in eligibility for migrant services.

Section 1.2.1 represents Student Participation while Section 1.3.8 represents Student Academic Achievement. TEA interprets the term "tested" as "participants." Certain students are counted as participants but do not have a scorable

test (students who are mobile, do not complete the test, etc.) and therefore are not included in the performance calculation.

- Additional racial/ethnic groups or combinations of racial/ethnic groups may be reported that are consistent with the major racial/ethnic categories that you use under NCLB.

**1.3.9 Grade 7 - Mathematics**

	<b>Total Number of Students Tested</b>	<b>Percent of Students Proficient or Advanced School Year 2005-2006</b>
All Students	313496	71.00
American Indian or Alaska Native	1059	76.00
Asian or Pacific Islander	9555	91.00
Black, non-Hispanic	44931	57.00
Hispanic	138571	63.00
White, non-Hispanic	119352	83.00
Students with Disabilities	39013	62.00
Limited English Proficient	42455	48.00
Economically Disadvantaged	168473	61.00
Migrant	4211	55.00
Male	160474	71.00
Female	153007	70.00

**Comments:** For the migrant student group, the decrease in the number tested reflects the decrease in the statewide count of migrant students enrolled in Texas public schools from the prior year due to changes in eligibility for migrant services.

Section 1.2.1 represents Student Participation while Section 1.3.9 represents Student Academic Achievement. TEA interprets the term "tested" as "participants." Certain students are counted as participants but do not have a scorable test (students who are mobile, do not complete the test, etc.) and therefore are not included in the performance calculation.

- Additional racial/ethnic groups or combinations of racial/ethnic groups may be reported that are consistent with the major racial/ethnic categories that you use under NCLB.

**1.3.10 Grade 7 - Reading/Language Arts**

	<b>Total Number of Students Tested</b>	<b>Percent of Students Proficient or Advanced School Year 2005-2006</b>
All Students	313394	78.00
American Indian or Alaska Native	1056	83.00
Asian or Pacific Islander	9541	91.00
Black, non-Hispanic	44914	69.00
Hispanic	138591	71.00
White, non-Hispanic	119264	88.00
Students with Disabilities	39044	63.00
Limited English Proficient	42499	53.00
Economically Disadvantaged	168454	70.00
Migrant	4234	61.00
Male	160459	75.00
Female	152920	81.00

**Comments:** For the migrant student group, the decrease in the number tested reflects the decrease in the statewide count of migrant students enrolled in Texas public schools from the prior year due to changes in eligibility for migrant services.

Section 1.2.1 represents Student Participation while Section 1.3.10 represents Student Academic Achievement. TEA interprets the term "tested" as "participants." Certain students are counted as participants but do not have a scorable test (students who are mobile, do not complete the test, etc.) and therefore are not included in the performance calculation.

- Additional racial/ethnic groups or combinations of racial/ethnic groups may be reported that are consistent with the major racial/ethnic categories that you use under NCLB.



**1.3.11 Grade 8 - Mathematics**

	<b>Total Number of Students Tested</b>	<b>Percent of Students Proficient or Advanced School Year 2005-2006</b>
All Students	310570	68.00
American Indian or Alaska Native	1005	71.00
Asian or Pacific Islander	9524	89.00
Black, non-Hispanic	44077	55.00
Hispanic	133984	59.00
White, non-Hispanic	121965	81.00
Students with Disabilities	37675	64.00
Limited English Proficient	35089	44.00
Economically Disadvantaged	160697	58.00
Migrant	4079	53.00
Male	158687	68.00
Female	151871	68.00

**Comments:** For the migrant student group, the decrease in the number tested reflects the decrease in the statewide count of migrant students enrolled in Texas public schools from the prior year due to changes in eligibility for migrant services.

For the LEP student group, additional training and staff development resources for the administration of the reading/ELA and mathematics assessments for English language learners contributed to the increased participation between 2005 and 2006.

Section 1.2.1 represents Student Participation while Section 1.3.11 represents Student Academic Achievement. TEA interprets the term "tested" as "participants." Certain students are counted as participants but do not have a scorable test (students who are mobile, do not complete the test, etc.) and therefore are not included in the performance calculation.

- Additional racial/ethnic groups or combinations of racial/ethnic groups may be reported that are consistent with the major racial/ethnic categories that you use under NCLB.

**1.3.12 Grade 8 - Reading/Language Arts**

	<b>Total Number of Students Tested</b>	<b>Percent of Students Proficient or Advanced School Year 2005-2006</b>
All Students	310516	83.00
American Indian or Alaska Native	1004	87.00
Asian or Pacific Islander	9511	93.00
Black, non-Hispanic	44077	77.00
Hispanic	133994	76.00
White, non-Hispanic	121917	92.00
Students with Disabilities	37703	68.00
Limited English Proficient	35109	56.00
Economically Disadvantaged	160678	75.00
Migrant	4100	67.00
Male	158652	81.00
Female	151852	85.00

**Comments:** For the migrant student group, the decrease in the number tested reflects the decrease in the statewide count of migrant students enrolled in Texas public schools from the prior year due to changes in eligibility for migrant services.

For the LEP student group, additional training and staff development resources for the administration of the reading/ELA and mathematics assessments for English language learners contributed to the increased participation

between 2005 and 2006.

Section 1.2.1 represents Student Participation while Section 1.3.12 represents Student Academic Achievement. TEA interprets the term "tested" as "participants." Certain students are counted as participants but do not have a scorable test (students who are mobile, do not complete the test, etc.) and therefore are not included in the performance calculation.

- Additional racial/ethnic groups or combinations of racial/ethnic groups may be reported that are consistent with the major racial/ethnic categories that you use under NCLB.
-

**1.3.13 High School - Mathematics**

	<b>Total Number of Students Tested</b>	<b>Percent of Students Proficient or Advanced School Year 2005-2006</b>
All Students	284485	62.00
American Indian or Alaska Native	957	70.00
Asian or Pacific Islander	9530	84.00
Black, non-Hispanic	39807	46.00
Hispanic	112879	52.00
White, non-Hispanic	121242	76.00
Students with Disabilities	31144	59.00
Limited English Proficient	21342	34.00
Economically Disadvantaged	122839	51.00
Migrant	3364	45.00
Male	143324	64.00
Female	141144	61.00

**Comments:** For the migrant and LEP student groups, additional training and staff development resources for the administration of the linguistically accommodated mathematics assessments contribute to the performance gains between 2006 and 2005 for English language learners.

Section 1.2.1 represents Student Participation while Section 1.3.13 represents Student Academic Achievement. TEA interprets the term "tested" as "participants." Certain students are counted as participants but do not have a scorable test (students who are mobile, do not complete the test, etc.) and therefore are not included in the performance calculation.

- Additional racial/ethnic groups or combinations of racial/ethnic groups may be reported that are consistent with the major racial/ethnic categories that you use under NCLB.

**1.3.14 High School - Reading/Language Arts**

	<b>Total Number of Students Tested</b>	<b>Percent of Students Proficient or Advanced School Year 2005-2006</b>
All Students	288621	84.00
American Indian or Alaska Native	972	88.00
Asian or Pacific Islander	9593	92.00
Black, non-Hispanic	40399	79.00
Hispanic	115301	78.00
White, non-Hispanic	122306	91.00
Students with Disabilities	31043	64.00
Limited English Proficient	22073	49.00
Economically Disadvantaged	125409	77.00
Migrant	3469	70.00
Male	145676	80.00
Female	142941	89.00

**Comments:** For the migrant and LEP student groups, additional training and staff development resources for the administration of the linguistically accommodated mathematics assessments contribute to the performance gains between 2006 and 2005 for English language learners.

Student performance on the grade 10 English language arts (ELA) test improved considerably from the prior year, particularly on the written composition portion of the ELA test.

Section 1.2.1 represents Student Participation while Section 1.3.14 represents Student Academic Achievement. TEA interprets the term "tested" as "participants." Certain students are counted as participants but do not have a scorable test (students who are mobile, do not complete the test, etc.) and therefore are not included in the performance

calculation.

- Additional racial/ethnic groups or combinations of racial/ethnic groups may be reported that are consistent with the major racial/ethnic categories that you use under NCLB.

**1.4 SCHOOL AND DISTRICT ACCOUNTABILITY**

**1.4.1** For all public elementary and secondary schools and districts in the State (Title I and non-Title I), please provide the total number and percentage of all schools and districts that made adequate yearly progress (AYP), based on data from the 2005-2006 school year.

School Accountability	Total number of public elementary and secondary schools (Title I and non-Title I) in State	Total number of public elementary and secondary schools (Title I and non-Title I) in State that made AYP	Percentage of public elementary and secondary schools (Title I and non-Title I) in State that made AYP
Based on 2005-2006 School Year Data	7956	6437	80.90

**Comments:**

District Accountability	Total number of public elementary and secondary districts (Title I and non-Title I) in State	Total number of public elementary and secondary districts (Title I and non-Title I) in State that made AYP	Percentage of public elementary and secondary districts (Title I and non-Title I) in State that made AYP
Based on 2005-2006 School Year Data	1227	1063	86.60

**Comments:**

**1.4.2** For all Title I schools and districts in the State, please provide the total number and percentage of all Title I schools and districts that made AYP, based on data from the 2005-2006 school year.

Title I School Accountability	Total number of Title I schools in State	Total number of Title I schools in State that made AYP	Percentage of Title I schools in State that made AYP
Based on 2005-2006 School Year Data	5342	4623	86.50

**Comments:**

Title I District Accountability	Total number of Title I districts in State	Total number of Title I districts in State that made AYP	Percentage of Title I districts in State that made AYP
Based on 2005-2006 School Year Data	1194	1034	86.60

**Comments:**

### **1.4.3 Title I Schools Identified for Improvement**

**1.4.3.1** Title I Schools Identified for Improvement, Corrective Action, and Restructuring (in 2006-2007 based on the data from 2005-2006)

**1.4.3.2** Briefly describe the measures being taken to address the achievement problems of **schools** identified for improvement, corrective action, and restructuring.

Technical assistance is available to Title I campuses identified for the Title I School Improvement Program (SIP) through the School Improvement Resource Center (SIRC). SIRC is a statewide initiative, funded by TEA, that serves in an advisory capacity as a support system to schools in need of improvement that receive the supplemental SIP funds as they move through the school improvement process.

The purpose of the School Improvement Resource Center is to work in conjunction with the Texas Education Agency to improve student performance by providing schools with information, clarification, resources, and technical assistance regarding the school improvement process as outlined by the No Child Left Behind Act.

Through an on-site visit and campus needs assessment conducted by SIRC, a school revises its Campus Improvement Plan to strategically address its needs. Then SIRC assists the campus administration in selecting a Technical Assistance Provider whose skill-set matches the needs of the school. Throughout a school's tenure in the School Improvement Program, SIRC works with the school and its Technical Assistance Provider fulfilling the role of the school support team by visiting the campus and maintaining frequent contact to provide resources, guidance, and support.

The goals of the School Improvement Resource Center include developing increased leadership capacity in administrators and building knowledge of content and instructional strategies in teachers. The aim is to raise learning expectations for teachers, students, and administrators and to create a learning culture that facilitates improved student performance.

The School Improvement Resource Center:

- Provides information and clarification regarding Title I, Part A, School Improvement requirements
- Conducts needs assessments through on-site visits
- Assists school personnel and Title I representatives in developing and implementing an effective Campus Improvement Plan
- Assists school administration in selecting a Campus Mentor or Technical Assistance Provider who will ensure the Campus Improvement Plan is being followed, monitored, and modified
- Serves as a resource for schools and for Campus Mentor or Technical Assistance Providers as schools implement their Campus Improvement Plans
- Manages the application process for Campus Mentor or Technical Assistance Providers
- Oversees the approval and renewal process for Supplemental Education Services providers for schools moving in to years 2-5 of the school improvement process
- Offers networking opportunities for School Improvement Campuses with Distinguished Schools
- Provides conferences with 'Best Practices' that will accelerate the improvement process on a campus

Stage 1 SIP campus principals are required to participate in the Campus Administrator Mentor Program (CAMP) and receive on-site visits and follow-up contacts. Administrative mentoring and coaching are vital components to any leadership development program. Experienced educators can help principals develop personal and professional skills necessary for effective leadership. Stage 1 Mentors are experienced educators and former administrators who will work closely with the principal to build a relationship of trust, to encourage individual capacity for leadership, and to target school improvement.

The Technical Assistance Provider, or TAP, serves as a hands-on consultant who works with Stage 2 and above

campus administration and faculty to guide the school through the improvement process. Ultimately, the TAP works to create a collaborative and positive school environment, develop increased leadership capacity in administrators, build content knowledge and teaching strategies in teachers, serve as a liaison with the regional Education Service Center to locate and arrange professional development customized to individual teacher needs, promote student achievement through specific mentoring and monitoring systems, and establish a teaching-learning community. These goals are achieved through analyzing the Campus Improvement Plan, observing the campus and classrooms, making recommendations, and collaborating with school personnel to implement, monitor, and adjust strategic plans designed to achieve the Campus Improvement Plan goals. In response to needs revealed by data disaggregation and observation, the TAP provides targeted training to school personnel in skills and practices relevant to their individual roles and the monitoring of student progress. The TAP uses a broad knowledge of scientific or evidence based resources and materials to address the range of administrative, curricular, or instructional needs that might be present on a campus in need of improvement.

Since the ability to stimulate and achieve school improvement is the core function of the TAP, the TAP application, resume, and the three references are examined for a past history of improving student performance in a school. Specific experience and abilities are listed for future matches with school needs identified in site visits. After SIRC initial site visits, TAP skill sets are matched with school needs. Schools are notified of possible potential TAPs, and the school makes the final TAP selection from the recommendations.

The TAP and school contract for the number of days and types of service. The SIRC office provides a minimum and maximum range of acceptable days of service. The school and TAP may agree to exceed the maximum, but are bound by a Letter of Agreement to the minimum number of days. The TAP and school are responsible for the contract; this remains outside the purview of the SIRC.

---

**1.4.4 Title I Districts Identified For Improvement.**

**1.4.4.1** Title I Districts Identified for Improvement and Corrective Action (in 2006-2007 based on the data from 2005-2006)

**1.4.4.2** Briefly describe the measures being taken to address the achievement problems of districts identified for improvement and corrective action.

Technical assistance is available to Title I LEAs identified for the Title I School Improvement Program (SIP) through the Statewide School Support Team Initiative (SSTI). SSTI is a statewide initiative, funded by TEA, that serves as a support system to districts in need of improvement as they move through the school improvement process.

The purpose of the SSTI is to work in conjunction with the Texas Education Agency to improve student performance by providing districts with information and professional development regarding the school improvement process as outlined by the No Child Left Behind Act.

**1.4.5 Public School Choice and Supplemental Educational Services**

<b>1.4.5.1 Public School Choice</b>		<b>Number</b>
1. Please provide the number of Title I schools identified for improvement, corrective action, and restructuring from which students transferred under the provisions for public school choice under section 1116 of Title I during the 2005-2006 school year.		183
2. Please provide the number of public schools to which students transferred under the provisions for public school choice under section 1116 of Title I during the 2005-2006 school year.		258
How many of these schools were charter schools?		0
3. Please provide the number of students who transferred to another public school under the provisions for public school choice under section 1116 of Title I during the 2005-2006 school year.		1209
4. Please provide the number of students who were eligible to transfer to another public school under the provisions for public school choice under section 1116 of Title I during the 2005-2006 school year.		157461
<b>Optional Information:</b>		
5. If the State has the following data, the Department would be interested in knowing the following:		
6. The number of students who applied to transfer to another public school under the provisions for public school choice under section 1116 of Title I during the 2005-2006 school year.		1302
7. The number of students, among those who applied to transfer to another public school under the Title I public school choice provisions, who were actually offered the opportunity to transfer by their LEAs, during the 2005-2006 school year.		0
<b>Comments:</b> DNA for number 2 (charters) and number 7		

<b>1.4.5.2 Supplemental Educational Services</b>	
	<b>Number</b>
1. Please provide the number of Title I schools identified for improvement, corrective action, and restructuring whose students received supplemental educational services under section 1116 of Title I during the 2005-2006 school year.	63
2. Please provide the number of students who received supplemental educational services under section 1116 of Title I during the 2005-2006 school year.	1136
3. Please provide the number of students who were eligible to receive supplemental educational services under section 1116 of Title I during the 2005-2006 school year.	61796
<b>Optional Information:</b>	
If the State has the following data, the Department would be interested in knowing the following:	
4. The number of students who applied to receive supplemental educational services under section 1116 of Title I during the 2005-2006 school year.	1198
<b>Comments:</b>	

**1.5 TEACHER AND PARAPROFESSIONAL QUALITY**

**1.5.1** In the following table, please provide data from the 2005-2006 school year for classes in the core academic subjects being taught by "highly qualified" teachers (as the term is defined in Section 9101(23) of the ESEA), in the aggregate for all schools and in "high-poverty" and "low-poverty" elementary schools (as the terms are defined in Section 1111(h)(1)(C)(viii) of the ESEA). Section 1111(h)(1)(C)(viii) defines "high-poverty" schools as schools in the top quartile of poverty in the State and "low-poverty" schools as schools in the bottom quartile of poverty in the State. Additionally, please provide information on classes being taught by highly qualified teachers by the elementary and secondary school level.

<b>School Type</b>	<b>Total Number of Core Academic Classes</b>	<b>Number of Core Academic Classes Taught by Highly Qualified Teachers</b>	<b>Percentage of Core Academic Classes Taught by Highly Qualified Teachers</b>
<b>All Schools in State</b>	743088	714676	96.20
<b>Elementary Level</b>			
<b>High-Poverty Schools</b>	47591	46609	97.90
<b>Low-Poverty Schools</b>	37454	37324	99.70
<b>All Elementary Schools</b>	174878	168033	96.10
<b>Secondary Level</b>			
<b>High-Poverty Schools</b>	84668	80571	95.20
<b>Low-Poverty Schools</b>	191211	186283	97.40
<b>All Secondary Schools</b>	568210	546643	96.20
<b>Comments:</b>			

**Definitions and Instructions**

*What are the core academic subjects?*

**English, reading or 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.**

***How is a teacher defined?***

An individual who provides instruction in the core academic areas to kindergarten, grades 1 through 12, or un-graded 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]

***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].

***Should 6th, 7th, and 8th grade classes be reported in the elementary or 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 if their schools are configured as elementary or middle schools.

***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.

*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 English, calculus, history, and science are taught in a self-contained classroom by the same teacher, count these as four classes in the denominator. If the teacher is Highly Qualified in English and history, he/she would be counted as Highly Qualified in two of the four subjects in the numerator.

**1.5.2** For those classes in core academic subjects being taught by teachers who are **not highly qualified** as reported in Question 1.5.1, estimate the percentages of those classes in the following categories (Note: Percentages should add to 100 percent of classes taught by not highly qualified teachers for each level).

<b>Reason For Being Classified as Not Highly Qualified</b>	<b>Percentage</b>
<b>ELEMENTARY SCHOOL CLASSES</b>	
a) 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	36.20
b) 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	9.80
c) Elementary school classes taught by teachers who are not fully certified (and are not in an approved alternative route program)	54.00
d) Other (please explain)	0.00
<b>SECONDARY SCHOOL CLASSES</b>	
a) 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)	35.10
b) Secondary school classes taught by certified special education teachers who have not demonstrated subject-matter competency in those subjects	34.30
c) Secondary school classes taught by teachers who are not fully certified (and are not in an approved alternative route program)	25.50
d) Other (please explain)	5.10

**Comments:** Various unique circumstances such as:

- substitutes filling vacancies
- waiting on out-of-state credentials to be verified/provided

**1.5.3** Please report the State poverty quartile breaks for high- and low-poverty elementary and secondary schools used in the table in Question 1.5.1.

	High-Poverty Schools (more than what %)	Low-Poverty Schools (less than what %)
<b>Elementary Schools</b>	79.70	34.80
<b>Poverty Metric Used</b>	Percentage of low income from 05-06 Title I, Part A application	
<b>Secondary Schools</b>	79.70	34.80
<b>Poverty Metric Used</b>	Percentage of low income from 05-06 Title I, Part A application	

**Comments:**

### Definitions and Instructions

*How are the poverty quartiles determined?*

Separately rank order elementary and secondary schools from highest to lowest on your percent poverty measure. Divide the list into 4 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.

*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-5 (including K-8 or K-12 schools) and would therefore include as secondary schools those that exclusively serve children in grades 6 and higher.

**1.5.4 Paraprofessional Quality.** NCLB defines a qualified paraprofessional as an employee who provides instructional support in a program supported by Title I, Part A funds who has (1) completed two years of study at an institution of higher education; (2) obtained an associate's (or higher) degree; or (3) met a rigorous standard of quality and be able to demonstrate, through a formal State or local academic assessment, knowledge of and the ability to assist in instructing reading, writing, and mathematics (or, as appropriate, reading readiness, writing readiness, and mathematics readiness) (Section 1119(c) and (d).) For more information on qualified paraprofessionals, please refer to the Title I paraprofessionals Guidance, available at:

<http://www.ed.gov/policy/elsec/guid/paraguidance.doc>

In the following chart, please provide data from the 2005-2006 school year for the percentage of Title I paraprofessionals (excluding those with sole duties as translators and parental involvement assistants) who are qualified.

School Year	Percentage of Qualified Title I Paraprofessionals
2005-2006 School Year	97.30

**Comments:**

**1.6 ENGLISH LANGUAGE PROFICIENCY****1.6.1.1 English Language Proficiency (ELP) Standards**

Has the State developed ELP standards (k-12) as required under Section 3113(b)(2) and are these ELP standards fully approved, adopted, or sanctioned by the State governing body?

Developed	Yes
Approved, adopted, sanctioned	Yes
Operationalized (e.g., Are standards being used by district and school teachers?)	Yes

Please provide a detailed description of the State's progress in establishing, implementing, and operationalizing English Language Proficiency (ELP) standards for raising the level of ELP, that are derived from the four domains of speaking, listening, reading, and writing, and that are aligned with achievement of the challenging State academic content and student academic achievement standards described in section 1111(b)(1).

**STATE RESPONSE**

Texas is in the process of developing revised ELP standards. These standards, which are part of the Texas Essential Knowledge and Skills (TEKS) state-mandated curriculum, were a discussion item for the State Board of Education (SBOE) on November 16, 2006. It is anticipated that the SBOE will adopt the revised ELP standards in spring 2007 so that they will be in effect beginning with the 2007-2008 school year. The State is proposing that the SBOE adopt the ELP standards within 19 Texas Administrative Code Chapter 74, Curriculum Requirements, Subchapter A, Required Curriculum under sections 74.4.

The current second language acquisition skills of the ELP standards enable English language learners (ELLs) to become fluent in the reading, writing, listening and speaking of English in the academic content areas. The current second language acquisition skills apply to all the content area classes of ELLs, whether the students are learning mathematics, science, or other subjects.

The revised ELP standards, if adopted as proposed, will accompany the knowledge and skills of each subject of the TEKS state-mandated curriculum, including mathematics. The ELP standards will be organized as follows:

- 1) Introduction explaining the goals of the revised ELP standards and their required use in all instruction provided to English language learners;
- 2) Second language acquisition knowledge and skills for the linguistic domains of listening, speaking, reading, and writing applied to subject area learning (including mathematics); and
- 3) Proficiency level descriptors that align to the second language acquisition standards and ELP assessments and that define the ability of ELLs to understand and use increasingly complex English during grade-level academic instruction.

**1.6.1.2 Alignment of Standards**

Please provide a detailed description of the State's progress for linking/aligning the State English Proficiency Standards to the State academic content and student academic achievement standards in English language arts/reading and mathematics.

**STATE RESPONSE**

The introduction to the current ESL TEKS (ELP standards) outlines three English language proficiency levels: beginning, intermediate, and advanced. The revised ELP standards will include the fourth proficiency level (advanced high), which has been added to enable the State to distinguish the English-proficient level required for Title III reporting.

The ELP standards described above, if adopted as proposed, will be part of the required knowledge and skills of each subject, including mathematics. The ELP standards will be published with each subjects content standards and will explicitly require ELLs to be taught the subject matter using linguistic accommodations commensurate with their linguistic needs and in alignment with the subjects content and achievement expectations.

**1.6.2 English Language Proficiency (ELP) Assessments**

**1. The expectation for the full administration of the new or enhanced ELP assessment(s) that are aligned with the State's English language proficiency (ELP) standards as required under Section 3113 (b)(2) is spring 2007. Please indicate if the State has conducted any of the following:**

- An independent alignment study No
- Other evidence of alignment Yes

**2. Provide an updated description of the State's progress in developing and implementing the new or enhanced ELP assessments. Specifically describe how the State ensures:**

1. The annual assessment of all LEP students in the State in grades k-12;
2. The ELP assessment(s) which address the five domains of listening, speaking, reading, writing, and comprehension;
3. ELP assessments are based on ELP standards;
4. Technical quality (validity, reliability, etc.)

**STATE RESPONSE**

2.1 and 2.2

In 2004-2005 the State administered new and/or expanded ELP assessments to all limited English proficient students in grades k-12. The ELP assessments measure listening, speaking, reading, and writing in k-12 and include comprehension scores based on students performance in reading and listening. The ELP assessments consist of the Reading Proficiency Tests in English (RPTE), which are administered to grades 3-12 LEP students, and the Texas Observation Protocols (TOP), which are administered to k-12 LEP students in listening, speaking, and writing and to k-2 LEP students in reading. Together, these assessments comprise TELPAS, the Texas English Language Proficiency Assessment System. As part of the expansion of the States ELP assessments, an RPTE advanced high proficiency rating began to be reported in the 2004-2005 school year. TOP was fully implemented in spring 2005 after its spring 2004 statewide field trial. All districts (with English language learners) are required to administer TELPAS annually. The results are reported at the student, campus, district, regional, and state level and are used in the States Performance-Based Monitoring Analysis System (PBMAS).

2.3

The States test development procedures ensure that all its assessments are grounded in the States standards. The ELP assessments were developed to assess the States ELP standards, which consist of second language acquisition skills required to be taught as part of all academic content area learning, including language arts, mathematics, and science. Skills that are not part of the ELP standards are not assessed on RPTE or TOP. Educator committees and assessment specialists developed and reviewed the alignment of RPTE and TOP to the standards, assessment proficiency level descriptors, and test items when the tests were developed. Each RPTE test question assesses a particular student expectation in the ELP standards. RPTE educator committees continue to evaluate the alignment of new RPTE test items to the standards as part of annual test item development and field-testing necessary for item bank renewal. TOP, a holistically rated assessment, assesses students progress in understanding and using English to fulfill assignments and learning activities required in grade-appropriate academic content area instruction. The holistic rating scale consisting of detailed proficiency level descriptors requires an evaluation of the extent to which students are acquiring the academic language proficiency required for grade-appropriate academic TEKS instruction in core academic content areas. The very nature and design of TOP ensures its integral connection to the ELP standards. The ELP standards are undergoing revision as part of the periodic revision and refinement of the TEKS standards. Afterwards, the alignment between the ELP standards and TELPAS will be reviewed, and adjustments in TELPAS will be made as necessary.

2.4

The State ensures the technical quality (validity and reliability) of TELPAS by following state of the art test development procedures and conducting ongoing technical studies involving its national technical advisory committee. A complete description of the steps the State is taking to ensure high technical quality of TELPAS is found in the October 23, 2006, Response to USDE on Title III Monitoring Report. This report describes a wide variety

of sources of validity and reliability evidence for RPTE and TOP, and for the combined TELPAS composite results. The State assures test reliability by providing empirical evidence of TELPAS composite rating reliability, reading internal consistency estimates, inter-rater reliability estimates of writing ratings, reliability estimates of listening and speaking ratings. The State has set forth plans for additional studies on estimates of listening and speaking reliability. The State assures content validity by following item and test development processes fully supported by the American Psychological Association (APA) Standards for Educational and Psychological Testing. Other test validity assurance needs are met through the States implementation of a thorough and closely monitored TOP training and rater qualification system, annual TOP rating and administration procedure audits and surveys, ongoing technical studies and analyses such as studies of the relationship between TELPAS domain ratings, studies of the relationship between TELPAS ratings and other measures, and analyses of consequential test validity. These processes and studies are detailed in the States Technical Digest, which is updated annually and posted on the TEA Student Assessment Division website at <http://www.tea.state.tx.us/student.assessment>.



<b>1.6.3.2 Data Reflecting the Most Common Languages Spoken in the State</b>		
<b>2005-2006 Data of the Most Common Languages Spoken by LEPs</b>		
<b>Language</b>	<b>Number of ALL LEP Students in the State</b>	<b>Percentage of ALL LEP Students in the State</b>
1. Spanish	655410	92.10
2. Vietnamese	12300	1.70
3. Urdu	3476	0.50
4. Arabic	3093	0.40
5. Korean	2824	0.40
6. Mandarin (Chinese)	1910	0.30
7. Cantonese (Chinese)	1384	0.20
8. Pilipino (Tagalog)	1295	0.20
9. French	840	0.10
10.		
<b>Comments:</b>		

- In the above chart, list the ten most commonly spoken languages in your State. Indicate the number and percentage of LEP students that speak each of the languages listed in table 1.6.3.2.



**1.6.4 Immigrant Children and Youth Data****Programs and activities for immigrant children and youth****Definitions:**

- **# immigrants enrolled in the State** = number of students, who meet the definition of immigrant children and youth in Section 3301(6), enrolled in the elementary or secondary schools in the State
- **# immigrants served by Title III** = 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
- **# of immigrant subgrants** = number of subgrants made in the State under Section 3114(d)(1), with the funds reserved for immigrant education programs/activities

**Table 1.6.4 Education Programs for Immigrant Students  
2005-2006**

<b># Immigrants enrolled in the State</b>	<b># Immigrants served by Title III</b>	<b># Immigrant subgrants</b>
109401	47222	29

**Comments:**

**STATE RESPONSE: (Provide information on what has changed, e.g., sudden influx of large number of immigrant children and youth, increase/change of minority language groups, sudden population change in school districts that are less experienced with education services for immigrant students in the State during the 2 previous years.)**

In 2003-2004, Texas had 116,818 immigrant students identified in our public schools. In 2004-2005, this number decreased slightly to 116,135. Currently, for school year 2005-2006, Texas has identified 109,401 immigrant students enrolled in public schools. However, the number of immigrant students served through the Title III, Part A-Immigrant grant has increased from 30,034 in 2004-2005 to 47,222 in 2005-2006. The number of grants received by LEAs has increased as well - from 26 grants awarded in 2004-2005 to 29 grants awarded in 2005-2006. There are 101 languages other than English represented in Texas public schools. The top five languages are Spanish, Vietnamese, Urdu, Korean, and Arabic. Over 88% of the students identified as limited English proficient are Spanish speakers.

**1.6.5 Definition of Proficient**

If the State has made changes since the last Consolidated State Performance Report submission (for school year 2004-2005), please provide the State's definition of "proficient" in English as defined by the State's English language proficiency standards and assessments under Section 3122(a)(3). Please include the following in your response:

1. The test score range or cut scores for each of the State's ELP assessments;
2. A description of how the five domains of listening, speaking, reading, writing, and comprehension are incorporated or weighted in the State's definition of "proficient" in English;
3. Other criteria used to determine attaining proficiency in English.

**STATE RESPONSE**

Since the last Consolidated State Performance Report submission, the State has not made changes in the definition of 'proficient' in English as defined by the States English language proficiency standards and assessments under Section 3122(a)(3). 'Proficient' continues to be defined as attaining an composite rating of Advanced High on the Texas English Language Proficiency Assessment System (TELPAS).

**1.6.6 Definition of Making Progress**

If the State has made changes since the last Consolidated State Performance Report submission (for school year 2004-2005), please provide the State's definition of "making progress" in learning English as defined by the State's English language proficiency standards and assessment(s) in Section 3122(a)(3).

Please include the following in your response:

1. A description of the English language proficiency levels and any sub-levels as defined by the State's English language proficiency standards and assessments;
2. A description of the criteria students must meet to progress from one proficiency level to the next (e.g., narrative descriptions, cut scores, formula, data from multiple sources).

**STATE RESPONSE**

Since the last Consolidated State Performance Report submission, the State has not made changes in the definition of 'making progress' in English as defined by the States English language proficiency standards and assessments under Section 3122(a)(3). 'Making progress' continues to be defined as making at least one composite TELPAS proficiency level of progress per year.

**1.6.7 Definition of Cohort**

If the State has made changes since the last Consolidated State Performance Report submission (for school year 2004-2005), please provide the State's definition of "cohort." Include a description of the specific characteristics of the cohort(s) in the State, e.g., grade/grade span or other characteristics.

**STATE RESPONSE**

The State has not made changes in the definition of 'cohort' since the last Consolidated State Performance Report submission (for school year 2004-2005). The cohorts are kindergarten through grade 2 and grades 3-12.

**1.6.8** Information on the Acquisition of English Language Proficiency for ALL Limited English Proficient Students in the State.

Please provide information on the progress made by **ALL LEP students in your State** in learning English and attaining English language proficiency.

Did your State apply the Title III English language proficiency annual measurable achievement objectives (AMAOs) to **ALL LEP** students in the State?

Yes

**If yes**, you may use the format provided below to report the requested information.

English Language Proficiency	Percent and Number of ALL LEP Students in the State Who Made Progress in Learning English				Percent and Number of ALL LEP Students in the State Who Attained English Proficiency			
	Projected AMAO Target		Actual		Projected AMAO Target		Actual	
	%	#	%	#	%	#	%	#
2005-2006 School Year	%	#	% 53.40	# 230362	%	#	% 34.40	# 217433

**If no**, please describe the different evaluation mechanism used by the State to measure both the progress of ALL LEP students in learning English and in attaining English language proficiency and provide the data from that evaluation.

Under the instruction from EDEN support, below is an explanation for table 1.6.8.

Progress:

Target -

k-2 - 15%

3-12 - 42%

Actual -

k-2 - 47.6 % (74,934)

3-12 - 56.7% (155,428)

Attainment:

Target -

k-2 - 2%

3-12 - Method 1 - 25.5%

Method 2 - 42.0%

Actual -

k-2 - 10.2% (26,858)

3-12 - Method 1 - 33.1% (105,599)

Method 2 - 51.7% (190,575)

### 1.6.9 Annual Measurable Achievement Objectives (AMAOs) for English Language Proficiency for Title III Participants

#### Critical synthesis of data reported by Title III subgrantees

[SEC. 3121(a) p. 1701, 3123(b)(1, 3) p.1704]

Provide the results of Title III LEP students in meeting the State English language proficiency (ELP) annual measurable achievement objectives (AMAOs) for making progress and attainment of English language proficiency as required in Table 1.6.9.

#### TABLE 1.6.9 INSTRUCTIONS:

Report **ONLY** the results from State English language proficiency assessment(s) for LEP students who participate in Title III English language instruction educational programs in grades K-12.

Blackened cells in this form indicate information which, each SEA should collect and maintain, but which is not being collected at this time.

#### Definitions:

1. **MAKING PROGRESS** = as defined by the State and submitted to OELA in the State Consolidated Application (CSA), or as amended.
2. **DID NOT MAKE PROGRESS** = The number and percentage of Title III LEP students who did not meet the State definition of "Making Progress."
3. **ATTAINED ENGLISH PROFICIENCY** = as defined by the State and submitted to OELA in the State Consolidated Application (CSA), or as amended.
4. **TOTAL** = the total number of students from **making progress**, **not making progress**, and **attainment**, for each year in the table. The figure reported in this cell should be an unduplicated count of LEP students who participate in Title III English language instruction educational programs in grades K-12.
5. **AMAO TARGET** = the AMAO target for the year as established by State and submitted to OELA in the CSA (September 2003 submission), or as amended and approved, for each objective for "Making progress" and "Attainment" of English language proficiency.
6. **ACHIEVEMENT RESULTS** = The number and percentage of Title III LEP students who met/did not meet the State definitions of "Making Progress" and the number and percentage of Title III LEP students who met the definition for "Attainment" of English language proficiency.

1.6.9 Annual Measurable Achievement Objectives (AMAOs) for English Language Proficiency for Title III Participants			
2005-2006			
	AMAO TARGET	ACHIEVEMENT RESULTS	
	%	#	%
<b>MAKING PROGRESS</b>		229978	53.40
<b>DID NOT MAKE PROGRESS</b>		200783	
<b>ATTAINED ENGLISH PROFICIENCY</b>		216800	34.40
<b>TOTAL</b>		647561	

**Explanation of data for Table**

**Check the answer to the following question.**

Are monitored\* LEP students reflected in the Table "Attainment" "Achievement Results"? Yes

\* Monitored LEP students are those who

- have achieved "proficient" on the State ELP assessment
- have transitioned into classrooms that are not designed for LEP students
- are no longer receiving Title III services, and who are being monitored for academic content achievement for 2 years after transition

**1.6.10 Title III program effectiveness in assisting LEP students to meet State English language proficiency and student academic achievement standards**

[SEC. 3122(b)(2) p. 1703, 3123(b)(1, 4) p.1704-5, 3121(b)(2) p. 1701,]

Provide the count for each year.

It is not necessary to respond to the items in this form, which reference other collections. The information provided by each SEA to those other collections will be collected by OELA and utilized to produce the Biennial Report.

**Title III Subgrantee Information**

	<b>2005-2006</b>
Total number of Title III subgrantees for each year	989
Total number of Title III subgrantees that met the AMAO target for <b>making progress</b>	952
Total number of Title III subgrantees that met the AMAO target for <b>attaining</b> English proficiency	923
Total number of Title III subgrantees that met the AMAO target for <b>AYP</b>	979
Total number of Title III subgrantees that met all three Title III AMAOs*	902
Total number of Title III subgrantees that met 2 AMAOs	65
Total number of Title III subgrantees that met 1 AMAO	18
Total number of Title III subgrantees that did not meet <b>any</b> AMAO	2
Total number of Title III subgrantees that did not meet AMAOs for two consecutive years	40
Total number of Title III subgrantees with an improvement plan for not meeting Title III AMAOs	0
Total number of Title III subgrantees who have not met Title III AMAOs for four consecutive years (beginning in 2007-08)	0
Did the <b>State</b> meet <b>all</b> three Title III AMAOs? *	Yes

**Comments:** Under the instruction from EDEN support, below is an explanation for table 1.6.9.

Progress:

Target -

k-2 - 15%

3-12 - 42%

Actual -

k-2 - 47.6 % (74,814)

3-12 - 56.7% (155,164)

Attainment:

Target -

k-2 - 2%

3-12 - Method 1 - 25.5%

Method 2 - 42.0%

Actual -

k-2 - 10.2% (26,777)

3-12 - Method 1 - 33.1% (105,286)

Method 2 - 51.7% (190,023)

\* Meeting all three Title III AMAOs means meeting each State set target for each objective: Making Progress, Attaining Proficiency and making AYP.

---

**1.6.11** On the following tables for 2005-2006, please provide data regarding the academic achievement of monitored LEP students who transitioned into classrooms not designated for LEP students and who are no longer receiving services under Title III. Please provide data only for those students who transitioned in 2005-2006 school year.

<b>1.6.11.1</b> Number and percent of former Title III served, monitored LEP students scoring at the proficient and advanced levels on the State reading language arts assessments		
<b>Grade/Grade Span</b>	<b>Students Proficient &amp; Advanced</b>	
	<b>#</b>	<b>%</b>
3	7178	98.50
4	20645	82.60
5	24429	89.80
6	17798	92.10
7	10821	72.00
8	8561	77.40
H.S.	3410	70.20

**Comments:**

**1.6.11.2** Number and percent of former Title III served, monitored LEP students scoring at the proficient and advanced levels on the State mathematics assessments

<b>Grade/Grade Span</b>	<b>Students Proficient &amp; Advanced</b>	
	<b>#</b>	<b>%</b>
3	6777	92.90
4	21652	86.50
5	25176	92.40
6	15249	78.90
7	9720	64.70
8	6568	59.30
H.S.	2200	46.00

**Comments:**

**1.7 PERSISTENTLY DANGEROUS SCHOOLS**

**1.7.1** In the following chart, please provide data for the number of schools identified as persistently dangerous as determined by the State by the start of the 2006-2007 school year. For further guidance on persistently dangerous schools, please refer to the Unsafe School Choice Option Non-Regulatory Guidance, available at:

	Number of Persistently Dangerous Schools
2006-2007 School Year	4

**Comments:**

## 1.8 GRADUATION AND DROPOUT RATES

### 1.8.1 Graduation Rates

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.

1. The Secretary approved each State's definition of the graduation rate, consistent with section 200.19 of the Title I regulations, as part of each State's accountability plan. Using the definition of the graduation rate that was approved as part of your State's accountability plan, in the following chart please provide graduation rate data for the 2004-2005 school year.

2. 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.

1.8.1 Graduation Rates	
High School Graduates	Graduation Rate
Student Group	2004-2005 School Year
All Students	84.00
American Indian or Alaska Native	84.30
Asian or Pacific Islander	92.70
Black, non-Hispanic	81.70
Hispanic	77.40
White, non-Hispanic	89.50
Students with Disabilities	74.80
Limited English Proficient	61.20
Economically Disadvantaged	77.40
Migrant	75.60
Male	80.80
Female	87.30

**Comments:** The increase in LEP graduation rates was not consistent with state trends for other groups for the year. Nevertheless, no change in data reporting or methods was implemented at this time. The increase is consistent with greater effort on the part of school districts on behalf of their limited English proficient students. Additional racial/ethnic groups or combinations of racial/ethnic groups may be reported that are consistent with the major racial/ethnic categories that you use under NCLB.



### 1.8.2 Dropout Rate

For purposes of calculating and reporting a dropout rate for this performance indicator, States should use the annual event school dropout rate for students leaving a school in a single year determined in accordance with the National Center for Education Statistics' (NCES) Common Core of Data

Consistent with this requirement, States must use NCES' definition of "high school dropout," 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.

In the following chart, please provide data for the 2004-2005 school year for the percentage of students who drop out of high school, disaggregated by race, ethnicity, gender, disability status, migrant status, English proficiency, and status as economically disadvantaged.

1.8.2 Dropout Rate	
Dropouts	Dropout Rate
Student Group	2004-2005 School Year
All Students	3.60
American Indian or Alaska Native	4.10
Asian or Pacific Islander	1.40
Black, non-Hispanic	4.20
Hispanic	5.10
White, non-Hispanic	2.10
Students with Disabilities	
Limited English Proficient	
Economically Disadvantaged	
Migrant	
Male	3.90
Female	3.20

**Comments:** The Asian/Pacific Islander population in the state of Texas and in grades 9-12 in Texas public school is relatively small. Because a difference of fewer than 10 students results in a significant change in rate data, including dropout rates, the data are relatively unstable from year-to-year.

Because the Black dropout rate in Texas is relatively low (e.g. 4.2%), a relatively small change results in a rate change greater than 3%. The increase in Black dropouts was part of a broader trend across ethnic groups in Texas between 2004 and 2005. The increase may be attributable, in part, to an increase in the number of students leaving school without meeting the exit-level examination requirements.

Additional racial/ethnic groups or combinations of racial/ethnic groups may be reported that are consistent with the major racial/ethnic categories that you use under NCLB.

---

Provide the following information for homeless children and youth in your State for the 2005-2006 school year (as defined by your State). To complete this form, compile data for LEAs with and without subgrants.

**1.9.1 DATA FROM ALL LEAs WITH AND WITHOUT MCKINNEY-VENTO SUBGRANTS**

**1.9 EDUCATION FOR HOMELESS CHILDREN AND YOUTH PROGRAM**

**1.9.1.1 How does your State define the period that constitutes a school year? (e.g., "The school year shall begin on the first day of July and end on the thirtieth day of June" or "A total of 175 instructional days").**

**STATE RESPONSE**

The Texas Education Code (TEC) states that for each school year, each district must operate so that the district provides for at least 180 days of instruction for students. The commissioner may approve the instruction of students for fewer than the number of days required in the event of extreme emergency or catastrophic conditions. A school district may not begin instruction for students for a school year before the fourth Monday in August unless the district operates a year-round system. In some circumstances, school districts that operate a year-round system may modify the start date of the school year. Additionally, districts can provide a flexible year program for students who need additional academic support. LEAs have the ability to approve their own school year calendars within the parameters set by the TEC and there is considerable variation across the State.

**1.9.1.2 What are the totals in your State as follows:**

	Total Number in State	Total Number LEAs Reporting
LEAs without Subgrants	1183	0
LEAs with Subgrants	66	31

**Comments:** The State of Texas does not currently have the capacity to count homeless children/youth enrolled in public schools in LEAs without subgrants. Texas had 3 different types of MV subgrants in 2005-06. The largest awarded subgrants to 29 LEAs. One of these 29 had personnel problems preventing it from entering student records into the THEO MV web-based database. Because of budget constraints, the two smaller MV subgrant programs did not participate in the web-based database. Instead, they submitted paper records. Reliance on paper records proved problematic; several participating LEAs had difficulty complying. One of the smaller subgrant programs was funded with administrative funds for staff development and planning related to homeless students several of these subgrants did not provide direct services to students. In order to remedy the problems with data collection in 2005-06, THEO has completely revised its data collection procedures and requirements.

**1.9.1.3 Number of Homeless Children And Youth In The State**

Provide the number of homeless children and youth in your State enrolled in public school (compulsory grades--excluding pre-school) during the 2005-2006 school year according to grade level groups below:

Grade Level	Number of homeless children/youth enrolled in public school in LEAs without subgrants	Number of homeless children/youth enrolled in public school in LEAs with subgrants
K	19745	1977
1	17130	1969
2	13262	1791
3	17269	1789
4	18675	1766
5	15780	1554
6	13391	1337
7	19267	1433
8	14596	1355
9	9021	1602
10	8298	1025
11	6027	822
12	3805	835

**Comments:** System space limitations prohibit detailed explanations. Additional, clarifying, information regarding any of these notes can be obtained from THEO.

The State of Texas does not currently have the capacity to count homeless children/youth enrolled in public schools in LEAs without subgrants.

In the original report, grade level totals for LEAs with subgrants were taken from a list of homeless students. However, the list of students provided to TEA for data about assessments and educational/support services was for all students served, including students at-risk, but not homeless. This error resulted in discrepancies throughout the report. This amendment contains revised numbers based on corrected student lists.

---

**1.9.1.4 Primary Nighttime Residence Of Homeless Children And Youth**

Of the total number of homeless children and youth (excluding preschoolers), provide the numbers who had the following as their primary nighttime residence at the time of initial identification by LEAs.

Primary nighttime residence	* Number of homeless children/ youth-- excluding preschoolers LEAs <b>without</b> subgrants	* Number of homeless children/ youth-- excluding preschoolers LEAs <b>with</b> subgrants
Shelters	42439	4636
Doubled-up	110328	12052
Unsheltered (e.g., cars, parks, campgrounds, etc.)	3643	398
Hotels/Motels	10454	1142
Unknown	9402	1027

**Comments:** System space limitations prohibit detailed explanations. Additional, clarifying, information regarding any of these notes can be obtained from THEO.

The State of Texas does not currently have the capacity to count homeless children/youth enrolled in public schools in LEAs without subgrants.

Columns containing counts of homeless children/youth enrolled in public school in LEAs with subgrants contain the actual numbers of specific homeless students that were served by MV subgrants and entered into the THEO MV database. Because of data collection and reporting problems, these totals undercount the actual numbers of homeless children/youth enrolled in public school in LEAs with subgrants. Although the actual numbers of these homeless students are greater for every category, each total represents the number of individual students that we can confirm with student records from the THEO MV database.

\* The primary nighttime residence is the basis for identifying homeless children and youth. The totals should match the totals in item #3 above.

**1.9.2 DATA FROM LEAs WITH MCKINNEY-VENTO SUBGRANTS**

**1.9.2.1 Number Of Homeless Children And Youths Served By McKinney-Vento Subgrants**

Provide the number of homeless children and youth that were served by McKinney-Vento subgrants in your State during the 2005-2006 academic school year disaggregated by grade level groups

Grade levels of homeless children and youth served by subgrants in 2005-2006	Number of homeless children and youth <i>served</i> by subgrants enrolled in school by grade level
K	1977
1	1969
2	1791
3	1789
4	1766
5	1554
6	1337
7	1433
8	1355
9	1602
10	1025
11	822
12	835

**Comments:**

**1.9.2.2 Number of homeless preschool-age children**

Provide the number of homeless preschool-age children in your State in districts with subgrants attending public preschool programs during the 2005-2006 school year (i.e., from birth through pre-K).

**Number of homeless preschool-age children enrolled in public preschool in LEAs with subgrants in 2005-2006**

1914

**Comments:**

**1.9.2.3 Unaccompanied Youths**

Provide the number of unaccompanied youths served by subgrants during the 2005-2006 school year.

**Number of homeless unaccompanied youths enrolled in public schools in LEAs with subgrants in 2005-2006**

2987

**Comments:**

**1.9.2.4 Migrant Children/Youth Served**

Provide the number of homeless migrant children/youth served by subgrants during the 2005-2006 school year.

**Number of homeless migrant children/youth enrolled in public schools (Total for LEAs with subgrants)**

359

**Comments:** In the original report, grade level totals for LEAs with subgrants were taken from a list of homeless students. However, the list of students provided to TEA for data about assessments and educational/support services was for all students served, including students at-risk, but not homeless. This error resulted in discrepancies throughout the report. This amendment contains revised numbers based on corrected student lists.

**1.9.2.5 Number of Children Receiving Educational and School Support Services**

Provide the number of homeless children and youth served by subgrants and enrolled in school during the 2005-2006 school year that received the following educational and school support services from the LEA

Educational and school related activities and services	Number of homeless students in subgrantee programs that received educational and support services
Special Education (IDEA)	3042
English Language Learners (ELL)	4172
Gifted and Talented	450
Vocational Education	2862

**Comments:** In the original report, grade level totals for LEAs with subgrants were taken from a list of homeless students. However, the list of students provided to TEA for data about assessments and educational/support services was for all students served, including students at-risk, but not homeless. This error resulted in discrepancies throughout the report. This amendment contains revised numbers based on corrected student lists.

**1.9.2.6 Educational Support Services**

Provide the number of subgrantee programs that provided the following educational support services with McKinney-Vento funds.

<b>Services and Activities Provided by the McKinney-Vento subgrant program</b>	<b>Number of your State's subgrantees that offer these services</b>
Tutoring or other instructional support	54
Expedited evaluations	34
Staff professional development and awareness	66
Referrals for medical, dental, and other health services	49
Transportation	39
Early childhood programs	30
Assistance with participation in school programs	66
Before-, after-school, mentoring, summer programs	46
Obtaining or transferring records necessary for enrollment	37
Parent education related to rights and resources for children	42
Coordination between schools and agencies	66
Counseling	39
Addressing needs related to domestic violence	36
Clothing to meet a school requirement	29
School supplies	57
Referral to other programs and services	66
Emergency assistance related to school attendance	42
Other (optional)	

**Comments:**

**1.9.2.7 Barriers To The Education Of Homeless Children And Youth**

Provide the number of subgrantees that reported the following barriers to the enrollment and success of homeless children and youth during the 2005-2006 school year.

<b>Barriers</b>	<b>List number of subgrantees reporting each barrier</b>
Eligibility for homeless services	
School selection	5
Transportation	66
School records	
Immunizations or other medical records	6
Other enrollment issues	

**Comments:**

**1.9.2.8 Additional Barriers (Optional)**

Note any other barriers not listed above that were frequently reported:

<b>List other barriers</b>	<b>List number of subgrantees reporting each barrier</b>
Unaccompanied youth and guardianship issues	66
Mobility of unaccompanied youth	66
High school credit accural	62

**Comments:**

**1.9.2.9 Academic Progress of Homeless Students**

In order to ensure that homeless children and youth have access to education and other services needed to meet the State's challenging academic standards:

a) Check the grade levels in which your State administered a statewide assessment in reading or mathematics; b) note the number of homeless children and youth served by subgrants in 2005-2006 that were included in statewide assessments in reading or mathematics; and c) note the number of homeless children and youth that met or exceeded the State's proficiency level or standard on the reading or mathematics assessment.

**Reading Assessment:**

<b>School Grade Levels *</b>	<b>a) Reading assessment by grade level (check boxes where appropriate; indicate "DNA" if assessment is required and data is not available for reporting; indicate "N/A" for grade not assessed by State)</b>	<b>b) Number of homeless children/youth taking reading assessment test.</b>	<b>c) Number of homeless children/youth that met or exceeded state proficiency.</b>
Grade 3	Yes	1964	1432
Grade 4	Yes	2074	1360
Grade 5	Yes	1718	1122
Grade 6	Yes	1519	1166
Grade 7	Yes	1496	916
Grade 8	Yes	1341	925
Grade 9	Yes	1532	1101
Grade 10	Yes	887	647
Grade 11	N/A	477	360
Grade 12	N/A	359	239

**Comments:** Assessment information for reading and math comes from three main assessments: the Texas Assessment of Knowledge and Skills (TAKS), the State-Developed Alternative Assessment II (SDAA II), and the Reading Proficiency Tests in English (RPTE) of the Texas English Language Proficiency Assessment System (TELPAS). Student assessment data is unduplicated within individual assessments, but an individual student may be assessed by more than one assessment. The sum of students tested for reading and math will include duplicates. There are also instances where student records in the MV homeless database did not correspond to records in TEA databases. There will not be a one-to-one correspondence between numbers of homeless students by grade level and numbers of students who have taken state-mandated reading and math assessments.

System space limitations prohibit detailed explanations. Additional, clarifying, information regarding any of these notes can be obtained from THEO.

**Mathematics Assessment:**

<b>School Grade Levels *</b>	<b>a) Mathematics assessment by grade level (check boxes where appropriate; indicate "DNA" if assessment is required and data is not available for reporting; indicate "N/A" for grade not assessed by State)</b>	<b>b) Number of homeless children/youth taking mathematics assessment test.</b>	<b>c) Number of homeless children/youth that met or exceeded state proficiency.</b>
Grade 3	Yes	1661	1140
Grade 4	Yes	1747	1160
Grade 5	Yes	1485	994
Grade 6	Yes	1314	783
Grade 7	Yes	1344	653
Grade 8	Yes	1209	554
Grade 9	Yes	1436	479
Grade 10	Yes	784	330
Grade 11	Yes	437	209
Grade 12	N/A	496	200

---

**Comments:** Assessment information for reading and math comes from three main assessments: the Texas Assessment of Knowledge and Skills (TAKS), the State-Developed Alternative Assessment II (SDAA II), and the Reading Proficiency Tests in English (RPTE) of the Texas English Language Proficiency Assessment System (TELPAS). Student assessment data is unduplicated within individual assessments, but an individual student may be assessed by more than one assessment. The sum of students tested for reading and math will include duplicates. There are also instances where student records in the MV homeless database did not correspond to records in TEA databases. There will not be a one-to-one correspondence between numbers of homeless students by grade level and numbers of students who have taken state-mandated reading and math assessments.

System space limitations prohibit detailed explanations. Additional, clarifying, information regarding any of these notes can be obtained from THEO.

---

\* Note: State assessments in grades 3-8 and one year of high school are NCLB requirements. However, States may assess students in other grades as well.

---