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 2008-09

TEXAS

NoChild
LeftBehind

PART I DUE FRIDAY, DECEMBER 18, 2009
PART II DUE FRIDAY, FEBRUARY 12, 2010

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:

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

The NCLB Consolidated State Performance Report (CSPR) for school year (SY) 2008-09 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 2008-09 must respond to this Consolidated State Performance Report (CSPR). Part I of the Report is due to the Department by Friday, December 18, 2009. Part II of the Report is due to the Department by Friday, February 12, 2010. Both Part I and Part II should reflect data from the SY 2008-09, 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 2008-09 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 2008-09 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).

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:

   X Part I, 2008-09   Part II, 2008-09

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):
Ann Smisko

_____   Friday, March 12, 2010, 3:55:14 PM

    Signature   Date

**CONSOLIDATED STATE PERFORMANCE REPORT
PART I**

For reporting on
School Year 2008-09

NoChild
LeftBehind

**PART I DUE DECEMBER 18, 2009
5PM EST**

1.1 STANDARDS AND ASSESSMENT DEVELOPMENT

STANDARDS OF ASSESSMENT DEVELOPMENT

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

1.1.1 Academic Content Standards

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 made or planned."

The response is limited to 4,000 characters.

Refinements to and alignment of the Texas Essential Knowledge and Skills (TEKS) for secondary mathematics were adopted by the State Board of Education in February 2005, and for elementary mathematics in September 2005. These mathematics standards were implemented beginning in the 2006-2007 school year. A limited scope review and revision of the secondary mathematics TEKS to align with college readiness standards was adopted by the SBOE in January 2009. These minor revisions were implemented beginning in the 2009-2010 school year. The mathematics standards are scheduled for the next review and revision beginning in Spring 2011.

English language proficiency standards (ELPS) were adopted by the State Board of Education in November 2007 to be effective in December 2007. The ELPS are the cross-curricular English language acquisition standards that must be implemented in conjunction with the TEKS in all content areas for English language learners.

Revisions to the English language arts and reading TEKS were adopted in May 2008. Revisions to the Spanish language arts and reading TEKS were adopted in September 2008. Professional development for the new TEKS occurred in the spring and summer of 2009. The new standards were implemented beginning in the 2009-2010 school year. The English language arts and reading and Spanish language arts and reading standards are scheduled for the next review and revision beginning in Spring 2013.

Revisions to the science TEKS were adopted in March 2009. Professional development for the new TEKS will occur in the spring and summer of 2010. The new science standards will be implemented beginning in the 2010-2011 school year. The science standards are scheduled for the next review and revision beginning in Spring 2014.

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 <u>not</u> 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.

No revisions or changes to assessments and/or academic achievement standards taken or planned.

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 <u>not</u> 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 4,000 characters.

No revisions or changes to assessments and/or academic achievement standards taken or planned.

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 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 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 withESEA. The percentage of students who were tested for mathematics will be calculated automatically.

The student group "children with disabilities (IDEA)" includes children who participated in the regular assessments with or without accommodations and alternate assessments. Do not include former students with disabilities(IDEA). Do not include students only covered under Section 504 of the Rehabilitation Act of 1973.

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

Student Group	# Students Enrolled	# Students Participating	Percentage of Students Participating
All students	2,434,441		>97%
American Indian or Alaska Native	8,777		>97%
Asian or Pacific Islander	88,089		>97%
Black, non-Hispanic	344,044		>97%
Hispanic	1,145,410		>97%
White, non-Hispanic	846,079		>97%
Children with disabilities (IDEA)	252,714		>97%
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	351,066		>97%
Economically disadvantaged students	1,352,516		>97%
Migratory students	20,099		>97%
Male	1,245,395		>97%
Female	1,187,766		>97%
Comments:			

Source – The table above is produced through EDFacts. The SEA submits the data in file N/X081 that includes data group 588, category sets A, B, C, D, E, and F, 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(IDEA). Do not include former students with disabilities (IDEA). Do not include students only covered under Section 504 of the Rehabilitation Act of 1973.

Type of Assessment	# Children with Disabilities (IDEA) Participating	Percentage of Children with Disabilities (IDEA) Participating, Who Took the Specified Assessment
Regular Assessment without Accommodations	35,403	14.1
Regular Assessment with Accommodations	95,279	38.1
Alternate Assessment Based on Grade-Level Achievement Standards		
Alternate Assessment Based on Modified Achievement Standards	100,551	40.2
Alternate Assessment Based on Alternate Achievement Standards	19,076	7.6
Total	250,309	
Comments:		

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

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

Student Group	# Students Enrolled	# Students Participating	Percentage of Students Participating
All students	2,444,714		>97%
American Indian or Alaska Native	8,808		>97%
Asian or Pacific Islander	88,354		>97%
Black, non-Hispanic	345,191		>97%
Hispanic	1,151,744		>97%
White, non-Hispanic	847,835		>97%
Children with disabilities (IDEA)	254,159		>97%
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	356,288		>97%
Economically disadvantaged students	1,360,316		>97%
Migratory students	20,595		>97%
Male	1,251,135		>97%
Female	1,192,362		>97%
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 reading/language arts assessment.

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

Type of Assessment	# Children with Disabilities (IDEA) Participating	Percentage of Children with Disabilities (IDEA) Participating, Who Took the Specified Assessment
Regular Assessment without Accommodations	40,943	16.3
Regular Assessment with Accommodations	94,304	37.6
Alternate Assessment Based on Grade-Level Achievement Standards		
Alternate Assessment Based on Modified Achievement Standards	96,851	38.6
Alternate Assessment Based on Alternate Achievement Standards	19,052	7.6
Total	251,150	
Comments: The children with disabilities subgroup includes 60 students who took only an English Language Proficiency test. These students are reported in N093 but are not represented in table 1.2.4.		

1.2.5 Participation of All Students in the Science Assessment

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

Student Group	# Students Enrolled	# Students Participating	Percentage of Students Participating
All students	1,013,725		>97%
American Indian or Alaska Native	3,725		>97%
Asian or Pacific Islander	36,542		>97%
Black, non-Hispanic	145,902		>97%
Hispanic	465,052		>97%
White, non-Hispanic	361,627		>97%
Children with disabilities (IDEA)	109,027		>97%
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	103,232		>97%
Economically disadvantaged students	535,009		>97%
Migratory students	8,430		>97%
Male	518,018		>97%
Female	495,178		>97%
Comments:			

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

1.2.6 Participation of Students with Disabilities in Science Assessment

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

The data provided should include science participation results from all students with disabilities as defined under the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act (IDEA). Do <u>not</u> include former students with disabilities (IDEA). Do <u>not</u> include students only covered under Section 504 of the Rehabilitation Act of 1973.

Type of Assessment	# Children with Disabilities (IDEA) Participating	Percentage of Children with Disabilities (IDEA) Participating, Who Took the Specified Assessment
Regular Assessment without Accommodations	38,962	36.8
Regular Assessment with Accommodations	13,337	12.6
Alternate Assessment Based on Grade-Level Achievement Standards	7,725	7.3
Alternate Assessment Based on Modified Achievement Standards	45,900	43.3
Alternate Assessment Based on Alternate Achievement Standards		
Total	105,924	
Comments:		

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

1.3 STUDENT ACADEMIC ACHIEVEMENT

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

1.3.1 Student Academic Achievement in Mathematics

In the format of the table below, provide the number of students who received a valid score on the State assessment(s) in mathematics implemented to meet the requirements of Section 1111(b)(3) of ESEA (regardless of whether the students were present for a full academic year) and for whom a proficiency level was assigned, and the number of these students who scored at or above proficient, in grades 3 through 8 and high school.The percentage of students who scored at or above proficient is calculated automatically.

The student group "children with disabilities (IDEA)" includes children who participated, and for whom a proficiency level was assigned in the regular assessments with or without accommodations and alternate assessments. Do not include former students with disabilities (IDEA). The student group "limited English proficient (LEP) students" does include recently arrived students who have attended schools in the United States for fewer than 12 months. Do not include former LEP students.

1.3.1.1 Student Academic Achievement in Mathematics -Grade 3

Grade 3	# Students Who Received a Valid Score and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned	# Students Scoring at or Above Proficient	Percentage of Students Scoring at or Above Proficient
All students	368,816	307,351	83.3
American Indian or Alaska Native	1,254	1,074	85.6
Asian or Pacific Islander	13,470	12,718	94.4
Black, non-Hispanic	50,870	37,389	73.5
Hispanic	181,374	145,565	80.3
White, non-Hispanic	121,519	110,365	90.8
Children with disabilities (IDEA)	33,997	25,006	73.6
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	95,030	74,865	78.8
Economically disadvantaged students	220,801	172,648	78.2
Migratory students	2,831	2,107	74.4
Male	188,558	157,625	83.6
Female	180,140	149,653	83.1
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.

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

Grade 3	# Students Who Received a Valid Score and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned	# Students Scoring at or Above Proficient	Percentage of Students Scoring at or Above Proficient
All students	369,939	342,852	92.7
American Indian or Alaska Native	1,267	1,192	94.1
Asian or Pacific Islander	13,238	12,829	96.9
Black, non-Hispanic	51,315	45,379	88.4
Hispanic	181,612	164,634	90.6
White, non-Hispanic	122,226		>97%
Children with disabilities (IDEA)	34,341	29,089	84.7
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	94,228	83,740	88.9
Economically disadvantaged students	221,880	199,146	89.8
Migratory students	2,909	2,444	84.0
Male	189,169	173,378	91.6
Female	180,683	169,406	93.8
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.

1.3.3.1 Student Academic Achievement in Science -Grade 3

Grade 3	# Students Who Received a Valid Score and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned	# Students Scoring at or Above Proficient	Percentage of Students Scoring at or Above Proficient
All students			
American Indian or Alaska Native			
Asian or Pacific Islander			
Black, non-Hispanic			
Hispanic			
White, non-Hispanic			
Children with disabilities (IDEA)			
Limited English proficient (LEP) students			
Economically disadvantaged students			
Migratory students			
Male			
Female			
Comments: Science is reported in grades 5, 8 and 10 only.			

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.

1.3.1.2 Student Academic Achievement in Mathematics -Grade 4

Grade 4	# Students Who Received a Valid Score and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned	# Students Scoring at or Above Proficient	Percentage of Students Scoring at or Above Proficient
All students	356,007	302,525	85.0
American Indian or Alaska Native	1,256	1,070	85.2
Asian or Pacific Islander	12,778	12,042	94.2
Black, non-Hispanic	49,115	37,511	76.4
Hispanic	172,331	142,060	82.4
White, non-Hispanic	120,193	109,619	91.2
Children with disabilities (IDEA)	35,076	24,904	71.0
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	75,692	59,442	78.5
Economically disadvantaged students	209,204	167,680	80.2
Migratory students	2,866	2,220	77.5
Male	181,652	154,132	84.8
Female	174,040	148,181	85.1
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.

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

Grade 4	# Students Who Received a Valid Score and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned	# Students Scoring at or Above Proficient	Percentage of Students Scoring at or Above Proficient
All students	353,797	296,578	83.8
American Indian or Alaska Native	1,244	1,071	86.1
Asian or Pacific Islander	12,466	11,594	93.0
Black, non-Hispanic	48,996	37,499	76.5
Hispanic	170,883	136,413	79.8
White, non-Hispanic	119,879	109,776	91.6
Children with disabilities (IDEA)	34,958	24,279	69.4
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	73,980	54,657	73.9
Economically disadvantaged students	207,705	162,325	78.2
Migratory students	2,830	2,041	72.1
Male	180,463	146,902	81.4
Female	173,036	149,459	86.4
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.

1.3.3.2 Student Academic Achievement in Science -Grade 4

Grade 4	# Students Who Received a Valid Score and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned	# Students Scoring at or Above Proficient	Percentage of Students Scoring at or Above Proficient
All students			
American Indian or Alaska Native			
Asian or Pacific Islander			
Black, non-Hispanic			
Hispanic			
White, non-Hispanic			
Children with disabilities (IDEA)			
Limited English proficient (LEP) students			
Economically disadvantaged students			
Migratory students			
Male			
Female			
Comments: Science is reported in grades 5, 8 and 10 only.			

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.

1.3.1.3 Student Academic Achievement in Mathematics -Grade 5

Grade 5	# Students Who Received a Valid Score and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned	# Students Scoring at or Above Proficient	Percentage of Students Scoring at or Above Proficient
All students	354,545	316,908	89.4
American Indian or Alaska Native	1,268	1,122	88.5
Asian or Pacific Islander	12,643	12,071	95.5
Black, non-Hispanic	49,853	41,547	83.3
Hispanic	170,450	148,353	87.0
White, non-Hispanic	120,108	113,658	94.6
Children with disabilities (IDEA)	38,162	29,904	78.4
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	54,168	41,692	77.0
Economically disadvantaged students	205,708	175,680	85.4
Migratory students	2,913	2,344	80.5
Male	181,549	162,173	89.3
Female	172,855	154,637	89.5
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.

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

Grade 5	# Students Who Received a Valid Score and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned	# Students Scoring at or Above Proficient	Percentage of Students Scoring at or Above Proficient
All students	353,812	314,718	89.0
American Indian or Alaska Native	1,262	1,129	89.5
Asian or Pacific Islander	12,350	11,753	95.2
Black, non-Hispanic	49,944	42,603	85.3
Hispanic	169,759	144,554	85.2
White, non-Hispanic	120,281	114,509	95.2
Children with disabilities (IDEA)	38,302	29,988	78.3
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	52,760	37,866	71.8
Economically disadvantaged students	205,421	173,131	84.3
Migratory students	2,953	2,234	75.6
Male	181,161	159,335	88.0
Female	172,501	155,270	90.0
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

Grade 5	# Students Who Received a Valid Score and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned	# Students Scoring at or Above Proficient	Percentage of Students Scoring at or Above Proficient
All students	349,617	286,069	81.8
American Indian or Alaska Native	1,230	1,047	85.1
Asian or Pacific Islander	12,546	11,383	90.7
Black, non-Hispanic	49,064	35,563	72.5
Hispanic	168,267	129,192	76.8
White, non-Hispanic	118,252	108,706	91.9
Children with disabilities (IDEA)	37,343	22,780	61.0
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	53,414	31,984	59.9
Economically disadvantaged students	202,468	151,949	75.0
Migratory students	2,823	1,889	66.9
Male	178,899	150,187	84.0
Female	170,530	135,755	79.6
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.

1.3.1.4 Student Academic Achievement in Mathematics -Grade 6

Grade 6	# Students Who Received a Valid Score and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned	# Students Scoring at or Above Proficient	Percentage of Students Scoring at or Above Proficient
All students	344,965	272,589	79.0
American Indian or Alaska Native	1,270	1,025	80.7
Asian or Pacific Islander	12,578	11,708	93.1
Black, non-Hispanic	48,389	33,308	68.8
Hispanic	162,940	121,546	74.6
White, non-Hispanic	119,504	104,824	87.7
Children with disabilities (IDEA)	35,960	21,225	59.0
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	40,801	24,559	60.2
Economically disadvantaged students	194,698	140,690	72.3
Migratory students	2,831	1,866	65.9
Male	176,615	137,958	78.1
Female	168,154	134,515	80.0
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

Grade 6	# Students Who Received a Valid Score and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned	# Students Scoring at or Above Proficient	Percentage of Students Scoring at or Above Proficient
All students	342,951	309,132	90.1
American Indian or Alaska Native	1,262	1,167	92.5
Asian or Pacific Islander	12,314	11,791	95.8
Black, non-Hispanic	48,281	41,866	86.7
Hispanic	161,491	139,878	86.6
White, non-Hispanic	119,311	114,200	95.7
Children with disabilities (IDEA)	35,887	26,250	73.2
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	39,088	26,609	68.1
Economically disadvantaged students	193,217	165,628	85.7
Migratory students	2,805	2,176	77.6
Male	175,585	156,694	89.2
Female	167,171	152,276	91.1
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.

1.3.3.4 Student Academic Achievement in Science -Grade 6

Grade 6	# Students Who Received a Valid Score and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned	# Students Scoring at or Above Proficient	Percentage of Students Scoring at or Above Proficient
All students			
American Indian or Alaska Native			
Asian or Pacific Islander			
Black, non-Hispanic			
Hispanic			
White, non-Hispanic			
Children with disabilities (IDEA)			
Limited English proficient (LEP) students			
Economically disadvantaged students			
Migratory students			
Male			
Female			
Comments: Science is reported in grades 5, 8 and 10 only.			

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.

1.3.1.5 Student Academic Achievement in Mathematics -Grade 7

Grade 7	# Students Who Received a Valid Score and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned	# Students Scoring at or Above Proficient	Percentage of Students Scoring at or Above Proficient
All students	341,584	264,834	77.5
American Indian or Alaska Native	1,218	951	78.1
Asian or Pacific Islander	12,492	11,489	92.0
Black, non-Hispanic	48,178	31,968	66.4
Hispanic	159,046	115,692	72.7
White, non-Hispanic	120,400	104,573	86.8
Children with disabilities (IDEA)	36,678	20,593	56.2
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	34,299	18,109	52.8
Economically disadvantaged students	186,446	130,871	70.2
Migratory students	2,925	1,938	66.3
Male	175,320	134,609	76.8
Female	166,095	130,136	78.4
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.

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

Grade 7	# Students Who Received a Valid Score and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned	# Students Scoring at or Above Proficient	Percentage of Students Scoring at or Above Proficient
All students	338,874	283,111	83.5
American Indian or Alaska Native	1,211	1,054	87.0
Asian or Pacific Islander	12,141	11,280	92.9
Black, non-Hispanic	48,118	37,966	78.9
Hispanic	156,978	122,759	78.2
White, non-Hispanic	120,181	109,882	91.4
Children with disabilities (IDEA)	36,577	22,450	61.4
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	31,906	15,314	48.0
Economically disadvantaged students	184,478	141,738	76.8
Migratory students	2,895	1,940	67.0
Male	173,924	140,922	81.0
Female	164,787	142,077	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

Grade 7	# Students Who Received a Valid Score and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned	# Students Scoring at or Above Proficient	Percentage of Students Scoring at or Above Proficient
All students			
American Indian or Alaska Native			
Asian or Pacific Islander			
Black, non-Hispanic			
Hispanic			
White, non-Hispanic			
Children with disabilities (IDEA)			
Limited English proficient (LEP) students			
Economically disadvantaged students			
Migratory students			
Male			
Female			
Comments: Science is reported in grades 5, 8 and 10 only.			

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.

1.3.1.6 Student Academic Achievement in Mathematics -Grade 8

Grade 8	# Students Who Received a Valid Score and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned	# Students Scoring at or Above Proficient	Percentage of Students Scoring at or Above Proficient
All students	344,602	286,401	83.1
American Indian or Alaska Native	1,288	1,097	85.2
Asian or Pacific Islander	11,993	11,246	93.8
Black, non-Hispanic	49,652	36,248	73.0
Hispanic	159,367	125,917	79.0
White, non-Hispanic	122,086	111,755	91.5
Children with disabilities (IDEA)	38,959	25,790	66.2
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	28,079	15,462	55.1
Economically disadvantaged students	184,031	141,368	76.8
Migratory students	3,011	2,155	71.6
Male	176,666	146,788	83.1
Female	167,822	139,542	83.2
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.

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

Grade 8	# Students Who Received a Valid Score and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned	# Students Scoring at or Above Proficient	Percentage of Students Scoring at or Above Proficient
All students	342,833	323,267	94.3
American Indian or Alaska Native	1,291	1,240	96.0
Asian or Pacific Islander	11,748	11,328	96.4
Black, non-Hispanic	49,584	46,202	93.2
Hispanic	157,860	144,641	91.6
White, non-Hispanic	122,115	119,697	98.0
Children with disabilities (IDEA)	39,012	31,909	81.8
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	26,209	17,515	66.8
Economically disadvantaged students	182,953	167,032	91.3
Migratory students	3,045	2,576	84.6
Male	175,749	164,176	93.4
Female	166,985	159,018	95.2
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

Grade 8	# Students Who Received a Valid Score and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned	# Students Scoring at or Above Proficient	Percentage of Students Scoring at or Above Proficient
All students	337,985	239,758	70.9
American Indian or Alaska Native	1,246	942	75.6
Asian or Pacific Islander	11,930	10,346	86.7
Black, non-Hispanic	48,615	28,139	57.9
Hispanic	155,931	97,539	62.6
White, non-Hispanic	119,982	102,629	85.5
Children with disabilities (IDEA)	37,634	18,731	49.8
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	27,287	8,104	29.7
Economically disadvantaged students	179,775	108,787	60.5
Migratory students	2,879	1,472	51.1
Male	173,124	126,871	73.3
Female	164,720	112,824	68.5
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.

1.3.1.7 Student Academic Achievement in Mathematics -High School

High School	# Students Who Received a Valid Score and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned	# Students Scoring at or Above Proficient	Percentage of Students Scoring at or Above Proficient
All students	311,829	201,324	64.6
American Indian or Alaska Native	1,173	806	68.7
Asian or Pacific Islander	11,731	10,249	87.4
Black, non-Hispanic	45,955	22,699	49.4
Hispanic	133,845	76,247	57.0
White, non-Hispanic	118,857	91,209	76.7
Children with disabilities (IDEA)	31,477	12,197	38.8
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	20,361	6,509	32.0
Economically disadvantaged students	144,160	78,174	54.2
Migratory students	2,557	1,282	50.1
Male	158,375	101,665	64.2
Female	153,275	99,598	65.0
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 Received a Valid Score and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned	# Students Scoring at or Above Proficient	Percentage of Students Scoring at or Above Proficient
All students	314,805	273,504	86.9
American Indian or Alaska Native	1,181	1,062	89.9
Asian or Pacific Islander	11,621	10,812	93.0
Black, non-Hispanic	46,633	38,602	82.8
Hispanic	135,371	111,596	82.4
White, non-Hispanic	119,792	111,278	92.9
Children with disabilities (IDEA)	32,073	19,925	62.1
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	19,960	8,957	44.9
Economically disadvantaged students	146,296	118,635	81.1
Migratory students	2,652	2,027	76.4
Male	160,124	133,814	83.6
Female	154,560	139,607	90.3
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.

1.3.3.7 Student Academic Achievement in Science -High School

High School	# Students Who Received a Valid Score and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned	# Students Scoring at or Above Proficient	Percentage of Students Scoring at or Above Proficient
All students	308,519	201,432	65.3
American Indian or Alaska Native	1,166	866	74.3
Asian or Pacific Islander	11,684	9,806	83.9
Black, non-Hispanic	45,440	22,910	50.4
Hispanic	132,208	71,444	54.0
White, non-Hispanic	117,765	96,293	81.8
Children with disabilities (IDEA)	30,947	12,538	40.5
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	20,013	4,251	21.2
Economically disadvantaged students	142,308	74,190	52.1
Migratory students	2,503	1,039	41.5
Male	156,734	106,838	68.2
Female	151,616	94,517	62.3
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.

High School	# Students Who Received a Valid Score and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned	# Students Scoring at or Above Proficient	Percentage of Students Scoring at or Above Proficient
All students	308,519	201,432	65.3
American Indian or Alaska Native	1,166	866	74.3

1.4 SCHOOL AND DISTRICT ACCOUNTABILITY

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

1.4.1 All Schools and Districts Accountability

In the table below, provide the total number of public elementary and secondary schools and districts in the State, including charters, and the total number of those schools and districts that made AYP based on data for the SY 2008-09. The percentage that made AYP will be calculated automatically.

Entity	Total #	Total # that Made AYP in SY 2008-09	Percentage that Made AYP in SY 2008-09
Schools	7,089	6,736	95.0
Districts	1,209	1,000	82.7
Comments:			

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

1.4.2 Title I School Accountability

In the table below, provide the total number of public Title I schools by type and the total number of those schools that made AYP based on data for the SY 2008-09 school year. Include only public Title I schools. Do <u>not</u> 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 2008-09	Percentage of Title I Schools that Made AYP in SY 2008-09
All Title I schools	5,093	4,836	95.0
Schoolwide (SWP) Title I schools	4,844	4,591	94.8
Targeted assistance (TAS) Title I schools	249	245	98.4
Comments:			

Source – The table above is produced through EDFacts. 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 2008-09. 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 2008-09	Percentage of Districts That Received Title I Funds and Made AYP in SY 2008-09
1,202	966	80.4
Comments:		

Source – Initially populated from EDFacts. See Attachment D: CSPR & EDFacts 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 2009-10 based on the data from SY 2008-09. For each school on the list, provide the following:

- District Name
- District NCES ID Code
- School Name
- School 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 <> (Use one of the following improvement status designations: School Improvement û Year 1, School Improvement û Year 2, Corrective Action, Restructuring Year 1 (planning), or Restructuring Year 2 (implementing)[1]
- 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 ESEA were implemented in SY 2008-09 (based on SY 2007-08 assessments under Section 1111 of ESEA).

Corrective Action	# of Title I Schools in Corrective Action in Which the Corrective Action was Implemented in SY 2008-09
Required implementation of a new research-based curriculum or instructional program	16
Extension of the school year or school day	4
Replacement of staff members relevant to the school's low performance	10
Significant decrease in management authority at the school level	1
Replacement of the principal	
Restructuring the internal organization of the school	21
Appointment of an outside expert to advise the school	15
Comments:	

1.4.4.4 Restructuring – Year 2

In the table below, for schools in restructuring – year 2 (implementation year), provide the number of schools for which the listed restructuring actions under ESEA were implemented in SY 2008-09 (based on SY 2007-08 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	
Entering into a contract with a private entity to operate the school	
Take over the school by the State	
Other major restructuring of the school governance	33
Comments:	

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 2009-10 based on the data from SY 2008-09. For each district on the list, provide the following:

- District Name
- District 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'ts 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 2009-10 (Use one of the following improvement status designations: Improvement or Corrective Action [2])
- 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.

1.4.5.3 Corrective Action

In the table below, for districts in corrective action, provide the number of districts in corrective action in which the listed corrective actions under ESEA were implemented in SY 2008-09 (based on SY 2007-08 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 2008-09
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 2007-08 and beginning of SY 2008-09 as a corrective action)	0
Comments:	

1.4.7 Appeal of AYP and Identification Determinations

In the table below, provide the number of districts and schools that appealed their AYP designations based on SY 2008-09 data and the results of those appeals.

	# Appealed Their AYP Designations	# Appeals Resulted in a Change in the AYP Designation
Districts	38	0
Schools	85	0
Comments:		

Date (MM/DD/YY) that processing appeals based on SY 2008-09 data was complete	12/21/09

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 2008-09.

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 2008-09.

Instructions for States that during SY 2008-09 administered assessments required under section 1116 of ESEA after fall 2008 (i.e., non fall-testing states):

- In the SY 2008-09 column, provide the total number and percentage of students in schools receiving School Improvement funds in SY 2008-09 who were:
  - Proficient in mathematics as measured by your State's assessments required under section 1111(b)(3) of ESEA that were administered in SY 2008-09.
  - Proficient in reading/language arts as measured by your State's assessments required under section 1111(b)(3) of ESEA in SY 2008-09.
  - In SY 2007-08 column, provide the requested data for the same schools whose student proficiency data are reported for SY 2008-09.

States that in SY 2008-09 administered assessments required under section 1116 of ESEA during fall 2008 (i.e., fall-testing states):

- In the SY 2008-09 column, provide the total number and percentage of students in schools receiving School Improvement funds in SY 2008-09 who were:
  - Proficient in mathematics as measured by your State's assessments required under section 1111(b)(3) of ESEA that were administered in fall 2009.
  - Proficient in reading/language arts as measured by your State's assessments required under section 1111(b)(3) of ESEA that were administered in fall 2009.
  - In the SY 2007-08 column, provide the requested data for the same schools whose student proficiency data are reported in the SY 2008-09 column.

Category	SY 2008-09	SY 2007-08
Total number of students who completed the mathematics assessment and for whom proficiency level was assigned and were enrolled in schools that received assistance through Section 1003(a) and/or 1003(g) funds in SY 2008-09	166,342	166,854
Total number of students who were proficient or above in mathematics in schools that received assistance through Section 1003(a) and/or 1003(g) funds in SY 2008-09	105,744	98,065
Percentage of students who were proficient or above in mathematics in schools that received assistance through Section 1003(a) and/or 1003(g) funds in SY 2008-09	63.6	58.8
Total number of students who completed the reading/language arts assessment and for whom proficiency level was assigned and were enrolled in schools that received assistance through Section 1003(a) and/or 1003(g) funds in SY 2008-09	165,816	167,967
Total number of students who were proficient or above in reading/language arts in schools that received assistance through Section 1003(a) and/or 1003(g) funds in SY 2008-09	133,707	132,174
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 2008-09	80.6	78.7
Comments:		

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

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 2008-09 that:

- Made adequate yearly progress
- Exited improvement status
- Did <u>not</u> make adequate yearly progress

Category	# of Schools
Number of schools receiving assistance through Section 1003(a) and/or 1003(g) funds during SY 2008-09 that made adequate yearly progress based on testing in SY 2008-09	249
Number of schools receiving assistance through Section 1003(a) and/or 1003(g) funds during SY 2008-09 that exited improvement status based on testing in SY 2008-09	41
Number of schools receiving assistance through Section 1003(a) and/or 1003(g) funds during SY 2008-09 that did not make adequate yearly progress based on testing in SY 2008-09	123
Comments:	

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.

For fall-testing States, responses for this item would be based on assessments administered in fall 2009. For all other States the responses would be based on assessments administered during SY 2008-09.

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 based on testing after the schools received this assistance**	**Number of schools that used the strategy(s), made AYP based on testing after the schools received this assistance, 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	349	49	47		NA
2	NA	349	49	47		NA
3	NA	349	49	47		NA
5	NA	349	49	47		NA
Comments: Do not collect data for column 6.						

Column 1 Response Options Box

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.

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.

3 = Create partnerships among the SEA, LEAs and other entities for the purpose of delivering technical assistance, professional development, and management advice.

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.

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.

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.

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.

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.

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.

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

1.4.8.5.1 Section 1003(a) State Reservations

In the space provided, enter the percentage of the FY 2008 (SY 2008-09) 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.
1.4.8.5.2 Section 1003(a) and 1003(g) Allocations to LEAs and Schools

For SY 2008-09 there is no need to upload a spreadsheet to answer this question in the CSPR.

1.4.8.5.2 will be answered automatically using data submitted to EDFacts in Data Group 694, School improvement funds allocation table, from File Specification N/X132. You may review data submitted to EDFacts using the report named "Section 1003(a) and 1003(g) Allocations to LEAs and Schools -CSPR 1.4.8.5.2 (EDEN012)" from the EDFacts Reporting System.
1.4.8.5.3 Use of Section 1003(g)(8) Funds for Evaluation and Technical Assistance

Section 1003(g)(8) of ESEA allows States to reserve up to five percent of Section 1003(g) funds for administration and to meet the evaluation and technical assistance requirements for this program. In the space below, identify and describe the specific Section 1003(g) evaluation and technical assistance activities that your State conducted during SY 2008-09.

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.

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 2008-09 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.

1.4.9 Public School Choice and Supplemental Educational Services

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

1.4.9.1 Public School Choice

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

1.4.9.1.2 Public School Choice – Students

In the table below, provide the number of students who were eligible for public school choice, the number of eligible students who applied to transfer, and the number who transferred under the provisions for public school choice under Section 1116 of ESEA. The number of students who were eligible for public school choice should include:

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

The number of students who applied to transfer should include:

1. All students who applied to transfer in the current school year but did not or were unable to transfer.
2. All students who transferred in the current school year under the public school choice provisions of Section 1116; and
3. All students who previously transferred under the public school choice provisions of Section 1116 and are continuing to transfer for the current school year under Section 1116.

For any of the respective student counts, States should indicate in the Comment section if the count does not include any of the categories of students discussed above.

	# Students
Eligible for public school choice	187,245
Applied to transfer	3,065
Transferred to another school under the Title I public school choice provisions	2,193

1.4.9.1.3 Funds Spent on Public School Choice

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

	Amount
Dollars spent by LEAs on transportation for public school choice	$ 4,697,850

1.4.9.1.4 Availability of Public School Choice Options

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

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

	# LEAs
LEAs Unable to Provide Public School Choice	62

FAQs about public school choice:

a. How should States report data on Title I public school choice for those LEAs that have open enrollment and other choice programs? For those LEAs that implement open enrollment or other school choice programs in addition to public school choice under Section 1116 of ESEA, the State may consider a student as having applied to transfer if the student meets the following:

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

- In addition, the State may consider costs for transporting a student meeting the above conditions towards the funds spent by an LEA on transportation for public school choice if the student is using district transportation services to attend the non-identified school.

b. How should States report on public school choice for those LEAs that are not able to offer public school choice? In the count of LEAS that are not able to offer public school choice (for any of the reasons specified in 1.4.9.1.4), States should include those LEAs that are unable to offer public school choice at one or more grade levels. For instance, if an LEA is able to provide public school choice to eligible students at the elementary level but not at the secondary level, the State should include the LEA in the count. States should also include LEAs that are not able to provide public school choice at all (i.e., at any grade level). States should provide the reason(s) why public school choice was not possible in these LEAs at the grade level(s) in the Comment section. In addition, States may also include in the Comment section a separate count just of LEAs that are not able to offer public school choice at any grade level.

For LEAs that are not able to offer public school choice at one or more grade levels, States should count as eligible for public school choice (in 1.4.9.1.2) all students who attend identified Title I schools regardless of whether the LEA is able to offer the students public school choice.

[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	142,318
Applied for supplemental educational services	35,546
Received supplemental educational services	19,999
Comments:	

Source – Initially populated from EDFacts. See Attachment D: CSPR & EDFacts 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	$ 16,571,371
Comments:	

1.5 TEACHER QUALITY

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

1.5.1 Core Academic Classes Taught by Teachers Who Are Highly Qualified

In the table below, provide the number of core academic classes for the grade levels listed, the number of those core academic classes taught by teachers who are highly qualified, and the number taught by teachers who are not highly qualified. The percentage of core academic classes taught by teachers who are highly qualified and the percentage taught by teachers who are not highly qualified will be calculated automatically. Below the table are FAQs about these data.

School Type	Number of Core Academic Classes (Total)	Number of Core Academic Classes Taught by Teachers Who Are Highly Qualified	Percentage of Core Academic Classes Taught by Teachers Who Are Highly Qualified	Number 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 classes	768,344	762,126	99.2	6,218	0.8
All elementary classes	171,142	170,665	99.7	477	0.3
All secondary classes	597,202	591,461	99.0	5,741	1.0

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 equals one class.

FAQs about highly qualified teachers and core academic subjects:

a. *What are the core academic subjects? English, reading/language arts, mathematics, science, foreign languages, civics and*
   government, economics, arts, history, and geography [Title IX, Section 9101(11)]. While the statute includes the arts in the core
   academic subjects, it does not specify which of the arts are core academic subjects; therefore, States must make this determination.

b. *How is a teacher defined? An individual who provides instruction in the core academic areas to kindergarten, grades 1 through 12, or ungraded classes, or individuals who teach in an environment other than a classroom setting (and who maintain daily student attendance records) [from NCES, CCD, 2001-02]*

c. *How is a class defined? A class is a setting in which organized instruction of core academic course content is provided to one or more students (including cross-age groupings) for a given period of time. (A course may be offered to more than one class.) Instruction, provided by one or more teachers or other staff members, may be delivered in person or via a different medium. Classes that share space should be considered as separate classes if they function as separate units for more than 50% of the time [from NCES Non-fiscal Data Handbook for Early Childhood, Elementary, and Secondary Education, 2003].*

d. *Should 6th-, 7th-, and 8th-grade classes be reported in the elementary or the secondary category? States are responsible for determining whether the content taught at the middle school level meets the competency requirements for elementary or secondary instruction. Report classes in grade 6 through 8 consistent with how teachers have been classified to determine their highly qualified status, regardless of whether their schools are configured as elementary or middle schools.*

e. *How should States count teachers (including specialists or resource teachers) in elementary classes? States that count self-contained classrooms as one class should, to avoid over-representation, also count subject-area specialists (e.g., mathematics or music teachers) or resource teachers as teaching one class. On the other hand, States using a departmentalized approach to instruction where a self-contained classroom is counted multiple times (once for each subject taught) should also count subject-area specialists or resource teachers as teaching multiple classes.*

f. *How should States count teachers in self-contained multiple-subject secondary classes? Each core academic subject taught for which students are receiving credit toward graduation should be counted in the numerator and the denominator. For example, if the same teacher teaches English, calculus, history, and science in a self-contained classroom, count these as four classes in the denominator. If the teacher is Highly Qualified to teach English and history, he/she would be counted as Highly Qualified in two of the four subjects in the numerator.*

g. *What is the reporting period? The reporting period is the school year. The count of classes must include all semesters, quarters, or terms of the school year. For example, if core academic classes are held in summer sessions, those classes should be included in the count of core academic classes. A state determines into which school year classes fall.*

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

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

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

	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	38.5
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	4.4
Elementary school classes taught by teachers who are not fully certified (and are not in an approved alternative route program)	45.7
Other (please explain in comment box below)	11.4
Total	100.0

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

Various reasons for other are: Alternative Certification Program paperwork in progress Out of state certified Vacant Positions

	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)	46.0
Secondary school classes taught by certified special education teachers who have not demonstrated subject-matter competency in those subjects	22.1
Secondary school classes taught by teachers who are not fully certified (and are not in an approved alternative route program)	24.3
Other (please explain in comment box below)	7.6
Total	100.0

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

Various reasons for other are: Alternative Certification Program paperwork in progress Out of state certified Long term substitute Vacant Positions

1.5.3 Poverty Quartiles and Metrics Used

In the table below, provide the number of core academic classes for each of the school types listed and the number of those core academic classes taught by teachers who are highly qualified. The percentage of core academic classes taught by teachers who are highly qualified will be calculated automatically. The percentages used for high-and low-poverty schools and the poverty metric used to determine those percentages are reported in the second table. Below the tables are FAQs about these data.

This means that for the purpose of establishing poverty quartiles, some classes in schools where both elementary and secondary classes are taught would be counted as classes in an elementary school rather than as classes in a secondary school in 1.5.3. This also means that such a 12th grade class would be in different category in 1.5.3 than it would be in 1.5.1.

NOTE: No source of classroom-level poverty data exists, so States may look at school-level data when figuring poverty quartiles. Because not all schools have traditional grade configurations, and because a school may not be counted as both an elementary and as a secondary school, States may include as elementary schools all schools that serve children in grades K through 5 (including K through 8 or K through 12 schools).

School Type	Number of Core Academic Classes (Total)	Number of Core Academic Classes Taught by Teachers Who Are Highly Qualified	Percentage of Core Academic Classes Taught by Teachers Who Are Highly Qualified
Elementary Schools			
High Poverty Elementary Schools	43,822	43,625	99.6
Low-poverty Elementary Schools	39,190	39,163	99.9
Secondary Schools			
High Poverty secondary Schools	146,502	144,817	98.8
Low-Poverty secondary Schools	163,809	163,159	99.6

1.5.4 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	39.4
Poverty metric used	Low income percentage	
Secondary schools	69.0	32.7
Poverty metric used	Low income percentage	

FAQs on poverty quartiles and metrics used to determine poverty

a. *What is a "high-poverty school"? Section 1111(h)(1)(C)(viii) defines "high-poverty" schools as schools in the top quartile of poverty in the State.*

b. *What is a "low-poverty school"? Section 1111(h)(1)(C)(viii) defines "low-poverty" schools as schools in the bottom quartile of poverty in the State.*

c. *How are the poverty quartiles determined? Separately rank order elementary and secondary schools from highest to lowest on your percentage poverty measure. Divide the list into four equal groups. Schools in the first (highest group) are high-poverty schools. Schools in the last group (lowest group) are the low-poverty schools. Generally, States use the percentage of students who qualify for the free or reduced-price lunch program for this calculation.*

d. *Since the poverty data are collected at the school and not classroom level, how do we classify schools as either elementary or secondary for this purpose? States may include as elementary schools all schools that serve children in grades K through 5 (including K through 8 or K through 12 schools) and would therefore include as secondary schools those that exclusively serve children in grades 6 and higher.*

1.6 TITLE III AND LANGUAGE INSTRUCTIONAL PROGRAMS

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

1.6.1 Language Instruction Educational Programs

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

Table 1.6.1 Definitions:

1. **Types of Programs = Types of programs described in the subgrantee's local plan (as submitted to the State or as implemented) that is closest to the descriptions in**
   http://www.ncela.gwu.edu/files/uploads/5/Language_Instruction_Educational_Programs.pdf.
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 programs	Spanish
No	Developmental bilingual	
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.

1.6.2 Student Demographic Data

1.6.2.1 Number of ALL LEP Students in the State

In the table below, provide the underlined number of ALL LEP students in the State who meet the LEP definition under Section 9101(25).

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

Number of ALL LEP students in the State	713,218
Comments:	

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

In the table below, provide the underlined 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.	712,320
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; Castilian	630,898
Vietnamese	12,777
Chinese	3,660
Arabic	3,490
Urdu	3,166

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

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

1.6.3 Student Performance Data

This section collects data on LEP student English language proficiency, as required by Sections 1111(h)(4)(D) and 3121(a)(2).

1.6.3.1.1 All LEP Students Tested on the State Annual English Language Proficiency Assessment

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

	#
Number tested on State annual ELP assessment	708,406
Number not tested on State annual ELP assessment	4,814
Total	713,220
Comments:	

1.6.3.1.2 ALL LEP Student English Language Proficiency Results

	#
Number proficient or above on State annual ELP assessment	230,795
Percent proficient or above on State annual ELP assessment	34.3
Comments:	

1.6.3.2.1 Title III LEP Students Tested on the State Annual English Language Proficiency (ELP) Assessment

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

	#
Number tested on State annual ELP assessment	707,526
Number not tested on State annual ELP assessment	4,794
Total	712,320
Comments:	
In the table below, provide the number of Title III Students who took the State annual ELP assessment for the first time and whose progress cannot be determined. Report this number ONLY if the State did not include these students in establishing AMAO1/making progress target and did not include them in the calculations for AMAO1/making progress(# and % making progress).	

	#
Number of Title III LEP with one data point whose progress can not be determined and whose results were not included in the calculation for AMAO1.	122,219

1.6.3.2.2
Table 1.6.3.2.2 Definitions:

1. **Annual Measureable Achievement Objectives (AMAOs) = State targets for the percent of students making progress and attaining proficiency.**
2. **Making Progress = Number of Title III LEP students that met the definition of ôMaking Progressö as defined by the State and**
   submitted to ED in the State Consolidated Application (CSA), or as amended.
3. **ELP Attainment = Number of Title III LEP students that meet the State defined English language proficiency submitted to ED in the State Consolidated Application (CSA), or as amended.**
4. **Results = Number and percent of Title III LEP students that met the State definition of ôMaking Progressö and the number and percent that met the State definition of ôAttainmentö of English language proficiency.**

In the table below, provide the State targets for the number and percentage of States making progress and attaining English proficiency for this reporting period. Additionally, provide the results from the annual State English language proficiency assessment for Title III-served LEP students who participated in a Title III language instruction educational program in grades K through 12. If your State uses cohorts, provide us with the range of targets, (i.e., indicate the lowest target among the cohorts, e.g., 10% and the highest target among a cohort, e.g., 70%).

	Results		Targets	
	#	%	#	%
Making progress	322,668	43.4	0	0.00
ELP attainment	230,434	31.0	0	0.00
Comments: Since Texas has the targets set by grade cohort, we are unable to report accurate targets above. Making Progress Targets: K-2 65,101 (21%) 3-12 109,331(48%) ELP Attainment Targets: K-2 10,850 (3.5%) 3-12 Method 1 -106,499 (27%) Method 2 -189,331 (48%)				

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:	

1.6.3.5.2 Native Language of Mathematics Tests Given

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

Language(s)
Spanish
Comments:

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 ESEA accountability determinations for reading/language arts.

Language(s)
Spanish
Comments:

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 ESEA accountability determinations for science.

Language(s)
Spanish
Comments:

1.6.3.6 Title III Served Monitored Former LEP (MFLEP) Students

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

1.6.3.6.1 Title III Served MFLEP Students by Year Monitored

In the table below, report the underlined 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 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
66,055	46,701	112,756
Comments:		

1.6.3.6.2 In the table below, report the number of MFLEP students who took the annual mathematics assessment. Please provide data only for those students who transitioned 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 of MFLEP students in grades used for NCLB accountability determinations (3**
   through 8 and once in high school) who did not score proficient on the State NCLB mathematics assessment. This will be
   automatically calculated.

# Tested	# At or Above Proficient	% Results	# Below Proficient
99,872	87,780	87.9	12,092
Comments:			

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

In the table below, report the number of MFLEP students who took the annual mathematics assessment. Please provide data only for those students who transitioned 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
100,007	92,360	92.4	7,647
Comments:			

1.6.3.6.4 Monitored Former LEP (MFLEP) Students Results for Science

In the table below, report results for monitored former LEP 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 total 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
45,218	34,722	76.8	10,496
Comments:			

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	1,061
# -Number of subgrantees that met all three Title III AMAOs	1,040
# -Number of subgrantees who met AMAO 1	1,055
# -Number of subgrantees who met AMAO 2	1,054
# -Number of subgrantees who met AMAO 3	1,051
# -Number of subgrantees that did not meet any Title III AMAOs	21
# -Number of subgrantees that did not meet Title III AMAOs for two consecutive years (SYs 2007-08 and 2008-09)	18
# -Number of subgrantees implementing an improvement plan in SY 2008-09 for not meeting Title III AMAOs	1
# -Number of subgrantees who have not met Title III AMAOs for four consecutive years (SYs 2005-06, 2006-07, 2007-08, and 2008-09)	2
Comments:	

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 all three Title III AMAOs	Yes
Comments:	

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:	

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 <u>unduplicated</u> number of immigrant students enrolled in schools in the State and who participated in qualifying educational programs under Section 3114(d)(1).

Table 1.6.5.1 Definitions:

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

   Sections 3114(a) and 3115(a) that serve immigrant students enrolled in them.

# Immigrant Students Enrolled	# Students in 3114(d)(1) Program	# of 3114(d)(1) Subgrants
86,319	16,386	18

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 EDFacts. See Attachment D: CSPR & EDFacts 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 under Section 3301(8) and reported in 1.6.1 (Types of language instruction educational programs) even if they are not paid with Title III funds.

Note: Section 3301(8) û The term æLanguage instruction educational program' means an instruction course û (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.	26,421
Estimate number of additional certified/licensed teachers that will be needed for Title III language instruction educational programs in the next 5 years*.	12,383

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.

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

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

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

Table 1.6.6.2 Definitions:

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

4. Total = Number of all participants in professional development (PD) activities

Type of Professional Development Activity	# Subgrantees	
Instructional strategies for LEP students	315	
Understanding and implementation of assessment of LEP students	238	
Understanding and implementation of ELP standards and academic content standards for LEP students	247	
Alignment of the curriculum in language instruction educational programs to ELP standards	164	
Subject matter knowledge for teachers	185	
Other (Explain in comment box)	33	
Participant Information	**# Subgrantees**	**# Participants**
PD provided to content classroom teachers	294	72,897
PD provided to LEP classroom teachers	61	3,671
PD provided to principals	243	6,401
PD provided to administrators/other than principals	253	8,295
PD provided to other school personnel/non-administrative	193	10,180
PD provided to community based organization personnel	305	58,998
Total	330	160,442

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

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 <u>intended school year</u>. 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 2008-09 funds July 1, 2008, and then made these funds available to subgrantees on August 1, 2008, for SY 2008-09 programs. Then the "# of days/$$ Distribution" is 30 days.

Date State Received Allocation	Date Funds Available to Subgrantees	# of Days/$$ Distribution
7/7/08	7/1/08	82
Comments: The date funds available to subgrantees is July 1, 2008 with pre-award costs as budgeted and approved in grant application.		

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.

The following steps have been/will be implemented: 1) Reorganization within Division of Formula Funding -effective November 30, 2009. Staff have been assigned to specific grant application teams under the leadership of a team lead specialist. Team lead specialist is responsible for ensuring timely processing of grant applications assigned to unit. 2) TEA business processes will be streamlined in order to expedite the issuance of Notice of Grant Awards (NOGAs). The NOGA process will be streamlined by issuing NOGAs based on planning amounts first. Revised NOGAs will follow once the roll forward process has been completed. The streamlined process is projected to be implemented with the beginning of the 2010-2011 school year.

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	
Comments: Per USDE and Partner Support, a blank = zero. File spec N130 was submitted with no persistently dangerous schools in Texas for 08-09.	

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 2007-08). Below the table are FAQs about the data collected in this table.

Student Group	Graduation Rate
All Students	79.1
American Indian or Alaska Native	81.7
Asian or Pacific Islander	91.2
Black, non-Hispanic	71.8
Hispanic	70.8
White, non-Hispanic	88.8
Children with disabilities (IDEA)	69.8
Limited English proficient	44.2
Economically disadvantaged	70.4
Migratory students	66.3
Male	76.8
Female	81.4
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 CSPR collection tool.

FAQs on graduation rates:

a. *What is the graduation rate? Section 200.19 of the Title I regulations issued under the No Child Left Behind Act on December 2,*
2002, defines graduation rate to mean:

- The percentage of students, measured from the beginning of high school, who graduate from public high school with a regular diploma (not including a GED or any other diploma not fully aligned with the State's academic standards) in the standard number of years; or,
- Another more accurate definition developed by the State and approved by the Secretary in the State plan that more accurately measures the rate of students who graduate from high school with a regular diploma; and
- Avoids counting a dropout as a transfer.

b. *What if the data collection system is not in place for the collection of graduate rates? For those States that are reporting transitional graduation rate data and are working to put into place data collection systems that will allow the State to calculate the graduation rate in accordance with Section 200.19 for all the required subgroups, please provide a detailed progress report on the status of those efforts.*

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 2007-08). Below the table is a FAQ about the data collected in this table.

Student Group	Dropout Rate
All Students	3.2
American Indian or Alaska Native	2.6
Asian or Pacific Islander	1.1
Black, non-Hispanic	5.0
Hispanic	4.4
White, non-Hispanic	1.5
Children with disabilities (IDEA)	4.1
Limited English proficient	5.8
Economically disadvantaged	3.5
Migratory students	5.3
Male	3.5
Female	3.0
Comments:	

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	1,161	580
LEAs with subgrants	120	120
Total	1,281	700
Comments: The numbers for 2008-2009 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. All of the 120 participating LEAs did report data concerning the 115 LEAs that did enroll and serve students. In Texas in 2008-2009, a total of 120 LEAs participated in 45 McKinney-Vento subgrants. Out of the total of 120 participating LEAs, 115 LEAs enrolled students.		

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)	2,379	3,397
K	3,417	4,295
1	3,801	4,427
2	3,124	3,871
3	3,000	3,698
4	2,863	3,395
5	2,609	3,210
6	2,386	2,931
7	2,357	2,824
8	2,617	2,678
9	2,187	3,690
10	1,712	2,530
11	1,511	2,197
12	1,598	2,236
Ungraded		
Total	35,561	45,379
Comments:		

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	4,459	10,592
Doubled-up (e.g., living with another family)	27,612	29,763
Unsheltered (e.g., cars, parks, campgrounds, temporary trailer, or abandoned buildings)	1,378	1,743
Hotels/Motels	2,112	2,155
Total	35,561	44,253
Comments: The total number of homeless students by primary nighttime residence does not match the total number of homeless students enrolled. The main reason for this mismatch is that in districts, especially large ones, where enrollment information about homeless students is collected at the campus level and not by McKinney-Vento sugrantee staff, information about the primary nighttime residence of homeless students is sometimes either not collected or not recorded at the time of enrollment. McKinney-Vento subgrantee staff have reported that it is impossible to go back and collect this information after the fact.		

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)	2,896
K	3,609
1	3,702
2	3,333
3	3,145
4	2,862
5	2,771
6	2,510
7	2,436
8	2,355
9	2,884
10	2,059
11	1,941
12	2,037
Ungraded	
Total	38,540
Comments:	

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

1.9.2.2 Subgroups of Homeless Students Served

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

	# Homeless Students Served
Unaccompanied youth	1,864
Migratory children/youth	308
Children with disabilities (IDEA)	3,914
Limited English proficient students	5,711
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	38
Expedited evaluations	14
Staff professional development and awareness	35
Referrals for medical, dental, and other health services	34
Transportation	34
Early childhood programs	14
Assistance with participation in school programs	33
Before-, after-school, mentoring, summer programs	39
Obtaining or transferring records necessary for enrollment	25
Parent education related to rights and resources for children	31
Coordination between schools and agencies	32
Counseling	27
Addressing needs related to domestic violence	26
Clothing to meet a school requirement	37
School supplies	42
Referral to other programs and services	33
Emergency assistance related to school attendance	27
Other (optional – in comment box below)	14
Other (optional – in comment box below)	
Other (optional – in comment box below)	

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

Tuition assistance and fees for summer school and other similar supplemental instructional programs; transportation to summer school; credit recovery; personnel for program staff; at-risk tutoring; professional development; social work services; camp counselors; transportation of parents to meetings at school and elsewhere; literature books; laptops; teen leadership conference fees; child care; before-/after-school snacks.

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	8
School Selection	7
Transportation	17
School records	13
Immunizations	9
Other medical records	4
Other Barriers – in comment box below	13

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

Transportation delays -transportation is provided but it can take a while to set up; enrollment delays because campus asks for proof of residence; campuses requesting guardianship information from unaccompanied youth; rigidity of shelter schedules; shelter staff turnover; unaccompanied youth; unaccompanied high school students; family conflicts; and parent/guardian involvement.

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 ESEA reading/language arts assessment and the number of those tested who scored at or above proficient. Provide data for grades 9 through 12 only for those grades tested for ESEA.

Grade	# Homeless Children/Youths Served by McKinney-Vento Taking Reading Assessment Test	# Homeless Children/Youths Served by McKinney-Vento Who Scored At or Above Proficient
3		
4		
5		
6		
7		
8		
High School		
Comments: Performance data on students served by McKinney-Vento are currently not available. Texas will modify the data collection to collect this indicator for all students in 2010 -2011.		

Source – Initially populated from EDFacts. See Attachment D: CSPR & EDFacts 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 ESEA 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		
4		
5		
6		
7		
8		
High School		
Comments: Performance data on students served by McKinney-Vento are currently not available. Texas will modify the data collection to collect this indicator for all students in 2010 -2011.		

Source – Initially populated from EDFacts. See Attachment D: CSPR & EDFacts 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, 2008 through August 31, 2009. This section also collects a report on the procedures used by States to produce true, accurate, and valid child counts.

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

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

FAQs on Child Count:

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-ofschool youth.)

1.10.1 Category 1 Child Count

In the table below, enter the underlined 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, 2008 through August 31, 2009. 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)	5,045
K	3,184
1	3,744
2	3,644
3	3,526
4	3,521
5	3,600
6	3,618
7	3,574
8	3,721
9	4,721
10	3,516
11	3,209
12	4,533
Ungraded	23
Out-of-school	1,750
Total	54,929
Comments:	

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

There was a difference of 788, which equals to 1.4% decrease.

1.10.2 Category 2 Child Count

In the table below, enter by age/grade the <u>unduplicated</u> statewide number of eligible migrant children age 3 through 21 who, within 3 years of making a qualifying move, were <u>served</u> for one or more days in a MEP-funded project conducted during either the <u>summer term or during intersession periods</u> that occurred within the reporting period of September 1, 2008 through August 31, 2009. 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 <u>not</u> 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)	1,075
K	758
1	954
2	941
3	915
4	979
5	905
6	762
7	689
8	732
9	649
10	486
11	455
12	51
Ungraded	
Out-of-school	104
Total	10,455
Comments:	

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

There was a difference of 194, which equals to 1.9% increase.

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 2008-2009 on the data compiled and generated by the New Generation System (NGS). The child counts for the 2007-2008 reporting period also were generated by NGS.

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 by 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 children. 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 2008-2009 school year and was entered on the system within 5 working days of submission to the NGS terminal site. NGS Data Specialists began recording residency verification information for each migrant student on the appropriate NGS history line as of the 2005-2006 reporting period.

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.

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 current qualifying move along with the unique identification number (Recruiter ID) of the recruiter who made the eligibility determination.

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 District, Residency Verification Date and the Two Year Olds 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 as for the category 1 count.

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 9/1/2008-8/31/2009 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 9/1/2008-8/31/2009. 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 Olds 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 as for the category 1 count.

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 children eligibility are outlined in the Texas Manual for the Identification and Recruitment of Migrant children.

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 COE to be used for 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 a statewide listserv, 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 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 eligible 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 2008-2009 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 2008-2009 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.

The eligibility validation process 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 and NGS Focus Groups meet approximately 2 times annually to review all ID&R and NGS procedures, eligibility validations and the business rules and edit checks built into NGS.

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 2008-2009 reporting period the State MEP in conjunction with the 20 regional ESCs conducted random re-interviews of 200 parents to validate eligibility determinations made in the 2008-2009 reporting period. Of the 200 children in the sample, all 200 children were determined to be eligible.

Each ESC received a list from TEA of children for the 2008-2009 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 2008-09 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 Children 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 2009. 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 identified themselves first and used the following script (also provided in Spanish): "The 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):

"The purpose of our visit is to ask you some questions to make sure that the correct information was collected on the Certificate of Eligibility (COE) regarding your migrant move(s). I want to assure you that this re-interview is not to question your responses, but rather to review our actual Identification and Recruitment (ID&R) process. The results will be used to improve the statewide Identification and Recruitment efforts in the Migrant Education Program. May we visit with you? All the information that you give me will be kept confidential."

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 and 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.

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 March and June 2009 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 2008-2009 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.

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 2008-2009 reporting period, reviewing supplemental documentation related to

qualifying work, intent, PMOL and economic necessary for all children newly identified as migrant in the 2008-2009 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.

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 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 (such as the states listserv the Weekly Recruiter) for quality control and eligibility validation efforts. Each year that state, regional, and local staff participates in this process, the more it improves.

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.