

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

**for
STATE FORMULA GRANT PROGRAMS
under the
ELEMENTARY AND SECONDARY EDUCATION ACT
As amended by the
No Child Left Behind Act of 2001**

For reporting on
School Year 2006-07

TEXAS



**PART I DUE FRIDAY, DECEMBER 28, 2007
PART II DUE FRIDAY, FEBRUARY 22, 2008**

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

INTRODUCTION

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

The Consolidated State Application and Report includes the following *ESEA* programs:

- Title I, Part A – *Improving Basic Programs Operated by Local Educational Agencies*
- Title I, Part B, Subpart 3 – *William F. Goodling Even Start Family Literacy Programs*
- Title I, Part C – *Education of Migratory Children*
- Title I, Part D – *Prevention and Intervention Programs for Children and Youth Who Are Neglected, Delinquent, or At-Risk*
- Title I, Part F – *Comprehensive School Reform*
- Title II, Part A – *Improving Teacher Quality State Grants (Teacher and Principal Training and Recruiting Fund)*
- Title II, Part D – *Enhancing Education through Technology*
- Title III, Part A – *English Language Acquisition, Language Enhancement, and Academic Achievement Act*
- Title IV, Part A, Subpart 1 – *Safe and Drug-Free Schools and Communities State Grants*
- Title IV, Part A, Subpart 2 – *Safe and Drug-Free Schools and Communities National Activities (Community Service Grant Program)*
- Title IV, Part B – *21st Century Community Learning Centers.*
- Title V, Part A – *Innovative Programs*
- Title VI, Section 6111 – *Grants for State Assessments and Related Activities*
- Title VI, Part B – *Rural Education Achievement Program*
- Title X, Part C – *Education for Homeless Children and Youths*

The *NCLB* Consolidated State Performance Report (CSPR) for school year (SY) 2006-07 consists of two information collections.

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.

Starting with SY 2005-06, collection of data for the Education of Homeless Children and Youths was added to Part I in order to provide timely data for the program's performance measures. This change allowed ED to retire OMB collection 1810-0650. For SY 2006-07, Migrant Education Program child count information that is used for funding purposes is now collected via Part I. This change allowed ED to retire OMB collection 1810-0519

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.
3. The information will provide valid evidence of program outcomes or results.
4. The CSPR is the best vehicle for collection of the data.

GENERAL INSTRUCTIONS AND TIMELINES

All States that received funding on the basis of the Consolidated State Application for the SY 2006-07 must respond to this Consolidated State Performance Report (CSPR). Part I of the Report is due to the Department by **Friday, December 28, 2007**. Part II of the Report is due to the Department by **Friday, February 22, 2008**. Both Part I and Part II should reflect data from the SY 2006-07, 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 2006-07 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 2006-07 CSPR will be found on the main CSPR page of the EDEN web site (<https://EDEN.ED.GOV/EDENPortal/>).

According to the Paperwork Reduction Act of 1965, no persons are required to respond to a collection of information unless it displays a valid OMB control number. The valid OMB control number for this information collection is 1810-0614. The time required to complete this information collection is estimated to average 111 hours per response, including the time to review instructions, search existing data resources, gather the data needed, and complete and review the information collection. If you have any comments concerning the accuracy of the time estimates(s) contact School Support and Technology Programs, 400 Maryland Avenue, SW, Washington DC 20202-6140. Questions about the new electronic CSPR submission process, should be directed to the EDEN Partner Support Center at 1-877-HLP-EDEN (1-877-457-3336).

	OMB Number: 1810-0614
	Expiration Date: 10/31/2010
<p>Consolidated State Performance Report For State Formula Grant Programs under the Elementary And Secondary Education Act as amended by the No Child Left Behind Act of 2001</p>	
Check the one that indicates the report you are submitting: <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Part I, 2006-07 <input type="checkbox"/> Part II, 2006-07	
Name of State Educational Agency (SEA) Submitting This Report: Texas Education Agency	
Address: 1701 N. Congress Ave. Austin, Texas 78701-1494	
Person to contact about this report:	
Name: Cory Green	
Telephone: 512-475-3553	
Fax: 512-305-9447	
e-mail: cory.green@tea.state.tx.us	
Name of Authorizing State Official: (Print or Type): Dr. Sharon Jackson	
_____ Signature	<u>Friday, March 7, 2008, 4:33:46 PM</u> Date

**CONSOLIDATED STATE PERFORMANCE REPORT:
PART I**

For reporting on
School Year 2006-07



PART I DUE DECEMBER 28, 2007

1.1 STANDARDS AND ASSESSMENT DEVELOPMENT

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

1.1.1 Academic Content Standards

In the space below, provide a description and timeline of any actions the State has taken or is planning to take to make revisions to or change the State's academic content standards in mathematics, reading/language arts or science. Indicate specifically in what year your state expects the changes to be implemented.

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

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

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

Math was first in the refinement/alignment cycle and those changes were adopted for secondary grades in February 2005 and for elementary grades in October 2005 -- to be implemented in the 2006-2007 school year. The process of revision of the English Language Arts and Reading TEKS began in 2006 and is anticipated to be concluded in 2008 -- for implementation anticipated in the 2009-2010 school year. Science work groups are scheduled to begin meeting early in 2008; adoption of the refined/aligned Science TEKS is scheduled to occur in November 2008 -- for implementation in the 2010-2011 school year.

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

Note: Mathematics and Reading/Language Arts has been added to this data collection for the SY 2006-07 CSPR.

1.1.2 Assessments in Mathematics and Reading/Language Arts

In the space below, provide a description and timeline of any actions the State has taken or is planning to take to make revisions to or change the State's assessments in mathematics or reading/language arts required under Section 1111(b)(3) of *ESEA*. As applicable, include any assessment (e.g., alternate assessments based on alternate achievement standards, alternate assessments based on modified achievement standards, native language assessments, or others) implemented to meet the assessment requirements under Section 1111(b)(3) of *ESEA*. Indicate specifically in what year your state expects the changes to be implemented.

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

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

Texas has fully implemented, in consultation with LEAs, assessments that meet the requirements of section 1111(b) (3) in reading at grades 3-9; in writing at grades 4 and 7; in English Language Arts at grades 10 and 11; in mathematics at Grades 3-11; in science at grades 5, 8, 10, 11; and social studies at grades 8, 10, and 11. The alternative assessment component includes the Texas Assessment of Knowledge and Skills - Alternate (TAKS-Alt) and is offered in all of the same grades and subjects as TAKS.

TAKS-Alternate (TAKS-Alt) is an alternate assessment based on alternate academic achievement standards designed to measure student progress on skills aligned with academic grade-level content standards. Students who are assessed with the TAKS-Alt are those with the most significant cognitive disabilities who cannot participate in the regular Texas assessment program even with accommodations. TAKS-Alt is an evaluation of the student's knowledge and skills through teacher observations of the student. More than one percent of students with significant cognitive disabilities may be assessed using the TAKS-Alt, although only one percent can be counted as proficient (based on alternate achievement standards) for federal adequate yearly progress (AYP) reporting purposes. TAKS-Alt will be administered as an operational assessment for the first time in the 2007-2008 school year.

Texas follows a rigorous test development process for all of its assessments.

The procedures described below outline the steps used to develop a framework for the tests and provide for ongoing development of test items.

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

- Data-review committees composed of Texas educators are trained in statistical analysis of field-test data and review each item and its associated data. The committees determine whether items are appropriate for inclusion in the bank of items from which test forms are built.
 - A final blueprint is developed that establishes the length of the test and the number of test items measuring each objective.
 - All field-test items and data are entered into a computerized item bank. Tests are built from the item bank and are designed to be equivalent in difficulty from one administration to the next.
 - Tests are administered to Texas students, and results are reported at the student, campus, district, regional, and state levels.
 - Stringent quality control measures are applied to all stages of printing, scanning, scoring, and reporting.
 - Texas Assessment of Knowledge and Skills (TAKS) tests are released to the public in accordance with state law.
 - The State Board of Education uses impact data and the statewide opportunity-to-learn study, along with additional information, to set a passing standard for each new test.
 - A technical digest that provides verified technical information about the tests to schools and the public is developed annually.
- As applicable, certain steps are repeated annually to ensure that tests of the highest quality are developed.

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

Note: The subject of science has been removed from this data element.

1.1.3 Academic Achievement Standards in Mathematics and Reading/Language Arts

In the space below, provide a description and timeline of any actions the State has taken or is planning to take to make revisions to or change the State's academic achievement standards in mathematics or reading/language arts implemented to meet the requirements under Section 1111(b)(3) of *ESEA*. As applicable, include alternate achievement standards for students with significant cognitive disabilities and modified academic achievement standards implemented to meet the requirements of Section 1111(b)(3) of *ESEA*. Indicate specifically in what year your state expects the changes to be implemented.

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

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

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

During September 2007, ten standard setting panels were convened to recommend performance standards—specifically, Met the Standard and Commended Performance—for the TAKS-Alt for the following grades and subjects: mathematics at grades 3-11; reading at grades 3-9; English language arts at grades 10 and 11; science at grades 8, 10, and 11; social studies at grades 8, 10, and 11; and writing at grades 4 and 7. The TAKS-Alt standard setting panels included stakeholders from the following groups: special educators, general educators, campus and district administrators, regional Education Service Center personnel, parents of students with disabilities, and advocacy groups (including Parent-to-Parent Network, Family-to-Family Network, and the Children's Special Needs Network.)

The standard-setting meetings included sessions in which panelists applied a body of work procedure to set recommended cut points. During the body of work procedure, panelists reviewed the content of student folders, engaged in small group and whole group discussions, and considered the impact on students when making the following cut-score recommendations;

- The recommended cut score for Met the Standard is 24 out of a possible 42 points.
- The recommend cut score for Commended Performance is 39 out of a possible 42 points.

In November 2007 the Commissioner of Education formally adopted these challenging academic achievement standards for TAKS-Alt in all of the same grades and subjects tested by TAKS.

TAKS-Alt was submitted to the U.S. Department of Education for Peer Review on November 19, 2007.

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

Note: The subject of science has been removed from this data element.

1.1.4 Assessments in Science

In the space below, provide a description of the State's progress in developing and implementing assessments in science that meet the requirements of Section 1111(b)(3) of ESEA in the required grade levels, including remaining major milestones (e.g., field testing) and a timeline for them. As applicable, include any assessment (e.g., alternate assessments based on alternate achievement standards, alternate assessments based on modified achievement standards, native language assessments, or others) implemented to meet the assessment requirements under Section 1111(b)(3) of ESEA.

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

Since its inception in 2003, the Texas Assessment of Knowledge and Skills (TAKS) has included science tests in grade 5 (English and Spanish) and grades 10 and 11.

The Texas assessment program implemented a grade 8 science assessment in the 2005-2006 school year.

In the 2007-2008 school year, Texas introduced two alternate TAKS assessments—TAKS-Modified (TAKS-M) and TAKS-Alternate (TAKS-Alt). TAKS-M and TAKS-Alt science assessments will be administered to a small number of students who meet participation requirements in grades 5, 8, 10, and 11.

In the 2007-2008 school year, Texas made linguistically accommodated testing (LAT) science assessments available to LEP-exempt recent immigrant students in grades 5, 8, and 10. Forms in Spanish are available for grade 5 science LAT administrations of TAKS, including TAKS (Accommodated), but not for grade 5 LAT administrations of TAKS-M.

During September 2007, ten standard setting panels were convened to recommend performance standards—specifically, Met the Standard and Commended Performance—for the TAKS-Alt for the following grades: science at grades 8, 10, and 11. The TAKS-Alt standard setting panels included stakeholders from the following groups: special educators, general educators, campus and district administrators, regional Education Service Center personnel, parents of students with disabilities, and advocacy groups (including Parent-to-Parent Network, Family-to-Family Network, and the Children's Special Needs Network.)

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

Note: This table was formerly part of Section 1.1.2 of the SY 2005-06 CSPR.

1.1.5 Academic Achievement Standards in Science

In the space below, provide a description of the State's progress in developing and implementing academic achievement standards in science that meet the requirements of Section 1111(b)(3) in the required grade levels, including remaining major milestones and a timeline for them. As applicable, include alternate achievement standards for students with significant cognitive disabilities implemented to meet the requirements of Section 1111(b)(3) of *ESEA*.

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

In November 2002 the State Board of Education formally adopted challenging academic achievement standards for the Texas Assessment of Knowledge and Skills (TAKS) in science that are specific for each grade assessed. Science is assessed at grades 5, 10, and 11. Spanish versions of TAKS are available for all subjects assessed in Grades 3-6. A grade 8 science test was added in spring 2006. The State Board of Education formally adopted challenging academic standards for this TAKS test in October 2005.

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

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

Note: This table was formerly part of Section 1.1.3 of the SY 2005-06 CSPR.

1.2 PARTICIPATION IN STATE ASSESSMENTS

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

1.2.1 Participation of All Students in Mathematics Assessment

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

The student group "children with disabilities (*IDEA*)" includes children who were tested using regular assessments with or without accommodations and alternate assessments.

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

Student Group	# Students Enrolled	# Students Tested	Percent of Students Tested
All students	2345468	2331319	99.4
American Indian or Alaska Native	8289	8233	99.3
Asian or Pacific Islander	77845	77599	99.7
Black, non-Hispanic	338213	335990	99.3
Hispanic	1066400	1060263	99.4
White, non-Hispanic	851752	847668	99.5
Children with disabilities (<i>IDEA</i>)	280511	276689	98.6
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	308028	305799	99.3
Economically disadvantaged students	1273448	1265901	99.4
Migratory students	23104	22937	99.3
Male	1199815	1192695	99.4
Female	1144299	1138624	99.5
Comments: The number of LEP students tested was verified for both participation and academic achievement. The number of LEP students differs because, as per a regulation implemented in an amendment to the USDE for our 2007 Texas AYP Workbook, students who are in their first year in U.S. schools are exempt from the academic achievement calculation.			

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

Note: This table was formerly Section 1.2.1.1 of the SY 2005-06 CSPR. For the SY 2006-07 CSPR, the total number of students enrolled has been added to this data collection.

1.2.2 Participation of Students with Disabilities in Mathematics Assessment

In the table below, provide the number of children with disabilities (IDEA) tested during the State's testing window for 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 were tested in mathematics for each type of assessment will be calculated automatically. The total number of children with disabilities (IDEA) tested will also be calculated automatically.

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

Type of Assessment	# Children with Disabilities (IDEA) Tested	Percentage of Children with Disabilities (IDEA) Tested, Who Took the Specified Assessment
Regular Assessment without Accommodations	65751	23.8
Regular Assessment with Accommodations	27091	9.8
Alternate Assessment Based on Grade-Level Achievement Standards	90486	32.7
Alternate Assessment Based on Modified Achievement Standards	82790	29.9
Alternate Assessment Based on Alternate Achievement Standards	10571	3.8
Total	276689	
Comments: The difference of 1,714 students is due to the exclusion of participants whose tests are non-scorable or exempt.		

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

Note: This table was formerly Section 1.2.2.1 of the SY 2005-06 CSPR.

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

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

Student Group	# Students Enrolled	# Students Tested	Percent of Students Tested
All students	315651	309338	98.0
American Indian or Alaska Native	1144	1122	98.1
Asian or Pacific Islander	10701	10571	98.8
Black, non-Hispanic	46490	45449	97.8
Hispanic	130856	127673	97.6
White, non-Hispanic	126125	124330	98.6
Children with disabilities (<i>IDEA</i>)	34751	33087	95.2
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	20477	19083	93.2
Economically disadvantaged students	140839	137378	97.5
Migratory students	3122	3040	97.4
Male	160204	156770	97.9
Female	155325	152568	98.2

Comments: This data includes 10th grade language arts assessments only. Reading assessments for grades 3 thru 8 have not been added. This issue has been escalated, as instructed, to the CSPR/EDEN staff. Below are the data for grade 3 thru 8 and 10.

Student Group - # Stud Enrolled - # Stud Tested - % of Stud Tested

All - 2,360,745 - 2,340,667 - 99.1%

Am. Indian or Alaska Native - 8,342 - 8,267 - 99.1%

Asian/PI - 78,147 - 77,527 - 99.2%

Black - 340,333 - 337,952 - 99.3%

Hispanic - 1,075,240 - 1,063,328 - 98.9%

White - 855,507 - 850,829 - 99.5%

IDEA - 282,704 - 277,557 - 98.2%

LEP - 313,846 - 304,824 - 97.1%

Eco. Disadv. - 1,284,782 - 1,271,765 - 99.0%

Migrant - 23,656 - 23,201 - 98.1%

Male - 1,208,135 - 1,196,982 - 99.1%

Female - 1,151,230 - 1,142,497 - 99.2%

The number of LEP students tested was verified for both participation and academic achievement. The number of LEP students differs because, as per a regulation implemented in an amendment to the USDE for our 2007 Texas AYP Workbook, students who are in their first year in U.S. schools are exempt from the academic achievement calculation.

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

Note: This table was formerly Section 1.2.1.2 of the SY 2005-06 CSPR. For the SY 2006-07 CSPR, the total number of students enrolled has been added to this data collection.

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

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

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

Type of Assessment	# Children with Disabilities (IDEA) Tested	Percentage of Children with Disabilities (IDEA) Tested, Who Took the Specified Assessment
Regular Assessment without Accommodations	77675	28.0
Regular Assessment with Accommodations	14668	5.3
Alternate Assessment Based on Grade-Level Achievement Standards	84749	30.5
Alternate Assessment Based on Modified Achievement Standards	89799	32.4
Alternate Assessment Based on Alternate Achievement Standards	10666	3.8
Total	277557	
Comments: The difference of 2,876 students is due to the exclusion of participants whose tests are non-scorable or exempt.		

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

Note: This table was formerly Section 1.2.2.2 of the SY 2005-06 CSPR.

1.3 STUDENT ACADEMIC ACHIEVEMENT

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

1.3.1 Student Academic Achievement in Mathematics

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

The student group "children with disabilities (*IDEA*)" includes children who were tested using regular assessments with or without accommodations and alternate assessments.

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

1.3.2 Student Academic Achievement in Reading/Language Arts

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

1.3.1 Student Academic Achievement in Mathematics - Grade 3

Grade 3	# Students Who Completed the Assessment and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned	# Students Scoring at or Above Proficient	Percentage of Students Scoring at or Above Proficient
All students	344979	278254	80.7
American Indian or Alaska Native	1195	988	82.7
Asian or Pacific Islander	11389	10626	93.3
Black, non-Hispanic	48506	33702	69.5
Hispanic	165233	127070	76.9
White, non-Hispanic	118251	105673	89.4
Children with disabilities (<i>IDEA</i>)	36802	27905	75.8
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	83872	62219	74.2
Economically disadvantaged students	202054	151295	74.9
Migratory students	3259	2351	72.1
Male	177096	143545	81.1
Female	167737	134617	80.3
Comments: Counts and percentages increasing by more than 10% for any student group are due to the reporting of students regardless of whether they were present for a full academic year. This is a change in reporting from the prior year that included only students who were present for the full academic year.			
Counts decreasing by more than 10% for Migrant students is due to fewer migrant families migrating as a result of changes in labor demands, increases in fuel costs, less availability of migrant housing, and a federal focus on eligibility requirements.			

Source – Initially prepopulated by ED Facts in file N/X075 that is data group 583, category sets A, B, C, D, E, and F. If the SEA has additional racial/ethnic groups or combinations of racial/ethnic groups in its accountability plan under *NCLB*, the SEA will report the above data for those groups through the online collection tool.

Note: The addition of the total number of students with an assigned proficiency level is a new data collection for the SY 2006-07 CSPR.

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

Grade 3	# Students Who Completed the Assessment and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned	# Students Scoring at or Above Proficient	Percentage of Students Scoring at or Above Proficient
All students	347177	318111	91.6
American Indian or Alaska Native	1206	1134	94.0
Asian or Pacific Islander	11370	10962	96.4
Black, non-Hispanic	49010	42815	87.4
Hispanic	166170	148256	89.2
White, non-Hispanic	119076	114771	96.4
Children with disabilities (<i>IDEA</i>)	36943	29051	78.6
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	84073	72674	86.4
Economically disadvantaged students	203977	180375	88.4
Migratory students	3359	2793	83.1
Male	178302	161122	90.4
Female	168765	156908	93.0
Comments: Counts and percentages increasing by more than 10% for any student group are due to the reporting of students regardless of whether they were present for a full academic year. This is a change in reporting from the prior year that included only students who were present for the full academic year.			
Counts decreasing by more than 10% for Migrant students is due to fewer migrant families migrating as a result of changes in labor demands, increases in fuel costs, less availability of migrant housing, and a federal focus on eligibility requirements.			

Source – Initially prepopulated by *EDFacts* in file N/X076, N/X077, or N/X078 that are data group 584, category sets A, B, C, D, E, and F. If the SEA has additional racial/ethnic groups or combinations of racial/ethnic groups in its accountability plan under NCLB, the SEA will report the above data for those groups through the online CSPR collection tool.

Note: The addition of the total number of students with an assigned proficiency level is a new data collection for the SY 2006-07 CSPR.

1.3.3 Student Academic Achievement in Mathematics - Grade 4

Grade 4	# Students Who Completed the Assessment and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned	# Students Scoring at or Above Proficient	Percentage of Students Scoring at or Above Proficient
All students	338638	286535	84.6
American Indian or Alaska Native	1199	1022	85.2
Asian or Pacific Islander	11437	10842	94.8
Black, non-Hispanic	47749	36119	75.6
Hispanic	159059	129192	81.2
White, non-Hispanic	118738	109128	91.9
Children with disabilities (<i>IDEA</i>)	39193	31325	79.9
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	57641	42722	74.1
Economically disadvantaged students	195207	155332	79.6
Migratory students	3335	2496	74.8
Male	173002	148254	85.7
Female	165368	138100	83.5

Comments: Counts and percentages increasing by more than 10% for any student group are due to the reporting of students regardless of whether they were present for a full academic year. This is a change in reporting from the prior year that included only students who were present for the full academic year.

Counts and percentages decreasing by more than 10% for LEP students are due to the exclusion of monitored former LEP (MFLEP) students. This is a change in reporting from the prior year that included the LEP and MFLEP students.

Counts decreasing by more than 10% for Migrant students is due to fewer migrant families migrating as a result of changes in labor demands, increases in fuel costs, less availability of migrant housing, and a federal focus on eligibility requirements.

Source – Initially prepopulated by ED*Facts* in file N/X075 that is data group 583, category sets A, B, C, D, E, and F. If the SEA has additional racial/ethnic groups or combinations of racial/ethnic groups in its accountability plan under *NCLB*, the SEA will report the above data for those groups through the online collection tool.

Note: The addition of the total number of students with an assigned proficiency level is a new data collection for the SY 2006-07 CSPR.

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

Grade 4	# Students Who Completed the Assessment and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned	# Students Scoring at or Above Proficient	Percentage of Students Scoring at or Above Proficient
All students	337631	278955	82.6
American Indian or Alaska Native	1196	1013	84.7
Asian or Pacific Islander	11340	10434	92.0
Black, non-Hispanic	47652	35945	75.4
Hispanic	158484	123882	78.2
White, non-Hispanic	118532	107463	90.7
Children with disabilities (<i>IDEA</i>)	39070	29713	76.1
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	57028	39752	69.7
Economically disadvantaged students	194535	149091	76.6
Migratory students	3309	2285	69.1
Male	172462	140436	81.4
Female	164931	138354	83.9

Comments: Counts and percentages increasing by more than 10% for any student group are due to the reporting of students regardless of whether they were present for a full academic year. This is a change in reporting from the prior year that included only students who were present for the full academic year.

Counts and percentages decreasing by more than 10% for LEP students are due to the exclusion of monitored former LEP

(MFLEP) students. This is a change in reporting from the prior year that included the LEP and MFLEP students.

Counts decreasing by more than 10% for Migrant students is due to fewer migrant families migrating as a result of changes in labor demands, increases in fuel costs, less availability of migrant housing, and a federal focus on eligibility requirements.

Source – Initially prepopulated by ED*Facts* in file N/X076, N/X077, or N/X078 that are data group 584, category sets A, B, C, D, E, and F. If the SEA has additional racial/ethnic groups or combinations of racial/ethnic groups in its accountability plan under NCLB, the SEA will report the above data for those groups through the online CSPR collection tool.

Note: The addition of the total number of students with an assigned proficiency level is a new data collection for the SY 2006-07 CSPR.

1.3.5 Student Academic Achievement in Mathematics - Grade 5

Grade 5	# Students Who Completed the Assessment and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned	# Students Scoring at or Above Proficient	Percentage of Students Scoring at or Above Proficient
All students	336892	301231	89.4
American Indian or Alaska Native	1150	1028	89.4
Asian or Pacific Islander	11225	10858	96.7
Black, non-Hispanic	47803	39612	82.9
Hispanic	156314	135442	86.7
White, non-Hispanic	120095	114147	95.1
Children with disabilities (<i>IDEA</i>)	41687	34505	82.8
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	46957	35739	76.1
Economically disadvantaged students	191465	163571	85.4
Migratory students	3324	2750	82.7
Male	171742	154087	89.7
Female	165018	147048	89.1

Comments: Counts and percentages increasing by more than 10% for any student group are due to the reporting of students regardless of whether they were present for a full academic year. This is a change in reporting from the prior year that included only students who were present for the full academic year.

Counts and percentages decreasing by more than 10% for LEP students are due to the exclusion of monitored former LEP (MFLEP) students. This is a change in reporting from the prior year that included the LEP and MFLEP students.

Counts decreasing by more than 10% for Migrant students is due to fewer migrant families migrating as a result of changes in labor demands, increases in fuel costs, less availability of migrant housing, and a federal focus on eligibility requirements.

Source – Initially prepopulated by ED*Facts* in file N/X075 that is data group 583, category sets A, B, C, D, E, and F. If the SEA has additional racial/ethnic groups or combinations of racial/ethnic groups in its accountability plan under *NCLB*, the SEA will report the above data for those groups through the online collection tool.

Note: The addition of the total number of students with an assigned proficiency level is a new data collection for the SY 2006-07 CSPR.

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

Grade 5	# Students Who Completed the Assessment and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned	# Students Scoring at or Above Proficient	Percentage of Students Scoring at or Above Proficient
All students	337258	296551	87.9
American Indian or Alaska Native	1149	1042	90.7
Asian or Pacific Islander	11185	10558	94.4
Black, non-Hispanic	47984	40083	83.5
Hispanic	156339	130992	83.8
White, non-Hispanic	120304	113738	94.5
Children with disabilities (<i>IDEA</i>)	41707	32632	78.2
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	46615	32628	70.0
Economically disadvantaged students	192057	159448	83.0
Migratory students	3377	2551	75.5
Male	171913	149188	86.8
Female	165218	147276	89.1

Comments: Counts and percentages increasing by more than 10% for any student group are due to the reporting of students regardless of whether they were present for a full academic year. This is a change in reporting from the prior year that included only students who were present for the full academic year.

Counts and percentages decreasing by more than 10% for LEP students are due to the exclusion of monitored former LEP

(MFLEP) students. This is a change in reporting from the prior year that included the LEP and MFLEP students.

Counts decreasing by more than 10% for Migrant students is due to fewer migrant families migrating as a result of changes in labor demands, increases in fuel costs, less availability of migrant housing, and a federal focus on eligibility requirements.

Source – Initially prepopulated by *EDFacts* in file N/X076, N/X077, or N/X078 that are data group 584, category sets A, B, C, D, E, and F. If the SEA has additional racial/ethnic groups or combinations of racial/ethnic groups in its accountability plan under NCLB, the SEA will report the above data for those groups through the online CSPR collection tool.

Note: The addition of the total number of students with an assigned proficiency level is a new data collection for the SY 2006-07 CSPR.

1.3.7 Student Academic Achievement in Mathematics - Grade 6

Grade 6	# Students Who Completed the Assessment and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned	# Students Scoring at or Above Proficient	Percentage of Students Scoring at or Above Proficient
All students	331778	259929	78.3
American Indian or Alaska Native	1173	938	80.0
Asian or Pacific Islander	10678	9941	93.1
Black, non-Hispanic	48089	32425	67.4
Hispanic	151686	111877	73.8
White, non-Hispanic	119765	104580	87.3
Children with disabilities (<i>IDEA</i>)	41980	30361	72.3
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	33586	19634	58.5
Economically disadvantaged students	184106	131949	71.7
Migratory students	3265	2256	69.1
Male	169977	132389	77.9
Female	161628	127441	78.9

Comments: Counts and percentages increasing by more than 10% for any student group are due to the reporting of students regardless of whether they were present for a full academic year. This is a change in reporting from the prior year that included only students who were present for the full academic year.

Counts and percentages decreasing by more than 10% for LEP students are due to the exclusion of monitored former LEP (MFLEP) students. This is a change in reporting from the prior year that included the LEP and MFLEP students.

Counts decreasing by more than 10% for Migrant students is due to fewer migrant families migrating as a result of changes in labor demands, increases in fuel costs, less availability of migrant housing, and a federal focus on eligibility requirements.

Source – Initially prepopulated by ED*Facts* in file N/X075 that is data group 583, category sets A, B, C, D, E, and F. If the SEA has additional racial/ethnic groups or combinations of racial/ethnic groups in its accountability plan under *NCLB*, the SEA will report the above data for those groups through the online collection tool.

Note: The addition of the total number of students with an assigned proficiency level is a new data collection for the SY 2006-07 CSPR.

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

Grade 6	# Students Who Completed the Assessment and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned	# Students Scoring at or Above Proficient	Percentage of Students Scoring at or Above Proficient
All students	330939	298879	90.3
American Indian or Alaska Native	1175	1087	92.5
Asian or Pacific Islander	10622	10194	96.0
Black, non-Hispanic	48071	41916	87.2
Hispanic	151056	131547	87.1
White, non-Hispanic	119632	113903	95.2
Children with disabilities (<i>IDEA</i>)	41927	33641	80.2
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	32911	22429	68.2
Economically disadvantaged students	183463	158498	86.4
Migratory students	3248	2636	81.2
Male	169523	149093	87.9
Female	161246	149643	92.8

Comments: Counts and percentages increasing by more than 10% for any student group are due to the reporting of students regardless of whether they were present for a full academic year. This is a change in reporting from the prior year that included only students who were present for the full academic year.

Counts and percentages decreasing by more than 10% for LEP students are due to the exclusion of monitored former LEP

(MFLEP) students. This is a change in reporting from the prior year that included the LEP and MFLEP students.

Counts decreasing by more than 10% for Migrant students is due to fewer migrant families migrating as a result of changes in labor demands, increases in fuel costs, less availability of migrant housing, and a federal focus on eligibility requirements.

Source – Initially prepopulated by ED*Facts* in file N/X076, N/X077, or N/X078 that are data group 584, category sets A, B, C, D, E, and F. If the SEA has additional racial/ethnic groups or combinations of racial/ethnic groups in its accountability plan under NCLB, the SEA will report the above data for those groups through the online CSPR collection tool.

Note: The addition of the total number of students with an assigned proficiency level is a new data collection for the SY 2006-07 CSPR.

1.3.9 Student Academic Achievement in Mathematics - Grade 7

Grade 7	# Students Who Completed the Assessment and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned	# Students Scoring at or Above Proficient	Percentage of Students Scoring at or Above Proficient
All students	327167	246413	75.3
American Indian or Alaska Native	1133	886	78.2
Asian or Pacific Islander	10591	9658	91.2
Black, non-Hispanic	47979	30797	64.2
Hispanic	145695	101014	69.3
White, non-Hispanic	121337	103921	85.7
Children with disabilities (<i>IDEA</i>)	41503	29759	71.7
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	25842	12680	49.1
Economically disadvantaged students	173724	117738	67.8
Migratory students	3267	2085	63.8
Male	168094	126624	75.3
Female	158895	119708	75.3

Comments: Counts and percentages increasing by more than 10% for any student group are due to the reporting of students regardless of whether they were present for a full academic year. This is a change in reporting from the prior year that included only students who were present for the full academic year.

Counts and percentages decreasing by more than 10% for LEP students are due to the exclusion of monitored former LEP (MFLEP) students. This is a change in reporting from the prior year that included the LEP and MFLEP students.

Counts decreasing by more than 10% for Migrant students is due to fewer migrant families migrating as a result of changes in labor demands, increases in fuel costs, less availability of migrant housing, and a federal focus on eligibility requirements.

Source – Initially prepopulated by ED*Facts* in file N/X075 that is data group 583, category sets A, B, C, D, E, and F. If the SEA has additional racial/ethnic groups or combinations of racial/ethnic groups in its accountability plan under *NCLB*, the SEA will report the above data for those groups through the online collection tool.

Note: The addition of the total number of students with an assigned proficiency level is a new data collection for the SY 2006-07 CSPR.

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

Grade 7	# Students Who Completed the Assessment and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned	# Students Scoring at or Above Proficient	Percentage of Students Scoring at or Above Proficient
All students	326108	273373	83.8
American Indian or Alaska Native	1129	990	87.7
Asian or Pacific Islander	10524	9762	92.8
Black, non-Hispanic	47924	37293	77.8
Hispanic	144887	113614	78.4
White, non-Hispanic	121250	111516	92.0
Children with disabilities (<i>IDEA</i>)	41465	31120	75.1
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	24954	11942	47.9
Economically disadvantaged students	172971	133583	77.2
Migratory students	3240	2272	70.1
Male	167496	137876	82.3
Female	158453	135385	85.4

Comments: Counts and percentages increasing by more than 10% for any student group are due to the reporting of students regardless of whether they were present for a full academic year. This is a change in reporting from the prior year that included only students who were present for the full academic year.

Counts and percentages decreasing by more than 10% for LEP students are due to the exclusion of monitored former LEP

(MFLEP) students. This is a change in reporting from the prior year that included the LEP and MFLEP students.

Counts decreasing by more than 10% for Migrant students is due to fewer migrant families migrating as a result of changes in labor demands, increases in fuel costs, less availability of migrant housing, and a federal focus on eligibility requirements.

Source – Initially prepopulated by ED*Facts* in file N/X076, N/X077, or N/X078 that are data group 584, category sets A, B, C, D, E, and F. If the SEA has additional racial/ethnic groups or combinations of racial/ethnic groups in its accountability plan under NCLB, the SEA will report the above data for those groups through the online CSPR collection tool.

Note: The addition of the total number of students with an assigned proficiency level is a new data collection for the SY 2006-07 CSPR.

1.3.11 Student Academic Achievement in Mathematics - Grade 8

Grade 8	# Students Who Completed the Assessment and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned	# Students Scoring at or Above Proficient	Percentage of Students Scoring at or Above Proficient
All students	333468	239353	71.8
American Indian or Alaska Native	1231	927	75.3
Asian or Pacific Islander	10472	9481	90.5
Black, non-Hispanic	50035	30332	60.6
Hispanic	146723	94933	64.7
White, non-Hispanic	124638	103561	83.1
Children with disabilities (<i>IDEA</i>)	40798	29410	72.1
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	28008	12142	43.4
Economically disadvantaged students	174323	110444	63.4
Migratory students	3393	2054	60.5
Male	170553	123105	72.2
Female	162731	116173	71.4

Comments: Counts and percentages increasing by more than 10% for any student group are due to the reporting of students regardless of whether they were present for a full academic year. This is a change in reporting from the prior year that included only students who were present for the full academic year.

Counts and percentages decreasing by more than 10% for LEP students are due to the exclusion of monitored former LEP (MFLEP) students. This is a change in reporting from the prior year that included the LEP and MFLEP students.

Counts decreasing by more than 10% for Migrant students is due to fewer migrant families migrating as a result of changes in labor demands, increases in fuel costs, less availability of migrant housing, and a federal focus on eligibility requirements.

Source – Initially prepopulated by ED*Facts* in file N/X075 that is data group 583, category sets A, B, C, D, E, and F. If the SEA has additional racial/ethnic groups or combinations of racial/ethnic groups in its accountability plan under *NCLB*, the SEA will report the above data for those groups through the online collection tool.

Note: The addition of the total number of students with an assigned proficiency level is a new data collection for the SY 2006-07 CSPR.

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

Grade 8	# Students Who Completed the Assessment and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned	# Students Scoring at or Above Proficient	Percentage of Students Scoring at or Above Proficient
All students	332651	291132	87.5
American Indian or Alaska Native	1227	1085	88.4
Asian or Pacific Islander	10418	9825	94.3
Black, non-Hispanic	50011	41895	83.8
Hispanic	146033	120969	82.8
White, non-Hispanic	124604	117177	94.0
Children with disabilities (<i>IDEA</i>)	40678	31815	78.2
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	27259	14531	53.3
Economically disadvantaged students	173679	142789	82.2
Migratory students	3367	2566	76.2
Male	170040	146114	85.9
Female	162427	144872	89.2

Comments: Counts and percentages increasing by more than 10% for any student group are due to the reporting of students regardless of whether they were present for a full academic year. This is a change in reporting from the prior year that included only students who were present for the full academic year.

Counts and percentages decreasing by more than 10% for LEP students are due to the exclusion of monitored former LEP

(MFLEP) students. This is a change in reporting from the prior year that included the LEP and MFLEP students.

Counts decreasing by more than 10% for Migrant students is due to fewer migrant families migrating as a result of changes in labor demands, increases in fuel costs, less availability of migrant housing, and a federal focus on eligibility requirements.

Source – Initially prepopulated by *EDFacts* in file N/X076, N/X077, or N/X078 that are data group 584, category sets A, B, C, D, E, and F. If the SEA has additional racial/ethnic groups or combinations of racial/ethnic groups in its accountability plan under NCLB, the SEA will report the above data for those groups through the online CSPR collection tool.

Note: The addition of the total number of students with an assigned proficiency level is a new data collection for the SY 2006-07 CSPR.

1.3.13 Student Academic Achievement in Mathematics - High School

High School	# Students Who Completed the Assessment and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned	# Students Scoring at or Above Proficient	Percentage of Students Scoring at or Above Proficient
All students	305071	195930	64.2
American Indian or Alaska Native	1118	723	64.7
Asian or Pacific Islander	10379	8885	85.6
Black, non-Hispanic	44764	21863	48.8
Hispanic	125066	68566	54.8
White, non-Hispanic	123342	95766	77.6
Children with disabilities (<i>IDEA</i>)	33012	20942	63.4
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	18207	6078	33.4
Economically disadvantaged students	134528	71787	53.4
Migratory students	2914	1424	48.9
Male	154351	100858	65.3
Female	150540	94998	63.1

Comments: Counts and percentages increasing by more than 10% for any student group are due to the reporting of students regardless of whether they were present for a full academic year. This is a change in reporting from the prior year that included only students who were present for the full academic year.

Counts and percentages decreasing by more than 10% for LEP students are due to the exclusion of monitored former LEP (MFLEP) students. This is a change in reporting from the prior year that included the LEP and MFLEP students.

Counts decreasing by more than 10% for Migrant students is due to fewer migrant families migrating as a result of changes in labor demands, increases in fuel costs, less availability of migrant housing, and a federal focus on eligibility requirements.

Source – Initially prepopulated by ED*Facts* in file N/X075 that is data group 583, category sets A, B, C, D, E, and F. If the SEA has additional racial/ethnic groups or combinations of racial/ethnic groups in its accountability plan under *NCLB*, the SEA will report the above data for those groups through the online collection tool.

Note: The addition of the total number of students with an assigned proficiency level is a new data collection for the SY 2006-07 CSPR.

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

High School	# Students Who Completed the Assessment and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned	# Students Scoring at or Above Proficient	Percentage of Students Scoring at or Above Proficient
All students	307759	256730	83.4
American Indian or Alaska Native	1110	950	85.6
Asian or Pacific Islander	10350	9388	90.7
Black, non-Hispanic	45261	35807	79.1
Hispanic	126729	98439	77.7
White, non-Hispanic	124013	111996	90.3
Children with disabilities (<i>IDEA</i>)	32891	22470	68.3
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	18116	7254	40.0
Economically disadvantaged students	136458	104605	76.7
Migratory students	3023	2156	71.3
Male	155891	123319	79.1
Female	151761	133343	87.9

Comments: Counts and percentages increasing by more than 10% for any student group are due to the reporting of students regardless of whether they were present for a full academic year. This is a change in reporting from the prior year that included only students who were present for the full academic year.

Counts and percentages decreasing by more than 10% for LEP students are due to the exclusion of monitored former LEP

(MFLEP) students. This is a change in reporting from the prior year that included the LEP and MFLEP students.

Counts decreasing by more than 10% for Migrant students is due to fewer migrant families migrating as a result of changes in labor demands, increases in fuel costs, less availability of migrant housing, and a federal focus on eligibility requirements.

Source – Initially prepopulated by ED*Facts* in file N/X076, N/X077, or N/X078 that are data group 584, category sets A, B, C, D, E, and F. If the SEA has additional racial/ethnic groups or combinations of racial/ethnic groups in its accountability plan under NCLB, the SEA will report the above data for those groups through the online CSPR collection tool.

Note: The addition of the total number of students with an assigned proficiency level is a new data collection for the SY 2006-07 CSPR.

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 and the total number of those schools and districts that made AYP based on data for the SY 2006-07 school year. The percentage that made AYP will be calculated automatically.

Entity	Total #	# That Made AYP in SY 2006-07	Percentage That Made AYP in SY 2006-07
Schools	7111	6447	90.7
Districts	1205	1069	88.7

Comments: The total number of public elementary and secondary schools should be 8,061, which includes 950 schools that were not evaluated for AYP. Including these schools in the total would have provided the accurate Percentage That Made AYP in SY 2006-07 as 80.0%.

The total number of public elementary and secondary districts should be 1,222, which includes 17 districts that were not evaluated for AYP. Including these districts in the total would have provided the accurate Percentage That Made AYP in SY 2006-07 as 87.5%

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

1.4.2 Title I School Accountability

In the table below, provide the total number of public Title I schools by type and the total number of those schools that made AYP based on data for the SY 2006-07 school year. Include only public Title I schools. Do not include Title I programs operated by local educational agencies in private schools. The percentage that made AYP will be calculated automatically.

Title I School	# Title I Schools	# Title I Schools That Made AYP in SY 2006-07	Percentage of Title I Schools That Made AYP in SY 2006-07
All Title I schools	5157	4672	90.6
Schoolwide (SWP) Title I schools	4861	4387	90.2
Targeted assistance (TAS) Title I schools	296	285	96.3

Comments:

Source – The table above is produced through *EDFacts*. The SEA submits the data in N/X101 for data group 22 and N/X103 for data group 32.

Note: New for the SY 2006-07 CSPR is the data collection requirement to report for public schools and to include data for schoolwide (SWP) and targeted assistance (TAS) Title I Schools.

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 2006-07. The percentage that made AYP will be calculated automatically.

# Districts That Received Title I Funds	# Districts That Received Title I Funds and Made AYP in SY 2006-07	Percentage of Districts That Received Title I Funds and Made AYP in SY 2006-07
1183	1039	87.8

Comments:

Source – Initially, pre-populated by *EDFacts* file N/X103 that is data group 32 and 582. If necessary, it is updated through manual entry by the SEA into the online collection tool.

Note: This table was formerly part of Section 1.4.2 of the SY 2005-06 CSPR.

1.4.4 Title I Schools Identified for Improvement

1.4.4.1 List of Title I Schools Identified for Improvement

In the following table, provide a list of Title I schools identified for improvement, corrective action, or restructuring under Section 1116 for the SY 2007-08 based on the data from SY 2006-07. For each school on the list, provide the following:

- District Name and NCES ID Code
- School Name and NCES ID Code
- Whether the school missed the proficiency target in reading/language arts as outlined in the State's Accountability Plan
- Whether the school met the participation rate target for the reading/language arts assessment
- Whether the school missed the proficiency target in mathematics as outlined in the State's Accountability Plan
- Whether the school met the participation rate target for the mathematics assessment
- Whether the school missed the other academic indicator for elementary/middle schools (if applicable) as outlined in the State's Accountability Plan
- Whether the school missed the graduation rate for high schools (if applicable) as outlined in the State's Accountability Plan
- Improvement status for SY 2007-08 (Use one of the following improvement status designations: School Improvement – Year 1, School Improvement – Year 2, Corrective Action, Restructuring Year 1 (planning), or Restructuring Year 2 (implementing))¹
- Whether the school is a Title I school (This column is optional and is used only by States that choose to list all schools in improvement.)

See attached for blank template that can be used to enter School Data.

Download template: [Question 1.4.4.1_0607.xls](#) ([Get MS Excel Viewer](#))

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

Note: Identification as Title I school is a new data collection for the SY 2006-07 CSPR.

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

1.4.4.2 Actions Taken for Title I Schools Identified for Improvement

In the space below, describe the measures being taken to address the achievement problems of schools identified for improvement, corrective action, and restructuring. Include a discussion of the technical assistance provided by and supported by the State, including a description of the statewide systems of support under *NCLB* (e.g., the number of schools served, the nature and duration of assistance provided, etc.).

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

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

The purpose of the SIRC is to work in conjunction with the TEA to improve student performance by providing schools with information, clarification, resources, and technical assistance regarding the school improvement process as outlined by the No Child Left Behind Act.

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

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

The School Improvement Resource Center:

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

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

The Technical Assistance Provider, or TAP, serves as a hands-on consultant who works with Stage 2 and above campus administration and faculty to guide the school through the improvement process. Ultimately, the TAP works to create a collaborative and positive school environment, develop increased leadership capacity in administrators, build content knowledge and teaching strategies in teachers, serve as a liaison with the regional Education Service Center to locate and arrange professional development customized to individual teacher needs, promote student achievement through specific mentoring and monitoring systems, and

establish a teaching-learning community. These goals are achieved through analyzing the Campus Improvement Plan, observing the campus and classrooms, making recommendations, and collaborating with school personnel to implement, monitor, and adjust strategic plans designed to achieve the Campus Improvement Plan goals. In response to needs revealed by data disaggregation and observation, the TAP provides targeted training to school personnel in skills and practices relevant to their individual roles and the monitoring of student progress. The TAP uses a broad knowledge of scientific or evidence based resources and materials to address the range of administrative, curricular, or instructional needs that might be present on a campus in need of improvement.

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

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

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

Note: The inclusion of the discussion of technical assistance provided by and supported by the State is a new data collection for the SY 2006-07 CSPR.

1.4.4.3 Corrective Action

In the table below, for schools in corrective action, provide the number of schools for which the listed corrective actions under *NCLB* are being implemented.

Corrective Action	# of Schools in Corrective Action in Which the Corrective Action Is Being Implemented
Required implementation of a new research-based curriculum or instructional program	19
Extension of the school year or school day	4
Replacement of staff members relevant to the school's low performance	4
Significant decrease in management authority at the school level	4
Replacement of the principal	0
Restructuring the internal organization of the school	4
Appointment of an outside expert to advise the school	13
Comments: Replacement of the principal is included in Replacement of staff members relevant to the school's low performance.	

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

Note: New data collection for the SY 2006-07 CSPR.

1.4.4.4 Restructuring – Year 2

In the table below, for schools in restructuring – year 2 (implementation year), provide the number of schools for which the listed restructuring actions under *NCLB* are being implemented.

Restructuring Action	# of Schools in Restructuring in Which Restructuring Action Is Being Implemented
Replacement of all or most of the school staff (which may include the principal)	1
Reopening the school as a public charter school	0
Entering into a contract with a private entity to operate the school	0
Take over the school by the State	0
Other major restructuring of the school governance	0
Comments:	

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

Note: New data collection for the SY 2006-07 CSPR.

1.4.5 Districts That Received Title I Funds Identified for Improvement

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

In the following table, provide a list of districts that received Title I funds and were identified for improvement or corrective action under Section 1116 for the SY 2007-08 based on the data from SY 2006-07. For each district on the list, provide the following:

- District Name and NCES ID Code
- Whether the district missed the proficiency target in reading/language arts as outlined in the State's Accountability Plan
- Whether the district met the participation rate target for the reading/language arts assessment
- Whether the district missed the proficiency target in mathematics as outlined in the State's Accountability Plan
- Whether the school met the participation rate target for the mathematics assessment
- Whether the district met the other academic indicator for elementary/middle schools (if applicable) as outlined in the State's Accountability Plan
- Whether the district met the graduation rate for high schools (if applicable) as outlined in the State's Accountability Plan
- Improvement status for SY 2007-08 (Use one of the following improvement status designations: Improvement or Corrective Action²)
- Whether the district is a district that received Title I funds (This column is optional and is used only by States that choose to list all districts in improvement.)

See attached for blank template that can be used to enter School Data.

Download template: [Question 1.4.5.1_0607.xls](#) ([Get MS Excel Viewer](#))

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

Note: Identification of a district as receiving Title I funds is a new data collection for the SY 2006-07 CSPR.

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

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

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

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

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

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

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

Note: The inclusion of the discussion of technical assistance provided by the State is a new data collection for the SY 2006-07 CSPR.

1.4.5.3 Corrective Action

In the table below, for districts in corrective action, provide the number of districts in corrective action in which the listed corrective actions under *NCLB* are being implemented.

Corrective Action	# of Districts in Corrective Action in Which Corrective Action Is Being Implemented
Implementing a new curriculum based on State standards	0
Authorized students to transfer from district schools to higher performing schools in a neighboring district	0
Deferred programmatic funds or reduced administrative funds	0
Replaced district personnel who are relevant to the failure to make AYP	0
Removed one or more schools from the jurisdiction of the district	0
Appointed a receiver or trustee to administer the affairs of the district	0
Restructured the district	0
Abolished the district (list the number of districts abolished between the SYs 2005-06 and 2006-07 as a corrective action)	0
Comments:	

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

Note: New data collection for the SY 2006-07 CSPR.

1.4.6 Dates of AYP and Identification Determinations

In the table below, provide the dates (MM/DD/YY) when your State provided final school and district AYP and identification for improvement, corrective action, or restructuring to schools and districts based on SY 2006-07 assessments. If applicable, also provide the dates for preliminary determinations provided to schools and districts.

	Districts	Schools
Final AYP and identification determinations	12/11/07	12/11/07
Preliminary school AYP and identification determinations (if applicable)	08/15/07	08/15/07
Comments:		

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

Note: New data collection for the SY 2006-07 CSPR.

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 2006-07 data and the results of those appeals.

	# Appealed Their AYP Designations	# Appeals Resulted in a Change in the AYP Designation
Districts	52	13
Schools	203	73
Comments:		

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

Note: New data collection for the SY 2006-07 CSPR.

Date (MM/DD/YY) that processing appeals based on SY 2006-07 data was complete	12/18/07
---	----------

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

Note: New data collection for the SY 2006-07 CSPR.

1.4.8 Section 1003(a) Funds

In the space below, describe your State's use of Section 1003(a) of ESEA funds. Specifically, address the following:

- Describe briefly any priorities the State uses in allocating these funds to schools.
- Describe briefly the State's methods for distributing these funds (e.g., formula, competitive, etc.).
- Describe briefly the types of activities supported by the Section 1003(a) funds.

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

The State does not set any priorities in allocating Section 1003(a) funds.

The State's method of distributing Section 1003(a) funds is by formula. All School Improvement campuses receive funds with an increase in funds to campuses in higher stages of improvement.

Types of activities supported by Section 1003(a) are:

- Extended instruction for reading and/or math
- Research-based professional development in reading and/or math
- Parental involvement initiatives
- Technology upgrades
- Development of curriculum and/or assessments

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

Note: New data collection for the SY 2006-07 CSPR.

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.

1.4.9.1.1 Schools Using Public School Choice

In the table below, provide the number of public schools *from which* and *to which* students transferred under the provisions for public school choice in Section 1116 of ESEA.

	# Schools
Title I schools <i>from which</i> students transferred for public school choice	99
Public Schools <i>to which</i> students transferred for public school choice	192
Comments:	

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

Note: This table was formerly part of section 1.4.5.1 of the SY 2005-06 CSPR.

1.4.9.1.2 Public School Choice – Students

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

Students who are eligible for public school choice includes:

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

	# Students
Eligible for public school choice	184691
Who applied to transfer	1668
Who transferred to another school under Title I public school choice provisions	1209

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

	Yes/No
1. Enrolled in a school identified for improvement	<u>Yes</u>
2. Transferred in the current school year, only	<u>No</u>
3. Transferred in a prior year and in the current year	<u>No</u>
Comments:	

Source – Initially, pre-populated by ED*Facts* file N/X010 that includes data groups 579, 574 and 544. If necessary, it is updated through manual entry by the SEA into the online CSPR collection tool.

Note: This table was formerly part of section 1.4.5.1 of the SY 2005-06 CSPR.

1.4.9.1.3 Funds Spent on Public School Choice

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

	Amount
Dollars spent by LEAs on transportation for public school choice	\$ 6173961
Comments:	

Source – Initially, pre-populated by ED*Facts* file N/X102 that includes data group 652. If necessary, it is updated through manual entry by the SEA into the online CSPR collection tool.

Note: New data collection for the SY 2006-07 CSPR.

1.4.9.1.4 Availability of Public School Choice Options

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

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

	# LEAs
LEAs Unable to Provide Public School Choice	49
Comments:	

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

Note: New data collection for the SY 2006-07 CSPR.

FAQs about public school choice:

- a. *How should States report data on Title I public school choice for those LEAs that have open enrollment and other choice programs?* An LEA may consider a student as eligible for and participating in Title I public school choice, and may consider costs for transporting that student towards its funds spent on transportation for public school choice, if the student meets the following conditions:
 - Has a "home" or "neighborhood" school (to which the student would have been assigned, in the absence of a choice program) that receives Title I funds and has been identified, under the statute, as in need of improvement, corrective action, or restructuring; and
 - Has elected to enroll, at some point since July 1, 2002 (the effective date of the Title I choice provisions), and after the home school has been identified as in need of improvement, in a school that has not been so identified and is attending that school; and
 - Is using district transportation services to attend such a school.³
- b. *How do States report on public school choice for those LEAs that are not able to offer public school choice (e.g., LEAs in which all schools in a grade level are in school improvement, LEAs that have only a single school at that grade level, or LEAs whose schools are so remote from one another that choice is impracticable)?* For those LEAs, States should count as eligible all students who attend identified Title I schools. States should report that no eligible schools or students were provided the option to transfer and should provide an explanation why choice is not possible within the LEA in the Comment Section.

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

1.4.9.2 Supplemental Educational Services

This section collects data on supplemental educational services.

1.4.9.2.1 Schools with Students Eligible for Supplemental Educational Services

In the table below, provide the number of Title I schools identified as in need of improvement, corrective action, or restructuring whose students received supplemental educational services under Section 1116 of ESEA. A Frequently Asked Questions (FAQ) section related to supplemental educational services is below the table.

	# Schools
Title I schools whose students received supplemental educational services	104
Comments:	

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

Note: This table was formerly part of section 1.4.5.2 of the SY 2005-06 CSPR.

FAQ about supplemental education services

How should a State define the phrase "students who received supplemental educational services"? States should consider students who "received" supplemental educational services as those students who enrolled and participated in some hours of services. States have the discretion to determine the minimum number of hours of participation necessary for a student to have "received" services.

1.4.9.2.2 Supplemental Educational Services - Students

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

	# Students
Eligible for supplemental educational services	80789
Who applied for supplemental educational services	6768
Who received supplemental educational services	5052
Comments:	

Source – Initially, pre-populated by ED*Facts* file N/X102 that includes data groups 578, 575, and 546. If necessary, it is updated through manual entry by the SEA into the online CSPR collection tool.

Note: This table was formerly part of Section 1.4.5.2 of the SY 2005-06 CSPR.

1.4.9.2.3 Funds Spent on Supplemental Educational Services

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

	Amount
Dollars spent by LEAs on supplemental educational services	\$ 53783413
Comments:	

Source – Initially, pre-populated by ED*Facts* file N/X102, which includes data group 651. If necessary, it is updated through manual entry by the SEA into the online collection tool.

Note: New data collection for the SY 2006-07 CSPR.

1.5 TEACHER QUALITY

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

1.5.1 Core Academic Classes Taught by Teachers Who Are Highly Qualified

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

School Type	# of Core Academic Classes (Total)	# of Core Academic Classes Taught by Teachers Who Are Highly Qualified	Percentage of Core Academic Classes Taught by Teachers Who Are Highly Qualified	# of Core Academic Classes Taught by Teachers Who Are NOT Highly Qualified	Percentage of Core Academic Classes Taught by Teachers Who Are NOT Highly Qualified
All schools	747289	732858	98.1	14431	1.9
Elementary level					
High-poverty schools	49259	48730	98.9	529	1.1
Low-poverty schools	40220	40060	99.6	160	0.4
All elementary schools	170231	169017	99.3	1214	0.7
Secondary level					
High-poverty schools	90672	87650	96.7	3022	3.3
Low-poverty schools	206620	203931	98.7	2689	1.3
All secondary schools	577058	563841	97.7	13217	2.3
Comments:					

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

Data table includes classes taught by special education teachers who provide direct instruction core academic subjects.	<u>Yes</u>
---	------------

If the answer above is no, please explain:

--

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

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

Yes, full day self-contained classroom equals one class.
--

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

Note: The data collection requirement to submit data for core classes taught by teachers who are NOT highly qualified has been added for the SY 2006-07 CSPR.

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 percent 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. See Question A-14 in the August 3, 2006, Non-Regulatory Guidance for additional information. Report classes in grade 6 through 8 consistent with how teachers have been classified to determine their highly qualified status, regardless of whether their schools are configured as elementary or middle schools.
- e. *How should States count teachers (including specialists or resource teachers) in elementary classes?* States that count self-contained classrooms as one class should, to avoid over-representation, also count subject-area specialists (e.g., mathematics or music teachers) or resource teachers as teaching one class. On the other hand, States using a departmentalized approach to instruction where a self-contained classroom is counted multiple times (once for each subject taught) should also count subject-area specialists or resource teachers as teaching multiple classes.
- f. *How should States count teachers in self-contained multiple-subject secondary classes?* Each core academic subject taught for which students are receiving credit toward graduation should be counted in the numerator and the denominator. For example, if the same teacher teaches English, calculus, history, and science in a self-contained classroom, count these as four classes in the denominator. If the teacher were Highly Qualified to teach English and history, he/she would be counted as Highly Qualified in two of the four subjects in the numerator.
- g. *What is a "high-poverty school"?* Section 1111(h)(1)(C)(viii) defines "high-poverty" schools as schools in the top quartile of poverty in the State. The poverty quartile breaks are reported later in this section.
- h. *What is a "low-poverty school"?* Section 1111(h)(1)(C)(viii) defines "low-poverty" schools as schools in the bottom quartile of poverty in the State. The poverty quartile breaks are reported later in this section.

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

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

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

	Percentage
Elementary School Classes	
Elementary school classes taught by certified general education teachers who did not pass a subject-knowledge test or (if eligible) have not demonstrated subject-matter competency through HOUSSE	40.1
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	10.1
Elementary school classes taught by teachers who are not fully certified (and are not in an approved alternative route program)	49.8
Other (please explain)	0.0
Total	100.0

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

	Percentage
Secondary School Classes	
Secondary school classes taught by certified general education teachers who have not demonstrated subject-matter knowledge in those subjects (e.g., out-of-field teachers)	29.0
Secondary school classes taught by certified special education teachers who have not demonstrated subject-matter competency in those subjects	27.4
Secondary school classes taught by teachers who are not fully certified (and are not in an approved alternative route program)	39.4
Other (please explain)	4.3
Total	100.0
Comments:	

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

1.5.3 Poverty Quartiles and Metrics Used

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

	High-Poverty Schools (more than what %)	Low-Poverty Schools (less than what %)
Elementary schools	54.1	41.8
Poverty metric used	Low Income Percentage	
Secondary schools	68.9	31.2
Poverty metric used	Low Income Percentage	
Comments:		

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

FAQs on poverty quartiles and metrics used to determine poverty

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

1.6 TITLE III AND LANGUAGE INSTRUCTIONAL PROGRAMS

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

Throughout this section:

- "AYP grades" is sometimes used to reference grades used for accountability determinations (grades 3 through 8 and one year of high school)
- "Non-AYP grades" is used to reference grades not used for accountability determinations.

1.6.1 Language Instruction Educational Programs (formerly 1.1. of the Title III Biennial Collection)

In the table below, provide the number of Title III subgrantees that use each type of language instruction educational program, as defined in Section 3301(8).

Note: Numbers reflected in 1.6.1 can be duplicative due to subgrantees' use of more than one type of program. The number for each type of program should be equal to or less than the total number of subgrantees in 1.6.4.1.

Table 1.6.1 Definitions:

1. **# Using Program** = Number of subgrantees that reported using a specific type of language instruction educational program. Subgrantees may use multiple programs. **(a.)** If multiple programs are used, count one for each program type used. **(b.)** Consortium is always counted as **one if all members used the same type of program**. If consortium members used different types of programs, count all members using the same type of program as one for each type. Do not count the members of the consortium individually as one, unless each member used a different type of program (e.g., use the same method of counting as one subgrantee using multiple types of programs in **(a.)**)
2. **Type of Program** = Type of programs described in the subgrantee's local plan (as submitted to the State or as implemented) that is closest to the descriptions in <http://www.ncela.gwu.edu/expert/glossary.html>.
3. **Other Language** = Name of the language of instruction, other than English, used in the program.
4. **% Language of Instruction** = Average percentages of English and the other language used as a language of instruction in the program or use the percentage of the most common practice in the State (applies **only** to the first five bilingual program types).
5. **OLOI** = Other Language of Instruction used in the bilingual language instruction educational program.

# Using Program	Type of Program	Other Language	% Language of Instruction	
			English	OLOI
77	Dual language			
41	Two-way immersion			
175	Transitional bilingual			
90	Developmental bilingual			
	Heritage language			
419	Sheltered English instruction			
	Structured English immersion			
	Specially designed academic instruction delivered in English (SDAIE)			
530	Content-based ESL			
360	Pull-out ESL			
	Other (explain)			
Comments: Implementing Other Language of Instruction data collection in 2007-2008.				

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

Note: New data collection for the SY 2006-07 CSPR.

1.6.2 Student Demographic Data**1.6.2.1 Number of LEP Students Who Received Title III Language Instruction Educational Program Services**

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

	#
LEP students who received services in a Title III language instruction educational program in grades K through 12 for this reporting year.	734032
Comments:	

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

Note: New data collection for the SY 2006-07 CSPR.

1.6.2.2 Most Commonly Spoken Languages in the State

In the table below, provide the five most commonly spoken languages, other than English, in the State. The top five languages should be determined by the highest number of students speaking each of those languages listed.

Language	# LEP Students
Spanish	671322
English	13356
Vietnamese	12727
Urdu	3432
Arabic	3277

For additional significant languages please use comment box.

Comments:

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

Note: This table was formerly in Section 1.6.3.2 of the SY 2005-06 CSPR.

1.6.3 Student Performance Data

This section collects data on LEP student English language proficiency and LEP academic content performance data (e.g., LEP tested in native language tables and MFLEP/AYP Grades results table).

1.6.3.1 Student English Language Proficiency Testing Status

This section collects data on the number of ALL LEP students and Title III-served LEP students in the State by testing status for English language proficiency.

1.6.3.1.1 ALL LEP Student English Language Proficiency Testing Status

In the table below, provide the unduplicated number of ALL LEP students in the State by testing status for English language proficiency. ALL LEP students includes the following students:

- Newly enrolled and continually enrolled LEP students in the State for the year of this report, whether or not they receive services in a Title III language Instruction educational program;
- All students assessed for English language proficiency (ELP) using an annual State English Language proficiency (ELP) assessment as required under Section 1111(b)(7) of the ESEA in the reporting year and who meet the LEP definition in Section 9101 (25).

Table 1.6.3.1.1. Definitions:

- **Tested/State Annual ELP** = Number of LEP students who took the annual State English language proficiency assessment as required under Section 1111(b)(7) of the *ESEA* in this reporting year.
- **Not Tested/State Annual ELP** = Number of LEP students enrolled at the time of testing but did not take the annual State English language proficiency assessment.
- **Subtotal** = Sum of "Tested/State Annual ELP" and "Not Tested/State Annual ELP" (i.e., the number of LEP students enrolled at the time of testing).
- **LEP/One Data Point** = Number of LEP students who took the annual State English language proficiency assessment as required under Section 1111(b)(7) for the first time in this reporting year. Note that "LEP/One Data Point" is a subset of those students reported as Tested on the annual State English Language proficiency assessment.

ALL LEP Testing Status	#
Tested/State annual ELP	638093
Not tested/State annual ELP	21324
Subtotal	659417
LEP/One Data Point	33318
Comments:	

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

Note: New data collection for the SY 2006-07 CSPR.

1.6.3.1.2 Title III Student English Language Proficiency Testing Status

In the table below, provide the unduplicated number of Title III-served LEP students in the State by testing status for English language proficiency.

Table 1.6.3.1.2. Definitions:

- **Tested/State Annual ELP** = Number of LEP students in Title III language instruction educational programs who took the annual State English language proficiency assessment.
- **Not Tested/State Annual ELP** = Number of LEP students in Title III language instruction educational programs enrolled at the time of testing but did not take the annual State English language proficiency assessment.
- **Subtotal** = Sum of "Tested/State Annual ELP" and "Not Tested/State Annual ELP" (i.e., the number of LEP students in Title III language instruction educational programs enrolled at the time of testing).
- **LEP/One Data Point** = Number of LEP students in Title III language instructional programs who took the annual State English language proficiency assessment for the first time in this reporting year. Note that "LEP/One Data Point" is a subset of those students reported as Tested on the annual State English Language proficiency assessment.

Title III LEP Testing Status	#
Tested/State annual ELP	637176
Not tested/State annual ELP	21217
Subtotal	658393
LEP/One Data Point	33255
Comments:	

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

Note: New data collection for the SY 2006-07 CSPR.

1.6.3.2 Student English Language Proficiency Results

This section collects data on the results from the annual State English language proficiency assessment(s) for LEP students. Before completing Table 1.6.3.2.2 or 1.6.3.2.3, please indicate your State's use of the flexibility to apply annual measurable achievement objectives (AMAOs) to all LEP students.

1.6.3.2.1 Application of Title III English Language Proficiency Annual Assessment and AMAOs (formerly 1.6.8 of the Title III Biennial Collection, reformatted)

In the table below, indicate the State application of the following:

State applied the Title III English language proficiency annual assessment to all LEP students in LEAs receiving Title III funds.	<u>Yes</u>
State applied the annual measurable achievement objectives (AMAOs) to ALL LEP students in LEAs receiving Title III funds.	<u>Yes</u>
Comments:	

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

Note: New data collection for the SY 2006-07 CSPR.

1.6.3.2.2 All LEP English Language Proficiency Results

Please report information in this section **ONLY** if the State checked "Yes" in section 1.6.3.2.1 (row 2), that annual measurable achievement objectives are applied to all LEP students in LEAs receiving Title III funds.

Report the results from the annual State English language proficiency assessment(s) for ALL LEP students in grades K through 12.

Table 1.6.3.2.2 Definitions:

1. **Making Progress** = Number of LEP students who met the definition of "Making Progress" as defined by the State and submitted to OELA in the State Consolidated Application (CSA), or as amended.
2. **No Progress** = Number of LEP students who did not meet the State definition of "Making Progress."
3. **ELP Attainment** = Number of LEP students who attained English language proficiency as defined by the State and submitted to OELA in the State Consolidated Application (CSA), or as amended.
4. **Target** = AMAO target for the year as established by the State and submitted to OELA in the CSA (September 2003 submission), or as amended, for each of "Making Progress" and "Attainment" of ELP.
5. **Results** = Number and percent of LEP students who met the State definition of "Making Progress" and the definition of "Attainment" of English language proficiency.
6. **Met/Y** = Met the annual target, "Met/N" = did not meet annual target. This cell will be automatically populated, based on the Target % and the Results %.

	Target	Results		Met
	%	#	%	Y/N
Making progress		262322	58.4	
No progress		186884		
ELP attainment		256678	38.5	

Comments: Progress:

Target -

k-2 - 17%

3-12 - 44%

Actual -

k-2 - 50.8% (84780)

3-12 - 62.9% (177542)

Attainment:

Target -

k-2 - 2.5%

3-12 - Method 1 - 26.0%

Method 2 - 44.0%

Actual -

k-2 - 11.7% (32349)

3-12 - Method 1 - 39.4% (129180)

Method 2 - 57.5% (224329)

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

Note: New data collection for the SY 2006-07 CSPR.

If a State does not count "ELP attainment" students as also "Making Progress", the number for "No Progress" should be the "Subtotal" in 1.6.3.1.1 minus the number "Making Progress" and "Attainment." If a State counts "ELP attainment" students as also "Making Progress", the number for "No Progress" should be the "Subtotal" in 1.6.3.1.1 minus "Making Progress".

1.6.3.2.3 Title III LEP English Language Proficiency Results

Please report information in this section **ONLY** if the State checked "No" in section in 1.6.3.2.1 (row 2), reporting that annual measurable achievement objectives (AMAOs) are applied to LEP students served by Title III.

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

Table 1.6.3.2.3 Definitions:

1. **Making Progress** = Number of Title III LEP students who met the definition of "Making Progress" as defined by the State and submitted to OELA in the State Consolidated Application (CSA), or as amended.
2. **No Progress** = Number of Title III LEP students who did not meet the State definition of "Making Progress."
3. **ELP Attainment** = Number of Title III LEP students who attained English language proficiency as defined by the State and submitted to OELA in the State Consolidated Application (CSA), or as amended.
4. **Target** = AMAO target for the year as established by the State and submitted to OELA in the CSA (September 2003 submission), or as amended, for each of "Making Progress" and "Attainment" of ELP.
5. **Results** = Number and percent of Title III LEP students who met the State definition of "Making Progress" and the definition of "Attainment" of English language proficiency.
6. **Met/Y** = Met the annual target, "Met/N" = did not meet annual target. This cell will be automatically populated, based on the Target % and the Results %.

	Target	Results		Met
	%	#	%	Yes/No
Making progress		262006	58.4	
No progress		186699		
ELP attainment		256050	38.5	

Comments: Progress:

Target -

k-2 - 17%

3-12 - 44%

Actual -

k-2 - 50.8% (84660)

3-12 - 62.9% (177346)

Attainment:

Target -

k-2 - 2.5%

3-12 - Method 1 - 26.0%

Method 2 - 44.0%

Actual -

k-2 - 11.7% (32278)

3-12 - Method 1 - 39.4% (128983)

Method 2 - 57.5% (223772)

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

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

Note: New data collection for the SY 2006-07 CSPR.

If a State does not count "ELP attainment" students as also "Making Progress", the number for "No Progress" should be the "Subtotal" in 1.6.3.1.2 minus the number "Making Progress" and "Attainment." If a State counts "ELP attainment" students as also "Making Progress", the number for "No Progress" should be the "Subtotal" in 1.6.3.1.2 minus "Making Progress".

1.6.3.4 LEP Subgroup Academic Content Assessment Results (formerly 3.2.3/MFLEP of the Title III Biennial Collection)

This section collects data on the academic content assessment results for LEP students.

1.6.3.4.1 LEP Subgroup Flexibility

In the table below, report whether the State exercises the LEP flexibility afforded States through the new regulation for monitored former LEP (MFLEP), in AYP determination.

MFLEP	Yes
Comments:	

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

Note: New data collection for the SY 2006-07 CSPR.

1.6.3.4.3 Status of Monitored Former LEP Students (MFLEP) (formerly 3.1 of the Title III Biennial Collection, modified)

In the table below, report the unduplicated count of MFLEP students in K-12 for each of the two years monitored during the SY 2006-07, which includes both MFLEP students in AYP grades and in non-AYP grades in row 1 and MFLEP students only in AYP grades in row 2.

Table 1.6.3.4.3 Definitions:**1. Monitored Former LEP (MFLEP) includes:**

- Students that have transitioned into classrooms that are not designed for LEP students;
- Students that are no longer receiving LEP services; and who are being monitored for academic content achievement for 2 years after transition.

2. Total MFLEP = State aggregated number of all MFLEP students in grades K through 12.**3. MFLEP/AYP Grades =** State aggregated number of MFLEP students in grades used for accountability determinations (3 through 8 and once in high school). These students may be included in the LEP subgroup AYP calculations.

	#
Total MFLEP	128507
MFLEP/AYP grades	117542
Comments:	

Source – Initially, pre-populated by ED Facts file N/X126, which contains data group 668, category set A. If necessary, it is updated through manual entry by the SEA into the online collection tool.

Note: New data collection for the SY 2006-07 CSPR.

1.6.3.4.4 LEP Students in Non-AYP Grades (formerly 2.3 of the Title III Biennial Collection)

In the table below, report the total number of LEP students in grade ranges that were not tested for AYP in SY 2006-07.

Table 1.6.3.4.4 Definitions:**1. LEP K-2 =** All LEP students in these grades. Do not include pre-K students.**2. LEP HS/Non-AYP =** High school students (grades 9 through 12 or 10 through 12 [State specific]) who are in the high school grades that are not tested for AYP in the State (e.g., if the State tested grade 10 for AYP, then the State should provide the aggregated number of LEP students in grades 9, 11 and 12).**3. LEP Other Grades =** Number of LEP students enrolled in public schools but not in grades K through 12. Students in non-graded grades or grade spans. Do not report LEP students in grades used for NCLB accountability determinations (3 through 8 and once in high school) in this row.

Grade	#
LEP K-2	294407
LEP HS/Non-AYP	59098
LEP other grades	0
Comments:	

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

Note: New data collection for the SY 2006-07 CSPR.

1.6.3.5 Native Language Assessments

This section collects data on LEP students assessed in their native language.

1.6.3.5.1 LEP Students Assessed in Native Language (formerly 2.4.1 of the Title III Biennial Collection)

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

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

Note: New data collection for the SY 2006-07 CSPR.

* If "No", proceed to 1.6.3.6.

1.6.3.5.2 Native Language of Mathematics Tests Given (formerly 2.4.2 of the Title III Biennial Collection)

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

Grade	Language
3	Spanish
4	Spanish
5	Spanish
6	Spanish
7	
8	
HS	
Comments:	

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

Note: New data collection for the SY 2006-07 CSPR.

1.6.3.5.3 Native Language of Reading/Language Arts Tests Given (formerly 2.4.2 of the Title III Biennial Collection)

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

Grade	Language
3	Spanish
4	Spanish
5	Spanish
6	Spanish
7	
8	
HS	
Comments:	

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

Note: New data collection for the SY 2006-07 CSPR.

1.6.3.5.4 Native Language Version of State NCLB Mathematics Assessment Results (formerly 2.4.3 of the Title III Biennial Collection)

In the table below, report the number of LEP students who took a mathematics assessment in their native language across all grades used for NCLB accountability determinations (3 through 8 and once in high school).

Table 1.6.3.5.4 Definitions:

1. **# Tested** = Number of LEP students in grades used for NCLB accountability determinations (3 through 8 and once in high school) who took the native language version of the mathematics assessment.
2. **# At or Above Proficient** = Number of students tested through the native language version of the mathematics assessment who scored at or above proficient.
3. **% Results** = Automatically calculated based on the number who scored at or above proficient divided by the number tested.

# Tested	# At or Above Proficient	% Results
49397	34380	69.6
Comments:		

Source – Initially pre-populated by ED*Facts* file N/X049 that is data group 272, category set A. If necessary, it is updated through manual entry by the SEA into the online collection tool.

Note: New data collection for the SY 2006-07 CSPR.

1.6.3.5.5 Native Language Version of State NCLB Reading/Language Arts Assessment Results (formerly 2.4.3 of the Title III Biennial Collection)

In the table below, report the number of LEP students who took a reading/language arts assessment in their native language across all grades used for NCLB accountability determinations (3 through 8 and once in high school).

Table 1.6.3.5.5 Definitions:

1. **# Tested** = Number of LEP students in grades used for NCLB accountability determinations (3 through 8 and once in high school) who took the native language version of the reading/language arts assessment.
2. **# At or Above Proficient** = Number of students tested through the native language version of the reading/language arts assessment who scored at or above proficient.
3. **% Results** = Automatically calculated based on the number who scored at or above proficient divided by the number tested.

# Tested	# At or Above Proficient	% Results
56417	47133	83.5
Comments:		

Source – Initially pre-populated by ED*Facts* file N/X049 that is data group 272, category set A. If necessary, it is updated through manual entry by the SEA into the online collection tool.

Note: New data collection for the SY 2006-07 CSPR.

1.6.3.6 Title III Served Monitored Former LEP Students

This section collects data on the performance of former LEP students.

1.6.3.6.1 Title III Served MFLEP Students by Year Monitored (formerly 3.1 of the Title III Biennial Collection)

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.

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
70444	59937	130381
Comments:		

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

Note: New data collection for the SY 2006-07 CSPR.

1.6.3.6.2 Monitored Former LEP (MFLEP) Students in AYP Grades Results for Mathematics (formerly 3.2 of the Title III Biennial Collection)

In the table below, report the number of monitored former LEP (MFLEP) students who took the annual mathematics assessment.

Table 1.6.3.6.2 Definitions:

1. **# Tested** = State-aggregated number of MFLEP students who were tested in mathematics for AYP.
2. **# At or Above Proficient** = State-aggregated number of MFLEP students who scored at or above proficient on the State annual mathematics assessment.
3. **% Results** = Automatically calculated based on number who scored at or above proficient divided by the number tested.
4. **# Below proficient** = State-aggregated number of MFLEP students in grades used for NCLB accountability determinations (3 through 8 and once in high school) who did not score proficient on the State *NCLB* mathematics assessment. This will be automatically calculated.

# Tested	# At or Above Proficient	% Results	# Below Proficient
117279	97151	82.8	20128

The number tested should be the same or near the total in 1.6.3.4.3 row 2, if not explain the difference in the comment box below.

Comments:

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

Note: New data collection for the SY 2006-07 CSPR.

1.6.3.6.3 Monitored Former LEP (MFLEP) Students in AYP Grades Results for Reading/Language Arts (formerly 3.2 of the Title III Biennial Collection)

In the table below, provide the number of monitored former LEP (MFLEP) students who took the annual reading/language arts assessment.

Table 1.6.3.6.3 Definitions:

1. **# Tested** = State-aggregated number of MFLEP students who were tested in reading/language arts for AYP.
2. **# At or Above Proficient** = State-aggregated number of MFLEP students who scored at or above proficient on the State annual reading/language arts assessment.
3. **% Results** = Automatically calculated based on number who scored at or above proficient divided by the total number tested.
4. **# Below proficient** = State-aggregated number MFLEP students in grades used for NCLB accountability determinations (3 through 8 and once in high school) who did not score proficient on the State annual reading/language arts assessment. This will be automatically calculated.

# Tested	# At or Above Proficient	% Results	# Below Proficient
117349	103335	88.1	14014

The number tested should be the same or near the total in 1.6.3.4.3 row 2, if not explain the difference in the comment box below.

Comments:

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

Note: New data collection for the SY 2006-07 CSPR.

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 (formerly 4.1 of the Title III Biennial Collection)

In the table below, report the number of Title III subgrantees meeting the criteria described in the table. Use the same method of counting consortia as in 1.6.1 (consortia regardless of number of members is only counted as one). 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. The total of the # met all three AMAOs + # met 2 AMAOs only + # Met one AMAO + # Met zero AMAOs=total # of subgrantees for the year.

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

	#
Total number of subgrantees for the year	1012
Number of subgrantees that met all three Title III AMAOs	949
Number of subgrantees that met only 2 AMAOs	58
Number of subgrantees that met AMAOs of Making Progress and ELP Attainment	16
Number of subgrantees that met AMAOs of Making Progress and AYP	27
Number of subgrantees that met AMAOs of ELP Attainment and AYP	15
Number of subgrantees that met only 1 AMAO	4
Number of subgrantees that met AMAO of Making Progress	2
Number of subgrantees that met AMAO of Attainment of ELP	0
Number of subgrantees that met AMAO AYP	2
Number of subgrantees that did not meet any AMAOs	1
Number of subgrantees that did not meet AMAOs for two consecutive years	22
Number of subgrantees with an improvement plan for not meeting Title III AMAOs	22
Number of subgrantees who have not met Title III AMAOs for four consecutive years (beginning in SY 2007-08)	
Comments:	

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

Note: This table was formerly in section 1.6.10 of the SY 2005-06 CSPR.

1.6.4.2 State Accountability (formerly 4.2 of the Title III Biennial Collection)

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.

State met <u>all</u> three Title III AMAOs	<u>Yes</u>
Comments:	

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

Note: This table was formerly in Section 1.6.10 of the SY 2005-06 CSPR.

1.6.4.3 Termination of Title III Language Instruction Educational Programs (formerly 6.1 of the Title III Biennial Collection)

Any Title III language instruction educational programs <u>or</u> programs and activities for immigrant children and youth terminated for failure to reach program goals.	<u>No</u>
If yes, provide the number of language instruction educational programs <u>or</u> programs and activities for immigrant children and youth terminated.	
Comments:	

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

Note: New data collection for the SY 2006-07 CSPR.

1.6.5 Education Programs and Activities for Immigrant Students (formerly 5.1 of the Title III Biennial Collection)

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

1.6.5.1 Immigrant Students

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

Table 1.6.5.1 Definitions:

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

# Immigrant Students Enrolled	# Students in 3114(d)(1) Program	# of 3114(d)(1) Subgrants
100073	17796	16

If state reports zero (0) students in programs or zero (0) subgrants, explain in comment box below.

Comments:

Source – Initially, the first column of the table is pre-populated by ED*Facts* file N/X045 that contains data group 519, grand total. The second and third columns are manual entry by the SEA.

Note: This table was formerly in section 1.6.4 of the SY 2005-06 CSPR.

1.6.5.2 Distribution of Immigrant Funds (formerly 5.3 of the Title III Biennial Collection, reformatted)

In the table below, report how the State distributes the funds reserved for the education of immigrant children and youth to subgrantees.

Subgrant award cycle			
Annual	<u>Yes</u>	Multi-year	<u>No</u>
Type of subgrant awarded			
Competitive	<u>No</u>	Formula	<u>Yes</u>

If the State checked more than one item in each category, explain in the comment box.

Comments:

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

Note: New data collection for the SY 2006-07 CSPR.

1.6.6 Teacher Information and Professional Development

This section collects data on teachers in Title III language instruction education programs.

1.6.6.1 Teacher Information (formerly 7.1 of the Title III Biennial Collection, modified)

In the table below, report the number of teachers who are working in the Title III language instruction educational programs as defined in Section 3301(8) and reported in table 1.6.1 (Types of language instruction educational programs).

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

	#
Number of all certified/licensed teachers currently working in Title III language instruction educational programs.	24000
Number of certified/licensed/endorsed ESL/BE teachers in the state currently working with LEP students (e.g., ESL/BE teachers for ALL LEP students), if the State has such requirements. <u>Or</u> number of teachers with professional development points or course work in ESL/BE, if the State does not require such certification/licensure/endorsement.	24000
Estimate number of additional certified/licensed teachers that will be needed for Title III language instruction educational programs in the next 5 years*.	14000

Explain in the comment box below if there is a zero for any item in the table above.

Comments:

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

Note: New data collection for the SY 2006-07 CSPR.

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

1.6.6.2 Professional Development (PD) Activities of Subgrantees Related to the Teaching and Learning of LEP Students
(formerly 7.4 of the Title III Biennial Collection)

In the table below, provide the number of professional development activities that specifically address only the teaching of LEP students or are related to the learning of LEP students. These professional development activities must meet the requirements of the Title III subgrantee required activities.

Table 1.6.6.2 Definitions:

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

Type of Professional Development Activity	# Subgrantees	
Instructional strategies for LEP students		
Understanding and implementation of assessment of LEP students		
Understanding and implementation of ELP standards and academic content standards for LEP students		
Alignment of the curriculum in language instruction educational programs to ELP standards		
Subject matter knowledge for teachers		
Other (Explain in comment box)		
Participant Information	# Subgrantees	# Participants
PD provided to content classroom teachers		
PD provided to LEP classroom teachers		
PD provided to principals		
PD provided to administrators/other than principals		
PD provided to other school personnel/non-administrative		
PD provided to community-based organization personnel		
Total		
Comments: Data are not available. Implementing data collection for 2007-2008.		

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

Note: New data collection for the SY 2006-07 CSPR.

1.6.7 State Subgrant Activities

This section collects data on State grant activities.

1.6.7.1 State Subgrant Process

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

Table 1.6.7.1 Definitions:

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

Example: State received SY 2006-07 funds July 1, 2006, and then made these funds available to subgrantees on August 1, 2006, for SY 2006-07 programs. Then the "# of days/\$\$ Distribution" is 30 days.

Date State Received Allocation	Date Funds Available to Subgrantees	# of Days/\$\$ Distribution
07/11/07	07/01/07	60
Comments: Sixty days represent the average time interval between receipt by TEA of the LEA grantee's application and TEA issuing a NOGA to the LEA grantee. Planning amounts are made available to subgrantees in early spring and these amounts are based on projected USDE allocations. Maximum entitlements (adjusted funding) are made available to subgrantees in December.		

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

Note: New data collection for the SY 2006-07 CSPR.

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.

Currently, there are no steps to shorten the distribution of Title III Immigrant funds to subgrantees. The Immigrant program is part of an electronic NCLB Consolidated Grant Application through eGrants which includes ten NCLB programs (for 2006-2007â€™5,163 NCLB programs in 1,206 consolidated applications). These are processed in date-order of receipt through the NCLB Program Coordination Division and the Formula Funding Division.
--

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

Note: New data collection for the SY 2006-07 CSPR.

1.7 PERSISTENTLY DANGEROUS SCHOOLS

In the table below, provide the number of schools identified as persistently dangerous, as determined by the State, by the start of the school year. For further guidance on persistently dangerous schools, refer to section B "Identifying Persistently Dangerous Schools" in the Unsafe School Choice Option Non-Regulatory Guidance, available at:

<http://www.ed.gov/policy/elsec/guid/unsafeschoolchoice.pdf>.

Persistently Dangerous Schools	0
Comments:	

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

1.8 GRADUATION RATES AND DROPOUT RATES

This section collects graduation and dropout rates.

1.8.1 Graduation Rates

In the table below, provide the graduation rates calculated using the methodology that was approved as part of the State's accountability plan for the **previous school year** (SY 2005-06). Below the table are FAQs about the data collected in this table.

Student Group	Graduation Rate
All Students	80.4
American Indian or Alaska Native	83.9
Asian or Pacific Islander	92.0
Black, non-Hispanic	74.5
Hispanic	71.7
White, non-Hispanic	89.0
Children with disabilities (<i>IDEA</i>)	72.7
Limited English proficient	48.5
Economically disadvantaged	72.0
Migratory students	66.8
Male	78.0
Female	82.8

Comments: The decrease in the LEP graduation rate was consistent with state trends for other groups following the incorporation of the NCES dropout definition in the indicator calculation. This change resulted in more students being classified as dropouts. In addition, fewer students may have been classified as graduates because of an increase in the number of students leaving school without meeting the exit-level examination requirements.

The decrease in the migratory students graduation rate was consistent with state trends for other groups following the incorporation of the NCES dropout definition in the indicator calculation. This change resulted in more students being classified as dropouts. In addition, fewer students may have been classified as graduates because of an increase in the number of students leaving school without meeting the exit-level examination requirements.

Source – Initially, pre-populated by EDFacts file N/X041 that is data group 563, category sets A, B, C, D, E, and F. If necessary, it is updated through manual entry by the SEA into the online collection tool. If the SEA has additional racial/ethnic groups or combinations of racial/ethnic groups in its accountability plan under *NCLB*, the SEA will report the above data for those groups through the online CSPR collection tool.

FAQs on graduation rates:

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

1.8.2 Dropout Rates

In the table below, provide the dropout rates calculated using the annual event school dropout rate for students leaving a school in a single year determined in accordance with the National Center for Education Statistic's (NCES) Common Core of Data (CCD) for the **previous school year** (SY 2005-06). Below the table is an FAQ about the data collected in this table.

Student Group	Dropout Rate
All Students	3.7
American Indian or Alaska Native	2.9
Asian or Pacific Islander	1.4
Black, non-Hispanic	5.4
Hispanic	5.2
White, non-Hispanic	1.8
Children with disabilities (<i>IDEA</i>)	4.7
Limited English proficient	7.3
Economically disadvantaged	4.2
Migratory students	6.4
Male	4.0
Female	3.4

Comments: The American Indian/Alaska Native population in the state of Texas and in grades 9-12 in Texas public school is quite small. A difference of fewer than 10 students results in a significant change in rate data, including dropout rates.

The increase in the Black dropout rate was consistent with state trends for other groups following the incorporation of the NCES dropout definition in the indicator calculation. This change resulted in more students being classified as dropouts. In addition, the increase may be attributable, in part, to an increase in the number of students leaving school without meeting the exit-level examination requirements.

A change was made in data reporting and processing for this data year to use the NCES dropout definition for state reporting. Implementation of the new dropout definition resulted in a change in rate data.

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

FAQ on dropout rates:

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

1.9 EDUCATION FOR HOMELESS CHILDREN AND YOUTHS PROGRAM

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

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

	#	# LEAs Reporting Data
LEAs without subgrants	1120	0
LEAs with subgrants	122	122
Total	1242	122
<p>Comments: The numbers for 2006-2007 LEAs include total districts and charter schools along with the 20 Education Service Centers (ESCs). Although ESCs are LEAs they are not districts and do not enroll students. The five ESCs that were subgrantees did report data from their participating districts. Therefore all 122 participating LEAs did report data concerning the 117 LEAs that did enroll and serve students. In Texas in 2006-2007 a total of 122 LEAs participated in 45 McKinney-Vento subgrants. Out of the total of 122 participating LEAs 117 LEAs enrolled students.</p>		

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

Note: This table was formerly Section 1.9.1.2 of the SY 2005-06 CSPR.

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

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

1.9.1.1 Homeless Children And Youths

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

Age/Grade	# of Homeless Children/Youths Enrolled in Public School in LEAs <u>Without</u> Subgrants	# of Homeless Children/Youths Enrolled in Public School in LEAs <u>With</u> Subgrants
Age 3 through 5 (not Kindergarten)		2272
K		3025
1		3272
2		2897
3		2718
4		2448
5		2467
6		2462
7		2558
8		2332
9		3200
10		1648
11		1307
12		1290
Ungraded		0
Total		33896

Comments: For the 2006-2007 school year, there was no mechanism in place to collect information about homeless students in LEAs without subgrants. This situation is being addressed by the addition of a new table to the eGrant system. The new table will collect information about homeless students enrolled by grade level and primary nighttime residence from all districts in the state.

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

Note: This table was formerly section 1.9.1.3 of the SY 2005-06 CSPR.

1.9.1.2 Primary Nighttime Residence of Homeless Children and Youths

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

	# of Homeless Children/Youths - LEAs <u>Without</u> Subgrants	# of Homeless Children/Youths - LEAs <u>With</u> Subgrants
Shelters, transitional housing, awaiting foster care		6509
Doubled-up (e.g., living with another family)		16870
Unsheltered (e.g., cars, parks, campgrounds, temporary trailer, or abandoned buildings)		6205
Hotels/Motels		1933
Total		31517

Comments: 1) The changes to the instructions for this table came too late in the year to implement effectively. Consequently some of our participating LEAs included the Age 3-5 students in these totals and some did not. Twelve of the LEAs reporting data did not include Age 3-5 students; however the rest of the LEAs reporting data (105) did.

2.) Similarly because of the late notice to the changes for this table all of our subgrantees continued to include the category "Unknown" in their data collection throughout 2006-2007. However because there is now no place in the table to report that category separately we have simply combined the totals for "Unknown" with those of "Unsheltered". Forty LEAs reported students in the "Unknown" category for a total of 5353 homeless students reported as having a primary nighttime residence as "Unknown" in 2006-

2007.

3.) Finally some of our subgrantees have difficulty collecting and recording these data for a variety of reasons. We continue to work to improve the accuracy of this table.

There are two reasons why the Primary Residence totals don't match Total Enrolled:

1.) The changes to the instructions for the Primary Nighttime Residence table came too late in the year to be implemented effectively. In previous years, Age 3-5 students were excluded from this table. For the 2006-2007 report, for the first time ever, Age 3-5 students were to be included in the numbers for the Primary Nighttime Residence. The instructions for this change came late in the year after data had been collected and software changes had already been made. Some districts were able to include Age 3-5 students in the Primary Nighttime Residence table and some were not.

2.) Some of our MV subgrants had difficulty collecting Primary Nighttime Residence information for students they had identified as homeless. They had identified students as homeless but had not recorded Primary Nighttime Residence at the time of the initial identification. The absence of this information was not discovered until much later and there was no way to go back and retrieve this information that was not collected in the first place.

Because of these two factors, there are more students in the Total Enrolled table than the Primary Nighttime Residence table.

No Data for LEAs without subgrants

For the 2006-2007 school year, there was no mechanism in place to collect information about homeless students in LEAs without subgrants. This situation is being addressed by the addition of a new table to the eGrant system. The new table will collect information about homeless students enrolled by grade level and primary nighttime residence from all districts in the state.

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

Note: This table was formerly section 1.9.1.4 of the SY 2005-06 CSPR.

1.9.2 LEAs with McKinney-Vento Subgrants

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

1.9.2.1 Homeless Children and Youths Served by McKinney-Vento Subgrants

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

Age/Grade	# Homeless Children/Youths Served by Subgrants
Age 3 through 5 (not Kindergarten)	1812
K	2311
1	2390
2	2181
3	2144
4	1897
5	1931
6	1638
7	1453
8	1437
9	1892
10	1171
11	991
12	969
Ungraded	0
Total	24217
Comments:	

Source – Initially, pre-populated by EDFacts file N/X043 that is data group 560, category set A. If necessary, it is updated through manual entry by the SEA into the online collection tool.

1.9.2.2 Subpopulations of Homeless Students Served

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

	# Homeless Students Served
Unaccompanied youth	1177
Migratory children/youth	361
Children with disabilities (<i>IDEA</i>)	2239
Limit English proficient students	1748
Comments:	

Source – Initially, pre-populated by EDFacts file N/X043 that is data group 560, category sets B, C, D, and E. If necessary, it is updated through manual entry by the SEA into the online collection tool.

Note: This table was formerly Sections 1.9.2.3, 1.9.2.4, and 1.9.2.5 of the SY 2005-06 CSPR. For the SY 2006-07 CSPR, the data collection has been changed to show the total number of students served.

1.9.2.3 Educational Support Services Provided by Subgrantees

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

	# McKinney-Vento Subgrantees That Offer
1. Tutoring or other instructional support	41
2. Expedited evaluations	22
3. Staff professional development and awareness	40
4. Referrals for medical, dental, and other health services	36
5. Transportation	42
6. Early childhood programs	14
7. Assistance with participation in school programs	38
8. Before-, after-school, mentoring, summer programs	43
9. Obtaining or transferring records necessary for enrollment	30
10. Parent education related to rights and resources for children	37
11. Coordination between schools and agencies	38
12. Counseling	34
13. Addressing needs related to domestic violence	27
14. Clothing to meet a school requirement	38
15. School supplies	43
16. Referral to other programs and services	38
17. Emergency assistance related to school attendance	31
18. Other (optional)	5
19. Other (optional)	0
20. Other (optional)	0
Comments: 1.) There are a total of 45 Texas MV subgrantees.	
2.) The Other (optional) services included: mentoring (1) computers for use by homeless students (2) credit recovery (2) dual credit courses (1) college entrance fees (1) and assessments for students (1).	

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

Note: This table was formerly Section 1.9.2.6 of the SY 2005-06 CSPR.

1.9.2.4 Barriers To The Education Of Homeless Children And Youth

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

	# Subgrantees Reporting
1. Eligibility for homeless services	13
2. School Selection	12
3. Transportation	18
4. School records	11
5. Immunizations	14
6. Other medical records	14
7. Other Barriers	13
Comments: 1.) There are a total of 45 Texas MV subgrantees.	
2.) This information was collected before notice was disseminated about Immunizations and Other Medical Records being split into two separate data collections. Fourteen districts reported barriers related to "Immunizations and Other Medical Records" but the breakdown between the two separate data collections is unknown--we simply reported the original total in both of the new data collections.	
The "Other barriers" included: immigration issues staff insensitivity improper coding special transportation needs of pregnant and	

parenting teens free lunch eligibility and organizational barriers.

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

Note: This table was formerly Section 1.9.2.7 of the SY 2005-06 CSPR. Immunizations and Other Medical Records have been changed to two separate data collections for the SY 2006-07 CSPR.

1.9.2.5 Academic Progress of Homeless Students

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

1.9.2.5.1 Reading Assessment

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

Grade	# Homeless Children/Youths Served by McKinney-Vento Taking Reading Assessment Test	# Homeless Children/Youths Served by McKinney-Vento Who Scored At or Above Proficient
3	1379	1031
4	1208	871
5	1256	892
6	1035	770
7	853	583
8	801	547
High School	2139	1398
Comments:		

Source – Initially, pre-populated by EDFacts file N/X076, N/X077, or N/X078 that are data group 584, category set G. If necessary, it is updated through manual entry by the SEA into the online collection tool.

Note: This table was formerly part of section 1.9.2.9 of the SY 2005-06 CSPR. Grades 9 through 12 have been changed to High School for the SY 2006-07 CSPR.

1.9.2.5.2 Mathematics Assessment

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

Grade	# Homeless Children/Youths Served by McKinney-Vento Taking Mathematics Assessment Test	# Homeless Children/Youths Served by McKinney-Vento Who Scored At or Above Proficient
3	1300	842
4	1183	829
5	1154	752
6	1042	588
7	843	455
8	795	352
High School	2271	953
Comments:		

Source – Similar to 1.9.2.5.1 but the file specification is N/X075 that is data group 583, category set G.

Note: This table was formerly part of section 1.9.2.9 of the SY 2005-06 CSPR. Grades 9 through 12 have been changed to High School for the SY 2006-07 CSPR.

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, 2006 through August 31, 2007. This section also collects a report on the procedures used by States to produce true, accurate, and valid child counts.

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

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

FAQs on Child Count:

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

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

1.10.1 Category 1 Child Count

In the table below, enter the unduplicated statewide number by age/grade of **eligible** migrant children age 3 through 21 who, within 3 years of making a qualifying move, resided in your State for one or more days during the reporting period of September 1, 2006 through August 31, 2007. 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)	5651
K	3640
1	4122
2	4021
3	3924
4	3921
5	3948
6	3904
7	4021
8	3997
9	5575
10	4100
11	3481
12	4309
Ungraded	66
Out-of-school	1377
Total	60057

Comments: The child count for the 2006-2007 reporting period was higher for the CSPR submission than for the EDEN submission because the October deadline for data entry for the EDEN submission did not give sufficient time for the districts to identify and recruit migrant families who had made new moves during the summer and then encode information on NGS. Districts continued to identify, recruit and enroll migrant children for the 2006-2007 reporting period after the deadline for the EDEN submission.

Source – Initially, pre-populated by EDFacts file N/X121 that is data group 634, Subtotal 1. If necessary, it is updated through manual entry by the SEA into the online collection tool.

Note: New data collection for the SY 2006-07 CSPR.

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%.

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

Under the No Child Left Behind (NCLB) Act, the Texas MEP incorporated stricter standards for migrant student eligibility, eliminating some families that may have been determined to be eligible in past years. The Texas MEP, the 20 regional ESCs and the migrant funded LEAs continue to make a good faith effort to follow the non-regulatory guidance issued October 23, 2003 which calls for increased documentation related to intent, moves in which employment was sought but not obtained, Principal Means of Livelihood (PMOL) and short distance/short duration moves.. Since these new guidelines for eligibility were "officially" incorporated during the 2004-2005 school year, the Texas MEP continues to find fewer families eligible for the program, many times due to a lack of required documentation.

Additionally, the Texas MEP is waiting for OME to finalize guidance related to the beef and poultry processing industries. While awaiting the finalization of the guidance, the State MEP has drastically limited the recruitment of the children of workers in the beef and poultry industries. The numbers of these children not currently being recruited by the Texas MEP continue to negatively impact the Category 1 child count for the State.

Most importantly, during the 2006-2007 reporting period, recruiters continued to report fewer families migrating in response to national issues that have a negative impact on the state's migrant population, e.g., rising gasoline prices, immigration reform, lack of housing in receiving states, etc.

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

Note: New data collection for the SY 2006-07 CSPR.

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, 2006 through August 31, 2007. Count a child who moved from one age/grade level to another during the reporting period only once in the highest age/grade that he/she attained during the reporting period. Count a child who moved to different schools within the State and who was served in both traditional summer and year-round school intersession programs only once. The unduplicated statewide total count is calculated automatically.

Do not include:

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

Age/Grade	Summer/Intersession Count of Eligible Migrant Children Who Are Participants and Who Can Be Counted for Funding Purposes
Age 3 through 5 (not Kindergarten)	1244
K	900
1	999
2	997
3	998
4	1004
5	933
6	779
7	800
8	744
9	692
10	556
11	472
12	53
Ungraded	<N
Out-of-school	21
Total	

Comments: The child count for the 2006-2007 reporting period was higher for the CSPR submission than for the EDEN submission because the October deadline for data entry for the EDEN submission did not give sufficient time for the districts to identify and recruit migrant families who had made new moves during the summer and then encode information on NGS. Districts continued to identify, recruit and enroll migrant children for the 2006-2007 reporting period after the deadline for the EDEN submission.

Source – Initially, pre-populated by EDFacts file N/X122 that is data group 635, Subtotal 1. If necessary, it is updated through manual entry by the SEA into the online collection tool.

Note: New data collection for the SY 2006-07 CSPR.

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%.

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

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

1. For summer 2007, the Texas MEP again emphasized to its subgrantees the importance of serving migrant students in summer projects of sufficient intensity and duration as to positively impact migrant students' reading and mathematics performance;
2. Implementation of roll forward fiscal process for the districts;
3. Elimination of a separate summer migrant application process;
4. Lack of incentive in the funding formula for districts to operate a summer migrant education program; and
5. Fewer eligible migrant children.

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

Note: New data collection for the SY 2006-07 CSPR.

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 2006-2007 on the data compiled and generated by the New Generation System (NGS). The child counts for the 2005-2006 reporting period had also been generated by NGS.

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

Note: New data collection for the SY 2006-07 CSPR.

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 had participated in annual training conducted by the regional Education Service Center (ESC) could complete COEs. Information concerning the data contained on the Texas COE can be found in the Texas Manual for the Identification and Recruitment of Migrant Children (<http://www.tea.state.tx.us/nclb/migrant/IDRMan2007.html>).

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

Participation data such as summer enrollment and supplemental program information were also collected for data entry via campus-generated enrollment and withdrawal lists and/or on data collection forms contained in the NGS Implementation Guidelines for School Districts and Education Service Centers (http://www.tea.state.tx.us/nclb/migrant/documents/2007_docs/NGS-Guidelines.doc). 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, e.g., meetings, home visits, etc. Phone interviews were not allowed unless they were a follow-up to the initial face-to-face interview. Parents signed the COE in person at the time of the interview if their children might have been eligible for the program. After completing a COE Supplemental Documentation form on an eligible family, recruiters submitted completed COEs to designated MEP personnel at either the school district or ESC (or both) for eligibility reviews/determinations. Every COE was reviewed by a trained eligibility reviewer. Questionable COEs were forwarded to the ESC migrant personnel, who if necessary, forwarded them to the State MEP for a final eligibility determination. All procedures related to the completion and eligibility review of COEs were outlined in the Texas Manual for the Identification and Recruitment of Migrant Students.

After the COE was signed by a trained eligibility reviewer, the COE was used as a data entry tool to encode information that enrolled the student into NGS.

Recruiters completed COEs on a daily basis throughout the year and trained NGS Data Specialists enrolled students by encoding demographic and enrollment information into the system at the designated terminal site within 10 working days of parent signature on the COE, if there were no questions regarding eligibility.

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

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

NGS Data Specialists collected supplemental program information, as well as other educational and health information at the end of the regular and/or summer term or at the time of student withdrawal. The above timelines and guidelines for data collection and

entry, as well as the accompanying forms, were contained in the NGS Implementation Guidelines for School Districts and Education Service Centers.

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

Note: New data collection for the SY 2006-07 CSPR.

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.

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 a "R" (regular) or "P" (participant) flag is created in NGS. A history line with a "S" (summer) or "I" (intersession) flag is created for each summer enrollment for the Category 2 count. "R" refers to regular term school enrollment; "P" refers to "Participant or Residency Only," in the case of a student who is not enrolled in school; "S" refers to summer school enrollment; and "I" refers to a year- round school intersession enrollment.

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

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

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

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

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

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

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

Note: New data collection for the SY 2006-07 CSPR.

1.10.3.3 Methods Used To Count Children

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

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

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

Texas bases its Category 1 count on new documentation of residency in the 9/1/2006-8/31/2007 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 9/1/2006-8/31/2007. In addition, before enrollment into summer/intersession and/or regular term projects or encoding into NGS as residency-only students, recruiters interview families to verify birthdates and residency status. Local recruiters use the NGS Two Year Old Turning Three report to keep track of the two-year-olds so that upon turning three, families are visited by recruiters to verify residency and to enroll newly turned 3 year olds into early childhood programs such as Building Bridges, Migrant Even Start, and Migrant Head Start. A residency verification date for every child who turned 3 years old during the reporting period is then entered into NGS on the appropriate NGS history line so that the system will count only those three year olds who were actually in residence in the state on or after their third birthday.

The NGS query is programmed to count a student only once statewide in the Category 1 count. As explained above, for each new or updated COE for the Category 1 count, history lines with specific enrollment type flags are created on NGS. A combination of enrollment, withdrawal and residency verification dates must be entered for every student identified and recruited during the appropriate reporting period in order to be included in the Category 1 count.

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

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

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

Note: New data collection for the SY 2006-07 CSPR.

1.10.3.4 Quality Control Processes

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

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

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

All recruiters, eligibility reviewers, NGS Data Specialists and other migrant-funded staff throughout the state undergo extensive annual training on the ID&R procedures and on the COE to be used for the each reporting period. Training includes basic eligibility requirements through a comprehensive trainer-of-trainer model. All recruiters receive the same training every year. The state provides ongoing training throughout the year via the statewide listserv, the Weekly Recruiter. Recruiters can receive follow-up training by the ESC throughout the year if needed.

In addition to the annual training, the State MEP conducts approximately 3 TETN (interactive video) teleconferences yearly for all regional ESCs and migrant funded districts to answer questions regarding ID&R procedures. The State also operates a weekly MEP-specific listserv to answer questions regarding ID&R and migrant student data collection efforts. All interested individuals may sign up by choosing "Texas Migrant ID&R and NGS List" at the following site: <http://tea.state.tx.us/nclb/migrant/list.html>

The annual State Migrant Education Conference also serves to review ID&R and data collection procedures and to obtain feedback from the field. ID&R and NGS sessions revolve around the national child eligibility initiative, edit checks on NGS, eligibility reviews, the COE process and quality control procedures. During the state conference, an annual ID&R Academy is held to review interviewing techniques, proper COE procedures and practice completing COEs. An NGS Academy is held to review data collection procedures and answer any questions from the NGS Data Specialists.

All migrant families are re-interviewed each reporting period through the enrollment process which the Texas MEP annually implements to check on the eligibility and continued residence of migrant children. Recruiters recheck the eligibility of each family during regularly scheduled face-to-face interviews/home visits for verifying eligibility/residence. During the annual training for recruiters, the types of errors that caused defective eligibility determinations are reviewed with recruiters, prior to conducting these parent interviews, to ensure the recruiters properly identify ineligible families.

For each COE, a trained recruiter completes then submits the document to a trained eligibility reviewer who determines whether or not recruiters have properly completed the COE and supplied sufficient documentation. COEs not containing sufficient documentation are returned to recruiters to re-interview parents for needed documentation. Questionable COEs are forwarded to the ESC migrant staff for review, who in turn may submit the COE for review at the State level. These checks and balances, although working, have proven to be a challenge to the program statewide and numbers are down due to this increased effort at documentation.

During the 2006-2007 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 2006-2007 reporting period.

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

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

Finally, the statewide ID&R Focus Group meets approximately 3 times annually to review all ID&R procedures, eligibility validations and the business rules and edit checks built into NGS, such as comments related to temporary qualifying work, short distance and short duration moves, etc.

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

Note: New data collection for the SY 2006-07 CSPR.

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.

As reported above, during the 2006-2007 reporting period the State MEP in conjunction with the 20 regional ESCs conducted random re-interviews of 404 parents to validate eligibility determinations made in the 2006-2007 reporting period. In total, approximately 1,000 student records were required in the replacement pool to sufficiently produce 404 COE validations stratified by region for the audit. Of the 404 children in the sample, a total of 382 children were determined to be eligible.

Each ESC received a list from TEA of children for the 2006-207 reporting period selected for the eligibility validation process. The ESC migrant 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 (should be for either the 2005-06 or 2006-07 reporting period and should be the auditable copy), the ESC migrant contact select individuals, certified in ID&R. 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 at 512-305-9447 for the state's review and sign-off. The next step was to schedule ESC regional training for re-interviewers. Training for re-interviewers covered basic MEP eligibility guidelines from section 1 of the Texas Manual for the Identification and Recruitment of Migrant Students as well as proper procedures for conducting the re-interview and completing the eligibility validation form. The State MEP instructed ESCs to contact the State MEP staff at any time before, during or after re-interview training for questions or clarifications.

The ESCs conducted re-interviews during the months of April. Using the list provided by TEA, the re-interviewers worked with district MEP contacts to set up interview schedules with migrant families that had been selected. When calling to set up the interview with the family, the re-interviewer/recruiter used the following script (also provided in Spanish):

"The Texas Migrant Education Program is in the process of updating family information. We would like to schedule a time to come out to talk to you."

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

LEA personnel not associated with the initial eligibility determination were allowed to accompany the re-interviewer to introduce family or assist with translation. At no time were LEA personnel permitted to conduct the re-interview.

The re-interviewer was instructed to follow this script (also provided in Spanish):

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

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

If the information was different, he asked follow-up questions to address any discrepancies and record clarifications on the back of the Eligibility Validation Form. For example, he might have clarified the nature of the qualifying work or the to/from moves in order to verify that the subject did, indeed, seek and/or obtain the work described on the COE. Re-interviewers were instructed to correct must take care of the non-critical errors they found on the COE, dating and initialing the correction in the presence of the interviewee.

They then made a recommendation regarding eligibility In the Summary of Findings section on Eligibility Validation form. If "Warrants Further Review" was checked, the re-interviewer explained the discrepancies in detail. If more space was needed, the re-interviewer used the back of the Eligibility Validation Form. Finally, they informed the family that the family might be contacted again regarding the answers they provided.

Before forwarding the completed eligibility validation forms to TEA, the ESC migrant contact conducted a thorough review of all the paperwork. The ESC migrant 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. Through an appeal process, ineligible student documentation information was forwarded to affected LEAs allowing them an opportunity to supply documentation disputing the ineligibility determination.

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

Note: New data collection for the SY 2006-07 CSPR.

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

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

At the April and June 2007 NCLB Coordinated Meetings, all 20 regional ESCs were instructed to run NGS reports to verify residency, child count, and enrollments for all eligible migrant students in the independent districts and Shared Services Arrangements (SSAs) within their regions for the 2006-2007 reporting period. Additionally, the State's Performance Based Monitoring Assessment System uses different migrant-specific indicators each year to conduct desk audits of the MEP-funded districts. These reports were also run, reviewed and cross-checked by the State MEP staff.

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

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

Note: New data collection for the SY 2006-07 CSPR.

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

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

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

The LEA, ESC and SEA scrutinized all new COEs for the 2006-2007 reporting period, reviewing supplemental documentation related to qualifying work, intent and PMOL for all children newly identified as migrant in the 2006-2007 reporting period as well as all migrant children who moved within the state of Texas from one school district to another whether or not the move was qualifying.

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

Note: New data collection for the SY 2006-07 CSPR.

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.

Upon closer examination, it was determined that six of the ineligibility determinations could be traced back to language issues. Language problems hindered five eligibility determinations made by the Region 5 ESC and the LEAs within the region. The COEs in question documented the eligibility of Vietnamese families who did not speak English. At this point in time, a recruiter has been hired in the region who speaks Vietnamese. Language problems also affected one of Region 14 eligibility determinations, while the eligibility validation process in Region 3 was affected by migrant staff resignations. These issues have been addressed by the SEA and the ESC which should make for a smoother eligibility validation process for the 2007-2008 reporting period.

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

Note: New data collection for the SY 2006-07 CSPR.

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.

At this writing there are no concerns about the accuracy of the reported child counts or the underlying eligibility determinations on which the counts are based.

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

Note: New data collection for the SY 2006-07 CSPR.