

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 2007-08

TEXAS



PART I DUE FRIDAY, DECEMBER 19, 2008
PART II DUE FRIDAY, FEBRUARY 27, 2009

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
WASHINGTON, DC 20202

INTRODUCTION

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

- Title I, Part A – Improving Basic Programs Operated by Local Educational Agencies
- Title I, Part B, Subpart 3 – William F. Goodling Even Start Family Literacy Programs
- Title I, Part C – Education of Migratory Children (Includes the Migrant Child Count)
- Title I, Part D – Prevention and Intervention Programs for Children and Youth Who Are Neglected, Delinquent, or At-Risk
- Title II, Part A – Improving Teacher Quality State Grants (Teacher and Principal Training and Recruiting Fund)
- Title III, Part A – English Language Acquisition, Language Enhancement, and Academic Achievement Act
- Title IV, Part A, Subpart 1 – Safe and Drug-Free Schools and Communities State Grants
- Title IV, Part A, Subpart 2 – Safe and Drug-Free Schools and Communities National Activities (Community Service Grant Program)
- Title V, Part A – Innovative Programs
- Title VI, Section 6111 – Grants for State Assessments and Related Activities
- Title VI, Part B – Rural Education Achievement Program
- Title X, Part C – Education for Homeless Children and Youths

The NCLB Consolidated State Performance Report (CSPR) for school year (SY) 2007-08 consists of two Parts, Part I and Part II.

PART I

Part I of the CSPR requests information related to the five ESEA Goals, established in the June 2002 Consolidated State Application, and information required for the Annual State Report to the Secretary, as described in Section 1111(h)(4) of the ESEA. The five ESEA Goals established in the June 2002 Consolidated State Application are:

- **Performance Goal 1: By SY 2013-14, all students will reach high standards, at a minimum attaining proficiency or better in reading/language arts and mathematics.**
- **Performance Goal 2: All limited English proficient students will become proficient in English and reach high academic standards, at a minimum attaining proficiency or better in reading/language arts and mathematics.**
- **Performance Goal 3: By SY 2005-06, all students will be taught by highly qualified teachers.**
- **Performance Goal 4: All students will be educated in learning environments that are safe, drug free, and conducive to learning.**
- **Performance Goal 5: All students will graduate from high school.**

Beginning with the CSPR SY 2005-06 collection, the Education of Homeless Children and Youths was added. The Migrant Child count was added for the SY 2006-07 collection.

PART II

Part II of the CSPR consists of information related to State activities and outcomes of specific ESEA programs. While the information requested varies from program to program, the specific information requested for this report meets the following criteria:

1. The information is needed for Department program performance plans or for other program needs.
2. The information is not available from another source, including program evaluations pending full implementation of required EDFacts submission.
3. The information will provide valid evidence of program outcomes or results.

GENERAL INSTRUCTIONS AND TIMELINES

All States that received funding on the basis of the Consolidated State Application for the SY 2007-08 must respond to this Consolidated State Performance Report (CSPR). Part I of the Report is due to the Department by Friday, December 19, 2008. Part II of the Report is due to the Department by Friday, February 27, 2009. Both Part I and Part II should reflect data from the SY 2007-08, unless otherwise noted.

The format states will use to submit the Consolidated State Performance Report has changed to an online submission starting with SY 2004-05. This online submission system is being developed through the Education Data Exchange Network (EDEN) and will make the submission process less burdensome. Please see the following section on transmittal instructions for more information on how to submit this year's Consolidated State Performance Report.

TRANSMITTAL INSTRUCTIONS

The Consolidated State Performance Report (CSPR) data will be collected online from the SEAs, using the EDEN web site. The EDEN web site will be modified to include a separate area (sub-domain) for CSPR data entry. This area will utilize EDEN formatting to the extent possible and the data will be entered in the order of the current CSPR forms. The data entry screens will include or provide access to all instructions and notes on the current CSPR forms; additionally, an effort will be made to design the screens to balance efficient data collection and reduction of visual clutter.

Initially, a state user will log onto EDEN and be provided with an option that takes him or her to the "SY 2007-08 CSPR". The main CSPR screen will allow the user to select the section of the CSPR that he or she needs to either view or enter data. After selecting a section of the CSPR, the user will be presented with a screen or set of screens where the user can input the data for that section of the CSPR. A user can only select one section of the CSPR at a time. After a state has included all available data in the designated sections of a particular CSPR Part, a lead state user will certify that Part and transmit it to the Department. Once a Part has been transmitted, ED will have access to the data. States may still make changes or additions to the transmitted data, by creating an updated version of the CSPR. Detailed instructions for transmitting the SY 2007-08 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-HLPEDEN (1-877-457-3336).

OMB Number: 1810-0614

Expiration Date: 10/31/2010

Consolidated State Performance Report
For
State Formula Grant Programs
under the
Elementary And Secondary Education Act
as amended by the
No Child Left Behind Act of 2001

Check the one that indicates the report you are submitting:

Part I, 2007-08

Part II, 2007-08

Name of State Educational Agency (SEA) Submitting This Report:

Texas Education Agency

Address:

1701 N. Congress Ave.
Austin, Texas 78701-1494

Person to contact about this report:

Name: Cory Green

Telephone: 512-475-3553

Fax: 512-305-9447

e-mail: cory.green@tea.state.tx.us

Name of Authorizing State Official: (Print or Type):

Anita Givens

Friday, March 13, 2009, 12:17:58 PM

Signature

Date

**CONSOLIDATED STATE PERFORMANCE REPORT
PART I**

For reporting on
School Year 2007-08



**PART I DUE DECEMBER 19, 2008
5PM EST**

1.1 STANDARDS AND ASSESSMENT DEVELOPMENT

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

1.1.1 Academic Content Standards

In the space below, provide a description and timeline of any actions the State has taken or is planning to take to make revisions to or change the State's academic content standards in mathematics, reading/language arts or science. Responses should focus on actions taken or planned since the State's content standards were approved through ED's peer review process for State assessment systems. Indicate specifically in what school year your State expects the changes to be implemented.

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

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

Texas academic standards in K through 12 mathematics were revised and implemented fall 2006. Academic standards in secondary mathematics are in the process of being revised and are scheduled for implementation fall 2009.

Texas academic standards in K through 12 English Language Arts/Reading were recently revised and are scheduled for implementation fall 2009.

Texas academic standards in K through 12 Science are in the process of being revised and are scheduled for implementation fall 2010.

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

1.1.2 Assessments in Mathematics and Reading/Language Arts

In the space below, provide a description and timeline of any actions the State has taken or is planning to take to make revisions to or change the State's assessments and/or academic achievement standards in mathematics or reading/language arts required under Section 1111(b)(3) of ESEA. Responses should focus on actions taken or planned since the State's assessment system was approved through ED's peer review process. Responses also should indicate specifically in what school year your State expects the changes to be implemented.

As applicable, include any assessment (e.g., alternate assessments based on alternate achievement standards, alternate assessments based on modified achievement standards, native language assessments, or others) implemented to meet the assessment requirements under Section 1111(b)(3) of ESEA as well as alternate achievement standards for students with significant cognitive disabilities and modified academic achievement standards for certain students with disabilities implemented to meet the requirements of Section 1111(b)(3) of ESEA. Indicate specifically in what year your state expects the changes to be implemented.

If the State has not made or is not planning to make revisions or changes, respond "No revisions or changes to assessments and/or academic achievement standards taken or planned."

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

The Texas Education Agency has proposed revised performance standards for TAKS mathematics and reading at grades 3 through 8 English and grades 3 through 6 Spanish due to the implementation of a vertical scale score system. If approved by the State Board of Education (SBOE) at its January 2009 meeting, these revised performance standards will be reported in spring 2009 for informational purposes only and will go into effect in spring 2010.

Revisions to the Texas Essential Knowledge and Skills (TEKS) for English language arts and reading were adopted by the SBOE in May 2008. The TAKS reading/ELA tests, which will be revised to reflect these new TEKS, will be implemented in spring 2012.

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

1.1.4 Assessments in Science

If your State's assessments and academic achievement standards in science required under Section 1111(b)(3) of ESEA have been approved through ED's peer review process, provide in the space below a description and timeline of any actions the State has taken or is planning to take to make revisions to or change the State's assessments and/or academic achievement standards in science required under Section 1111(b)(3) of ESEA. Responses should focus on actions taken or planned since the State's assessment system was approved through ED's peer review process. Responses also should indicate specifically in what school year your State expects the changes to be implemented.

As applicable, include any assessment (e.g., alternate assessments based on alternate achievement standards, alternate assessments based on modified achievement standards, native language assessments, or others) implemented to meet the assessment requirements under Section 1111(b)(3) of ESEA as well as alternate achievement standards for students with significant cognitive disabilities and modified academic achievement standards for certain students with disabilities implemented to meet the requirements of Section 1111(b)(3) of ESEA.

If the State has not made or is not planning to make revisions or changes, respond "No revisions or changes to assessments and/or academic achievement standards taken or planned."

If the State's assessments in science required under Section 1111(b)(3) of ESEA have not been approved through ED's peer review process, respond "State's assessments and academic achievement standards in science not yet approved."

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

State's assessments and academic achievement standards in science not yet approved.

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

1.2 PARTICIPATION IN STATE ASSESSMENTS

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

1.2.1 Participation of All Students in Mathematics Assessment

In the table below, provide the number of students enrolled during the State's testing window for NCLB mathematics assessments required under Section 1111(b)(3) of ESEA (regardless of whether the students were present for a full academic year) and the number of students who participated in the mathematics assessment in accordance with NCLB. The percentage of students who were tested for mathematics will be calculated automatically.

The student group "children with disabilities (IDEA)" includes children who participated in the regular assessments with or without accommodations and alternate assessments.

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

Student Group	# Students Enrolled	# Students Participating	Percentage of Students Participating
All students	2,378,792	2,369,792	99.6
American Indian or Alaska Native	8,562	8,518	99.5
Asian or Pacific Islander	82,618	82,463	99.8
Black, non-Hispanic	338,770	336,972	99.5
Hispanic	1,100,148	1,095,882	99.6
White, non-Hispanic	846,548	843,867	99.7
Children with disabilities (IDEA)	265,170	263,058	99.2
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	332,889	331,672	99.6
Economically disadvantaged students	1,290,949	1,285,574	99.6
Migratory students	20,329	20,241	99.6
Male	1,216,985	1,211,942	99.6
Female	1,160,550	1,156,630	99.7
Comments:			

Source – The table above is produced through ED Facts. The SEA submits the data in file N/X081 that includes data group 588, category sets A, B, C, D, E, and F, and subtotal 1. If the SEA has additional racial/ethnic groups or combinations of racial/ethnic groups in its accountability plan under NCLB, the SEA will report the above data for those groups through the online collection tool.

1.2.2 Participation of Students with Disabilities in Mathematics Assessment

In the table below, provide the number of children with disabilities (IDEA) participating during the State's testing window in mathematics assessments required under Section 1111(b)(3) of ESEA (regardless of whether the children were present for a full academic year) by the type of assessment. The percentage of children with disabilities (IDEA) who participated in the mathematics assessment for each assessment option will be calculated automatically. The total number of children with disabilities (IDEA) participating will also be calculated automatically.

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

Type of Assessment	# Children with Disabilities (IDEA) Participating	Percentage of Children with Disabilities (IDEA) Participating, Who Took the Specified Assessment
Regular Assessment without Accommodations	44,141	16.8
Regular Assessment with Accommodations	119,558	45.4
Alternate Assessment Based on Grade-Level Achievement Standards	0	0.0
Alternate Assessment Based on Modified Achievement Standards	82,664	31.4
Alternate Assessment Based on Alternate Achievement Standards	16,695	6.3

Total	263,058	
Comments: The difference of 839 students is due to the exclusion of participants whose tests are non-scorable or exempt. Texas does not have Alternate Assessment Based on Grade-Level Achievement Standards.		

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

1.2.3 Participation of All Students in the Reading/Language Arts Assessment

This section is similar to 1.2.1 and collects data on the State's NCLB reading/language arts assessment.

Student Group	# Students Enrolled	# Students Participating	Percentage of Students Participating
All students	2,388,550	2,376,330	99.5
American Indian or Alaska Native	8,560	8,507	99.4
Asian or Pacific Islander	82,813	82,437	99.6
Black, non-Hispanic	339,914	338,232	99.5
Hispanic	1,106,181	1,099,148	99.4
White, non-Hispanic	848,793	846,004	99.7
Children with disabilities (IDEA)	266,712	264,192	99.1
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	337,023	332,261	98.6
Economically disadvantaged students	1,298,674	1,290,953	99.4
Migratory students	20,837	20,526	98.5
Male	1,222,499	1,215,861	99.5
Female	1,164,810	1,159,331	99.5
Comments:			

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

1.2.4 Participation of Students with Disabilities in Reading/Language Arts Assessment

This section is similar to 1.2.2 and collects data on the State's NCLB reading/language arts assessment.

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

Type of Assessment	# Children with Disabilities (IDEA) Participating	Percentage of Children with Disabilities (IDEA) Participating, Who Took the Specified Assessment
Regular Assessment without Accommodations	51,914	19.7
Regular Assessment with Accommodations	113,094	42.8
Alternate Assessment Based on Grade-Level Achievement Standards	0	0.0
Alternate Assessment Based on Modified Achievement Standards	82,408	31.2
Alternate Assessment Based on Alternate Achievement Standards	16,776	6.3
Total	264,192	
Comments: The difference of 932 students is due to the exclusion of participants whose tests are non-scorable or exempt. Texas does not have Alternate Assessment Based on Grade-Level Achievement Standards.		

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

1.2.5 Participation of All Students in the Science Assessment

This section is similar to 1.2.1 and collects data on the State's NCLB science assessment.

Student Group	# Students Enrolled	# Students Participating	Percentage of Students Participating
All students	993,808	980,853	98.7
American Indian or Alaska Native	3,603	3,540	98.3
Asian or Pacific Islander	34,815	34,613	99.4
Black, non-Hispanic	143,498	141,318	98.5
Hispanic	445,403	439,286	98.6
White, non-Hispanic	365,519	361,169	98.8
Children with disabilities (IDEA)	112,278	109,747	97.7
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	96,416	95,009	98.5
Economically disadvantaged students	510,082	502,678	98.5
Migratory students	8,426	8,280	98.3
Male	507,184	500,198	98.6
Female	485,957	480,039	98.8
Comments:			

Source – Manual input by the SEA using the online collection tool. Note: New collection for the SY 2007-08 CSPR. Proposed under OMB 83I.

1.2.6 Participation of Students with Disabilities in Science Assessment

This section is similar to 1.2.2 and collects data on the State's NCLB science assessment.

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

Type of Assessment	# Children with Disabilities (IDEA) Participating	Percentage of Children with Disabilities (IDEA) Participating, Who Took the Specified Assessment
Regular Assessment without Accommodations	17,110	15.6
Regular Assessment with Accommodations	43,436	39.6
Alternate Assessment Based on Grade-Level Achievement Standards	0	0.0
Alternate Assessment Based on Modified Achievement Standards	42,196	38.4
Alternate Assessment Based on Alternate Achievement Standards	7,005	6.4
Total	109,747	
Comments: The difference of 66 students is due to the exclusion of participants whose tests are non-scorable or exempt. Texas does not have Alternate Assessment Based on Grade-Level Achievement Standards.		

Source – Manual input by the SEA using the online collection tool. Note: New collection for the SY 2007-08 CSPR. Proposed under OMB 83I.

1.3 STUDENT ACADEMIC ACHIEVEMENT

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

1.3.1 Student Academic Achievement in Mathematics

In the format of the table below, provide the number of students who completed the State NCLB assessment(s) in mathematics implemented to meet the requirements of Section 1111(b)(3) of ESEA (regardless of whether the students were present for a full academic year) and for whom a proficiency level was assigned, and the number of these students who scored at or above proficient, in

grades 3 through 8 and high school. The percentage of students who scored at or above proficient is calculated automatically.

The student group "children with disabilities (IDEA)" includes children who participated in the regular assessments with or without accommodations and alternate assessments.

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

1.3.2 Student Academic Achievement in Reading/Language Arts

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

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

1.3.3 Student Academic Achievement in Science

This section is similar to 1.3.1. The only difference is that this section collects data on the State's NCLB science assessment administered at least one in each of the following grade spans 3 through 5, 6 through 9, and 10 through 12.

Limited English Proficiency (LEP) students includes recently arrived students who have attended schools in the United States for fewer than 12 months. Do not include former LEP students.

1.3.1.1 Student Academic Achievement in Mathematics -Grade 3

	# Students Who Completed the Assessment and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned	# Students Scoring at or Above Proficient	Percentage of Students Scoring at or Above Proficient
Grade 3			
All students	354,742	291,194	82.1
American Indian or Alaska Native	1,257	1,039	82.7
Asian or Pacific Islander	12,017	11,312	94.1
Black, non-Hispanic	49,256	34,950	71.0
Hispanic	171,915	136,398	79.3
White, non-Hispanic	120,000	107,275	89.4
Children with disabilities (IDEA)	34,890	22,674	65.0
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	89,186	69,592	78.0
Economically disadvantaged students	207,783	159,284	76.7
Migratory students	2,930	2,145	73.2
Male	181,207	149,801	82.7
Female	173,404	141,302	81.5
Comments:			

Source – Initially populated from EDFacts. See Attachment D: CSPR & EDFacts Data Crosswalk. If the SEA has additional racial/ethnic groups or combinations of racial/ethnic groups in its accountability plan under NCLB, the SEA will report the above data for those groups through the online collection tool.

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

	# Students Who Completed the Assessment and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned	# Students Scoring at or Above Proficient	Percentage of Students Scoring at or Above Proficient
Grade 3			
All students	356,880	328,317	92.0
American Indian or Alaska Native	1,262	1,178	93.3
Asian or Pacific Islander	12,037	11,605	96.4
Black, non-Hispanic	49,705	43,598	87.7
Hispanic	172,838	155,172	89.8
White, non-Hispanic	120,783	116,562	96.5
Children with disabilities (IDEA)	35,088	25,892	73.8
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	89,531	78,174	87.3
Economically disadvantaged students	209,620	186,013	88.7
Migratory students	3,014	2,515	83.4
Male	182,272	165,206	90.6
Female	174,515	163,035	93.4
Comments:			

Source – Initially populated from EDFacts. See Attachment D: CSPR & EDFacts Data Crosswalk. If the SEA has additional racial/ethnic groups or combinations of racial/ethnic groups in its accountability plan under NCLB, the SEA will report the above data for those groups through the online collection tool.

1.3.3.1 Student Academic Achievement in Science -Grade 3

	# Students Who Completed the Assessment and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned	# Students Scoring at or Above Proficient	Percentage of Students Scoring at or Above Proficient
Grade 3			
All students	0	0	0.0
American Indian or Alaska Native	0	0	0.0
Asian or Pacific Islander	0	0	0.0
Black, non-Hispanic	0	0	0.0
Hispanic	0	0	0.0
White, non-Hispanic	0	0	0.0
Children with disabilities (IDEA)	0	0	0.0
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	0	0	0.0
Economically disadvantaged students	0	0	0.0
Migratory students	0	0	0.0
Male	0	0	0.0
Female	0	0	0.0
Comments:			

Source – Manual input by the SEA using the online collection tool. If the SEA has additional racial/ethnic groups or combinations of racial/ethnic groups in its accountability plan under NCLB, the SEA will report the above data for those groups through the online CSPR collection tool.

Note: New collection for the SY 2007-08 CSPR. Proposed under OMB 83I.

1.3.1.2 Student Academic Achievement in Mathematics -Grade 4

	# Students Who Completed the Assessment and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned	# Students Scoring at or Above Proficient	Percentage of Students Scoring at or Above Proficient
Grade 4			
All students	345,540	286,456	82.9
American Indian or Alaska Native	1,216	1,012	83.2
Asian or Pacific Islander	11,863	11,263	94.9
Black, non-Hispanic	48,418	35,154	72.6
Hispanic	165,228	132,153	80.0
White, non-Hispanic	118,474	106,646	90.0
Children with disabilities (IDEA)	37,218	22,398	60.2
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	68,428	51,317	75.0
Economically disadvantaged students	198,974	153,882	77.3
Migratory students	2,846	2,113	74.2
Male	177,056	147,224	83.2
Female	168,215	139,067	82.7
Comments:			

Source – Initially populated from EDFacts. See Attachment D: CSPR & EDFacts Data Crosswalk. If the SEA has additional racial/ethnic groups or combinations of racial/ethnic groups in its accountability plan under NCLB, the SEA will report the above data for those groups through the online collection tool.

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

	# Students Who Completed the Assessment and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned	# Students Scoring at or Above Proficient	Percentage of Students Scoring at or Above Proficient
Grade 4			
All students	344,992	280,519	81.3
American Indian or Alaska Native	1,214	1,011	83.3
Asian or Pacific Islander	11,818	10,948	92.6
Black, non-Hispanic	48,379	35,195	72.7
Hispanic	164,907	126,493	76.7
White, non-Hispanic	118,337	106,636	90.1
Children with disabilities (IDEA)	37,183	21,545	57.9
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	68,122	46,345	68.0
Economically disadvantaged students	198,666	147,911	74.5
Migratory students	2,838	1,892	66.7
Male	176,765	140,500	79.5
Female	167,960	139,832	83.3
Comments:			

Source – Initially populated from EDFacts. See Attachment D: CSPR & EDFacts Data Crosswalk. If the SEA has additional racial/ethnic groups or combinations of racial/ethnic groups in its accountability plan under NCLB, the SEA will report the above data for those groups through the online collection tool.

1.3.3.2 Student Academic Achievement in Science -Grade 4

	# Students Who Completed the Assessment and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned	# Students Scoring at or Above Proficient	Percentage of Students Scoring at or Above Proficient
Grade 4			
All students	0	0	0.0
American Indian or Alaska Native	0	0	0.0
Asian or Pacific Islander	0	0	0.0
Black, non-Hispanic	0	0	0.0
Hispanic	0	0	0.0
White, non-Hispanic	0	0	0.0
Children with disabilities (IDEA)	0	0	0.0
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	0	0	0.0
Economically disadvantaged students	0	0	0.0
Migratory students	0	0	0.0
Male	0	0	0.0
Female	0	0	0.0
Comments:			

Source – Manual input by the SEA using the online collection tool. If the SEA has additional racial/ethnic groups or combinations of racial/ethnic groups in its accountability plan under NCLB, the SEA will report the above data for those groups through the online CSPR collection tool.

Note: New collection for the SY 2007-08 CSPR. Proposed under OMB 83I.

1.3.1.3 Student Academic Achievement in Mathematics -Grade 5

	# Students Who Completed the Assessment and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned	# Students Scoring at or Above Proficient	Percentage of Students Scoring at or Above Proficient
Grade 5			
All students	346,157	302,410	87.4
American Indian or Alaska Native	1,269	1,118	88.1
Asian or Pacific Islander	12,006	11,541	96.1
Black, non-Hispanic	48,905	38,863	79.5
Hispanic	163,473	138,637	84.8
White, non-Hispanic	120,251	112,093	93.2
Children with disabilities (IDEA)	39,291	24,147	61.5
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	49,524	36,224	73.1
Economically disadvantaged students	197,016	162,893	82.7
Migratory students	3,019	2,355	78.0
Male	176,526	153,539	87.0
Female	169,456	148,764	87.8
Comments:			

Source – Initially populated from EDFacts. See Attachment D: CSPR & EDFacts Data Crosswalk. If the SEA has additional racial/ethnic groups or combinations of racial/ethnic groups in its accountability plan under NCLB, the SEA will report the above data for those groups through the online collection tool.

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

	# Students Who Completed the Assessment and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned	# Students Scoring at or Above Proficient	Percentage of Students Scoring at or Above Proficient
Grade 5			
All students	346,821	306,960	88.5
American Indian or Alaska Native	1,268	1,152	90.9
Asian or Pacific Islander	11,978	11,372	94.9
Black, non-Hispanic	49,035	41,097	83.8
Hispanic	163,733	139,144	85.0
White, non-Hispanic	120,528	114,022	94.6
Children with disabilities (IDEA)	39,379	24,948	63.4
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	49,530	35,021	70.7
Economically disadvantaged students	197,673	165,326	83.6
Migratory students	3,082	2,328	75.5
Male	176,876	154,508	87.4
Female	169,779	152,345	89.7
Comments:			

Source – Initially populated from EDFacts. See Attachment D: CSPR & EDFacts Data Crosswalk. If the SEA has additional racial/ethnic groups or combinations of racial/ethnic groups in its accountability plan under NCLB, the SEA will report the above data for those groups through the online collection tool.

1.3.3.3 Student Academic Achievement in Science -Grade 5

	# Students Who Completed the Assessment and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned	# Students Scoring at or Above Proficient	Percentage of Students Scoring at or Above Proficient
Grade 5			
All students	344,598	269,371	78.2
American Indian or Alaska Native	1,251	1,033	82.6
Asian or Pacific Islander	12,226	10,822	88.5
Black, non-Hispanic	48,502	32,294	66.6
Hispanic	163,353	118,717	72.7
White, non-Hispanic	118,951	106,327	89.4
Children with disabilities (IDEA)	38,565	21,119	54.8
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	49,887	27,006	54.1
Economically disadvantaged students	196,554	138,598	70.5
Migratory students	2,985	1,882	63.0
Male	175,680	141,704	80.7
Female	168,660	127,537	75.6
Comments:			

Source – Manual input by the SEA using the online collection tool. If the SEA has additional racial/ethnic groups or combinations of racial/ethnic groups in its accountability plan under NCLB, the SEA will report the above data for those groups through the online CSPR collection tool.

Note: New collection for the SY 2007-08 CSPR. Proposed under OMB 83I.

1.3.1.4 Student Academic Achievement in Mathematics -Grade 6

	# Students Who Completed the Assessment and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned	# Students Scoring at or Above Proficient	Percentage of Students Scoring at or Above Proficient
Grade 6			
All students	334,335	262,274	78.4
American Indian or Alaska Native	1,169	929	79.5
Asian or Pacific Islander	11,602	10,922	94.1
Black, non-Hispanic	47,300	31,351	66.3
Hispanic	154,690	115,076	74.4
White, non-Hispanic	119,267	103,808	87.0
Children with disabilities (IDEA)	38,755	17,982	46.4
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	38,313	22,581	58.9
Economically disadvantaged students	184,361	131,437	71.3
Migratory students	2,914	1,958	67.2
Male	171,229	132,794	77.6
Female	162,921	129,368	79.4
Comments:			

Source – Initially populated from EDFacts. See Attachment D: CSPR & EDFacts Data Crosswalk. If the SEA has additional racial/ethnic groups or combinations of racial/ethnic groups in its accountability plan under NCLB, the SEA will report the above data for those groups through the online collection tool.

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

	# Students Who Completed the Assessment and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned	# Students Scoring at or Above Proficient	Percentage of Students Scoring at or Above Proficient
Grade 6			
All students	333,925	298,051	89.3
American Indian or Alaska Native	1,172	1,067	91.0
Asian or Pacific Islander	11,555	11,070	95.8
Black, non-Hispanic	47,288	40,307	85.2
Hispanic	154,454	133,027	86.1
White, non-Hispanic	119,151	112,342	94.3
Children with disabilities (IDEA)	38,712	23,675	61.2
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	38,027	25,693	67.6
Economically disadvantaged students	184,151	155,826	84.6
Migratory students	2,907	2,250	77.4
Male	171,015	147,955	86.5
Female	162,732	149,959	92.2
Comments:			

Source – Initially populated from EDFacts. See Attachment D: CSPR & EDFacts Data Crosswalk. If the SEA has additional racial/ethnic groups or combinations of racial/ethnic groups in its accountability plan under NCLB, the SEA will report the above data for those groups through the online collection tool.

1.3.3.4 Student Academic Achievement in Science -Grade 6

	# Students Who Completed the Assessment and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned	# Students Scoring at or Above Proficient	Percentage of Students Scoring at or Above Proficient
Grade 6			
All students	0	0	0.0
American Indian or Alaska Native	0	0	0.0
Asian or Pacific Islander	0	0	0.0
Black, non-Hispanic	0	0	0.0
Hispanic	0	0	0.0
White, non-Hispanic	0	0	0.0
Children with disabilities (IDEA)	0	0	0.0
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	0	0	0.0
Economically disadvantaged students	0	0	0.0
Migratory students	0	0	0.0
Male	0	0	0.0
Female	0	0	0.0
Comments:			

Source – Manual input by the SEA using the online collection tool. If the SEA has additional racial/ethnic groups or combinations of racial/ethnic groups in its accountability plan under NCLB, the SEA will report the above data for those groups through the online CSPR collection tool.

Note: New collection for the SY 2007-08 CSPR. Proposed under OMB 83I.

1.3.1.5 Student Academic Achievement in Mathematics -Grade 7

Grade 7	# Students Who Completed the Assessment and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned	# Students Scoring at or Above Proficient	Percentage of Students Scoring at or Above Proficient
All students	336,298	250,871	74.6
American Indian or Alaska Native	1,260	982	77.9
Asian or Pacific Islander	11,199	10,358	92.5
Black, non-Hispanic	48,608	30,196	62.1
Hispanic	154,246	106,597	69.1
White, non-Hispanic	120,648	102,550	85.0
Children with disabilities (IDEA)	39,645	16,238	41.0
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	30,359	13,940	45.9
Economically disadvantaged students	180,526	119,264	66.1
Migratory students	2,927	1,772	60.5
Male	172,567	126,577	73.3
Female	163,560	124,218	75.9
Comments:			

Source – Initially populated from EDFacts. See Attachment D: CSPR & EDFacts Data Crosswalk. If the SEA has additional racial/ethnic groups or combinations of racial/ethnic groups in its accountability plan under NCLB, the SEA will report the above data for those groups through the online collection tool.

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

Grade 7	# Students Who Completed the Assessment and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned	# Students Scoring at or Above Proficient	Percentage of Students Scoring at or Above Proficient
All students	335,823	278,920	83.1
American Indian or Alaska Native	1,255	1,089	86.8
Asian or Pacific Islander	11,156	10,393	93.2
Black, non-Hispanic	48,616	37,567	77.3
Hispanic	153,875	120,048	78.0
White, non-Hispanic	120,593	109,590	90.9
Children with disabilities (IDEA)	39,651	20,951	52.8
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	29,968	13,781	46.0
Economically disadvantaged students	180,195	137,047	76.1
Migratory students	2,925	1,949	66.6
Male	172,356	138,026	80.1
Female	163,310	140,786	86.2
Comments:			

Source – Initially populated from EDFacts. See Attachment D: CSPR & EDFacts Data Crosswalk. If the SEA has additional racial/ethnic groups or combinations of racial/ethnic groups in its accountability plan under NCLB, the SEA will report the above data for those groups through the online collection tool.

1.3.3.5 Student Academic Achievement in Science -Grade 7

	# Students Who Completed the Assessment and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned	# Students Scoring at or Above Proficient	Percentage of Students Scoring at or Above Proficient
Grade 7			
All students	0	0	0.0
American Indian or Alaska Native	0	0	0.0
Asian or Pacific Islander	0	0	0.0
Black, non-Hispanic	0	0	0.0
Hispanic	0	0	0.0
White, non-Hispanic	0	0	0.0
Children with disabilities (IDEA)	0	0	0.0
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	0	0	0.0
Economically disadvantaged students	0	0	0.0
Migratory students	0	0	0.0
Male	0	0	0.0
Female	0	0	0.0
Comments:			

Source – Manual input by the SEA using the online collection tool. If the SEA has additional racial/ethnic groups or combinations of racial/ethnic groups in its accountability plan under NCLB, the SEA will report the above data for those groups through the online CSPR collection tool.

Note: New collection for the SY 2007-08 CSPR. Proposed under OMB 83I.

1.3.1.6 Student Academic Achievement in Mathematics -Grade 8

	# Students Who Completed the Assessment and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned	# Students Scoring at or Above Proficient	Percentage of Students Scoring at or Above Proficient
Grade 8			
All students	331,062	264,076	79.8
American Indian or Alaska Native	1,179	970	82.3
Asian or Pacific Islander	11,027	10,411	94.4
Black, non-Hispanic	48,484	32,820	67.7
Hispanic	147,799	110,968	75.1
White, non-Hispanic	122,298	108,758	88.9
Children with disabilities (IDEA)	39,993	17,507	43.8
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	25,002	11,587	46.3
Economically disadvantaged students	170,373	122,615	72.0
Migratory students	2,941	1,975	67.2
Male	169,770	134,315	79.1
Female	161,148	129,687	80.5
Comments:			

Source – Initially populated from EDFacts. See Attachment D: CSPR & EDFacts Data Crosswalk. If the SEA has additional racial/ethnic groups or combinations of racial/ethnic groups in its accountability plan under NCLB, the SEA will report the above data for those groups through the online collection tool.

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

	# Students Who Completed the Assessment and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned	# Students Scoring at or Above Proficient	Percentage of Students Scoring at or Above Proficient
Grade 8			
All students	330,966	306,895	92.7
American Indian or Alaska Native	1,162	1,096	94.3
Asian or Pacific Islander	10,989	10,622	96.7
Black, non-Hispanic	48,437	43,475	89.8
Hispanic	147,669	132,702	89.9
White, non-Hispanic	122,451	118,807	97.0
Children with disabilities (IDEA)	40,105	27,450	68.4
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	24,763	15,064	60.8
Economically disadvantaged students	170,587	151,540	88.8
Migratory students	2,964	2,487	83.9
Male	169,744	155,027	91.3
Female	161,086	151,764	94.2
Comments:			

Source – Initially populated from EDFacts. See Attachment D: CSPR & EDFacts Data Crosswalk. If the SEA has additional racial/ethnic groups or combinations of racial/ethnic groups in its accountability plan under NCLB, the SEA will report the above data for those groups through the online collection tool.

1.3.3.6 Student Academic Achievement in Science -Grade 8

	# Students Who Completed the Assessment and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned	# Students Scoring at or Above Proficient	Percentage of Students Scoring at or Above Proficient
Grade 8			
All students	328,200	218,862	66.7
American Indian or Alaska Native	1,157	832	71.9
Asian or Pacific Islander	11,189	9,509	85.0
Black, non-Hispanic	47,706	25,525	53.5
Hispanic	147,082	84,018	57.1
White, non-Hispanic	120,744	98,833	81.9
Children with disabilities (IDEA)	38,964	15,730	40.4
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	25,738	6,021	23.4
Economically disadvantaged students	169,083	92,813	54.9
Migratory students	2,868	1,346	46.9
Male	168,193	115,293	68.5
Female	159,800	103,488	64.8
Comments:			

Source – Manual input by the SEA using the online collection tool. If the SEA has additional racial/ethnic groups or combinations of racial/ethnic groups in its accountability plan under NCLB, the SEA will report the above data for those groups through the online CSPR collection tool.

Note: New collection for the SY 2007-08 CSPR. Proposed under OMB 83I.

1.3.1.7 Student Academic Achievement in Mathematics -High School

High School	# Students Who Completed the Assessment and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned	# Students Scoring at or Above Proficient	Percentage of Students Scoring at or Above Proficient
All students	308,804	190,401	61.7
American Indian or Alaska Native	1,144	713	62.3
Asian or Pacific Islander	11,071	9,522	86.0
Black, non-Hispanic	45,185	20,348	45.0
Hispanic	129,264	68,653	53.1
White, non-Hispanic	121,895	91,066	74.7
Children with disabilities (IDEA)	32,427	9,066	28.0
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	19,715	5,353	27.2
Economically disadvantaged students	137,421	68,609	49.9
Migratory students	2,455	1,141	46.5
Male	156,729	96,389	61.5
Female	151,948	93,968	61.8
Comments:			

Source – Initially populated from EDFacts. See Attachment D: CSPR & EDFacts Data Crosswalk. If the SEA has additional racial/ethnic groups or combinations of racial/ethnic groups in its accountability plan under NCLB, the SEA will report the above data for those groups through the online collection tool.

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

High School	# Students Who Completed the Assessment and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned	# Students Scoring at or Above Proficient	Percentage of Students Scoring at or Above Proficient
All students	312,884	266,052	85.0
American Indian or Alaska Native	1,145	980	85.6
Asian or Pacific Islander	11,062	10,237	92.5
Black, non-Hispanic	45,933	36,434	79.3
Hispanic	131,483	106,322	80.9
White, non-Hispanic	123,074	111,954	91.0
Children with disabilities (IDEA)	33,142	17,722	53.5
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	20,042	8,759	43.7
Economically disadvantaged students	140,092	110,250	78.7
Migratory students	2,563	1,913	74.6
Male	159,297	129,204	81.1
Female	153,480	136,774	89.1
Comments:			

Source – Initially populated from EDFacts. See Attachment D: CSPR & EDFacts Data Crosswalk. If the SEA has additional racial/ethnic groups or combinations of racial/ethnic groups in its accountability plan under NCLB, the SEA will report the above data for those groups through the online collection tool.

1.3.3.7 Student Academic Achievement in Science -High School

	# Students Who Completed the Assessment and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned	# Students Scoring at or Above Proficient	Percentage of Students Scoring at or Above Proficient
High School			
All students	307,640	194,293	63.2
American Indian or Alaska Native	1,131	782	69.1
Asian or Pacific Islander	11,179	9,183	82.1
Black, non-Hispanic	44,954	21,003	46.7
Hispanic	128,825	66,371	51.5
White, non-Hispanic	121,259	96,828	79.9
Children with disabilities (IDEA)	32,152	11,253	35.0
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	19,673	3,654	18.6
Economically disadvantaged students	136,857	67,268	49.2
Migratory students	2,426	994	41.0
Male	156,119	102,948	65.9
Female	151,366	91,285	60.3
Comments:			

Source – Manual input by the SEA using the online collection tool. If the SEA has additional racial/ethnic groups or combinations of racial/ethnic groups in its accountability plan under NCLB, the SEA will report the above data for those groups through the online CSPR collection tool.

Note: New collection for the SY 2007-08 CSPR. Proposed under OMB 83I.

1.4 SCHOOL AND DISTRICT ACCOUNTABILITY

This section collects data on the Adequate Yearly Progress (AYP) status of schools and districts.

1.4.1 All Schools and Districts Accountability

In the table below, provide the total number of schools and districts and the total number of those schools and districts that made AYP based on data for the SY 2007-08. The percentage that made AYP will be calculated automatically.

Entity	Total #	Total # that Made AYP in SY 2007-08	Percentage that Made AYP in SY 2007-08
Schools	7,279	6,170	84.8
Districts	1,215	824	67.8
Comments:			

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

1.4.2 Title I School Accountability

In the table below, provide the total number of public Title I schools by type and the total number of those schools that made AYP based on data for the SY 2007-08 school year. Include only public Title I schools. Do not include Title I programs operated by local educational agencies in private schools. The percentage that made AYP will be calculated automatically.

Title I School	# Title I Schools	# Title I Schools that Made AYP in SY 2007-08	Percentage of Title I Schools that Made AYP in SY 2007-08
All Title I schools	5,282	4,528	85.7
Schoolwide (SWP) Title I schools	4,997	4,263	85.3
Targeted assistance (TAS) Title I schools	285	265	93.0
Comments:			

Source – The table above is produced through ED Facts. The SEA submits the data in N/X129 for data group 22 and N/X103 for data group 32.

1.4.3 Accountability of Districts That Received Title I Funds

In the table below, provide the total number of districts that received Title I funds and the total number of those districts that made AYP based on data for SY 2007-08. The percentage that made AYP will be calculated automatically.

# Districts That Received Title I Funds	# Districts That Received Title I Funds and Made AYP in SY 2007-08	Percentage of Districts That Received Title I Funds and Made AYP in SY 2007-08
1,192	790	66.3
Comments:		

Source – Initially populated from ED Facts. See Attachment D: CSPR & ED Facts Data Crosswalk.

Note: DG 582 is not collected from the SEA, rather it comes from the Title I funding data.

1.4.4 Title I Schools Identified for Improvement

1.4.4.1 List of Title I Schools Identified for Improvement

In the following table, provide a list of Title I schools identified for improvement, corrective action, or restructuring under Section 1116 for the SY 2008-09 based on the data from SY 2007-08. For each school on the list, provide the following:

- District Name and NCES ID Code
- School Name and NCES ID Code
- Whether the school met the proficiency target in reading/language arts as outlined in the State's Accountability Plan
- Whether the school met the participation rate target for the reading/language arts assessment
- Whether the school met the proficiency target in mathematics as outlined in the State's Accountability Plan
- Whether the school met the participation rate target for the mathematics assessment
- Whether the school met the other academic indicator for elementary/middle schools (if applicable) as outlined in the State's Accountability Plan

- Whether the school met the graduation rate for high schools (if applicable) as outlined in the State's Accountability Plan
- Improvement status for SY 2008-09 (Use one of the following improvement status designations: School Improvement – Year 1, School Improvement – Year 2, Corrective Action, Restructuring Year 1 (planning), or Restructuring Year 2 (implementing))
- Whether (yes or no) the school is or is not a Title I school (This column must be completed by States that choose to list all schools in improvement. Column is optional for States that list only Title I schools.)
- Whether (yes or no) the school was provided assistance through 1003(a).
- Whether (yes or no) the school was provided assistance through 1003 (g).

See attached for blank template that can be used to enter school data.

Download template: [Question 1.4.4.1 \(Get MS Excel Viewer\)](#)

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

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

1.4.4.3 Corrective Action

In the table below, for schools in corrective action, provide the number of schools for which the listed corrective actions under NCLB were implemented in SY 2007-08 (based on SY 2006-07 assessments under Section 1111 of ESEA).

Corrective Action	# of Title I Schools in Corrective Action in Which the Corrective Action was Implemented in SY 2007-08
Required implementation of a new research-based curriculum or instructional program	19
Extension of the school year or school day	6
Replacement of staff members relevant to the school's low performance	0
Significant decrease in management authority at the school level	1
Replacement of the principal	3
Restructuring the internal organization of the school	13
Appointment of an outside expert to advise the school	15
Comments:	

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

1.4.4.4 Restructuring – Year 2

In the table below, for schools in restructuring – year 2 (implementation year), provide the number of schools for which the listed restructuring actions under NCLB were implemented in SY 2007-08 (based on SY 2006-07 assessments under Section 1111 of ESEA).

Restructuring Action	# of Title I Schools in Restructuring in Which Restructuring Action Is Being Implemented
Replacement of all or most of the school staff (which may include the principal)	3
Reopening the school as a public charter school	0
Entering into a contract with a private entity to operate the school	0
Take over the school by the State	0
Other major restructuring of the school governance	17
Comments:	

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

In the space below, list specifically the "other major restructuring of the school governance" action(s) that were implemented.

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

Assign an executive principal; dissolve the school and assign students to other schools in the district; replace all math and science instructors; restructuring proposal is to add pathways in manufacturing, engineering and technology; school within a school and effective schools correlates systemic reform and alternative governance AP of SIP.

1.4.5 Districts That Received Title I Funds Identified for Improvement

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

In the following table, provide a list of districts that received Title I funds and were identified for improvement or corrective action under Section 1116 for the SY 2008-09 based on the data from SY 2007-08. For each district on the list, provide the following:

- District Name and NCES ID Code
- Whether the district met the proficiency target in reading/language arts as outlined in the State's Accountability Plan
- Whether the district met the participation rate target for the reading/language arts assessment
- Whether the district met the proficiency target in mathematics as outlined in the State's Accountability Plan
- Whether the school met the participation rate target for the mathematics assessment
- Whether the district met the other academic indicator for elementary/middle schools (if applicable) as outlined in the State's Accountability Plan

- Whether the district met the graduation rate for high schools (if applicable) as outlined in the State's Accountability Plan
- Improvement status for SY 2008-09 (Use one of the following improvement status designations: Improvement or Corrective Action)
- Whether the district is a district that received Title I funds. Indicate "Yes" if the district received Title I funds and "No" if the district did not receive Title I funds. (This column **must be completed by States that choose to list all districts or all districts in improvement. This column is optional for States that list only** districts in improvement that receive Title I funds.)

See attached for blank template that can be used to enter district data.

Download template: [Question 1.4.5.1 \(Get MS Excel Viewer\)](#)

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

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

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

In the space below, briefly describe the measures being taken to address the achievement problems of districts identified for improvement or corrective action. Include a discussion of the technical assistance provided by the State (e.g., the number of districts served, the nature and duration of assistance provided, etc.).

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

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.

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

1.4.5.3 Corrective Action

In the table below, for districts in corrective action, provide the number of districts in corrective action in which the listed corrective actions under NCLB were implemented in SY 2007-08 (based on SY 2006-07 assessments under Section 1111 of ESEA).

Corrective Action	# of Districts receiving Title I funds in Corrective Action in Which Corrective Action was Implemented in SY 2007-08
Implementing a new curriculum based on State standards	0
Authorized students to transfer from district schools to higher performing schools in a neighboring district	0
Deferred programmatic funds or reduced administrative funds	0
Replaced district personnel who are relevant to the failure to make AYP	0
Removed one or more schools from the jurisdiction of the district	0
Appointed a receiver or trustee to administer the affairs of the district	0
Restructured the district	0
Abolished the district (list the number of districts abolished between the end of SY 2006-07 and beginning of SY 2007-08 as a corrective action)	0
Comments: No districts in corrective action for 07-08.	

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

1.4.7 Appeal of AYP and Identification Determinations

In the table below, provide the number of districts and schools that appealed their AYP designations based on 2007-08 data and the results of those appeals.

	# Appealed Their AYP Designations	# Appeals Resulted in a Change in the AYP Designation
Districts	78	8
Schools	196	51
Comments:		

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

Date (MM/DD/YY) that processing appeals based on SY 2007-08 data was complete	12/22/08
---	----------

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

1.4.8 School Improvement Status

In the section below, "Schools in Improvement" means Title I schools identified for improvement, corrective action, or restructuring under Section 1116 of ESEA for SY 2007-08.

1.4.8.1 Student Proficiency for Schools Receiving Assistance Through Section 1003(a) and 1003(g) Funds

The table below pertains only to schools that received assistance through Section 1003(a) and/or 1003(g) funds during SY 2007-08.

- In the SY 2007-08 column, provide the total number and percentage of students in schools receiving School Improvement funds in SY 2007-08 who were:
 - Proficient in mathematics as measured by your State's assessments required under Section 1111(b)(3) of ESEA in SY 2007-08.
 - Proficient in reading/language arts as measured by your State's assessments required under Section 1111(b)(3) of ESEA in SY 2007-08.
 - Total number of schools for which the data in this table are reported. This should be the total number of schools that received assistance through Section 1003(a) and/or 1003(g) funds during SY 2007-08.
- In the SY 2006-07 column, provide the requested data for the same schools whose student proficiency data are reported for SY 2007-08. No total is requested for schools in SY 2006-07.

Category	SY 2007-08	SY 2006-07
Total number of students who were enrolled in schools that received assistance through Section 1003 (a) and/or 1003(g) funds in SY 2007-08	124,971	129,795
Total number of students who were proficient in mathematics in schools that received assistance through Section 1003(a) and/or 1003(g) funds in SY 2007-08	70,695	69,369
Percentage of students who were proficient in mathematics in schools that received assistance through Section 1003(a) and/or 1003(g) funds in SY 2007-08	56.6	53.4
Total number of students who were proficient in reading/language arts in schools that received assistance through Section 1003(a) and/or 1003(g) funds in SY 2007-08	94,613	93,664
Percentage of students who were proficient in reading/language arts in schools that received assistance through Section 1003(a) and/or 1003(g) funds in SY 2007-08	75.7	72.2
Number of schools that received assistance through Section 1003(a) and/or 1003(g) funds in SY 2007-08	282	
Comments: The enrollment reported includes only students who were in grades assessed under section 1111 of ESEA. Also, the SY 2006-07 column includes only data for schools that received assistance through section 1003(a) and/or 1003(g) funds during SY 2007-08.		

Source – Manual input by the SEA using the online collection tool. Note: New collection for the SY 2007-08 CSPR. Proposed under OMB 83I.

1.4.8.2 School Improvement Status and School Improvement Assistance

In the table below, indicate the number of schools receiving assistance through Section 1003(a) and/or 1003(g) funds during SY 2007-08 that:

- Made adequate yearly progress;
- Exited improvement status;
- Did not make adequate yearly progress.

Category	# of Schools
Number of schools receiving assistance through Section 1003(a) and/or 1003(g) funds during SY 2007-08 that made adequate yearly progress based on testing in SY 2007-08	87
Number of schools receiving assistance through Section 1003(a) and/or 1003(g) funds during SY 2007-08 that exited improvement status based on testing in SY 2007-08	40
Number of schools receiving assistance through Section 1003(a) and/or 1003(g) funds during SY 2007-08 that did not make adequate yearly progress based on testing in SY 2007-08	302
Comments:	

Source – Manual input by the SEA using the online collection tool. Note: New collection for the SY 2007-08 CSPR. Proposed under OMB

1.4.8.3 Effective School Improvement Strategies

In the table below, indicate the effective school improvement strategies used that were supported through Section 1003(a) and/or 1003(g) funds.

Column 1	Column 2	Column 3	Column 4	Column 5	Column 6	Column 7
Effective Strategy or Combination of Strategies Used (See response options in "Column 1 Response Options Box" below.) If your State's response includes a "5" (other strategies), identify the specific strategy(s) in Column 2.	Description of "Other Strategies" This response is limited to 500 characters.	Number of schools in which the strategy(s) was used	Number of schools that used the strategy(s), made AYP, and exited improvement status	Number of schools that used the strategy(s), made AYP, but did not exit improvement status	Most common other Positive Outcome from the Strategy (See response options in "Column 6 Response Options Box" below)	Description of "Other Positive Outcome" if Response for Column 6 is "D" This response is limited to 500 characters.
1	NA	344	45	55		NA
2	NA	344	45	55		NA
3	NA	344	45	55		NA
5	NA	344	45	55		NA
Comments: Do not collect data for Column 6						

Column 1 Response Options Box
<p>1 = Provide customized technical assistance and/or professional development that is designed to build the capacity of LEA and school staff to improve schools and is informed by student achievement and other outcome-related measures.</p> <p>2 = Utilize research-based strategies or practices to change instructional practice to address the academic achievement problems that caused the school to be identified for improvement, corrective action, or restructuring.</p> <p>3 = Create partnerships among the SEA, LEAs and other entities for the purpose of delivering technical assistance, professional development, and management advice.</p> <p>4 = Provide professional development to enhance the capacity of school support team members and other technical assistance providers who are part of the Statewide system of support and that is informed by student achievement and other outcome-related measures.</p> <p>5 = Implement other strategies determined by the SEA or LEA, as appropriate, for which data indicate the strategy is likely to result in improved teaching and learning in schools identified for improvement, corrective action, or restructuring.</p> <p>6 = Combination 1: Schools using a combination of strategies from above. Please use Column 2 to indicate which of the above strategies comprise this combination.</p> <p>7 = Combination 2: Schools using a combination of strategies from above. Please use Column 2 to indicate which of the above strategies comprise this combination.</p> <p>8 = Combination 3: Schools Using a combination of strategies from above. Please use Column 2 to indicate which of the above strategies comprise this combination.</p>

Column 6 Response Options Box

A = Improvement by at least five percentage points in two or more AYP reporting cells

B = Increased teacher retention

C = Improved parental involvement

D = Other

Source – Manual input by the SEA using the online collection tool. Note: New collection for the SY 2007-08 CSPR. Proposed under OMB

831.

1.4.8.4 Sharing of Effective Strategies

In the space below, describe how your State shared the effective strategies identified in item 1.4.8.3 with its LEAs and schools. Please exclude newsletters and handouts in your description.

This response is limited to 8,000 characters.

The School Improvement Resource Center (SIRC) is a statewide initiative funded by TEA that serves all campus identified in Title I school improvement status. SIRC disseminates information through several resources such as a series of 12 Principal's Planning Guides. This information is available at <http://www5.esc13.net/sirc/resources.html>. SIRC also hosts an annual Texas School Improvement Conference which SIP campuses are required to attend. SIRC, LEAs, and TEA share information on effective strategies at his conference. Information is available at <http://www5.esc13.net/sirc/tsic.html>.

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

1.4.8.5 Use of Section 1003(a) and (g) School Improvement Funds

Note: New section for the SY 2007-08 CSPR. Proposed under OMB 83I.

1.4.8.5.1 Section 1003(a) State Reservations

In the space provided, enter the percentage of the FY 2007 (SY 2007-08) Title I, Part A allocation that the SEA reserved in accordance with Section 1003(a) of ESEA and §200.100(a) of ED's regulations governing the reservation of funds for school improvement under Section 1003(a) of ESEA: 4.0 %

Comments:

Source – Manual input by the SEA using the online collection tool. Note: New collection for the SY 2007-08 CSPR. Proposed under OMB 83I.

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

In the tables below, provide the requested information for FY 2007 (SY 2007-08).

See attached for blank template that can be used to enter allocation data.

Download template: [Question 1.4.8.5.2 \(Get MS Excel Viewer\)](#)

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

Note: New collection for the SY 2007-08 CSPR. Proposed under OMB 831.

1.4.8.5.3 Use of Section 1003(g)(8) Funds for Evaluation and Technical Assistance

Section 1003(g)(8) of ESEA allows States to reserve up to five percent of Section 1003(g) funds for administration and to meet the evaluation and technical assistance requirements for this program. In the space below, identify and describe the specific Section 1003(g) evaluation and technical assistance activities that your State conducted during SY 2007-08.

This response is limited to 8,000 characters.

The School Improvement Resource Center (SIRC) provided the technical assistance to eligible campuses to meet the state's commitment as stated in the state's application to the United States Department of Education (USDE). The grant provides additional funding and technical assistance to support these campuses in their continued efforts in the complex task of school improvement.

The technical assistance included campus-wide improvement planning in the summer, optional additional technical assistance days, coaching provided to the campus leadership team, and further customized professional development. The evaluation component collected documentation from the grantees on the required activities conducted. More in-depth evaluation strategies, as defined in the state's application, will begin in the second year of the grant.

Source – Manual input by the SEA using the online collection tool. Note: New collection for the SY 2007-08 CSPR. Proposed under OMB 831.

1.4.8.6 Actions Taken for Title I Schools Identified for Improvement Supported by Funds Other than Those of Section 1003(a) and 1003(g).

In the space below, describe actions (if any) taken by your State in SY 2007-08 that were supported by funds other than Section 1003(a) and 1003(g) funds to address the achievement problems of schools identified for improvement, corrective action, or restructuring under Section 1116 of ESEA.

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

None

Source – Manual input by the SEA using the online collection tool. Note: New collection for the SY 2007-08 CSPR. Proposed under OMB 831.

1.4.9 Public School Choice and Supplemental Educational Services

This section collects data on public school choice and supplemental educational services.

1.4.9.1 Public School Choice

This section collects data on public school choice. FAQs related to the public school choice provisions are at the end of this section.

1.4.9.1.2 Public School Choice – Students

In the table below, provide the number of students who were eligible for public school choice, the number of eligible students who applied for public school choice, and the number who transferred under the provisions for public school choice in Section 1116 of ESEA.

Students who are eligible for public school choice includes:

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

	# Students
Eligible for public school choice	152,229
Applied to transfer	2,418
Transferred to another school under the Title I public school choice provisions	1,963

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

	Yes/No
Enrolled in a school identified for improvement	Yes
Transferred in the current school year, only	No
Transferred in a prior year and in the current year	No
Comments:	

Source – Initially populated from ED Facts. See Attachment D: CSPR & ED Facts Data Crosswalk.

1.4.9.1.3 Funds Spent on Public School Choice

In the table below, provide the total dollar amount spent by LEAs on transportation for public school choice in Section 1116 of ESEA.

	Amount
Dollars spent by LEAs on transportation for public school choice	\$ 2,707,927
Comments:	

Source – Initially populated from ED Facts. See Attachment D: CSPR & ED Facts Data Crosswalk.

1.4.9.1.4 Availability of Public School Choice Options

In the table below provide the number of LEAs in your State that are unable to provide public school choice options to eligible students due to any of the following reasons:

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

	# LEAs
LEAs Unable to Provide Public School Choice	114
Comments: Due to an increase of schools being identified for School Improvement, the number of LEAs not being able to offer school choice has also increased.	

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

FAQs about public school choice:

a. How should States report data on Title I public school choice for those LEAs that have open enrollment and other choice programs?

An LEA may consider a student as eligible for and participating in Title I public school choice, and may consider costs for transporting that student towards its funds spent on transportation for public school choice, if the student meets the following conditions:

- Has a "home" or "neighborhood" school (to which the student would have been assigned, in the absence of a choice program) that receives Title I funds and has been identified, under the statute, as in need of improvement, corrective action, or restructuring; and
- Has elected to enroll, at some point since July 1, 2002 (the effective date of the Title I choice provisions), and after the home school has been identified as in need of improvement, in a school that has not been so identified and is attending that school; and³
- Is using district transportation services to attend such a school.

b. How do States report on public school choice for those LEAs that are not able to offer public school choice (e.g., LEAs in which all schools in a grade level are in school improvement, LEAs that have only a single school at that grade level, or LEAs whose schools are so remote from one another that choice is impracticable)? For those LEAs, States should count as eligible all students who attend identified Title I schools. States should report that no eligible schools or students were provided the option to transfer and should provide an explanation why choice is not possible within the LEA in the Comment Section.

³ Adapted from OESE/OII policy letter of August 2004. The policy letter may be found on the Department's Web page at <http://www.ed.gov/policy/elsec/guid/stateletters/choice/choice081804.html>.

1.4.9.2 Supplemental Educational Services

This section collects data on supplemental educational services.

1.4.9.2.2 Supplemental Educational Services – Students

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

	# Students
Eligible for supplemental educational services	130,742
Applied for supplemental educational services	19,547
Received supplemental educational services	15,199
Comments: The numbers for SES have increased from last year partially due to Texas incorporating a statewide SES management system for gathering data.	

Source – Initially populated from ED Facts. See Attachment D: CSPR & ED Facts Data Crosswalk.

1.4.9.2.3 Funds Spent on Supplemental Educational Services

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

	Amount
Dollars spent by LEAs on supplemental educational services	\$ 13,323,096
Comments:	

Source – Initially populated from ED Facts. See Attachment D: CSPR & ED Facts Data Crosswalk.

1.5 TEACHER QUALITY

This section collects data on "highly qualified" teachers as the term is defined in Section 9101(23) of ESEA.

1.5.1 Core Academic Classes Taught by Teachers Who Are Highly Qualified

In the table below, provide the number of core academic classes for each of the school types listed and the number of those core academic classes taught by teachers who are highly qualified (as the term is defined in Section 9101(23) of ESEA) and the number taught by teachers who are not highly qualified. The percentage of core academic classes taught by teachers who are highly qualified and the percentage taught by teachers who are not highly qualified will be calculated automatically. Below the table are FAQs about these data. The percentages used for high-and low-poverty schools and the poverty metric used to determine those percentages are reported in 1.5.3.

School Type	# of Core Academic Classes (Total)	# of Core Academic Classes Taught by Teachers Who Are Highly Qualified	Percentage of Core Academic Classes Taught by Teachers Who Are Highly Qualified	# of Core Academic Classes Taught by Teachers Who Are NOT Highly Qualified	Percentage of Core Academic Classes Taught by Teachers Who Are NOT Highly Qualified
All schools	737,697	729,602	98.9	8,095	1.1
Elementary level					
High-poverty schools	47,617	47,259	99.2	358	0.8
Low-poverty schools	41,291	41,259	99.9	32	0.1
All elementary schools	169,214	168,449	99.5	765	0.5
Secondary level					
High-poverty schools	84,042	82,071	97.7	1,971	2.3
Low-poverty schools	211,240	209,567	99.2	1,673	0.8
All secondary schools	568,483	561,153	98.7	7,330	1.3
Comments:					

Do the data in Table 1.5.1 above include classes taught by special education teachers who provide direct instruction core academic subjects?

Data table includes classes taught by special education teachers who provide direct instruction core academic subjects.

Yes

If the answer above is no, please explain below. The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

Does the State count elementary classes so that a full-day self-contained classroom equals one class, or does the State use a departmentalized approach where a classroom is counted multiple times, once for each subject taught?

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

Yes. Full day self-contained classroom equals one class.

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

FAQs about highly qualified teachers and core academic subjects:

- a. *What are the core academic subjects? English, reading/language arts, mathematics, science, foreign languages, civics and government, economics, arts, history, and geography [Title IX, Section 9101(11)]. While the statute includes the arts in the core academic subjects, it does not specify which of the arts are core academic subjects; therefore, States must make this determination.*
- b. *How is a teacher defined? An individual who provides instruction in the core academic areas to kindergarten, grades 1 through 12, or ungraded classes, or individuals who teach in an environment other than a classroom setting (and who maintain daily student attendance records) [from NCES, CCD, 2001-02]*
- c. *How is a class defined? A class is a setting in which organized instruction of core academic course content is provided to one or more students (including cross-age groupings) for a given period of time. (A course may be offered to more than one class.) Instruction, provided by one or more teachers or other staff members, may be delivered in person or via a different medium. Classes that share space should be considered as separate classes if they function as separate units for more than 50% of the time [from NCES Non-fiscal Data Handbook for Early Childhood, Elementary, and Secondary Education, 2003].*
- d. *Should 6th-, 7th-, and 8th-grade classes be reported in the elementary or the secondary category? States are responsible for determining whether the content taught at the middle school level meets the competency requirements for elementary or secondary instruction. Report classes in grade 6 through 8 consistent with how teachers have been classified to determine their highly qualified status, regardless of whether their schools are configured as elementary or middle schools.*
- e. *How should States count teachers (including specialists or resource teachers) in elementary classes? States that count self-contained classrooms as one class should, to avoid over-representation, also count subject-area specialists (e.g., mathematics or music teachers) or resource teachers as teaching one class. On the other hand, States using a departmentalized approach to instruction where a self-contained classroom is counted multiple times (once for each subject taught) should also count subject-area specialists or resource teachers as teaching multiple classes.*
- f. *How should States count teachers in self-contained multiple-subject secondary classes? Each core academic subject taught for which students are receiving credit toward graduation should be counted in the numerator and the denominator. For example, if the same teacher teaches English, calculus, history, and science in a self-contained classroom, count these as four classes in the denominator. If the teacher were Highly Qualified to teach English and history, he/she would be counted as Highly Qualified in two of the four subjects in the numerator.*
- g. *What is a "high-poverty school"? Section 1111(h)(1)(C)(viii) defines "high-poverty" schools as schools in the top quartile of poverty in the State. The poverty quartile breaks are reported later in this section.*
- h. *What is a "low-poverty school"? Section 1111(h)(1)(C)(viii) defines "low-poverty" schools as schools in the bottom quartile of poverty in the State. The poverty quartile breaks are reported later in this section.*

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

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

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

	Percentage
Elementary School Classes	
Elementary school classes taught by certified general education teachers who did not pass a subject-knowledge test or (if eligible) have not demonstrated subject-matter competency through HOUSSE	36.8
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	6.9
Elementary school classes taught by teachers who are not fully certified (and are not in an approved alternative route program)	56.3
Other (please explain in comment box below)	0.0
Total	100.0

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

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

	Percentage
Secondary School Classes	
Secondary school classes taught by certified general education teachers who have not demonstrated subject-matter knowledge in those subjects (e.g., out-of-field teachers)	39.4
Secondary school classes taught by certified special education teachers who have not demonstrated subject-matter competency in those subjects	22.2
Secondary school classes taught by teachers who are not fully certified (and are not in an approved alternative route program)	33.1
Other (please explain in comment box below)	5.3
Total	100.0

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

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

1.5.3 Poverty Quartiles and Metrics Used

In the table below, provide the poverty quartiles breaks used in determining high-and low-poverty schools and the poverty metric used to determine the poverty quartiles. Below the table are FAQs about the data collected in this table.

	High-Poverty Schools (more than what %)	Low-Poverty Schools (less than what %)
Elementary schools	85.3	40.0
Poverty metric used	Percentage of low income	
Secondary schools	69.0	32.7
Poverty metric used	Percentage of low income	
Comments:		

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

FAQs on poverty quartiles and metrics used to determine poverty

- a. *How are the poverty quartiles determined? Separately rank order elementary and secondary schools from highest to lowest on your percentage poverty measure. Divide the list into four equal groups. Schools in the first (highest group) are high-poverty schools. Schools in the last group (lowest group) are the low-poverty schools. Generally, States use the percentage of students who qualify for the free or reduced-price lunch program for this calculation.*
- b. *Since the poverty data are collected at the school and not classroom level, how do we classify schools as either elementary or secondary for this purpose? States may include as elementary schools all schools that serve children in grades K through 5 (including K through 8 or K through 12 schools) and would therefore include as secondary schools those that exclusively serve children in grades 6 and higher.*

1.6 TITLE III AND LANGUAGE INSTRUCTIONAL PROGRAMS

This section collects annual performance and accountability data on the implementation of Title III programs.

1.6.1 Language Instruction Educational Programs

In the table below, place a check next to each type of language instruction educational programs implemented in the State, as defined in Section 3301(8), as required by Sections 3121(a)(1), 3123(b)(1), and 3123(b)(2).

Table 1.6.1 Definitions:

1. **Types of Programs = Types of programs described in the subgrantee's local plan (as submitted to the State or as implemented) that is closest to the descriptions in <http://www.ncela.gwu.edu/expert/glossary.html>.**
2. **Other Language = Name of the language of instruction, other than English, used in the program.**

Check Types of Programs	Type of Program	Other Language
Yes	Dual language	Spanish
Yes	Two-way immersion	Spanish
Yes	Transitional bilingual	Spanish
Yes	Developmental bilingual	Spanish
No	Heritage language	
Yes	Sheltered English instruction	
No	Structured English immersion	
No	Specially designed academic instruction delivered in English (SDAIE)	
Yes	Content-based ESL	
Yes	Pull-out ESL	
No	Other (explain in comment box below)	

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

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

1.6.2 Student Demographic Data

1.6.2.1 Number of ALL LEP Students in the State

In the table below, provide the unduplicated number of ALL LEP students in the State. LEP students are defined as all students assessed for English language proficiency (ELP) using an annual State ELP assessment as required under Section 1111(b)(7) of ESEA in the reporting year and who meet the LEP definition in Section 9101(25).

- Include newly enrolled (recent arrivals to the U.S.) and continually enrolled LEP students, whether or not they receive services in a Title III language instruction educational program
- Do not include Former LEP students (as defined in Section 200.20(f)(2) of the Title I regulation) and monitored Former LEP students (as defined in Section 3121(a)(4) of Title III) in the ALL LEP student count in this table.

Number of ALL LEP students in the State	701,799
Comments:	

Source – Manual entry by SEA into the online collection tool. Note: New or substantially revised

question for the SY 2007-08 CSPR. Proposed under OMB 831.

1.6.2.2 Number of LEP Students Who Received Title III Language Instruction Educational Program Services

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

	#
LEP students who received services in a Title III language instruction educational program in grades K through 12 for this reporting year.	691,717
Comments:	

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

1.6.2.3 Most Commonly Spoken Languages in the State

In the table below, provide the five most commonly spoken languages, other than English, in the State (for all LEP students, not just LEP students who received Title III Services). The top five languages should be determined by the highest number of students speaking each of the languages listed.

Language	# LEP Students
Spanish	711,388
Vietnamese	14,094
Urdu	3,627
Arabic	3,594
Korean	3,195

Report additional languages with significant numbers of LEP students in the comment box below. The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

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

1.6.3 Student Performance Data

This section collects data on LEP student English language proficiency, as required by Sections 1111(h)(4)(D) and 3121(b)(1).

1.6.3.1.1 ALL LEP Participation in State Annual English Language Proficiency Assessment

In the table below, please provide the number of ALL LEP students tested on annual State English language proficiency assessment (as defined in 1.6.2.1).

	#
Number tested on State annual ELP assessment	676,634
Number not tested on State annual ELP assessment	25,165
Total	701,799
Comments:	

Source – Manual entry by SEA into the online collection tool. Note: New or substantially revised question for the SY 2007-08 CSPR.

Proposed under OMB 831.

1.6.3.1.2 ALL LEP Student English Language Proficiency Results

	#
Number proficient or above on State annual ELP assessment	215,954
Percent proficient or above on State annual ELP assessment	30.8
Comments: AMAO 1 (progress) not available this year. Reference letter from TEA to USDE dated July 23, 2008.	

Source – Manual entry by SEA into the online collection tool. Note: New or substantially revised question for the SY 2007-08 CSPR.

Proposed under OMB 831.

1.6.3.2.1 Title III LEP Participation in English Language Proficiency

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

	#
Number tested on State annual ELP assessment	675,263
Number not tested on State annual ELP assessment	25,032
Total	700,295
Comments:	

Source – Manual entry by SEA into the online collection tool. Note: New or substantially revised

question for the SY 2007-08 CSPR. Proposed under OMB 831.

1.6.3.2.2 Title III LEP English Language Proficiency Results

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

Table 1.6.3.2.2 Definitions:

1. **Making Progress = Number of Title III LEP students who met the definition of "Making Progress" as defined by the State and submitted to OELA in the State Consolidated Application (CSA), or as amended.**
2. **ELP Attainment = Number of Title III LEP students who attained English language proficiency as defined by the State and submitted to OELA in the State Consolidated Application (CSA), or as amended.**
3. **Results = Number and percent of Title III LEP students who met the State definition of "Making Progress" and the number and percent that met the State definition of "Attainment" of English language proficiency.**

	Results	
	#	%
Making progress	0	0.0
ELP attainment	296,497	42.3

Comments: AMAO 1 (progress) not available this year. Reference letter from TEA to USDE dated July 23, 2008. Attainment: Target K-2 -2.5 3-12 Method 1 -25% Method 2 -40% Actual K-2 -16% (46,137) 3-12 Method 1 -45.9% (162,535) Method 2 -60.8% (411,727)

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

1.6.3.5 Native Language Assessments

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

1.6.3.5.1 LEP Students Assessed in Native Language

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

State offers the State reading/language arts content tests in the students' native language(s).	Yes
State offers the State mathematics content tests in the students' native language(s).	Yes
State offers the State science content tests in the students' native language(s).	Yes
Comments:	

Source – Manual entry by SEA into the online collection tool. Note: New or substantially revised question for the SY 2007-08 CSPR. Proposed under OMB 831.

1.6.3.5.2 Native Language of Mathematics Tests Given

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

Language(s)
Spanish
Comments:

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

1.6.3.5.3 Native Language of Reading/Language Arts Tests Given

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

Language(s)
Spanish
Comments:

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

1.6.3.5.4 Native Language of Science Tests Given

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

Language(s)
Spanish
Comments:

Source – Manual entry by SEA into the online collection tool. Note: New or substantially revised question for the SY 2007-08 CSPR.

Proposed under OMB 831.

1.6.3.6 Title III Served Monitored Former LEP Students

This section collects data on the performance of former LEP students as required by Sections 3121(a)(4) and 3123(b)(8).

1.6.3.6.1 Title III Served MFLEP Students by Year Monitored

In the table below, report the unduplicated count of monitored former LEP students during the two consecutive years of monitoring, which includes both MFLEP students in AYP grades and in non-AYP grades.

Monitored Former LEP (MFLEP) students include:

- Students who have transitioned out of a language instruction educational program funded by Title III into classrooms that are not tailored for LEP students.
- Students who are no longer receiving LEP services and who are being monitored for academic content achievement for 2 years after the transition.

Table 1.6.3.6.1 Definitions:

1. **# Year One = Number of former LEP students in their first year of being monitored.**
2. **# Year Two = Number of former LEP students in their second year of being monitored.**
3. **Total = Number of monitored former LEP students in year one and year two. This is automatically calculated.**

# Year One	# Year Two	Total
56,205	67,157	123,362
Comments:		

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

1.6.3.6.2 Monitored Former LEP (MFLEP) Students Results for Mathematics

In the table below, report the number of monitored former LEP (MFLEP) students who took the annual mathematics assessment. Please provide data only for those students who transitioned into classrooms not designed for LEP students and who no longer received services under Title III in this reporting year. These students include both students who are monitored former LEP students in their first year of monitoring, and those in their second year of monitoring.

Table 1.6.3.6.2 Definitions:

1. **# Tested = State-aggregated number of MFLEP students who were tested in mathematics in all AYP grades.**
2. **# At or Above Proficient = State-aggregated number of MFLEP students who scored at or above proficient on the State annual mathematics assessment.**
3. **% Results = Automatically calculated based on number who scored at or above proficient divided by the number tested.**
4. **# Below proficient = State-aggregated number MFLEP students who did not score proficient on the State annual mathematics assessment. This will be automatically calculated.**

# Tested	# At or Above Proficient	% Results	# Below Proficient
108,394	93,930	86.7	14,464
Comments:			

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

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

In the table below, report results monitored former LEP (MFLEP) students who took the annual reading/language arts assessment. Please provide data only for those students who transitioned into classrooms not designed for LEP students and who no longer received services under Title III in this reporting year. These students include both students who are monitored former LEP students in their first year of monitoring, and those in their second year of monitoring.

Table 1.6.3.6.3 Definitions:

1. **# Tested = State-aggregated number of MFLEP students who were tested in reading/language arts in all AYP grades.**
2. **# At or Above Proficient = State-aggregated number of MFLEP students who scored at or above proficient on the State annual reading/language arts assessment.**
3. **% Results = Automatically calculated based on number who scored at or above proficient divided by the total number tested.**
4. **# Below proficient = State-aggregated number MFLEP students who did not score proficient on the State annual reading/language arts assessment. This will be automatically calculated.**

# Tested	# At or Above Proficient	% Results	# Below Proficient
108,780	100,149	92.1	8,631
Comments:			

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

1.6.3.6.4 Monitored Former LEP (MFLEP) Students Results for Science

In the table below, report results for monitored former LEP (MFLEP) students who took the annual science assessment. Please provide data only for those students who transitioned into classrooms not designed for LEP students and who no longer received services under Title III in this reporting year. These students include both students who are monitored former LEP students in their first year of monitoring, and those in their second year of monitoring.

Table 1.6.3.6.4 Definitions:

1. **# Tested = State-aggregated number of MFLEP students who were tested in science.**
2. **# At or Above Proficient = State-aggregated number of MFLEP students who scored at or above proficient on the State annual science assessment.**
3. **% Results = Automatically calculated based on number who scored at or above proficient divided by the number tested.**
4. **# Below proficient = State-aggregated number MFLEP students who did not score proficient on the State annual science assessment. This will be automatically calculated.**

# Tested	# At or Above Proficient	% Results	# Below Proficient
46,877	34,510	73.6	12,367
Comments:			

Source – Manual entry by SEA into the online collection tool. Note: New or substantially revised question for the SY 2007-08 CSPR.

Proposed under OMB 831.

1.6.4 Title III Subgrantees

This section collects data on the performance of Title III subgrantees.

1.6.4.1 Title III Subgrantee Performance

In the table below, report the number of Title III subgrantees meeting the criteria described in the table. Do not leave items blank. If there are zero subgrantees who met the condition described, put a zero in the number (#) column. Do not double count subgrantees by category.

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

	#
Total number of subgrantees for the year	1,019
Number of subgrantees that met all three Title III AMAOs	1,005
Number of subgrantees who met AMAO 1	0
Number of subgrantees who met AMAO 2	1,014
Number of subgrantees who met AMAO 3	1,009
Number of subgrantees that did not meet any Title III AMAOs	1
Number of subgrantees that did not meet Title III AMAOs for two consecutive years (SYs 2006-07 and 2007-08)	4
Number of subgrantees implementing an improvement plan in SY 2007-08 for not meeting Title III AMAOs	1
Number of subgrantees who have not met Title III AMAOs for four consecutive years (SYs 2004-05, 2005-06, 2006-07, and 200708)	5
Comments: AMAO 1 (progress) not available this year. Reference letter from TEA to USDE dated July 23, 2008.	

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

1.6.4.2 State Accountability

In the table below, indicate whether the State met all three Title III AMAOs.

Note: Meeting all three Title III AMAOs means meeting each State-set target for each objective: Making Progress, Attaining Proficiency, and Making AYP for the LEP subgroup. This section collects data that will be used to determine State AYP, as required under Section 6161.

State met <u>all</u> three Title III AMAOs	<u>Yes</u>
Comments: AMAO 1 (progress) not available this year. Reference letter from TEA to USDE dated July 23, 2008.	

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

1.6.4.3 Termination of Title III Language Instruction Educational Programs

This section collects data on the termination of Title III programs or activities as required by Section 3123(b)(7).

Were any Title III language instruction educational programs or activities terminated for failure to reach program goals?	No
If yes, provide the number of language instruction educational programs or activities for immigrant children and youth terminated.	
Comments:	

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

1.6.5 Education Programs and Activities for Immigrant Students

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

1.6.5.1 Immigrant Students

In the table below, report the unduplicated number of immigrant students enrolled in the State and who participated in qualifying educational programs under Section 3114(d)(1).

Table 1.6.5.1 Definitions:

1. **Immigrant Students Enrolled = Number of students who meet the definition of immigrant children and youth in Section 3301(6) and enrolled in the elementary or secondary schools in the State.**
2. **Students in 3114(d)(1) Program = Number of immigrant students who participated in programs for immigrant children and youth funded under Section 3114(d)(1), using the funds reserved for immigrant education programs/activities. This number should not include immigrant students who receive services in Title III language instructional educational programs under Sections 3114(a) and 3115(a).**
3. **3114(d)(1) Subgrants = Number of subgrants made in the State under Section 3114(d)(1), with the funds reserved for immigrant education programs/activities. Do not include Title III LIEP subgrants made under Sections 3114(a) and 3115(a) that serve immigrant students enrolled in them.**

# Immigrant Students Enrolled	# Students in 3114(d)(1) Program	# of 3114(d)(1) Subgrants
93,627	20,696	15

If state reports zero (0) students in programs or zero (0) subgrants, explain in comment box below. The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

Source – Initially populated from ED Facts. See Attachment D: CSPR & ED Facts Data Crosswalk.

1.6.6 Teacher Information and Professional Development

This section collects data on teachers in Title III language instruction education programs as required under Section 3123(b)(5).

1.6.6.1 Teacher Information

This section collects information about teachers as required under Section 3123 (b)(5).

In the table below, report the number of teachers who are working in the Title III language instruction educational programs as defined in Section 3301(8) and reported in 1.6.1 (Types of language instruction educational programs) even if they are not paid with Title III funds.

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

	#
Number of all certified/licensed teachers currently working in Title III language instruction educational programs.	52,205
Estimate number of additional certified/licensed teachers that will be needed for Title III language instruction educational programs in the next 5 years*.	14,098

Explain in the comment box below if there is a zero for any item in the table above. The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

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

* This number should be the total additional teachers needed for the next 5 years, not the number needed for each year. Do not include the number of teachers currently working in Title III English language instruction educational programs.

1.6.6.2 Professional Development (PD) Activities of Subgrantees Related to the Teaching and Learning of LEP Students

In the table below, provide information about the subgrantee professional development activities that meets the requirements of Section 3115(c)(2).

Table 1.6.6.2 Definitions:

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

Type of Professional Development Activity	# Subgrantees	
Instructional strategies for LEP students	303	
Understanding and implementation of assessment of LEP students	224	
Understanding and implementation of ELP standards and academic content standards for LEP students	179	
Alignment of the curriculum in language instruction educational programs to ELP standards	132	
Subject matter knowledge for teachers	191	
Other (Explain in comment box)	33	
Participant Information	# Subgrantees	# Participants
PD provided to content classroom teachers	275	58,214
PD provided to LEP classroom teachers	287	54,743
PD provided to principals	219	5,702
PD provided to administrators/other than principals	219	6,757

PD provided to other school personnel/non-administrative	146	8,953
PD provided to community based organization personnel	38	2,460
Total	1,040	136,829

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

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

1.6.7 State Subgrant Activities

This section collects data on State grant activities.

1.6.7.1 State Subgrant Process

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

Table 1.6.7.1 Definitions:

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

Example: State received SY 2007-08 funds July 1, 2007, and then made these funds available to subgrantees on August 1, 2007, for SY 2007-08 programs. Then the "# of days/\$\$ Distribution" is 30 days.

Date State Received Allocation	Date Funds Available to Subgrantees	# of Days/\$\$ Distribution
7/11/07	7/1/07	10
Comments:		

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

1.6.7.2 Steps To Shorten the Distribution of Title III Funds to Subgrantees

In the comment box below, describe how your State can shorten the process of distributing Title III funds to subgrantees. The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

Currently, there are no steps to shorten the distribution of Title III funds to subgrantees. The Title III program is part of an electronic NCLB Consolidated Grant Application through eGrants which includes ten NCLB programs (2007-2008 1,216 consolidated applications). These are processed in date-order of receipt through the Division of NCLB Program Coordination and the Division of Formula Funding.

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

1.7 PERSISTENTLY DANGEROUS SCHOOLS

In the table below, provide the number of schools identified as persistently dangerous, as determined by the State, by the start of the school year. For further guidance on persistently dangerous schools, refer to Section B "Identifying Persistently Dangerous Schools" in the Unsafe School Choice Option Non-Regulatory Guidance, available at: <http://www.ed.gov/policy/elsec/guid/unsafeschoolchoice.pdf>.

	#
Persistently Dangerous Schools	0
Comments:	

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

1.8 GRADUATION RATES AND DROPOUT RATES

This section collects graduation and dropout rates.

1.8.1 Graduation Rates

In the table below, provide the graduation rates calculated using the methodology that was approved as part of the State's accountability plan for the previous school year (SY 2006-07). Below the table are FAQs about the data collected in this table.

Student Group	Graduation Rate
All Students	78.0
American Indian or Alaska Native	81.4
Asian or Pacific Islander	91.5
Black, non-Hispanic	70.7
Hispanic	68.5
White, non-Hispanic	88.2
Children with disabilities (IDEA)	70.3
Limited English proficient	39.3
Economically disadvantaged	68.8
Migratory students	60.1
Male	75.8
Female	80.3
Comments:	

Source – Initially populated from ED Facts. See Attachment D: CSPR & ED Facts Data Crosswalk. If the SEA has additional racial/ethnic groups or combinations of racial/ethnic groups in its accountability plan under NCLB, the SEA will report the above data for those groups through the online CSPR collection tool.

FAQs on graduation rates:

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

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

1.8.2 Dropout Rates

In the table below, provide the dropout rates calculated using the annual event school dropout rate for students leaving a school in a single year determined in accordance with the National Center for Education Statistic's (NCES) Common Core of Data (CCD) for the previous school year (SY 2006-07). Below the table is a FAQ about the data collected in this table.

Student Group	Dropout Rate
All Students	3.9
American Indian or Alaska Native	2.8
Asian or Pacific Islander	1.4
Black, non-Hispanic	5.8
Hispanic	5.4
White, non-Hispanic	1.9
Children with disabilities (IDEA)	4.8
Limited English proficient	7.6
Economically disadvantaged	4.3
Migratory students	6.3
Male	4.2
Female	3.7
Comments:	

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

FAQ on dropout rates:

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

1.9 EDUCATION FOR HOMELESS CHILDREN AND YOUTHS PROGRAM

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

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

	#	# LEAs Reporting Data
LEAs without subgrants	1,162	1,103
LEAs with subgrants	119	119
Total	1,281	1,222

Comments: The numbers for 2007-2008 LEAs include total districts and charter schools, along with the 20 Education Service Centers (ESCs). Although ESCs are LEAs, they are not districts and do not enroll students. The five ESCs that were subgrantees did report data from their participating districts. Therefore, all 119 participating LEAs did report data concerning the 114 LEAs that did enroll and serve students. In Texas in 2007-2008, a total of 119 LEAs participated in 45 McKinney-Vento subgrants. Out of the total of 119 participating LEAs, 114 LEAs enrolled students.

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

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

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

1.9.1.1 Homeless Children And Youths

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

Age/Grade	# of Homeless Children/Youths Enrolled in Public School in LEAs Without Subgrants	# of Homeless Children/Youths Enrolled in Public School in LEAs With Subgrants
Age 3 through 5 (not Kindergarten)	1,484	2,032
K	2,004	3,037
1	2,255	2,965
2	2,014	2,872
3	1,811	2,655
4	1,651	2,728
5	1,607	2,474
6	1,412	2,100
7	1,348	2,034
8	1,310	1,965
9	1,498	3,086
10	1,008	1,689
11	787	1,304
12	877	1,235
Ungraded	0	0
Total	21,066	32,176
Comments:		

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

1.9.1.2 Primary Nighttime Residence of Homeless Children and Youths

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

	# of Homeless Children/Youths - LEAs Without Subgrants	# of Homeless Children/Youths - LEAs With Subgrants
Shelters, transitional housing, awaiting foster care	2,936	8,452
Doubled-up (e.g., living with another family)	16,633	21,170
Unsheltered (e.g., cars, parks, campgrounds, temporary trailer, or abandoned buildings)	597	1,083
Hotels/Motels	900	1,471
Total	21,066	32,176
Comments:		

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

1.9.2 LEAs with McKinney-Vento Subgrants

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

1.9.2.1 Homeless Children and Youths Served by McKinney-Vento Subgrants

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

Age/Grade	# Homeless Children/Youths Served by Subgrants
Age 3 through 5 (not Kindergarten)	2,032
K	3,037
1	2,965
2	2,872
3	2,655
4	2,728
5	2,474
6	2,100
7	2,034
8	1,965
9	3,086
10	1,689
11	1,304
12	1,235
Ungraded	0
Total	32,176
Comments:	

Source – Initially populated from EDFacts. See Attachment D: CSPR & EDFacts Data Crosswalk.

1.9.2.2 Subpopulations of Homeless Students Served

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

	# Homeless Students Served
Unaccompanied youth	1,581
Migratory children/youth	271
Children with disabilities (IDEA)	3,986
Limited English proficient students	4,789
Comments:	

Source – Initially populated from EDFacts. See Attachment D: CSPR & EDFacts Data Crosswalk.

1.9.2.3 Educational Support Services Provided by Subgrantees

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

	# McKinney-Vento Subgrantees That Offer
Tutoring or other instructional support	40
Expedited evaluations	20
Staff professional development and awareness	40
Referrals for medical, dental, and other health services	36
Transportation	41
Early childhood programs	17
Assistance with participation in school programs	40
Before-, after-school, mentoring, summer programs	42
Obtaining or transferring records necessary for enrollment	29
Parent education related to rights and resources for children	32
Coordination between schools and agencies	37
Counseling	28
Addressing needs related to domestic violence	29
Clothing to meet a school requirement	36
School supplies	43
Referral to other programs and services	37
Emergency assistance related to school attendance	31
Other (optional – in comment box below)	13
Other (optional – in comment box below)	
Other (optional – in comment box below)	

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

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

1.9.2.4 Barriers To The Education Of Homeless Children And Youth

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

	# Subgrantees Reporting
Eligibility for homeless services	12
School Selection	12
Transportation	24
School records	18
Immunizations	13
Other medical records	8
Other Barriers – in comment box below	17

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

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

1.9.2.5 Academic Progress of Homeless Students

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

1.9.2.5.1 Reading Assessment

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

Grade	# Homeless Children/Youths Served by McKinney-Vento Taking Reading Assessment Test	# Homeless Children/Youths Served by McKinney-Vento Who Scored At or Above Proficient
3	1,403	1,064
4	1,381	893
5	1,343	999
6	966	746
7	922	573
8	874	686
High School	2,466	1,594
Comments:		

Source – Initially populated from ED Facts. See Attachment D: C SPR & ED Facts Data Crosswalk.

1.9.2.5.2 Mathematics Assessment

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

Grade	# Homeless Children/Youths Served by McKinney-Vento Taking Mathematics Assessment Test	# Homeless Children/Youths Served by McKinney-Vento Who Scored At or Above Proficient
3	1,297	869
4	1,356	904
5	1,277	918
6	969	571
7	894	460
8	899	501
High School	2,412	1,079
Comments:		

Source – Initially populated from ED Facts. See Attachment D: C SPR & ED Facts Data Crosswalk.

1.10 MIGRANT CHILD COUNTS

This section collects the Title I, Part C, Migrant Education Program (MEP) child counts which States are required to provide and may be used to determine the annual State allocations under Title I, Part C. The child counts should reflect the reporting period of September 1, 2007 through August 31, 2008. This section also collects a report on the procedures used by States to produce true, accurate, and valid child counts.

To provide the child counts, each SEA should have sufficient procedures in place to ensure that it is counting only those children who are eligible for the MEP. Such procedures are important to protecting the integrity of the State's MEP because they permit the early discovery and correction of eligibility problems and thus help to ensure that only eligible migrant children are counted for funding purposes and are served. If an SEA has reservations about the accuracy of its child counts, it must inform the Department of its concerns and explain how and when it will resolve them in Section 1.10.3.4 Quality Control Processes.

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

FAQs on Child Count:

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

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

1.10.1 Category 1 Child Count

In the table below, enter the unduplicated statewide number by age/grade of eligible migrant children age 3 through 21 who, within 3 years of making a qualifying move, resided in your State for one or more days during the reporting period of September 1, 2007 through August 31, 2008. This figure includes all eligible migrant children who may or may not have participated in MEP services. Count a child who moved from one age/grade level to another during the reporting period only once in the highest age/grade that he/she attained during the reporting period. The unduplicated statewide total count is calculated automatically.

Do not include:

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

Age/Grade	12-Month Count of Eligible Migrant Children Who Can be Counted for Funding Purposes
Age 3 through 5 (not Kindergarten)	5,577
K	3,209
1	3,775
2	3,641
3	3,590
4	3,510
5	3,674
6	3,495
7	3,747
8	3,613
9	4,944
10	3,709
11	3,238
12	4,197
Ungraded	53
Out-of-school	1,745
Total	55,717
Comments:	

Source – Initially populated from ED Facts. See Attachment D: CSPR & ED Facts Data Crosswalk.

1.10.1.1 Category 1 Child Count Increases/Decreases

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

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

Under the No Child Left Behind (NCLB) Act, the Texas MEP incorporated stricter standards for migrant student eligibility, eliminating some families that may have been determined to be eligible in past years. In 2007-2008, the Texas MEP, the 20 regional ESCs and the MEP funded LEAs continued to make a good faith effort to follow the non-regulatory guidance issued October 23, 2003, which called for increased documentation related to intent, moves in which employment was sought but not obtained, Principal Means of Livelihood (PMOL) and short distance/short duration moves. These new guidelines for eligibility resulted in fewer families eligible for the program, many times due to a lack of required documentation.

Additionally, in 2007-2008, the Texas MEP continued to wait for OME to finalize guidance related to the beef and poultry processing industries. While awaiting the final guidance, the State MEP has drastically limited the recruitment of the children of workers in the beef and poultry industries. The numbers of these children not currently being recruited by the Texas MEP continue to impact the Category 1 child count for the State. Most importantly, during the 2007-2008 reporting period, recruiters continued to report fewer families migrating in response to national issues that have a negative impact on the state's migrant population, such as rising gasoline prices, immigration reform, lack of housing in receiving states, etc.

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

1.10.2 Category 2 Child Count

In the table below, enter by age/grade the unduplicated statewide number of eligible migrant children age 3 through 21 who, within 3 years of making a qualifying move, were served for one or more days in a MEP-funded project conducted during either the summer term or during intersession periods that occurred within the reporting period of September 1, 2007 through August 31, 2008. Count a child who moved from one age/grade level to another during the reporting period only once in the highest age/grade that he/she attained during the reporting period. Count a child who moved to different schools within the State and who was served in both traditional summer and year-round school intersession programs only once. The unduplicated statewide total count is calculated automatically.

Do not include:

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

Age/Grade	Summer/Intersession Count of Eligible Migrant Children Who Are Participants and Who Can Be Counted for Funding Purposes
Age 3 through 5 (not Kindergarten)	1,202
K	869
1	952
2	901
3	922
4	927
5	863
6	726
7	607
8	642
9	631
10	473
11	423
12	75
Ungraded	N<5
Out-of-school	44
Total	10,261
Comments:	

Source – Initially populated from ED Facts. See Attachment D: CSPR & ED Facts Data Crosswalk.

1.10.2.1 Category 2 Child Count Increases/Decreases

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

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

The Texas MEP attributes a reduction in the Category 2 migrant count to the following:

1. An overall decrease in the number of migrant students identified eligible for the program during the regular school year;
2. The fact that Texas is a sending state and many of our students travel outside of the state for the summer;
3. Local school district decisions not to operate a MEP-funded summer program;
4. Other summer programs available to migrant students not funded through the MEP.

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

1.10.3 Child Count Calculation and Validation Procedures

The following question requests information on the State's MEP child count calculation and validation procedures.

1.10.3.1 Student Information System

In the space below, respond to the following questions: What system(s) did your State use to compile and generate the Category 1 and Category 2 child count for this reporting period (e.g., NGS, MIS 2000, COEStar, manual system)? Were child counts for the last reporting period generated using the same system(s)? If the State's category 2 count was generated using a different system from the category 1 count, please identify each system.

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

Texas based its Category 1 and Category 2 child counts for 2007-2008 on the data compiled and generated by the New Generation System (NGS). The child counts for the 2006-2007 reporting period also were generated by NGS.

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

1.10.3.2 Data Collection and Management Procedures

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

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

The data collected came from Certificates of Eligibility (COEs). Only recruiters who completed the annual training conducted by the regional Education Service Center (ESC) could complete COEs. Information concerning the data contained on the Texas COE can be found in the Texas Manual for the Identification and Recruitment of Migrant Children (<http://www.tea.state.tx.us/nclb/migrant/IDRMan2008a.html>).

Child count data included individual student demographic data information related to the student's last qualifying move, e.g., qualifying arrival date (QAD) and qualifying activity, residency verification information, school enrollment and school withdrawal dates. Other eligibility data such as termination reason and date, and end of eligibility (EOE) date were also used by NGS to determine the child count. NGS Data Specialists flagged students with termination codes such as GED, Graduate and Deceased at the time of the occurrence. These students were included in the Category 1 count for the current reporting year. However, because they were flagged as "terminated" on NGS, they will no longer be included in any subsequent Category 1 or Category 2 counts. The EOE data were automatically generated by NGS based on the student's QAD. Migrant staff was provided guidance in the NGS Guidelines on when to withdraw students from the system. In order for a data specialist to enter a "withdrawal" into the NGS system, he/she must have official documentation from the district.

Participation data such as summer enrollment and supplemental program information were also collected for data entry via campus-generated enrollment and withdrawal lists and/or on data collection forms contained in the NGS Implementation Guidelines for School Districts and Education Service Centers (<http://www.tea.state.tx.us/nclb/migrant/ngsGuidelines.html>). These guidelines also contain stringent timelines and procedures that NGS Data Specialists follow to input data into the system in a timely manner. At the beginning of the school year, recruiters conducted face-to-face interviews with every potentially eligible migrant family, such as meetings, home visits, etc. Phone interviews were not allowed unless they were a follow-up to the initial face-to-face interview. Parents signed the COE in person at the time of the interview if their children might have been eligible for the program. After completing a COE and COE Supplemental Documentation form on an eligible family, a recruiter submitted completed COEs to designated MEP personnel at either the school district or ESC (or both) for eligibility reviews/determinations. Every COE was reviewed by a trained eligibility reviewer. Questionable COEs were forwarded to the ESC migrant personnel, who if necessary, forwarded them to the State MEP for a final eligibility determination. All procedures related to the completion and eligibility review of COEs were outlined in the Texas Manual for the Identification and Recruitment of Migrant Students. After the COE was signed by a trained eligibility reviewer, the COE was used as a data entry tool to encode information that enrolled the student into NGS. Recruiters completed COEs on a daily basis throughout the year and trained NGS Data Specialists enrolled students by encoding demographic and enrollment information into the system at the designated terminal site within 10 working days of parent signature on the COE, if there were no questions regarding eligibility.

Residency verification was conducted by recruiters between September 1 and November 1 of the 2007-2008 school year and was entered on the system within 5 working days of submission to the NGS terminal site. Beginning with the 2005-2006 reporting period, NGS Data Specialists began recording residency verification information for each migrant student on the appropriate NGS history line.

Before summer/intersession school began, the recruiter or other migrant staff collected information on which regular term students (without a new QAD) planned to attend the migrant-funded summer school program. After the summer school program was underway, and the child was physically present in the classroom or visited in a home-based program, NGS Data Specialists used either NGS multiple enrollment worksheets or district-generated enrollment lists containing name, birth date, grade level, campus and date of enrollment to multiply or individually enroll migrant students into NGS. This process was ongoing throughout the summer program for those students without new QADs. For students with new QADs, NGS data specialists enrolled students based on the NGS Guidelines for new COEs. The timeline for entering summer/intersession program information into the system was 2 working days after receipt of enrollment data and 5 working days after receipt of a new COE. After the summer program ended, the LEA confirmed and documented the enrollment, withdrawal and participation data on NGS.

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

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

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

NGS Data Specialists collected supplemental program information, as well as other educational and health information at the end of the regular and/or summer term or at the time of student withdrawal. The above timelines and guidelines for data collection and entry, as well as the accompanying forms, were contained in the NGS Implementation Guidelines for School Districts and Education Service Centers.

Trained NGS Data Specialists enter data at the local education agency (LEA) and education service center (ESC) level. Texas bases its Category 1 count on new documentation of residency each year. Recruiters contact all migrant families at the time of enrollment to conduct face-to-face interviews to determine the most current qualifying move. If the QAD remains the same, the COE information with the most current QAD is updated and verified with the parent as part of the quality control process and signed by the parent. If a new QAD occurs, then a new COE is completed at that time. The NGS history line at the beginning of the school year reflects the student's most For each new or updated COE for the Category 1 count, a history line with a "R" (regular) or "P" (participant) flag is created in NGS. A history line with a "S" (summer) or "I" (intersession) flag is created for each summer enrollment for the Category 2 count. "R" refers to regular term school enrollment; "P" refers to "Participant or Residency Only," in the case of a student who is not enrolled in school; "S" refers to summer school enrollment; and "I" refers to a year-round school intersession enrollment.

After September 1 and before November 1 recruiters conduct residency verification for every identified migrant child by either using school attendance records or conducting a home visit. Residency verification cannot be done by telephone. This information is recorded on the COE, which is then submitted to NGS Data Specialists who record the date and manner of residency verification on the appropriate NGS history line after receipt and throughout the year for newly identified children.

The NGS query is programmed to count a student only once statewide in the Category 1 and Category 2 counts. In order to avoid duplication and to assure correct student identification, NGS creates a unique student identification (USID) number for each new student entered into the NGS centralized database. Before a new student record can be created, the system checks for duplication based on the student's last name or similar last name by using a system-generated wild card prompt. Potential duplicates are then checked against additional fields such as first name, birth date and parents' names. Any matches generate further review by the NGS Data Specialist at the regional level or at the NGS Help Desk.

Each LEA is able to query the centralized database for a district-wide unique student count in both Category 1 and Category 2. NGS campus and district reports are used in conjunction with unique student count reports to provide a continuous verification of student enrollment into the system. In addition to the unique student count reports, LEAs also verify their child counts by using other NGS reports (e.g., the residency verification date and the two year old turning three reports), certificates of eligibility (COEs), data entry logs, and local databases to ensure that all identified students have been included in the Category 1 and Category 2 counts and to eliminate any duplications.

Finally, the SEA establishes a deadline for entering all data into the system pertaining to the reporting year. After the established deadline the data are extracted from NGS into a file format specified by USDE to populate the EDEN database.

If the data for the State's category 2 count were collected and maintained differently from the category 1 count, please describe each set of procedures.

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

Counts were collected and maintained the same.

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

1.10.3.3 Methods Used To Count Children

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

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

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

Texas bases its Category 1 count on new documentation of residency in the 9/1/2007-8/31/2008 federal reporting window. NGS was programmed to check not only the enrollment and withdrawal date fields, but also the residency verification date field to document residency during this period.

The NGS query is programmed to include only children who were at least 3 and less than 22 years of age who had eligibility for at least one day during the period 9/1/2007-8/31/2008. In addition, before enrollment into summer/intersession and/or regular term projects or encoding into NGS as residency-only students, recruiters interview families to verify birthdates and residency status.

Local recruiters use the NGS Two Year Old Turning Three report to keep track of the two-year-olds so that upon turning three, families are visited by recruiters to verify residency and to enroll newly turned 3 year olds into early childhood programs such as Building Bridges, Migrant Even Start, and Migrant Head Start. A residency verification date for every child who turned 3 years old during the reporting period is then entered into NGS on the appropriate NGS history line so that the system will count only those three year olds who were actually in residence in the state on or after their third birthday. The NGS query is programmed to count a student only once statewide in the Category 1 count. As explained above, for each new or updated COE for the Category 1 count, history lines with specific enrollment type flags are created on NGS. A combination of enrollment, withdrawal and residency verification dates must be entered for every student identified and recruited during the appropriate reporting period in order to be included in the Category 1 count.

For the Category 2 count, the NGS query is programmed to include only eligible children who received either MEP-funded instructional and/or support services under a summer enrollment flag of "S" (summer) or "I" (intersession). Summer enrollment information is entered into the system only after the student is enrolled and physically present in a summer migrant program which, as part of the migrant application process, must begin at least one day after the district's regular migrant program ends and conclude at least one day before the regular program begins in the fall. NGS Data Specialists use campus-generated enrollment lists to enter summer enrollment information into NGS on an ongoing basis throughout the summer. Students can be multiply or individually enrolled and withdrawn into summer, as well as, regular programs.

At the state level, the NGS query is programmed to count a student only once by age/grade statewide in the Category 1 and Category 2 counts. The system is programmed to capture the maximum age/grade for each student in the reporting period.

NGS creates a unique student identification (USID) number for each new student entered into the NGS centralized database. Before a new student record can be created, the system checks for duplication based on the student's last name or similar last name by using a system-generated wild card prompt. Potential duplicates are then checked against additional fields such as first name, birth date, and mother's name. Any matches generate further review. As part of the clean-up process before the NGS snapshot is run, the NGS Help Desk works with districts to review their NGS Duplicate Student reports to ensure that all potential duplicates have been checked and any duplicates have been merged into a single student record.

If your State's category 2 count was generated using a different system from the category 1 count, please describe each system separately.

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

Counts were generated the same.

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

1.10.3.4 Quality Control Processes

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

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

Standardized quality control procedures to ensure that adequate steps are taken to properly determine and verify migrant student eligibility are outlined in the Texas Manual for the Identification and Recruitment of Migrant Students.

All recruiters, eligibility reviewers, NGS Data Specialists and other migrant-funded staff throughout the state undergo extensive annual training on the ID&R procedures and on the COE to be used for the each reporting period. Training includes basic eligibility requirements through a comprehensive trainer-of-trainer model. All recruiters receive the same training every year. The state provides ongoing training throughout the year via the statewide listserv, the Weekly Recruiter. Recruiters can receive follow-up training by the ESC throughout the year if needed. All interested individuals may sign up by choosing "Texas Migrant ID&R and NGS List" at the following site: <http://tea.state.tx.us/nclb/migrant/list.html>. The annual State Migrant Education Conference also serves to review ID&R and data collection procedures and to obtain feedback from the field. ID&R and NGS sessions revolve around the national child eligibility initiative, edit checks on NGS, eligibility reviews, the COE process and quality control procedures. During the state conference, an annual ID&R Academy is held to review interviewing techniques, proper COE procedures and practice completing COEs. An NGS Academy is held to review data collection procedures and answer any questions from the NGS Data Specialists. All migrant families are re-interviewed each reporting period through the enrollment process which the Texas MEP annually implements to check on the eligibility and continued residence of migrant children. Recruiters recheck the eligibility of each family during regularly scheduled face-to-face interviews/home visits for verifying eligibility/residence. During the annual training for recruiters, the types of errors that caused defective eligibility determinations are reviewed with recruiters, prior to conducting these parent interviews, to ensure the recruiters properly identify ineligible families.

For each COE, a trained recruiter completes then submits the document to a trained eligibility reviewer who determines whether or not recruiters have properly completed the COE and supplied sufficient documentation. COEs not containing sufficient documentation are returned to recruiters to re-interview parents for needed documentation. Questionable COEs are forwarded to the ESC MEP staff for review, who in turn may submit the COE for review at the State level.

During the 2007-2008 reporting period the State MEP in conjunction with the 20 regional ESCs conducted random re-interviews of parents to validate eligibility determinations made in the 2007-2008 reporting period.

Although the state does not review student attendance at migrant funded summer programs, the state does provide guidelines on how LEAs are to collect student enrollment and withdrawal information and enter it on NGS as outlined above. All attendance documentation is kept at the local level.

Prior to the national re-interview initiative, monitoring of eligibility documentation was conducted at the ESC level. ESCs conducted an annual review of a random sample of COEs. The state did not receive any COEs as part of this eligibility validation process. The eligibility validation process now in place is conducted by the ESCs in conjunction with the state. The state determines the random sample for each of the ESCs and receives and reviews all of the eligibility validation documentation along with accompanying COEs completed by the ESCs. A statewide ID&R Focus Group participates in the review of COEs and makes recommendations to the State MEP on eligibility validations/determinations.

Finally, the statewide ID&R Focus Group meets approximately 2 times annually to review all ID&R procedures, eligibility validations and the business rules and edit checks built into NGS.

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

In the space below, describe specifically the procedures used and the results of any re-interview processes used by the SEA during the reporting period to test the accuracy of the State's MEP eligibility determinations. In this description, please include the number of eligibility determinations sampled, the number for which a test was completed, and the number found eligible.

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

During the 2007-2008 reporting period the State MEP in conjunction with the 20 regional ESCs conducted random re-interviews of 196 parents to validate eligibility determinations made in the 2007-2008 reporting period. In total, approximately 810 student records were required in the replacement pool to sufficiently produce 196 COE validations stratified by region for the audit. Of the 196 children in the sample, a total of 186 children were determined to be eligible. Of the 10 who were not, five were determined to be ineligible and five interviews were not able to be completed because of extenuating circumstances (e.g., death of migrant staff member and life-threatening illness of a recruiter -both situations are documented in our files.)

Each ESC received a list from TEA of children for the 2007-2008 reporting period selected for the eligibility validation process. The ESC

MEP contact obtained from the fiscal agent (ESC or LEA) a copy of the appropriate COE, supplemental documentation and NGS history for each child selected for the random re-interview. After confirming that the correct COE was being used (for the 2007-08 reporting period and should be the auditable copy), the ESC MEP contact selected individuals certified in Identification and Recruitment who would be conducting re-interviews in the region. The names of re-interviewers listing their MEP-related experience and date of training was faxed to TEA for the state's review and sign-off.

Next, ESC regional training for re-interviewers was conducted. Training for re-interviewers covered basic MEP eligibility guidelines from Section 1 of the Texas Manual for the Identification and Recruitment of Migrant Students as well as proper procedures for conducting the re-interview and completing the eligibility validation form. The State MEP instructed ESCs to contact the State MEP staff at any time before, during or after re-interview training for questions or clarifications.

The ESCs conducted re-interviews during the months of January and February 2008. Using the list provided by TEA, the re-interviewers worked with district MEP contacts to set up interview schedules with migrant families that had been selected. When calling to set up the interview with the family, the re-interviewer/recruiter used the following script (also provided in Spanish): "The Texas Migrant Education Program is in the process of updating family information. We would like to schedule a time to come out to talk to you."

If the subject was not at home, the re-interviewer entered the date of first attempt in the General Information section of the form and proceeded to the next subject from the sample list. After two attempts to contact the family were unsuccessful, the subject was removed from the sample. If the subject could not be located, the re-interviewer checked the appropriate box in the General Information section of the form. (Note: All attempts were made to locate the family within that region.) In order to receive a substitution for a child not able to participate in the eligibility validation process, the re-interviewer completed the General Information section of the Eligibility Validation form. However, for reasons of confidentiality, the child's name was not listed on the form, but rather his/her NGS identifier.

LEA personnel not associated with the initial eligibility determination were allowed to accompany the re-interviewer to introduce family or assist with translation. At no time was LEA personnel permitted to conduct the re-interview. The re-interviewer was instructed to follow this script (also provided in Spanish):

"As you know, the Migrant Education Program is federally funded. The purpose of our visit is to ask you some questions to make sure that the right information was collected regarding your migrant moves. This information will be used to improve the process of our identification and recruitment effort. May we visit with you? All the information that you give me will be kept confidential and will be used to help make the migrant education program better."

If the subject declined the interview, the re-interviewer checked the appropriate box on the form, and proceeded to the next subject from the sample list. Re-interviewers were instructed to follow the questions in the order they appeared on the form as well as to not leave any questions on the form blank. If the subject did not wish to respond to a particular question, the re-interviewer wrote "did not respond" in the appropriate line on the form. They then explained in detail what occurred in the Comments section. After completing the last item on the form, the re-interviewer reviewed the Eligibility Data section on the COE to determine if the information on the COE was the same as the information provided by the subject in response to the questions asked.

If the information was different, he asked follow-up questions to address any discrepancies and record clarifications on the back of the Eligibility Validation Form. For example, he might have clarified the nature of the qualifying work or the to/from moves in order to verify that the subject did, indeed, seek and/or obtain the work described on the COE. Re-interviewers were instructed to correct must take care of the non-critical errors they found on the COE, dating and initialing the correction in the presence of the interviewee. They then made a recommendation regarding eligibility in the Summary of Findings section on Eligibility Validation form. If "Warrants Further Review" was checked, the re-interviewer explained the discrepancies in detail. If more space was needed, the re-interviewer used the back of the Eligibility Validation Form. Finally, they informed the family that the family might be contacted again regarding the answers they provided.

Before forwarding the completed eligibility validation forms to TEA, the ESC MEP contact conducted a thorough review of all the paperwork. The ESC MEP contact also thoroughly reviewed the re-interviewer's notes to verify that the re-interviewer adequately addressed all questions and explained any discrepancies. ESCs submitted all forms to TEA for compilation and review by the Statewide ID&R Focus Group. An appeal process allows LEAs the opportunity to supply additional documentation disputing the ineligibility determination if necessary.

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

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

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

At the April and June 2008 NCLB Coordinated Meetings, all 20 regional ESCs were instructed to run NGS reports to verify residency, child

count, and enrollments for all eligible migrant students in the independent districts and Shared Services Arrangements (SSAs) within their regions for the 2007-2008 reporting period. Additionally, the State's Performance Based Monitoring Assessment System uses different migrant-specific indicators each year to conduct desk audits of the MEP-funded districts. These reports were also run, reviewed and cross-checked by the State MEP staff.

At the local level, LEAs use system generated reports to verify migrant student counts against COEs on file and to assess identification and recruitment progress to date. ESCs use similar reports to actively monitor and to provide technical assistance to their districts.

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

In the space below, respond to the following question: What final steps are taken by State staff to verify the child counts produced by your student information system(s) are accurate counts of children in Category 1 and Category 2 prior to their submission to ED?

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

The State MEP verified that the children included in the two child counts met the eligibility criteria (i.e., that they were migrant children as defined in 34 CFR 200.40) through ongoing verifications of district certificates of eligibility (COEs) by the 20 regional education service centers (ESCs), identification and recruitment (ID&R) training and guidelines, New Generation System (NGS) training and guidelines, data verification through various NGS reports and the cross-checking of the NGS reports for accuracy with local databases and actual COEs.

The LEA, ESC and SEA scrutinized all new COEs for the 2007-2008 reporting period, reviewing supplemental documentation related to qualifying work, intent and PMOL for all children newly identified as migrant in the 2007-2008 reporting period as well as all migrant children who moved within the state of Texas from one school district to another whether or not the move was qualifying.

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

In the space below, describe those corrective actions or improvements that will be made by the SEA to improve the accuracy of its MEP eligibility determinations in light of the prospective re-interviewing results.

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

The SEA will ensure that ESCs and LEAs conduct enough follow up and ask the proper questions in order to verify eligibility. Also, the SEA will continue to improve training and resources for quality control and eligibility validation efforts. Each year that state, regional, and local staff participates in this process, the more it improves.

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

In the space below, discuss any concerns about the accuracy of the reported child counts or the underlying eligibility determinations on which the counts are based.

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

There are no concerns about the accuracy of the reported child counts or the underlying eligibility determinations on which the counts are based.

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