

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

**for  
STATE FORMULA GRANT PROGRAMS  
under the  
ELEMENTARY AND SECONDARY EDUCATION ACT  
As amended in 2001**

**For reporting on  
School Year 2011-12**

**TEXAS**



**PART I DUE THURSDAY, DECEMBER 20, 2012  
PART II DUE FRIDAY, FEBRUARY 15, 2013**

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

## INTRODUCTION

Sections 9302 and 9303 of the *Elementary and Secondary Education Act (ESEA)*, as amended in 2001 provide to States the option of applying for and reporting on multiple *ESEA* programs through a single consolidated application and report. Although a central, practical purpose of the Consolidated State Application and Report is to reduce "red tape" and burden on States, the Consolidated State Application and Report are also intended to have the important purpose of encouraging the integration of State, local, and *ESEA* programs in comprehensive planning and service delivery and enhancing the likelihood that the State will coordinate planning and service delivery across multiple State and local programs. The combined goal of all educational agencies—State, local, and Federal—is a more coherent, well-integrated educational plan that will result in improved teaching and learning. The Consolidated State Application and Report includes the following *ESEA* programs:

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

The *ESEA* Consolidated State Performance Report (CSPR) for school year (SY) 2011-12 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 ED Facts 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 2011-12 must respond to this Consolidated State Performance Report (CSPR). Part I of the Report is due to the Department by **Thursday, December 20, 2012**. Part II of the Report is due to the Department by **Friday, February 15, 2013**. Both Part I and Part II should reflect data from the SY 2011-12, 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 2011-12 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 2011-12 CSPR will be found on the main CSPR page of the EDEN web site (<https://EDEN.ED.GOV/EDENPortal/>).

		OMB Number: 1810-0614
		Expiration Date: 11/30/2013
<p>Consolidated State Performance Report          For          State Formula Grant Programs          under the          Elementary And Secondary Education Act          as amended in 2001</p>		
<p>Check the one that indicates the report you are submitting:  <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Part I, 2011-12                      <input type="checkbox"/> Part II, 2011-12</p>		
<p>Name of State Educational Agency (SEA) Submitting This Report:          Texas Education Agency</p>		
<p>Address:          1701 N. Congress Ave.          Austin, Texas 78701-1494</p>		
<p>Person to contact about this report:</p>		
<p>Name: Didi Garcia</p>		
<p>Telephone: 512-463-9147</p>		
<p>Fax: 512-463-9560</p>		
<p>e-mail: didi.garcia@tea.state.tx.us</p>		
<p>Name of Authorizing State Official: (Print or Type):          Gene Lenz</p>		
		<p>Wednesday, April 17, 2013, 4:39:09 PM</p>
<p>_____</p>		
<p>Signature</p>		

**CONSOLIDATED STATE PERFORMANCE REPORT  
PART I**

For reporting on  
**School Year 2011-12**



**PART I DUE DECEMBER 20, 2012  
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**

Indicate below whether your state has made or is planning to make revisions to or change the State's academic content standards in mathematics, reading/language arts or science since the State's content standards were most recently approved through ED's peer review process for State assessment systems. If yes, indicate specifically in what school year your State implemented or will implement the revisions or changes.

State has revised or changed	No revisions or changes to academic content standards in mathematics, reading/language arts or science made or planned.
	State has revised or changed its academic content standards in mathematics, reading/language arts or science or is planning to make revisions to or change its academic content standards in mathematics, reading/language arts or science. Indicate below the year these changes were or will be implemented or GÇ£Not ApplicableGÇ¥ to indicate that changes were not made or will not be made in the subject area.

Acceptable responses are a school year (e.g., 2011-12) or Not Applicable.

	Mathematics	Reading/Language Arts	Science
Academic Content Standards	2014-2015(K-8); 2015-2016(HS)	2009-2010	2010-2011

If the responses above do not fully describe revisions or changes to your State's academic achievement standards, describe the revisions or changes below.

The response is limited to 1,000 characters

The mathematics standards were revised and the State Board of Education adopted revised mathematics standards in April 2012. The revised mathematics standards for Kindergarten - Grade 8 are scheduled for implementation in the 2014-2015 if the commissioner of education has determined that funding has been made available to Texas public schools for materials aligned with the new standards. The revised mathematics standards for high school are scheduled for implementation in the 2015-2016 if the commissioner of education has determined that funding has been made available to Texas public schools for materials aligned with the new standards.

The English language arts and reading and Spanish language arts and reading standards are scheduled for the next review and revision beginning in spring 2015.

The science standards are scheduled for the next review and revision beginning in spring 2016.

**1.1.1.1 Academic Achievement Standards in Mathematics, Reading/Language Arts and Science**

Indicate below whether your state has changed or is planning to change the State's academic achievement standards in mathematics, reading/language arts or science since the State's academic achievement standards were most recently approved through ED's peer review process for State assessment systems. If yes, indicate specifically in what school year your State implemented or will implement the changes.

As applicable, include changes to academic achievement standards based on any assessments (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.

<p>State has revised or changed</p>	<p>No revisions or changes to academic content standards in mathematics, reading/language arts or science made or planned.</p>
	<p>State has changed its academic achievement standards or is planning to change its academic achievement standards in mathematics, reading/language arts or science. Indicate below either the school year in which these changes were or will be implemented or GÇ£Not ApplicableGÇ¥ to indicate that changes were not made or will not be made in the subject area.</p>

Acceptable responses are a school year (e.g., 2011-12) or Not Applicable.

Academic Achievement Standards for	Mathematics	Reading/Language Arts	Science
Regular Assessments in Grades 3-8	2011-2012	2011-2012	2011-2012
Regular Assessments in High School	2011-2012	2011-2012	2011-2012
Alternate Assessments Based on Grade-Level Achievement Standards (if applicable)			
Alternate Assessments Based on Modified Achievement Standards (if applicable)	2011-2012	2011-2012	2011-2012
Alternate Assessments Based on Alternate Achievement Standards	2011-2012	2011-2012	2011-2012

If the responses above do not fully describe revisions or changes to your State's academic achievement standards, describe the revisions or changes below.

The response is limited to 1,000 characters

**1.1.2 Assessments in Mathematics and Reading/Language Arts and Science**

Indicate below whether your state has changed or is planning to change the State's academic assessments in mathematics, reading/language arts or science since the State's academic assessments were most recently approved through ED's peer review process for State assessment systems. If yes, indicate specifically in what school year your State implemented or will implement the changes.

As applicable, include any assessments (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.

<p style="text-align: center;">State has revised or changed</p>	<p>No changes to assessments in mathematics, reading/language arts or science made or planned.</p>
	<p>State has changed or is planning to change its assessments in mathematics, reading/language arts or science. Indicate below the year these changes were implemented or GÇ£Not ApplicableGÇ¥ to indicate that changes were not made or will not be made in the subject area.</p>

Acceptable responses are a school year (e.g., 2011-12) or Not Applicable.

Academic Assessments	Mathematics	Reading/Language Arts	Science
Regular Assessments in Grades 3-8	2011-2012	2011-2012	2011-2012
Regular Assessments in High School	2011-2012	2011-2012	2011-2012
Alternate Assessments Based on Grade-Level Achievement Standards (if applicable)			
Alternate Assessments Based on Modified Achievement Standards (if applicable)	2011-2012	2011-2012	2011-2012
Alternate Assessments Based on Alternate Achievement Standards	2011-2012	2011-2012	2011-2012

If the responses above do not fully describe revisions or changes to your State's academic achievement standards, describe the revisions or changes below.

The response is limited to 1,000 characters

### 1.1.3 Grants for State Assessments and Related Activities

#### 1.1.3.1 Percentages of Funds Used for Standards and Assessment Development and Other Purposes

For funds your State had available under *ESEA* section 6111 (Grants for State Assessments and Related Activities) during SY 2011-12, estimate what percentage of the funds your State used for the following (round to the nearest ten percent).

Purpose	Percentage (rounded to the nearest ten percent)
To pay the costs of the development of the State assessments and standards required by section 1111(b)	50.00
To administer assessments required by section 1111(b) or to carry out other activities described in section 6111 and other activities related to ensuring that the State's schools and local educational agencies are held accountable for the results	50.00
<b>Comments:</b> The response is limited to 4,000 characters.	

#### 1.1.3.2 Uses of Funds for Purposes Other than Standards and Assessment Development

For funds your State had available under *ESEA* section 6111 (Grants for State Assessments and Related Activities) during SY 2011-12 that were used for purposes other than the costs of the development of the State assessments and standards required by section 1111(b), for what purposes did your State use the funds? (Enter "yes" for all that apply and "no" for all that do not apply).

Purpose	Used for Purpose (yes/no)
Administering assessments required by section 1111(b)	___ No
Developing challenging State academic content and student academic achievement standards and aligned assessments in academic subjects for which standards and assessments are not required by section 1111 (b)	___ No
Developing or improving assessments of English language proficiency necessary to comply with section 1111(b)(7)	___ No
Ensuring the continued validity and reliability of State assessments, and/or refining State assessments to ensure their continued alignment with the State's academic content standards and to improve the alignment of curricula and instructional materials	___ No
Developing multiple measures to increase the reliability and validity of State assessment systems	___ No
Strengthening the capacity of local educational agencies and schools to provide all students the opportunity to increase educational achievement, including carrying out professional development activities aligned with State student academic achievement standards and assessments	___ No
Expanding the range of accommodations available to students with limited English proficiency and students with disabilities ( <i>IDEA</i> ) to improve the rates of inclusion of such students, including professional development activities aligned with State academic achievement standards and assessments	___ No
Improving the dissemination of information on student achievement and school performance to parents and the community, including the development of information and reporting systems designed to identify best educational practices based on scientifically based research or to assist in linking records of student achievement, length of enrollment, and graduation over time	___ No
Other	___ No
<b>Comments:</b> The response is limited to 4,000 characters.	

## 1.2 PARTICIPATION IN STATE ASSESSMENTS

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

Note: States are not required to report these data by the seven (7) racial/ethnic groups; instead, they are required to report these data by the major racial and ethnic groups that are identified in their Accountability Workbooks. The charts below display racial/ethnic data that has been mapped back from the major racial and ethnic groups identified in their workbooks, to the 7 racial/ethnic groups to allow for the examination of data across states.

### 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 with *ESEA*. 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 States for fewer than 12 months. Do not include former *LEP* students.

Student Group	# Students Enrolled	# Students Participating	Percentage of Students Participating
All students	S	2,540,687	>=99
American Indian or Alaska Native	S	9,925	>=99
Asian	S	90,978	>=99
Black or African American	S	324,361	>=99
Hispanic or Latino	S	1,274,156	>=99
Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander	S	3,074	>=99
White	S	793,628	>=99
Two or more races	S	42,615	>=99
Children with disabilities ( <i>IDEA</i> )	S	236,326	>=99
Limited English proficient ( <i>LEP</i> ) students	S	360,683	>=99
Economically disadvantaged students	S	1,521,990	>=99
Migratory students	S	19,138	>=99
Male	S	1,299,791	>=99
Female	S	1,240,144	>=99
<b>Comments:</b> The response is limited to 4,000 characters. A discrepancy with missing or blank values has been discovered in the reporting system. Procedures to correct this discrepancy will be implemented and the appropriate files will be resubmitted.			

**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 ( <i>IDEA</i> ) Participating	Percentage of Children with Disabilities ( <i>IDEA</i> ) Participating, Who Took the Specified Assessment
Regular Assessment without Accommodations	33,732	14.27
Regular Assessment with Accommodations	92,574	39.17
Alternate Assessment Based on Grade-Level Achievement Standards		
Alternate Assessment Based on Modified Achievement Standards	85,664	36.25
Alternate Assessment Based on Alternate Achievement Standards	24,356	10.31
Total	236,326	////////////////////////////////////
<b>Comments:</b> The response is limited to 4,000 characters. All data are correct and consistent with 2010-11 data.		

### 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	S	2,541,570	>=99
American Indian or Alaska Native	S	9,927	>=99
Asian	S	90,942	>=99
Black or African American	S	324,715	>=99
Hispanic or Latino	S	1,275,072	>=99
Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander	S	3,066	>=99
White	S	793,316	>=99
Two or more races	S	42,614	>=99
Children with disabilities ( <i>IDEA</i> )	S	236,584	>=99
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	S	360,841	>=99
Economically disadvantaged students	S	1,523,162	>=99
Migratory students	S	19,185	98
Male	S	1,300,388	>=99
Female	S	1,240,467	>=99

**Comments:** The response is limited to 4,000 characters. A discrepancy with missing or blank values has been discovered in the reporting system. Procedures to correct this discrepancy will be implemented and the appropriate files will be resubmitted.

#### 1.2.3.1 Recently Arrived LEP Students Taking ELP Assessments in Lieu of Reading/Language Arts Assessment

In the table below, provide the number of recently arrived LEP students (as defined in 34 C.F.R. Part 200.6(b)(4)) included in the participation counts in 1.2.3 and 1.3.2.1 who took an assessment of English language proficiency in lieu of the State's reading/language arts assessment, as permitted under 34 C.F.R. Part 200.20.

Recently arrived LEP students who took an assessment of English language proficiency in lieu of the State's reading/language arts assessment	13,637
----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	--------

**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.

Note: For this question only, report on students with disabilities (*IDEA*) who are also LEP students in the U.S. less than 12 months who took the ELP in lieu of the statewide reading/language arts assessment.

Type of Assessment	# Children with Disabilities ( <i>IDEA</i> ) Participating	Percentage of Children with Disabilities ( <i>IDEA</i> ) Participating, Who Took the Specified Assessment
Regular Assessment without Accommodations	43,395	18.32
Regular Assessment with Accommodations	83,429	35.23
Alternate Assessment Based on Grade-Level Achievement Standards		
Alternate Assessment Based on Modified Achievement Standards	85,318	36.03
Alternate Assessment Based on Alternate Achievement Standards	24,442	10.32
LEP < 12 months, took ELP	239	0.10
Total	236,823	////////////////////
<p><b>Comments:</b> The response is limited to 4,000 characters. All data are correct and consistent with 2010-11 data. Recent immigrant students who took only an English Language Proficiency test are considered participants but are excluded from academic achievement calculations.</p>		

**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	S	1,047,350	>=99
American Indian or Alaska Native	S	4,323	98
Asian	S	36,854	>=99
Black or African American	S	135,369	>=99
Hispanic or Latino	S	515,502	>=99
Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander	S	1,300	>=99
White	S	335,891	>=99
Two or more races	S	17,276	>=99
Children with disabilities ( <i>IDEA</i> )	S	97,167	98
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	S	97,525	>=99
Economically disadvantaged students	S	602,299	>=99
Migratory students	S	8,051	98
Male	S	535,525	>=99
Female	S	511,417	>=99
<b>Comments:</b> The response is limited to 4,000 characters. As discussed at the October 25, 2012, conference call (Ticket #181851), Texas will not be able to submit the 2011-12 Science data by the December 19 due date.			

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 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 ( <i>IDEA</i> ) Participating	Percentage of Children with Disabilities ( <i>IDEA</i> ) Participating, Who Took the Specified Assessment
Regular Assessment without Accommodations	12,411	12.77
Regular Assessment with Accommodations	43,883	45.16
Alternate Assessment Based on Grade-Level Achievement Standards		
Alternate Assessment Based on Modified Achievement Standards	32,810	33.77
Alternate Assessment Based on Alternate Achievement Standards	8,063	8.30
Total	97,167	////////////////////////////////////
<b>Comments:</b> The response is limited to 4,000 characters. As discussed at the October 25, 2012, conference call (Ticket #181851), Texas will not be able to submit the 2011-12 Science data by the December 19 due date."		

### 1.3 STUDENT ACADEMIC ACHIEVEMENT

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

Note: States are not required to report these data by the seven (7) racial/ethnic groups; instead, they are required to report these data by the major racial and ethnic groups that are identified in their Accountability Workbooks. The charts below display racial/ethnic data that has been mapped back from the major racial and ethnic groups identified in their workbooks, to the 7 racial/ethnic groups to allow for the examination of data across states.

#### 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**

<b>Grade 3</b>	<b># Students Who Received a Valid Score and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned</b>	<b># Students Scoring at or Above Proficient</b>	<b>Percentage of Students Scoring at or Above Proficient</b>
All students	376,975	S	86
American Indian or Alaska Native	1,317	S	87
Asian	13,803	S	96
Black or African American	46,890	S	76
Hispanic or Latino	195,254	S	84
Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander	441	S	87
White	112,259	S	92
Two or more races	6,766	S	90
Children with disabilities ( <i>IDEA</i> )	32,817	S	77
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	97,885	S	83
Economically disadvantaged students	239,056	S	82
Migratory students	2,760	S	78
Male	193,101	S	86
Female	183,806	S	86
<b>Comments:</b> The response is limited to 4,000 characters. A discrepancy with missing or blank values has been discovered in the reporting system. Procedures to correct this discrepancy will be implemented and the appropriate files will be resubmitted.			

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

<b>Grade 3</b>	<b># Students Who Received a Valid Score and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned</b>	<b># Students Scoring at or Above Proficient</b>	<b>Percentage of Students Scoring at or Above Proficient</b>
All students	376,776	S	92
American Indian or Alaska Native	1,317	S	91
Asian	13,823	S	96
Black or African American	46,877	S	87
Hispanic or Latino	195,138	S	90
Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander	440	S	90
White	112,167	S	96
Two or more races	6,766	S	95
Children with disabilities ( <i>IDEA</i> )	32,801	S	86
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	97,870	S	89
Economically disadvantaged students	238,924	S	89
Migratory students	2,761	S	84
Male	192,993	S	90
Female	183,713	S	93
<b>Comments:</b> The response is limited to 4,000 characters. A discrepancy with missing or blank values has been discovered in the reporting system. Procedures to correct this discrepancy will be implemented and the appropriate files will be resubmitted.			

**1.3.3.1 Student Academic Achievement in Science - Grade 3**

<b>Grade 3</b>	<b># Students Who Received a Valid Score and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned</b>	<b># Students Scoring at or Above Proficient</b>	<b>Percentage of Students Scoring at or Above Proficient</b>
All students			
American Indian or Alaska Native			
Asian			
Black or African American			
Hispanic or Latino			
Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander			
White			
Two or more races			
Children with disabilities ( <i>IDEA</i> )			
Limited English proficient (LEP) students			
Economically disadvantaged students			
Migratory students			
Male			
Female			
<b>Comments:</b> The response is limited to 4,000 characters. Science reported for grades 5, 8 and 10 only.			

**1.3.1.2 Student Academic Achievement in Mathematics - Grade 4**

<b>Grade 4</b>	<b># Students Who Received a Valid Score and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned</b>	<b># Students Scoring at or Above Proficient</b>	<b>Percentage of Students Scoring at or Above Proficient</b>
All students	373,007	S	89
American Indian or Alaska Native	1,382	S	90
Asian	13,352	S	97
Black or African American	46,977	S	80
Hispanic or Latino	191,659	S	88
Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander	413	S	93
White	112,546	S	94
Two or more races	6,432	S	92
Children with disabilities ( <i>IDEA</i> )	35,880	S	80
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	80,454	S	85
Economically disadvantaged students	234,803	S	85
Migratory students	2,730	S	82
Male	191,209	S	88
Female	181,734	S	89
<b>Comments:</b> The response is limited to 4,000 characters. A discrepancy with missing or blank values has been discovered in the reporting system. Procedures to correct this discrepancy will be implemented and the appropriate files will be resubmitted.			

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

<b>Grade 4</b>	<b># Students Who Received a Valid Score and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned</b>	<b># Students Scoring at or Above Proficient</b>	<b>Percentage of Students Scoring at or Above Proficient</b>
All students	372,730	S	87
American Indian or Alaska Native	1,383	S	88
Asian	13,338	S	94
Black or African American	46,944	S	79
Hispanic or Latino	191,558	S	84
Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander	414	S	90
White	112,422	S	94
Two or more races	6,423	S	91
Children with disabilities ( <i>IDEA</i> )	35,853	S	78
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	80,432	S	79
Economically disadvantaged students	234,626	S	82
Migratory students	2,726	S	75
Male	191,056	S	85
Female	181,611	S	89
<b>Comments:</b> The response is limited to 4,000 characters. A discrepancy with missing or blank values has been discovered in the reporting system. Procedures to correct this discrepancy will be implemented and the appropriate files will be resubmitted.			

**1.3.3.2 Student Academic Achievement in Science - Grade 4**

<b>Grade 4</b>	<b># Students Who Received a Valid Score and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned</b>	<b># Students Scoring at or Above Proficient</b>	<b>Percentage of Students Scoring at or Above Proficient</b>
All students			
American Indian or Alaska Native			
Asian			
Black or African American			
Hispanic or Latino			
Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander			
White			
Two or more races			
Children with disabilities ( <i>IDEA</i> )			
Limited English proficient (LEP) students			
Economically disadvantaged students			
Migratory students			
Male			
Female			
<b>Comments:</b> The response is limited to 4,000 characters. Science reported for grades 5, 8 and 10 only.			

**1.3.1.3 Student Academic Achievement in Mathematics - Grade 5**

<b>Grade 5</b>	<b># Students Who Received a Valid Score and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned</b>	<b># Students Scoring at or Above Proficient</b>	<b>Percentage of Students Scoring at or Above Proficient</b>
All students	373,912	S	86
American Indian or Alaska Native	1,366	S	85
Asian	13,287	S	96
Black or African American	47,291	S	78
Hispanic or Latino	191,884	S	84
Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander	456	S	88
White	113,039	S	92
Two or more races	6,287	S	90
Children with disabilities ( <i>IDEA</i> )	36,808	S	74
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	58,470	S	77
Economically disadvantaged students	233,432	S	82
Migratory students	2,794	S	78
Male	191,245	S	86
Female	182,588	S	87
<b>Comments:</b> The response is limited to 4,000 characters. A discrepancy with missing or blank values has been discovered in the reporting system. Procedures to correct this discrepancy will be implemented and the appropriate files will be resubmitted.			

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

<b>Grade 5</b>	<b># Students Who Received a Valid Score and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned</b>	<b># Students Scoring at or Above Proficient</b>	<b>Percentage of Students Scoring at or Above Proficient</b>
All students	374,759	S	87
American Indian or Alaska Native	1,370	S	87
Asian	13,407	S	95
Black or African American	47,290	S	82
Hispanic or Latino	191,957	S	84
Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander	456	S	88
White	113,661	S	93
Two or more races	6,315	S	92
Children with disabilities ( <i>IDEA</i> )	36,748	S	78
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	58,446	S	72
Economically disadvantaged students	233,375	S	83
Migratory students	2,795	S	76
Male	191,697	S	86
Female	182,984	S	89
<b>Comments:</b> The response is limited to 4,000 characters. A discrepancy with missing or blank values has been discovered in the reporting system. Procedures to correct this discrepancy will be implemented and the appropriate files will be resubmitted.			

**1.3.3.3 Student Academic Achievement in Science - Grade 5**

<b>Grade 5</b>	<b># Students Who Received a Valid Score and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned</b>	<b># Students Scoring at or Above Proficient</b>	<b>Percentage of Students Scoring at or Above Proficient</b>
All students	373,028	S	87
American Indian or Alaska Native	1,350	S	87
Asian	12,942	S	97
Black or African American	47,122	S	79
Hispanic or Latino	191,130	S	84
Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander	451	S	87
White	113,446	S	94
Two or more races	6,328	S	92
Children with disabilities ( <i>IDEA</i> )	36,597	S	69
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	56,273	S	72
Economically disadvantaged students	232,292	S	82
Migratory students	2,736	S	76
Male	190,826	S	88
Female	182,146	S	86

**Comments:** The response is limited to 4,000 characters. As discussed at the October 25, 2012, conference call (Ticket #181851), Texas will not be able to submit the 2011-12 Science data by the December 19 due date.

**1.3.1.4 Student Academic Achievement in Mathematics - Grade 6**

<b>Grade 6</b>	<b># Students Who Received a Valid Score and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned</b>	<b># Students Scoring at or Above Proficient</b>	<b>Percentage of Students Scoring at or Above Proficient</b>
All students	364,013	S	82
American Indian or Alaska Native	1,317	S	83
Asian	12,409	S	95
Black or African American	46,766	S	72
Hispanic or Latino	183,931	S	79
Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander	422	S	85
White	112,950	S	90
Two or more races	5,935	S	87
Children with disabilities ( <i>IDEA</i> )	34,718	S	66
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	42,999	S	67
Economically disadvantaged students	222,277	S	77
Migratory students	2,730	S	70
Male	186,004	S	82
Female	177,887	S	83
<b>Comments:</b> The response is limited to 4,000 characters. A discrepancy with missing or blank values has been discovered in the reporting system. Procedures to correct this discrepancy will be implemented and the appropriate files will be resubmitted.			

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

<b>Grade 6</b>	<b># Students Who Received a Valid Score and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned</b>	<b># Students Scoring at or Above Proficient</b>	<b>Percentage of Students Scoring at or Above Proficient</b>
All students	369,244	S	86
American Indian or Alaska Native	1,321	S	86
Asian	13,171	S	94
Black or African American	47,132	S	82
Hispanic or Latino	185,741	S	82
Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander	430	S	87
White	115,102	S	93
Two or more races	6,061	S	92
Children with disabilities ( <i>IDEA</i> )	34,722	S	71
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	43,197	S	61
Economically disadvantaged students	223,997	S	80
Migratory students	2,738	S	70
Male	188,689	S	84
Female	180,433	S	88
<b>Comments:</b> The response is limited to 4,000 characters. A discrepancy with missing or blank values has been discovered in the reporting system. Procedures to correct this discrepancy will be implemented and the appropriate files will be resubmitted.			

**1.3.3.4 Student Academic Achievement in Science - Grade 6**

<b>Grade 6</b>	<b># Students Who Received a Valid Score and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned</b>	<b># Students Scoring at or Above Proficient</b>	<b>Percentage of Students Scoring at or Above Proficient</b>
All students			
American Indian or Alaska Native			
Asian			
Black or African American			
Hispanic or Latino			
Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander			
White			
Two or more races			
Children with disabilities ( <i>IDEA</i> )			
Limited English proficient (LEP) students			
Economically disadvantaged students			
Migratory students			
Male			
Female			
<b>Comments:</b> The response is limited to 4,000 characters. Science reported for grades 5, 8 and 10 only.			

**1.3.1.5 Student Academic Achievement in Mathematics - Grade 7**

<b>Grade 7</b>	<b># Students Who Received a Valid Score and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned</b>	<b># Students Scoring at or Above Proficient</b>	<b>Percentage of Students Scoring at or Above Proficient</b>
All students	344,299	S	83
American Indian or Alaska Native	1,405	S	85
Asian	11,211	S	95
Black or African American	45,062	S	73
Hispanic or Latino	172,475	S	80
Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander	438	S	86
White	107,764	S	91
Two or more races	5,660	S	89
Children with disabilities ( <i>IDEA</i> )	33,099	S	68
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	34,569	S	64
Economically disadvantaged students	206,907	S	77
Migratory students	2,710	S	71
Male	176,384	S	82
Female	167,783	S	84
<b>Comments:</b> The response is limited to 4,000 characters. A discrepancy with missing or blank values has been discovered in the reporting system. Procedures to correct this discrepancy will be implemented and the appropriate files will be resubmitted.			

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

<b>Grade 7</b>	<b># Students Who Received a Valid Score and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned</b>	<b># Students Scoring at or Above Proficient</b>	<b>Percentage of Students Scoring at or Above Proficient</b>
All students	361,687	S	88
American Indian or Alaska Native	1,495	S	91
Asian	12,432	S	94
Black or African American	46,930	S	84
Hispanic or Latino	179,402	S	84
Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander	461	S	87
White	114,745	S	93
Two or more races	5,939	S	93
Children with disabilities ( <i>IDEA</i> )	33,220	S	71
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	35,286	S	62
Economically disadvantaged students	214,183	S	83
Migratory students	2,727	S	73
Male	184,670	S	85
Female	176,881	S	91
<b>Comments:</b> The response is limited to 4,000 characters. A discrepancy with missing or blank values has been discovered in the reporting system. Procedures to correct this discrepancy will be implemented and the appropriate files will be resubmitted.			

**1.3.3.5 Student Academic Achievement in Science - Grade 7**

<b>Grade 7</b>	<b># Students Who Received a Valid Score and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned</b>	<b># Students Scoring at or Above Proficient</b>	<b>Percentage of Students Scoring at or Above Proficient</b>
All students			
American Indian or Alaska Native			
Asian			
Black or African American			
Hispanic or Latino			
Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander			
White			
Two or more races			
Children with disabilities ( <i>IDEA</i> )			
Limited English proficient (LEP) students			
Economically disadvantaged students			
Migratory students			
Male			
Female			
<b>Comments:</b> The response is limited to 4,000 characters. Science reported for grades 5, 8 and 10 only.			

**1.3.1.6 Student Academic Achievement in Mathematics - Grade 8**

<b>Grade 8</b>	<b># Students Who Received a Valid Score and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned</b>	<b># Students Scoring at or Above Proficient</b>	<b>Percentage of Students Scoring at or Above Proficient</b>
All students	381,118	S	81
American Indian or Alaska Native	1,661	S	82
Asian	14,432	S	95
Black or African American	49,045	S	72
Hispanic or Latino	184,751	S	77
Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander	473	S	87
White	124,159	S	90
Two or more races	6,252	S	88
Children with disabilities ( <i>IDEA</i> )	33,310	S	63
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	28,296	S	56
Economically disadvantaged students	215,277	S	75
Migratory students	2,880	S	65
Male	194,982	S	81
Female	185,975	S	82
<b>Comments:</b> The response is limited to 4,000 characters. A discrepancy with missing or blank values has been discovered in the reporting system. Procedures to correct this discrepancy will be implemented and the appropriate files will be resubmitted.			

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

<b>Grade 8</b>	<b># Students Who Received a Valid Score and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned</b>	<b># Students Scoring at or Above Proficient</b>	<b>Percentage of Students Scoring at or Above Proficient</b>
All students	356,367	S	89
American Indian or Alaska Native	1,550	S	90
Asian	12,282	S	94
Black or African American	46,710	S	86
Hispanic or Latino	175,574	S	86
Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander	435	S	91
White	113,731	S	95
Two or more races	5,776	S	94
Children with disabilities ( <i>IDEA</i> )	33,064	S	72
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	27,389	S	57
Economically disadvantaged students	205,757	S	85
Migratory students	2,840	S	76
Male	182,880	S	88
Female	173,323	S	91
<b>Comments:</b> The response is limited to 4,000 characters. A discrepancy with missing or blank values has been discovered in the reporting system. Procedures to correct this discrepancy will be implemented and the appropriate files will be resubmitted.			

**1.3.3.6 Student Academic Achievement in Science - Grade 8**

<b>Grade 8</b>	<b># Students Who Received a Valid Score and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned</b>	<b># Students Scoring at or Above Proficient</b>	<b>Percentage of Students Scoring at or Above Proficient</b>
All students	350,620	S	79
American Indian or Alaska Native	1,519	S	82
Asian	11,500	S	95
Black or African American	46,394	S	69
Hispanic or Latino	172,006	S	73
Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander	424	S	84
White	112,709	S	90
Two or more races	5,717	S	87
Children with disabilities ( <i>IDEA</i> )	32,744	S	58
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	23,815	S	47
Economically disadvantaged students	202,076	S	71
Migratory students	2,832	S	61
Male	179,881	S	81
Female	170,556	S	77

**Comments:** The response is limited to 4,000 characters. As discussed at the October 25, 2012, conference call (Ticket #181851), Texas will not be able to submit the 2011-12 Science data by the December 19 due date.

**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	327,358	S	74
American Indian or Alaska Native	1,477	S	72
Asian	12,484	S	91
Black or African American	42,330	S	62
Hispanic or Latino	154,198	S	69
Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander	431	S	76
White	110,910	S	82
Two or more races	5,283	S	79
Children with disabilities ( <i>IDEA</i> )	29,689	S	51
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	18,009	S	44
Economically disadvantaged students	170,234	S	66
Migratory students	2,534	S	64
Male	166,864	S	73
Female	160,368	S	75

**Comments:** The response is limited to 4,000 characters. A discrepancy with missing or blank values has been discovered in the reporting system. Procedures to correct this discrepancy will be implemented and the appropriate files will be resubmitted.

**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	330,006	S	90
American Indian or Alaska Native	1,491	S	90
Asian	12,489	S	94
Black or African American	42,832	S	87
Hispanic or Latino	155,701	S	88
Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander	430	S	90
White	111,488	S	94
Two or more races	5,334	S	94
Children with disabilities ( <i>IDEA</i> )	30,175	S	69
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	18,221	S	55
Economically disadvantaged students	172,299	S	87
Migratory students	2,598	S	81
Male	168,402	S	87
Female	161,522	S	94

**Comments:** The response is limited to 4,000 characters. A discrepancy with missing or blank values has been discovered in the reporting system. Procedures to correct this discrepancy will be implemented and the appropriate files will be resubmitted.

**1.3.3.7 Student Academic Achievement in Science - High School**

<b>High School</b>	<b># Students Who Received a Valid Score and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned</b>	<b># Students Scoring at or Above Proficient</b>	<b>Percentage of Students Scoring at or Above Proficient</b>
All students	323,702	S	74
American Indian or Alaska Native	1,454	S	76
Asian	12,412	S	88
Black or African American	41,853	S	62
Hispanic or Latino	152,366	S	67
Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander	425	S	76
White	109,736	S	86
Two or more races	5,231	S	84
Children with disabilities ( <i>IDEA</i> )	27,826	S	41
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	17,437	S	32
Economically disadvantaged students	167,931	S	65
Migratory students	2,483	S	57
Male	164,818	S	76
Female	158,715	S	72

**Comments:** The response is limited to 4,000 characters. As discussed at the October 25, 2012, conference call (Ticket #181851), Texas will not be able to submit the 2011-12 Science data by the December 19 due date.

## 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 SY 2011-12. The percentage that made AYP will be calculated automatically.

Entity	Total #	Total # that Made AYP in SY 2011-12	Percentage that Made AYP in SY 2011-12
Schools	7,848	3,794	48.34
Districts	1,213	340	28.03

**Comments:** The response is limited to 4,000 characters.

### 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 SY 2011-12. Include only public Title I schools. Do not include Title I programs operated by local educational agencies in private schools. The percentage that made AYP will be calculated automatically.

Title I School	# Title I Schools	# Title I Schools that Made AYP in SY 2011-12	Percentage of Title I Schools that Made AYP in SY 2011-12
All Title I schools	5,784	2,498	43.19
Schoolwide (SWP) Title I schools	5,648	2,398	42.46
Targeted assistance (TAS) Title I schools	136	100	73.53

**Comments:** The response is limited to 4,000 characters.

### 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 2011-12. The percentage that made AYP will be calculated automatically.

# Districts That Received Title I Funds in SY 2011-12	# Districts That Received Title I Funds and Made AYP in SY 2011-12	Percentage of Districts That Received Title I Funds and Made AYP in SY 2011-12
1,172	312	26.62

**Comments:** The response is limited to 4,000 characters.

**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 2011-12 (based on SY 2010-11 assessments under Section 1111 of *ESEA*).

<b>Corrective Action</b>	<b># of Title I Schools in Corrective Action in Which the Corrective Action was Implemented in SY 2011-12</b>
Required implementation of a new research-based curriculum or instructional program	8
Extension of the school year or school day	5
Replacement of staff members relevant to the school's low performance	7
Significant decrease in management authority at the school level	
Replacement of the principal	
Restructuring the internal organization of the school	9
Appointment of an outside expert to advise the school	5
<b>Comments:</b> The response is limited to 4,000 characters.	

**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 2011-12 (based on SY 2010-11 assessments under Section 1111 of *ESEA*).

<b>Restructuring Action</b>	<b># of Title I Schools in Restructuring in Which Restructuring Action Is Being Implemented</b>
Replacement of all or most of the school staff (which may include the principal)	10
Reopening the school as a public charter school	
Entering into a contract with a private entity to operate the school	1
Takeover the school by the State	
Other major restructuring of the school governance	39
<b>Comments:</b> The response is limited to 4,000 characters.	

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.

--

**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 2011-12 (based on SY 2010-11 assessments under Section 1111 of *ESEA*).

<b>Corrective Action</b>	<b># of Districts receiving Title I funds in Corrective Action in Which Corrective Action was Implemented in SY 2011-12</b>
Implemented a new curriculum based on State standards	55
Authorized students to transfer from district schools to higher performing schools in a neighboring district	5
Deferred programmatic funds or reduced administrative funds	6
Replaced district personnel who are relevant to the failure to make AYP	19
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	5
Abolished the district (list the number of districts abolished between the end of SY 2010-11 and beginning of SY 2011-12 as a corrective action)	0
<b>Comments:</b> The response is limited to 4,000 characters.	

**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 2011-12 data and the results of those appeals.

<b>Entity</b>	<b># Appealed Their AYP Designations</b>	<b># Appeals Resulted in a Change in the AYP Designation</b>
Districts	38	3
Schools	622	25
<b>Comments:</b> The response is limited to 4,000 characters.		

Date (MM/DD/YY) that processing appeals based on SY 2011-12 data was complete	12/6/12
-------------------------------------------------------------------------------	---------

**1.4.8 Sections 1003(a) and (g) School Improvement Funds**

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 2011-12.

**1.4.8.5.1 Section 1003(a) State Reservations**

In the space provided, enter the percentage of the FY 2011 (SY 2011-12) 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*: 4.00%

**Comments:** The response is limited to 4,000 characters.

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

For SY 2011-12 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 ED Facts in Data Group 694, School improvement funds allocation table, from File Specification N/X132. You may review data submitted to ED Facts using the report named "Section 1003(a) and 1003(g) Allocations to LEAs and Schools- CSPR 1.4.8.5.2 (EDEN012)" from the ED Facts 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 2011-12.

This response is limited to 8,000 characters.

In conjunction with TEA, 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, optional additional technical assistance days, coaching for the campus leadership team, and further customized professional development. The evaluation component collected documentation from the grantees on the required activities conducted. 90 day plans, quarterly implementation reports, quarterly calls, site visits, and End of Year reports provided information to assist with evaluation and support. Each campus had a case manager, professional service provider, and program specialist who assisted with technical assistance and the implementation of the grant.

**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 2011-12 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

## 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.

<b>Public School Choice</b>	<b># Students</b>
Eligible for public school choice	126,372
Applied to transfer	1,902
Transferred to another school under the Title I public school choice provisions	1,511
<b>Comments:</b> The response is limited to 4,000 characters.	

**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*.

<b>Transportation for Public School Choice</b>	<b>Amount</b>
Dollars spent by LEAs on transportation for public school choice	\$ 38,426,914

**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.

<b>Unable to Provide Public School Choice</b>	<b># LEAs</b>
LEAs Unable to Provide Public School Choice	61

**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:
  - o 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
  - o 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
  - o 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.

<b>Comments:</b> The response is limited to 4,000 characters.
---------------------------------------------------------------

<sup>3</sup> 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*.

<b>Supplemental Educational Services</b>	<b># Students</b>
Eligible for supplemental educational services	107,983
Applied for supplemental educational services	59,662
Received supplemental educational services	45,850
<b>Comments:</b> The response is limited to 4,000 characters.	

**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*.

<b>Spending on Supplemental Educational Services</b>	<b>Amount</b>
Dollars spent by LEAs on supplemental educational services	\$ 541,934,119
<b>Comments:</b> The response is limited to 4,000 characters.	

**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.

	<b>Number of Core Academic Classes (Total)</b>	<b>Number of Core Academic Classes Taught by Teachers Who Are Highly Qualified</b>	<b>Percentage of Core Academic Classes Taught by Teachers Who Are Highly Qualified</b>	<b>Number of Core Academic Classes Taught by Teachers Who Are <u>NOT</u> Highly Qualified</b>	<b>Percentage of Core Academic Classes Taught by Teachers Who Are <u>NOT</u> Highly Qualified</b>
All classes	760,063	757,241	99.63	96	0.01
All elementary classes	143,574	143,478	99.93	96	0.07
All secondary classes	616,489	613,763	99.56	2,726	0.44

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.

Full-day self-contained classroom 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
- e. or middle schools.
- f. *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.
- g. *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.
- h. *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.

Elementary School Classes	Percentage
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	41.90
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	7.00
Elementary school classes taught by teachers who are not fully certified (and are not in an approved alternative route program)	25.00
Other (please explain in comment box below)	26.10
Total	100.00

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

- vacant position filled by permanent substitute
- teachers are certified and scheduled to take content exam
- teacher absent due to VISA issues
- out-of-state certificate
- substitute
- enrolled in Educator Prep Program

Secondary School Classes	Percentage
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)	44.90
Secondary school classes taught by certified special education teachers who have not demonstrated subject-matter competency in those subjects	18.20
Secondary school classes taught by teachers who are not fully certified (and are not in an approved alternative route program)	27.50
Other (please explain in comment box below)	9.40
Total	100.00

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

- vacant position filled by substitute teacher
- teacher scheduled to take content exam
- teacher left mid year
- rural multi-subject secondary school
- class taught by long-term substitute
- class taught by teacher in alternative program

### 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.

**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).

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 a different category in 1.5.3 than it would be in 1.5.1.

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
<b>Elementary Schools</b>			
High Poverty Elementary Schools	35,596	35,546	99.86
Low-poverty Elementary Schools	35,183	35,180	99.99
<b>Secondary Schools</b>			
High Poverty secondary Schools	159,441	158,520	99.42
Low-Poverty secondary Schools	109,934	109,757	99.84

#### 1.5.3.1 Poverty Quartile Breaks

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	88.00	45.70
Poverty metric used	low income percentage	
Secondary schools	75.60	28.00
Poverty metric used	low income percnetage	

**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/rcd/BE021775/Glossary\\_of\\_Terms.pdf](http://www.ncela.gwu.edu/files/rcd/BE021775/Glossary_of_Terms.pdf).
2. **Other Language** = Name of the language of instruction, other than English, used in the programs.

Check Types of Programs	Type of Program	Other Language
<input type="checkbox"/> Yes	Dual language	Spanish, Vietnamese, Chinese
<input type="checkbox"/> Yes	Two-way immersion	Spanish, Vietnamese, Chinese
<input type="checkbox"/> Yes	Transitional bilingual programs	Spanish, Vietnamese, Chinese
<input type="checkbox"/> No	Developmental bilingual	
<input type="checkbox"/> No	Heritage language	
<input type="checkbox"/> No	Sheltered English instruction	////////////////////////////////////
<input type="checkbox"/> No	Structured English immersion	////////////////////////////////////
<input type="checkbox"/> No	Specially designed academic instruction delivered in English (SDAIE)	//////////////////////////////////// ////////////////////////////////////
<input type="checkbox"/> Yes	Content-based ESL	////////////////////////////////////
<input type="checkbox"/> Yes	Pull-out ESL	////////////////////////////////////
<input type="checkbox"/> 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 unduplicated 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	747,422
<b>Comments:</b> The response is limited to 4,000 characters.	

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

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

LEP Students Receiving Services	#
LEP students who received services in a Title III language instruction educational program in grades K through 12 for this reporting year.	745,899
<b>Comments:</b> The response is limited to 4,000 characters.	

**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	677,614
Vietnamese	13,587
Arabic	5,228
Chinese	4,185
Urdu	3,472

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 students' 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 and not tested on annual State English language proficiency (ELP) assessment (as defined in 1.6.2.1).

All LEP Testing	#
Number tested on State annual ELP assessment	737,134
Number not tested on State annual ELP assessment	15,431
Total	752,565
<b>Comments:</b> The response is limited to 4,000 characters. A discrepancy with missing or blank values has been discovered in the reporting system. Procedures to correct this discrepancy will be implemented and the appropriate files will be resubmitted.	

#### 1.6.3.1.2 ALL LEP Student English Language Proficiency Results

All LEP Results	#
Number attained proficiency on State annual ELP assessment	271,632
Percent attained proficiency on State annual ELP assessment	36.85
<b>Comments:</b> The response is limited to 4,000 characters.	

**1.6.3.2.1 Title III LEP Students Tested on the State Annual English Language Proficiency Assessment**

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

<b>Title III LEP Testing</b>	<b>#</b>
Number tested on State annual ELP assessment	735,414
Number not tested on State annual ELP assessment	15,324
Total	750,738
<b>Comments:</b> The response is limited to 4,000 characters. A discrepancy with missing or blank values has been discovered in the reporting system. Procedures to correct this discrepancy will be implemented and the appropriate files will be resubmitted.	

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 and whose results were not included in the calculation for AMAO 1. Report this number ONLY if the State did not include these students in establishing AMAO 1/ making progress target and did not include them in the calculations for AMAO 1/ making progress (# and % making progress).

<b>Title III First Time Tested</b>	<b>#</b>
Number of Title III students who took the State annual ELP assessment for the first time whose progress cannot be determined and whose results were not included in the calculation for AMAO 1.	155,589

**1.6.3.2.2 Title III LEP English Language Proficiency Results**

This section collects information on Title III LEP students' development of English and attainment of English proficiency.

**Table 1.6.3.2.2 Definitions:**

- Annual Measureable Achievement Objectives (AMAOs)** = State targets for the number and percent of students making progress and attaining proficiency.
- Making Progress** = Number and percent of Title III LEP students that met the definition of "Making Progress" as defined by the State and submitted to ED in the Consolidated State Application (CSA), or as amended.
- Attained Proficiency** = Number and percent of Title III LEP students that met the State definition of "Attainment" of English language proficiency submitted to ED in the Consolidated State Application (CSA), or as amended.
- Results** = Number and percent of Title III LEP students that met the State definition of "Making Progress" and the number and percent that met the State definition of "Attainment" of English language proficiency.

In the table below, provide the State targets for the number and percent of students 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%).

<b>Title III Results</b>	<b>Results #</b>	<b>Results %</b>	<b>Targets #</b>	<b>Targets %</b>
Making progress	123,413	21.28	579,825	49.00
Attained proficiency	270,849	36.83	735,414	
<b>Comments:</b> The response is limited to 4,000 characters. Since Texas has the attainment targets set by number of years identified as LEP, we are unable to report the targets accurately above.				
A target of 14.0% applies to students who have been identified as LEP for 1-4 years.				
A target of 27.0% applies to a second subgroup who have been identified as LEP 5 or more years.				

**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
<b>Comments:</b> The response is limited to 4,000 characters.	

**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
<b>Comments:</b> The response is limited to 4,000 characters. Grades 3-5 State of Texas Assessments of Academic Readiness (STAAR) Assessments

**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.

<b>Language(s)</b>
Spanish
<b>Comments:</b> The response is limited to 4,000 characters. Grade 3-5 STAAR Assessments

**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.

<b>Language(s)</b>
Spanish
<b>Comments:</b> The response is limited to 4,000 characters. Grade 5 STAAR assessments

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

Monitored Former LEP (MFLEP) students include:

- Students who have transitioned out of a language instruction educational program.
- 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
78,087	65,205	143,292

**Comments:** The response is limited to 4,000 characters.

**1.6.3.6.2 MFLEP Students Results for Mathematics**

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 out of language instruction educational programs 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 who did not score proficient on the State annual mathematics assessment. This will be automatically calculated.

# Tested	# At or Above Proficient	% Results	# Below Proficient
142,825	S	89	S

**Comments:** The response is limited to 4,000 characters.

**1.6.3.6.3 MFLEP Students Results for Reading/Language Arts**

In the table below, report results for MFLEP students who took the annual reading/language arts assessment. Please provide data only for those students who transitioned out of language instruction educational programs 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. This will be automatically calculated.
4. **# Below proficient** = State-aggregated number MFLEP students who did not score proficient on the State annual reading/language arts assessment.

# Tested	# At or Above Proficient	% Results	# Below Proficient
142,875	S	92	S
<b>Comments:</b> The response is limited to 4,000 characters.			

**1.6.3.6.4 MFLEP Students Results for Science**

In the table below, report results for MFLEP students who took the annual science assessment. Please provide data only for those students who transitioned out of language instruction educational programs and who no longer received services under Title III in this reporting year. These students include both students who are MFLEP 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. This will be automatically calculated.
4. **# Below proficient** = State-aggregated number MFLEP students who did not score proficient on the State annual science assessment.

# Tested	# At or Above Proficient	% Results	# Below Proficient
62,410	S	84	S
<b>Comments:</b> The response is limited to 4,000 characters.			

**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.)

<b>Title III Subgrantees</b>	<b>#</b>
# - Total number of subgrantees for the year	1,037
////////////////////////////////////	
# - Number of subgrantees that met all three Title III AMAOs	779
# - Number of subgrantees who met AMAO 1	977
# - Number of subgrantees who met AMAO 2	894
# - Number of subgrantees who met AMAO 3	92
////////////////////////////////////	
# - Number of subgrantees that did not meet any Title III AMAOs	227
////////////////////////////////////	
# - Number of subgrantees that did not meet Title III AMAOs for two consecutive years (SYs 2010-11 and 2011-12)	82
# - Number of subgrantees implementing an improvement plan in SY 2011-12 for not meeting Title III AMAOs for two consecutive years	82
# - Number of subgrantees that have not met Title III AMAOs for four consecutive years (SYs 2008-09, 2009-10, 2010-11, and 2011-12)	6

Provide information on how the State counted consortia members in the total number of subgrantees and in each of the numbers in table 1.6.4.1.

The response is limited to 4,000 characters.

**Comments:** The response is limited to 4,000 characters. In reporting the total number of subgrantees, each LEA that is a member of a consortium for the Title III program is counted as one subgrantee. Consortia members are counted in the numbers in table, based on subgrantees meeting each AMAO, as determined using the subgrantee's data, alone, or using consortium-level data.

**1.6.4.2 State Accountability**

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

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

State met <u>all</u> three Title III AMAOs	Yes
<b>Comments:</b> The response is limited to 4,000 characters.	

**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 <u>or</u> activities terminated for failure to reach program goals?	No
If yes, provide the number of language instruction educational programs <u>or</u> activities for immigrant children and youth terminated	
<b>Comments:</b> The response is limited to 4,000 characters	

**1.6.5 Education Programs and Activities for Immigrant Students**

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

**Note: All immigrant students are not LEP students.**

**1.6.5.1 Immigrant Students**

In the table below, report the unduplicated 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 only 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
153,068	11,785	23

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.

**1.6.6 Teacher Information and Professional Development**

This section collects data on teachers in Title III language instruction educational 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) v The term 'Language instruction educational program' means an instruction course v (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 as a second language.

Title III Teachers	#
Number of all certified/licensed teachers currently working in Title III language instruction educational programs.	22,453
Estimate number of <b>additional</b> certified/licensed teachers that will be needed for Title III language instruction educational programs in the next 5 years*.	10,811

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

**1.6.6.2 Professional Development 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 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 and 1.6.4.)
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.

<b>Type of Professional Development Activity</b>	<b># Subgrantees</b>	////////////////////
Instructional strategies for LEP students	329	////////////////////
Understanding and implementation of assessment of LEP students	263	////////////////////
Understanding and implementation of ELP standards and academic content standards for LEP students	251	////////////////////
Alignment of the curriculum in language instruction educational programs to ELP standards	176	////////////////////
Subject matter knowledge for teachers	233	////////////////////
Other (Explain in comment box)	25	////////////////////
<b>Participant Information</b>	<b># Subgrantees</b>	<b># Participants</b>
PD provided to content classroom teachers	315	94,903
PD provided to LEP classroom teachers	325	65,843
PD provided to principals	277	8,017
PD provided to administrators/other than principals	272	10,184
PD provided to other school personnel/non-administrative	211	10,333
PD provided to community based organization personnel	92	8,761
<b>Total</b>	<b>1,492</b>	<b>198,041</b>

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

- Dual Language Institute Training
- Parent Involvement and Literacy Training
- TExES ESL Preparation Certification Training
- Brain based strategies
- Subject matter knowledge in native language
- Understanding ELPS/TELPAS training
- Kagan Training
- Application English Language Proficiency Standards

### 1.6.7 State Subgrant Activities

This section collects data on State grant activities.

#### 1.6.7.1 State Subgrant Process

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

##### 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 2011-12 funds July 1, 2011, and then made these funds available to subgrantees on August 1, 2011, for SY 2011-12 programs. Then the "# of days/\$\$ Distribution" is 30 days.

Date State Received Allocation	Date Funds Available to Subgrantees	# of Days/\$\$ Distribution
07/01/11	9/10/11	71
<b>Comments:</b> The response is limited to 4,000 characters.		

#### 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.

For 2011-2012, current year funds were made available to grantees in approximately 71 days. In August 2011, the Texas Education Agency underwent a reorganization. The program and fiscal reviews have been consolidated in the Division of Grants Administration. As a result, application review and approval processes have been streamlined beginning with the 2012-2013 applications.

**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>.

<b>Persistently Dangerous Schools</b>	<b>#</b>
Persistently Dangerous Schools	0
<b>Comments:</b> The response is limited to 4,000 characters.	

**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 automatically calculated.

<b>LEAs</b>	<b>#</b>	<b># LEAs Reporting Data</b>
LEAs without subgrants	1,114	576
LEAs with subgrants	126	126
Total	1,240	702
<b>Comments:</b> The response is limited to 4,000 characters. Of the 1114 LEAs without subgrants, 576 LEAs reported having homeless children enrolled. The remainder reported 0 homeless children.		

**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:

<b>Age/Grade</b>	<b># of Homeless Children/Youths Enrolled in Public School in LEAs <u>Without</u> Subgrants</b>	<b># of Homeless Children/Youths Enrolled in Public School in LEAs <u>With</u> Subgrants</b>
Age 3 through 5 (not Kindergarten)	2,976	4,572
K	3,552	5,614
1	3,395	5,669
2	3,143	4,853
3	3,044	4,704
4	2,792	4,457
5	2,615	4,241
6	2,424	3,851
7	2,373	3,474
8	2,364	3,320
9	2,350	4,469
10	1,813	2,747
11	1,827	2,673
12	2,207	3,105
Ungraded		
Total	36,875	57,749

**Comments:** The response is limited to 4,000 characters. Ungraded is equal to 0 for both without subgrants and with subgrants.

**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.

<b>Primary Nighttime Residence</b>	<b># of Homeless Children/Youths - LEAs <u>Without</u> Subgrants</b>	<b># of Homeless Children/Youths - LEAs <u>With</u> Subgrants</b>
Shelters, transitional housing, awaiting foster care	2,878	8,471
Doubled-up (e.g., living with another family)	30,618	44,511
Unsheltered (e.g., cars, parks, campgrounds, temporary trailer, or abandoned buildings)	1,489	1,859
Hotels/Motels	1,890	2,908
Total	36,875	57,749

**Comments:** The response is limited to 4,000 characters.

## 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 Birth Through 2	
Age 3 through 5 (not Kindergarten)	4,572
K	5,614
1	5,669
2	4,853
3	4,704
4	4,457
5	4,241
6	3,851
7	3,474
8	3,320
9	4,469
10	2,747
11	2,673
12	3,105
Ungraded	
Total	57,749
<b>Comments:</b> The response is limited to 4,000 characters. Age birth through 2 and Ungraded equal to 0.	

### 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.

Subgroups	# Homeless Students Served
Unaccompanied homeless youth	4,464
Migratory children/youth	467
Children with disabilities ( <i>IDEA</i> )	4,969
Limited English Proficient (LEP) students	5,768
<b>Comments:</b> The response is limited to 4,000 characters.	

### 1.9.3 Academic Achievement of Homeless Students

The following questions collect data on the academic achievement of enrolled homeless children and youths.

#### 1.9.3.1 Reading Assessment

In the table below, provide the number of enrolled homeless children and youths 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/Youth Who Received a Valid Score and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned	# Homeless Children/Youth Scoring at or above Proficient
3	5,510	4,722
4	5,122	3,974
5	4,929	3,885
6	4,720	3,604
7	4,226	3,302
8	3,955	3,242
High School	2,816	2,334

**Comments:** The response is limited to 4,000 characters.

#### 1.9.3.2 Mathematics Assessment

This section is similar to 1.9.3.1. The only difference is that this section collects data on the State mathematics assessment.

Grade	# Homeless Children/Youth Who Received a Valid Score and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned	# Homeless Children/Youth Scoring at or above Proficient
3	5,517	4,225
4	5,126	4,102
5	4,936	3,758
6	4,706	3,318
7	4,085	2,912
8	4,121	2,816
High School	2,761	1,575

**Comments:** The response is limited to 4,000 characters.

#### 1.9.3.3 Science Assessment

This section is similar to 1.9.3.1. The only difference is that this section collects data on the State science assessment.

Grade	# Homeless Children/Youth Who Received a Valid Score and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned	# Homeless Children/Youth Scoring at or above Proficient
3		
4		
5	4,939	3,895
6		
7		
8	3,877	2,584
High School	2,704	1,516

**Comments:** The response is limited to 4,000 characters. As discussed at the October 25, 2012, conference call (Ticket #181851), Texas will not be able to submit the 2011-12 Science data by the December 19 due date.

## 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, 2011 through August 31, 2012. 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:

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

**1.10.1 Category 1 Child Count**

In the table below, enter the unduplicated statewide number by age/grade of **eligible** migrant children age 3 through 21 who, within 3 years of making a qualifying move, resided in your State for one or more days during the reporting period of September 1, 2011 through August 31, 2012. 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)	4,632
K	2,949
1	3,339
2	3,241
3	3,217
4	3,313
5	3,248
6	3,344
7	3,351
8	3,428
9	4,420
10	3,185
11	3,199
12	4,522
Ungraded	30
Out-of-school	1,224
Total	50,642
<b>Comments:</b> The response is limited to 4,000 characters.	

**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 2,000, which equals a 3.8% decrease.

**1.10.2 Category 2 Child Count**

In the table below, enter by age/grade the unduplicated statewide number of **eligible** migrant children age 3 through 21 who, within 3 years of making a qualifying move, were served for one or more days in a MEP-funded project conducted during either the summer term or during intersession periods that occurred within the reporting period of September 1, 2011 through August 31, 2012. Count a child who moved from one age/grade level to another during the reporting period only once in the highest age/grade that he/she attained during the reporting period. Count a child who moved to different schools within the State and who was served in both traditional summer and year-round school intersession programs only once. The unduplicated statewide total count is calculated automatically.

Do not include:

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

<b>Age/Grade</b>	<b>Summer/Intersession Count of Eligible Migrant Children Who Are Participants and Who Can Be Counted for Funding Purposes</b>
Age 3 through 5 (not Kindergarten)	989
K	740
1	874
2	868
3	869
4	831
5	777
6	645
7	568
8	562
9	326
10	255
11	221
12	13
Ungraded	0
Out-of-school	11
Total	8,549
<b>Comments:</b> The response is limited to 4,000 characters.	

**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 281, which equals a 3.2% decrease.

**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 2011-2012 on the data compiled and generated by the New Generation System (NGS). The child counts for the 2010-2011 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 Centers (ESCs) could complete COEs. Information concerning the data contained on the Texas COE can be found in the Texas Manual for the Identification and Recruitment of Migrant Children ([http://www.tea.state.tx.us/index4.aspx?id=4761&menu\\_id=798](http://www.tea.state.tx.us/index4.aspx?id=4761&menu_id=798)). 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 Texas Manual for NGS Data Management Requirements ([http://www.tea.state.tx.us/index4.aspx?id=4762&menu\\_id=798](http://www.tea.state.tx.us/index4.aspx?id=4762&menu_id=798)). 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, onsite school registration, 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, if applicable, a COE Supplemental Documentation Form (SDF), 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 2011-2012 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 encoded COE information within 5 working days of receipt for each COE and collected supplemental program information, as well as other educational and health information during the regular and/or summer term. The timelines and guidelines for data collection and entry, as well as the accompanying forms, were contained in the Texas Manual for NGS Data Management Requirements. 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 of the recruiter (Recruiter ID) who made the eligibility determination. For each new or updated COE for the Category 1 count, a history line with an "R" (regular) or "P" (participant) flag is created in NGS. A history line with an "S" (summer) or "I" (intersession) flag is created for each summer/intersession 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.

The Category 2 count was 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
- 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 9/1/2011-8/31/2012 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 9/1/2011-8/31/2012. 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, Stepping Stones, and/or refer them to a 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 3 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 into and withdrawn from summer programs, as well as, regular programs on NGS. 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.

The Category 2 count was collected and maintained 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 annual training on the ID&R procedures and COE to be used for each reporting period. Training includes basic eligibility requirements through a comprehensive training-of-trainer model. All recruiters receive the same training every year. The state provides ongoing training throughout the year via e-mails, TETNs, webinars etc. Recruiters can receive follow-up training by the ESC throughout the year if needed. 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 and proper COE procedures. An NGS Academy is held to review data collection procedures and answer any questions from the NGS data specialists. All identified migrant children are verified each reporting period for continued eligibility and residence. Recruiters recheck the eligibility and residence of each family during regularly scheduled face-to-face interviews, home visits or school visits/records. During the annual training for recruiters, the types of previous errors that caused defective eligibility determinations are reviewed with recruiters, prior to conducting parent interviews, to ensure the recruiters properly identify eligible families. Each COE that a trained recruiter completes and submits to a trained eligibility reviewer is reviewed to determine whether or not the recruiter has properly completed the COE and supplied sufficient documentation. Incomplete or questionable COEs are returned to recruiters for correction, further explanation, documentation and/or verification by re-interviewing parents, if needed. Questionable COEs are forwarded to the ESC MEP staff for review, who in turn, may submit the COE for review at the State level. The State MEP will review all the information and contact the ESC with a determination, as well as share the information at the earliest opportunities (training sessions, webinars/TETNs, and e-mail). The regional ESC staff must share eligibility decisions with the inquiring district immediately and, when applicable, with all other MEP-funded districts in their service area within 30 days of being notified by the State. The process for resolving eligibility questions is outlined in the ID&R manual. During the 2011-2012 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 2011-2012 reporting period. Additionally, one of the primary responsibilities of the ESC Migrant Contacts is to review every COE in their region because districts are required to send a copy of the COE to them. Also the State uses NGS to review eligibility data. The system will flag students whose eligibility is questionable and district recruiters/NGS users follow up to ensure eligibility. The State MEP staff does not directly evaluate the effectiveness of recruitment efforts, however, the State contracts with the 20 regional ESCs and this is one of their quality control responsibilities. ID&R procedures are revised as needed based on input from the field. 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 in the Texas Manual for NGS Data Management Requirements. Enrollments are captured through a COE, an NGS family enrollment worksheet, an NGS multiple enrollment worksheet, or a district attendance sheet. All attendance documentation is kept at the local level.

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.

The state MEP re-interviews families annually statewide to confirm their child's eligibility and to ensure the quality of interviewers' eligibility decisions beyond just reviewing documentation for face validity. During the 2011-2012 reporting period, the State MEP in conjunction with the 20 regional ESCs conducted random re-interviews of 200 families to validate eligibility determinations made in the 2011-2012 reporting period. Of the 200 children in the sample, 193 children were determined to be eligible. In all, 223 families were contacted for a response rate of 90%. Reasons for non-response included: family no longer in the region, declined interview due to medical reasons, unable to locate family, etc. All ESCs were trained by the State MEP on the Eligibility Validation process. Each ESC received a list from TEA of children for the 2011-2012 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 2011-2012 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 approval. 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-March 2012. 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 Texas Migrant Education Program is in the process of reviewing the data on some of the districts' Certificates of Eligibility. Your COE was randomly selected. We would like to schedule a time to speak with you about this matter." If the parent/guardian 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 child was removed from the sample. If the parent/guardian 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 parent/guardian declined the interview, the re-interviewer checked the appropriate box on the form, and proceeded to the next child 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 parent/guardian 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 parent/guardian in response to the questions asked. If the information was different, s/he asked follow-up questions to address any discrepancies and record clarifications on the back of the Eligibility Validation Form. For example, s/he might have clarified the nature of the qualifying work or the from/to moves in order to verify that the parent/guardian 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. The re-interviewer 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, the re-interviewer informed the family that they 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 to the State MEP, disputing the ineligibility determination if necessary. The State MEP will review all documentation and will make the final decision.

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 October 2012 TEA/ESC Coordinated Meeting, 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 2011-2012 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. The NGS Help Desk periodically run duplicate reports to consolidate applicable NGS records. Prior to doing so, the NGS Help Desk staff consult with the appropriate LEAs to verify the record's data to ensure the consolidation.

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. The State ensured that the NGS criteria used for capturing the child counts was correct. Prior to submission, the State Director met with the MEP staff to compare counts to previous years, expectations for the current year and to review other tables in the CSPR for reasonableness of the count.

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

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

In order to improve the accuracy of the state's MEP eligibility determinations in light of the prospective re-interviewing results, the state MEP worked in collaboration with the applicable ESC migrant staff to follow-up and provide guidance to the recruiters whose COEs were found to be ineligible. ESC MEP staff was instructed to review other COEs completed by these recruiters to ensure that there was no pattern of false information and provide extensive follow-up to them. For the 2012-2013 Eligibility Validation process, the State MEP will increase the number of students selected in the random sample for those regions with LEAs that were found to have misidentified students in the 2011-2012 Eligibility Validation process.

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.

As a result of the seven families that were found to be ineligible during the re-interview process, the sample child and his/her siblings have been removed from the migrant database, NGS and will not be counted in the Category 1 child count. At this time, there are no other concerns about the accuracy of the state MEP child count data or the underlying eligibility determinations on which the counts are based.