

Initial Compliance Review Crosswalk 2009-2010

	Compliance Item					
	1	2	3 (Report Only)	4 (NEW)	5	6 (NEW)
Data Source	If zero percent (0%) of Title I, Part A funds were reserved or \$0 of Title II, Part A or Title V, Part A funds were expended for assisting teachers to become highly qualified, are 100% of the classes on Title I campuses highly qualified?	Do 100% of the Title I paraprofessionals meet the required qualifications?	Did the LEA conduct Title I, Part A activities/services as approved in the NCLB Consolidated Application for Federal Funding?	If the LEA has a facility serving neglected or delinquent children, did the LEA submit the N&D Survey of the October caseload on time?	Did the LEA reserve funds for homeless students attending non-Title I, Part A campuses as approved in the 2008-2009 NCLB Consolidated Application for Federal Funding?	Did the LEA coordinate and integrate Title I, Part A services with other educational services in the LEA or individual school, such as Head Start, Even Start, Reading First, Early Reading First, and other preschool programs, and services for children with limited English proficiency or with disabilities, migratory children, neglected or delinquent youth, Indian children served under Part A of Title VII, homeless children, and immigrant children in order to increase program effectiveness, to eliminate duplication, and to reduce fragmentation of the instructional program? [P.L. 107-110, Section 1112(b)(1)(E)]
2008-2009 SAS-NCLBAA09 (Consolidated Application for Federal Funding)	PS3101 – Title I, Part A <i>Part 1.c – Use of funds to meet Teacher Quality and Paraprofessional Qualifications</i>		PS3101 – Title I, Part A <i>Part 1.a – Activities Conducted with Reserved Funds Part 4 – Planned Activities for Title I, Part A Funds</i>		PS3101 - Title I, Part A <i>Part 1.a – Activities Conducted with Reserved Funds SC5000 – Campus Selection Part 3 - Campus List</i>	
2008-2009 SAS-NCLBAA09 (Consolidated Compliance Report)	PR3000 – Title II, Part A <i>Part 4 – Program Expenditures and Activities Participation</i> PR5000 – Title V, Part A <i>Part 4, Col. A – Funds Expended</i>		PR1000 – Title I, Part A <i>Part 2 – Estimated Expenditures from Title I, Part A Funds Reserved at LEA Level Part 3 – Schoolwide Campus Programs Part 4 – Targeted Assistance Campus Programs</i>		PR1000 – Title I, Part A <i>Part 6.3 – Services Provided</i>	PR1000 – Title I, Part A <i>Part 9 – Program Implementation</i>
Other	PR1100 - Highly Qualified Teacher Report <i>Part 3 - calculated Percentage of Highly Qualified teachers</i>	PR1100 - Highly Qualified Teacher Report <i>Part 7 - Paraprofessional Qualifications</i>		SC9000 - Survey of Children in Local Facilities for the Neglected and/or Delinquent TEA receipt date		
Requirements for “Met Standard”	100% of the teachers are highly qualified OR less than 100% of the teachers are highly qualified and a reserve greater than 0 in PS3101 or expended greater than \$0 in the PR3000 or PR5000.	100% of the paraprofessionals meet the required qualifications	LEA indicated expenditures or services for same activities in the PR1000 as approved on the PS3101.	TEA received the report on or before December 5, 2008.	Indicated reservation of funds for homeless students in the PS3101 and a <u>reserved amount</u> greater than \$0 in the PR1000 OR all campuses listed on the SC5000 are served under Title I, Part A as schoolwide or targeted assistance.	LEA indicated compliance with this indicator.

Initial Compliance Review Crosswalk 2009-2010

	Compliance Item					
	7 (NEW)	8 (NEW)	9 (NEW)	10 (NEW)	11 (NEW)	12 (NEW)
Data Source	Did each campus operating a Title I, Part A schoolwide program conduct a comprehensive needs assessment of the entire school? [P.L. 107-110, Section 1114(b)(1)]	For each Title I, Part A targeted assistance program, did the LEA identify students not older than age 21 who have the greatest need for special assistance and who are failing, or most at risk of failing, to meet the State's student academic achievement standards? [P.L. 107-110, Section 1115(b)]	Did the LEA have a written parent involvement policy that is developed jointly with, and agreed upon by, and distributed to parents of participating students? [P.L. 107-110, Section 1118(a)(2)]	Did the LEA conduct, with the involvement of parents, an annual evaluation of the content and effectiveness of the parental involvement policy toward improving the academic quality of Title I, Part A schools? [P.L. 107-110, Section 1118(a)(2)]	Did each Title I, Part A campus have a written parent involvement policy that is developed jointly with, and agreed upon by, and distributed to parents of participating students? [P.L. 107-110, Section 1118(b)]	Did each Title I, Part A campus convene an annual meeting to notify parents of their school's participation in the Title I program, to explain the program requirements, and to inform parents of their right to be involved? [P.L. 107-110, Section 1118(c)(1)]
2008-2009 SAS-NCLBAA09 (Consolidated Application for Federal Funding)						
2008-2009 SAS-NCLBAA09 (Consolidated Compliance Report)	PR1000 – Title I, Part A <i>Part 8 – Student Participation Part 9 – Program Implementation</i>	PR1000 – Title I, Part A <i>Part 8 – Student Participation Part 9 – Program Implementation</i>	PR1000 – Title I, Part A <i>Part 9 – Program Implementation</i>	PR1000 – Title I, Part A <i>Part 9 – Program Implementation</i>	PR1000 – Title I, Part A <i>Part 9 – Program Implementation</i>	PR1000 – Title I, Part A <i>Part 9 – Program Implementation</i>
Other						
Requirements for “Met Standard”	LEA indicated compliance with this indicator.	LEA indicated compliance with this indicator.	LEA indicated compliance with this indicator.	LEA indicated compliance with this indicator.	LEA indicated compliance with this indicator.	LEA indicated compliance with this indicator.

Initial Compliance Review Crosswalk 2009-2010

	Compliance Item					
	13 (NEW)	14 (NEW)	15 (NEW)	16 (NEW)	17 (NEW)	18 (NEW)
Data Source	Did the LEA have School-Parent compacts at each Title I, Part A campus that outline how the parents, the entire school staff, and the students share the responsibility for improved student achievement and the means by which the school and parents will build and develop a partnership to help children achieve the State's high standards? [P.L. 107-110, Section 1118(d)]	Did the LEA and its Title I, Part A campuses educate teachers, pupil services personnel, principals, and other staff members, with the assistance of parents, in the value and utility of the contributions of parents? [P.L. 107-110, Section 1118(e)(3)]	Did the LEA provide communications about the Title I, Part A program in a format and, to the extent practicable, in a language that parents can understand? [P.L. 107-110, Section 1111, §1118(e)(5) and (f)]	Did each Title I, Part A campus provide, to each individual parent, information on the parent's right to request information regarding the professional qualifications of his/her child's classroom teachers? [P.L. 107-110, Section 1111(h)(6)(A-B)]	Did each Title I, Part A campus provide, to each individual parent, information on the level of achievement of the parent's child in each of the required state academic assessments? [P.L. 107-110, Section 1111(h)(6)(A-B)]	Did each Title I, Part A campus provide timely notice, to each individual parent, if the child was assigned to or taught for four or more consecutive weeks by a teacher who was not highly qualified? [P.L. 107-110, Section 1111(h)(6)(A-B)]
2008-2009 SAS-NCLBAA09 (Consolidated Application for Federal Funding)						
2008-2009 SAS-NCLBAA09 (Consolidated Compliance Report)	PR1000 – Title I, Part A Part 9 – Program Implementation	PR1000 – Title I, Part A Part 9 – Program Implementation	PR1000 – Title I, Part A Part 9 – Program Implementation	PR1000 – Title I, Part A Part 9 – Program Implementation	PR1000 – Title I, Part A Part 9 – Program Implementation	PR1000 – Title I, Part A Part 9 – Program Implementation
Other						
Requirements for "Met Standard"	LEA indicated compliance with this indicator.	LEA indicated compliance with this indicator.	LEA indicated compliance with this indicator.	LEA indicated compliance with this indicator.	LEA indicated compliance with this indicator.	LEA indicated compliance with this indicator.

Initial Compliance Review Crosswalk 2009-2010

	Compliance Item					
	19 (NEW)	20 (NEW)	21 (NEW)	22 (NEW)	23 (NEW)	24 (NEW)
Data Source	Does the LEA have on file for each Title I, Part A campus a written attestation signed by the principal stating that the principal understands the requirements of Section 1119 and the current status of his/her campus with respect to meeting those requirements?	Was the LEA's consultation with participating private nonprofit school officials regarding the development and implementation of the Title I, Part A program timely and meaningful? Did it occur before the LEA made any decision that affected the opportunities of eligible private school children, teachers, and other educational personnel to participate in the program, and continue throughout the implementation and assessment of program activities? [P.L. 107-110, Sections 1120(a), 1120(b)(2)]	Did the LEA academically assess Title I, Part A services provided to participating private schools as agreed upon during consultation, and were these results used to improve services to private schools? [P.L. 107-110, Section 1120(b)(1)(D); 9501(c)(1)(D)]	Did the LEA establish and implement a policy requiring that the following students be offered and allowed to attend a safe public elementary or secondary school within the local educational agency, including a public charter school: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Any student attending a persistently dangerous public elementary school or secondary school (as determined by the Texas Education Agency), and • Any student who becomes a victim of a violent criminal offense, while in or on the grounds of a public elementary or secondary school that the student attends, is offered and allowed to attend a safe public elementary or secondary school within the local educational agency, including a public charter school? [P.L. 107-110, Section 9532] 	Did the LEA notify parents about the option to transfer to a safe public school: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • At least 14 calendar days prior to the start of school year for students enrolled in a persistently dangerous school, or • Within 14 calendar days of the incident for students who are victims of a violent criminal act? [P.L. 107-110, Section 9532] 	If the LEA consolidates administrative funds for NCLB programs, did the LEA ensure that no additional funds under those programs were used for administration during the fiscal year? [P.L. 107-110, Section 9203(c)]
2008-2009 SAS-NCLBAA09 <i>(Consolidated Application for Federal Funding)</i>						
2008-2009 SAS-NCLBAA09 <i>(Consolidated Compliance Report)</i>	PR1000 – Title I, Part A <i>Part 9 – Program Implementation</i>	PR1000 – Title I, Part A <i>Part 1 – Private Nonprofit School Participation Part 9 – Program Implementation</i>	PR1000 – Title I, Part A <i>Part 1 – Private Nonprofit School Participation Part 9 – Program Implementation</i>	PR6200 – School Choice Option (Title IX, Sec 9532) <i>Part 3 – Program Implementation</i>	PR6200 – School Choice Option (Title IX, Sec 9532) <i>Part 3 – Program Implementation</i>	PR6200 – School Choice Option (Title IX, Sec 9532) <i>Part 3 – Program Implementation</i>
Other						
Requirements for “Met Standard”	LEA indicated compliance with this indicator.	LEA indicated compliance with this indicator.	LEA indicated compliance with this indicator.	LEA indicated compliance with this indicator.	LEA indicated compliance with this indicator.	LEA indicated compliance with this indicator.

Initial Compliance Review Crosswalk 2009-2010

	Compliance Item					
	25	26	27	28	29	30
Data Source	Did the LEA notify parents of students on campuses identified in need of improvement of school choice and supplemental educational services if applicable?	Did the LEA review Migrant Priority for Services student reports at least 9 months out of the year?	Did the LEA that operated a Migrant-funded summer/intercession program encode summer/intercession enrollments in NGS?	Did the LEA ensure PEIMS identification numbers are reported on NGS for every enrolled Migrant student?	Did the LEA have Migrant ID&R and NGS staff trained annually by the regional ESC?	Did the LEA encode Graduation Plans for Migrant students in grades 9-12 in NGS?
2008-2009 SAS-NCLBAA09 <i>(Consolidated Application for Federal Funding)</i>						
2008-2009 SAS-NCLBAA09 <i>(Consolidated Compliance Report)</i>			PR1200 – Title I, Part C Part 3 – Mathematics Achievement = Success (MAS) Part 4 – Other Migrant Summer Program Data			
Other	2008-2009 SAS-NCLBAB09 SIP Application for Funding Parent Notification Letters	NGS Priority for Services Report	NGS Summer/Intercession Enrollments	NGS K-12 PEIMS ID numbers	ESCs Attendee Regional Lists on ID&R and NGS Training	NGS Student Graduation Plans
Requirements for “Met Standard”	All campus letters within the district were submitted with the SAS-NCLBAB09.	Accessed the reports in NGS at least 9 months out of the year from July 2008 to June 2009.	LEA indicated having a MEP funded summer/intercession program reported in Part 3 or Part 4 of the PR1200 and one or more summer/intercession enrollments encoded in NGS as of August 3, 2009 OR LEA did not indicate having a MEP funded summer/intercession program in Part 3 or Part 4 of the PR1200 and did not encode summer/intercession enrollments in NGS.	All migrant students with an “R” enrollment type have a PEIMS identification numbers in NGS as of August 3, 2009.	LEA is represented on both lists.	LEA encoded graduation plans for all eligible migrant students in grades 9-12 with an “R” enrollment type in NGS as of August 3, 2009.

Initial Compliance Review Crosswalk 2009-2010

	Compliance Item					
	31 (NEW)	32 (NEW)	33 (NEW)	34 (NEW)	35 (NEW)	36 (NEW)
Data Source	Did the LEA make adequate provision for serving the unmet educational needs of preschool migrant children? [P.L. 107-110, Section 1304 (b)(1) and (c)(4)]	Did the LEA give service priority to migrant children who are failing, or most at risk of failing, to meet the State's content and performance standards and whose education has been interrupted during the regular school year? [P.L. 107-110, Sections 1301(2), §1304(d)]	Did the LEA identify and address the special educational needs of migrant children through a comprehensive plan for needs assessment and service delivery? [P.L. 107-110, Section 1306(a)(1)(A)-(G)]	Did the LEA establish a parent advisory council (PAC) for the migrant program and provide for appropriate consultation in the planning, implementation and evaluation of the LEA's migrant program? [P.L. 107-110, Sections 1304(c)(3); 1306(a)(1)(B)(ii); and 1118]	Did the LEA evaluate and improve the effectiveness of the migrant program, where feasible, using the same approaches and standards that are used to assess the performance of students under Title I, Part A, specifically, to enable all migrant students to meet the same challenging State content and performance standards that all Texas children are expected to meet. [P.L. 107-110, Section 1304 (b)(1), (b)(2), and (c)(5)]	Was the LEA's consultation with participating private nonprofit school officials regarding the development and implementation of the Migrant program timely and meaningful? Did the consultation occur before the LEA made any decision that affected the opportunities of eligible private school children, teachers, and other educational personnel to participate in the program, and was the consultation continued throughout the implementation and assessment of program activities? [P.L. 107-110, Section 9501]
2008-2009 SAS-NCLBAA09 <i>(Consolidated Application for Federal Funding)</i>						
2008-2009 SAS-NCLBAA09 <i>(Consolidated Compliance Report)</i>	PR1200 – Title I, Part C <i>Part 7 – Program Implementation</i>	PR1200 – Title I, Part C <i>Part 7 – Program Implementation</i>	PR1200 – Title I, Part C <i>Part 7 – Program Implementation</i>	PR1200 – Title I, Part C <i>Part 7 – Program Implementation</i>	PR1200 – Title I, Part C <i>Part 7 – Program Implementation</i>	PR1200 – Title I, Part C <i>Part 1 – Private Nonprofit School Participation Part 7 – Program Implementation</i>
Other						
Requirements for "Met Standard"	LEA indicated compliance with this indicator.	LEA indicated compliance with this indicator.	LEA indicated compliance with this indicator.	LEA indicated compliance with this indicator.	LEA indicated compliance with this indicator.	LEA indicated compliance with this indicator.

Initial Compliance Review Crosswalk 2009-2010

	Compliance Item					
	37 (NEW)	38	39	40 (NEW)	41 *	42 * (Revised)
Data Source	Did the LEA academically assess Title I, Part C services provided to participating private schools as agreed upon during consultation, and were these results used to improve services to private schools. [P.L. 107-110, Section 9501(c)(1)(D)]	Did the LEA conduct Title I, Part D, Subpart 1 or Subpart 2 activities/services for either Mathematics, Reading, Science, Social Studies, and/or Career Orientation/Training as approved in the 2008-2009 NCLB Consolidated Application for Federal Funding?	Did the LEA conduct Title I, Part D, Subpart 1 or Subpart 2 transitional activities/services as approved in the 2008-2009 NCLB Consolidated Application for Federal Funding?	Title I, Part D, Subpart 2 data are collected, disaggregated, and evaluated to show the program's impact on the ability of participants to: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● maintain and improve educational achievement; ● accrue school credits that meet State requirements for grade promotion and secondary school graduation; ● make the transition to a regular program or other educational program operated by an LEA; ● complete secondary school (or secondary school equivalency requirements) and obtain employment after leaving the facility; and, ● as appropriate, to participate in postsecondary education and job training programs. [P.L. 107-110, Section 1431(a)] 	Did the LEA meet the state's target (100%) for the number of teachers participating in high quality professional development in 2008-2009?	Did the LEA implement the supplemental Title II, Part A activities as approved in the NCLB Consolidated Application for Federal Funding?
2008-2009 SAS-NCLBAA09 <i>(Consolidated Application for Federal Funding)</i>		PS3101 – Title I, Part D, Subpart 1 (TYC and Windham) Part 2 – Planned Expenditures PS3102 – Title I, Part D, Subpart 2 Part 2 – Planned Activities	PS3101 – Title I, Part D, Subpart 1 (TYC and Windham) Part 1 – Funding Requirements PS3102 – Title I, Part D, Subpart 2 Part 2 – Planned Activities			PS3104 – Title II, Part A Part 2 – Planned Expenditures
2008-2009 SAS-NCLBAA09 <i>(Consolidated Compliance Report)</i>	PR1200 – Title I, Part C Part 1 – Private Nonprofit School Participation Part 7 – Program Implementation	PR2000 – Title I, Part D Part 4 – Instructional Services	PR2000 – Title I, Part D Part 5 – Support Services Part 6 – Program Impact	PR2000 – Title I, Part D Part 11 – Program Implementation	PR3000 – Title II, Part A Part 1 – Funding Transferability Part 2 – Section 6211 - REAP PR1000 – Title I, Part A Part 5 – High Quality Professional Development	PR3000 – Title II, Part A Part 1 – Funding Transferability Part 2 – Section 6211 - REAP Part 4 – Program Expenditures and Activities Participation
Other					2008-2009 State Targets	
Requirements for “Met Standard”	LEA indicated compliance with this indicator.	LEA indicated Mathematics, Reading, Science, Social Studies and/or Career Orientation/Training in the PS3101/PS3102 and reported matching activities/strategies in the PR2000 <u>OR</u> LEA did not indicate Mathematics, Reading, Science, Social Studies and/or Career Orientation/Training in the PS3101/PS3102 and did not report these activities/strategies in the PR2000.	LEA indicated transitional services in the PS3101/PS3102 and reported transitional services in the PR2000 <u>OR</u> LEA did not indicate transitional services in the PS3101/PS3102 and did not report transitional services in the PR2000.	LEA indicated compliance with this indicator.	Percentage of teachers participating in high quality professional development in the PR1000 equals 100%.	

Initial Compliance Review Crosswalk 2009-2010

	Compliance Item					
	43 * (NEW)	44 * (NEW)	45 * (NEW)	46 (NEW)	47 *	48 * (NEW)
Data Source	Based on an assessment of local needs for professional development and hiring, the LEA targets Title II, Part A funds to schools within the LEA that: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • have the lowest proportion of highly qualified teachers • have the largest average class size, or • are identified for school improvement under Title I, Part A. [P.L. 107-110, Section 2122(b)(3) and (c)]	Did the LEA collaborate with teachers, paraprofessionals, principals, other relevant school personnel, and parents in planning Title II, Part A program activities and preparing the LEA application for funding? [P.L. 107-110, Section 2122(b)(7)]	Did the LEA coordinate professional development activities funded under Title II, Part A with professional development activities funded under other Federal, State, and local programs. [P.L. 107-110, Section 2122(b)(4)]	Was the LEA's consultation with participating private nonprofit school officials regarding the development and implementation of the Title II, Part A program timely and meaningful? Did the consultation occur before the LEA made any decision that affected the opportunities of eligible private school teachers, and other educational personnel to participate in the program, and did the consultation continue throughout the implementation and assessment of program activities? [P.L. 107-110, Section 9501]	Did the LEA expend less than the required 25% of Title II, Part D current year (maximum) entitlement for professional development without an approved waiver?	If the LEA used funding under Title II, Part D to train teachers to integrate technology into curricula and instruction to improve teaching, learning, and technology literacy, then did the LEA integrate funding under Title II, Part A for such professional development activities? [P.L. 107-110, Section 2122(b)(6)]
2008-2009 SAS-NCLBAA09 (Consolidated Application for Federal Funding)					<i>PS3105 – Part 2 – Planned Expenditures WV4002 - Title II, Part D Waiver</i>	
2008-2009 SAS-NCLBAA09 (Consolidated Compliance Report)	<i>PR3000 – Title II, Part A Part 1 – Funding Transferability Part 2 – Section 6211 - REAP Part 5 – Program Implementation</i>	<i>PR3000 – Title II, Part A Part 1 – Funding Transferability Part 2 – Section 6211 - REAP Part 5 – Program Implementation</i>	<i>PR3000 – Title II, Part A Part 1 – Funding Transferability Part 2 – Section 6211 - REAP Part 5 – Program Implementation</i>	<i>PR3000 – Title II, Part A Part 3 – Private Nonprofit School Participation Part 5 – Program Implementation</i>	<i>PR8000 – Title II, Part D Part 1 – Funding Transferability Part 2 – Section 6211 - REAP Part 4 – Funds Received and Expenditures for Professional Development (calculated percentage expended for professional development)</i>	<i>PR3000 – Title II, Part A Part 1 – Funding Transferability Part 2 – Section 6211 - REAP Part 5 – Program Implementation</i>
Other						
Requirements for “Met Standard”	LEA indicated compliance with this indicator.	LEA indicated compliance with this indicator.	LEA indicated compliance with this indicator.	LEA indicated compliance with this indicator.	LEA reported expending more than or equal to the statutory requirement of 25% in the PR8000 OR LEA has submitted an approved WV4002.	LEA indicated compliance with this indicator.

Initial Compliance Review Crosswalk 2009-2010

	Compliance Item					
	49 * (NEW)	50 (NEW)	51 (Report Only)	52 (Report Only)	53 (Report Only)	54 (NEW)
Data Source	Did the LEA coordinate activities under Title II, Part D with technology-related activities carried out with funds from other Federal, State, and local programs? [P.L. 107-110, Section 2414(b)(6)]	Was the LEA's consultation with participating private nonprofit school officials regarding the development and implementation of the Title II, Part D program timely and meaningful? Did the consultation occur before the LEA made any decision that affected the opportunities of eligible private school children, teachers, and other educational personnel to participate in the program, and did the consultation continue throughout the implementation and assessment of program activities? [P.L. 107-110, Section 9501]	Did the LEA implement the supplemental Title III, Part A (LEP) instructional activities as approved in the 2008-2009 NCLB Consolidated Application for Federal Funding?	Did the LEA implement the supplemental Title III, Part (LEP) professional development activities as approved in the 2008-2009 NCLB Consolidated Application for Federal Funding?	Did the LEA implement the supplemental Title III, Part A (Immigrant) activities as approved in the 2008-2009 NCLB Consolidated Application for Federal Funding?	Did the LEA determine the needs for instruction in languages other than English and ensure that all teachers in Title III language instructional programs for LEP children are fluent in both English and any other language used for instruction, including having written and oral communication skills? [P.L. 107-110, Section 3116(c)]
2008-2009 SAS-NCLBAA09 (Consolidated Application for Federal Funding)			PS3106 – Title III, Part A Part 4A – Supplemental Instructional Activities	PS3106 – Title III, Part A Part 4B – Supplemental, High Quality Professional Development	PS3106 – Title III, Part A Part 5 – Planned Use of Title III, Part A - Immigrant Funds	
2008-2009 SAS-NCLBAA09 (Consolidated Compliance Report)	PR8000 – Title II, Part D Part 1 – Funding Transferability Part 2 – Section 6211 - REAP Part 6 – Program Implementation	PR8000 – Title II, Part D Part 3 – Private Nonprofit School Participation Part 6 – Program Implementation	PR3002 – Title III, Part A Part 4 – Expenditures for Supplemental Instructional Activities Implemented	PR3002 – Title III, Part A Part 5 – Expenditures for Supplemental Professional Development Activities Implemented	PR3002 – Title III, Part A Part 6 – Supplemental Activities with Title III – Immigrant Funds	PR3002 – Title III, Part A Part 11 – Program Implementation
Other						
Requirements for “Met Standard”	LEA indicated compliance with this indicator.	LEA indicated compliance with this indicator.	The supplemental instructional activities indicated in the PS3106 match the supplemental instructional activities reported in the PR3002.	The supplemental professional development activities indicated in the PS3106 match the supplemental professional development activities reported in the PR3002.	The supplemental immigrant activities indicated in the PS3106 match the supplemental immigrant activities in the PR3002.	LEA indicated compliance with this indicator.

Initial Compliance Review Crosswalk 2009-2010

	Compliance Item					
	55 (NEW)	56 (NEW)	57 *	58 *	59 * (NEW)	60 (NEW)
Data Source	Did the LEA implement an effective means of outreach to parents of LEP/immigrant students to inform the parents of how they can be involved in the education of their children and be active participants in assisting their children to attain English proficiency, achieve at high levels in core academic subjects, and meet challenging State standards expected of all students? [P.L. 107-110, Section 3302(e)]	Was the LEA's consultation with participating private nonprofit school officials regarding the development and implementation of the Title III, Part A program timely and meaningful? Did the consultation occur before the LEA made any decision that affected the opportunities of eligible private school children, teachers, and other educational personnel to participate in the program, and did the consultation continue throughout the implementation and assessment of program activities? [P.L. 107-110, Section 9501]	Did the LEA conduct SDFSC activities as approved in the 2008-2009 NCLB Consolidated Application for Federal Funding?	Did the LEA include parents, students and community in the assessment, delivery and planning of the SDFSC program?	Does timely and meaningful consultation/collaboration with state and local government representatives, representatives of schools to be served (including private schools), teachers and other staff, parents, students, community-based organizations, and others with relevant and demonstrated expertise in drug and violence prevention activities (such as medical, mental health, and law enforcement professionals) occur on an ongoing basis regarding the design and development of the LEA's SDFSC program? [P.L. 107-110, Section 4114(c)]	Was the LEA's consultation with participating private nonprofit school officials regarding the development and implementation of the SDFSC program timely and meaningful? Did the consultation occur before the LEA made any decision that affected the opportunities of eligible private school children, teachers, and other educational personnel to participate in the program, and did the consultation continue throughout the implementation and assessment of program activities? [P.L. 107-110, Section 9501]
2008-2009 SAS-NCLBAA09 (Consolidated Application for Federal Funding)			PS3107 – Title IV, Part A <i>Part 4 – Planned Expenditures</i>			
2008-2009 SAS-NCLBAA09 (Consolidated Compliance Report)	PR3002 – Title III, Part A <i>Part 11 – Program Implementation</i>	PR3002 – Title III, Part A <i>Part 1 – Private Nonprofit School Participation (LEP) Part 2 – Private Nonprofit School Participation (Immigrant) Part 11 – Program Implementation</i>	PR4000 – Title IV, Part A <i>Part 1 – Funding Transferability Part 2 – Section 6211 - REAP Part 6 – Program Expenditures</i>	PR4000 – Title IV, Part A <i>Part 1 – Funding Transferability Part 2 – Section 6211 – REAP Part 8 - Program Effectiveness</i>	PR4000 – Title IV, Part A <i>Part 1 – Funding Transferability Part 2 – Section 6211 – REAP Part 9 – Program Implementation</i>	PR4000 – Title IV, Part A <i>Part 3 – Private Nonprofit School Participation Part 9 – Program Implementation</i>
Other						
Requirements for “Met Standard”	LEA indicated compliance with this indicator.	LEA indicated compliance with this indicator.	LEA indicated planned expenditures in the PS3107 and reported program expenditures greater than \$0 for the same activities in the PR4000.	LEA reported participation of parents, students, and community-based organizations in the PR4000.	LEA indicated compliance with this indicator.	LEA indicated compliance with this indicator.

Initial Compliance Review Crosswalk 2009-2010

	Compliance Item					
	61 * (NEW)	62 * (NEW)	63 * (NEW)	64 * (NEW)	65 *	66 * (NEW)
Data Source	<p>Has the LEA adopted and carried out a comprehensive drug and violence prevention program?</p> <p>Note: The comprehensive program is not required to be fully funded with SDFSC funds. Comprehensive is defined as program activities provided for each grade level and for staff. [P.L. 107-110, Section 4115(b)(1)]</p>	<p>Were the Title IV, SDFSC program activities based on an assessment of objective data regarding the incidence of violence and illegal drug use in the elementary schools and secondary schools and communities to be served, including an objective analysis (based on ongoing local assessment or evaluation activities) of the current conditions and consequences regarding violence and illegal drug use? [P.L. 107-110, Section 4115(a)(1)(A)]</p>	<p>Are the SDFSC programs, strategies, and activities implemented for youth evaluated periodically to assess progress toward reducing violence and illegal drug use? [P.L. 107-110, Section 4115(a)(2)]</p>	<p>Do all of the LEA's SDFSC programs and activities comply with the six Principles of Effectiveness? These Principles state that programs/activities are: 1) based on an assessment of objective data from local evaluation activities regarding the incidence of violence and illegal drug use and related issues; 2) based on an established set of performance measures aimed at ensuring that the schools and communities served have a safe, orderly, and drug-free learning environment; 3) based on scientifically based research that provides evidence that the program will reduce violence and illegal drug use; based on an analysis of the data reasonably available at the time of the prevalence of risk factors, including high or increasing rates of reported cases of child abuse and domestic violence; 4) protective factors, buffers, assets, or other variables in schools and communities; 5) developed and implemented with meaningful, ongoing consultation with parents; and evaluated periodically to assess their effectiveness in reducing violence and illegal drug use in the served schools with results being used to strengthen the program and made available to the public. [P.L. 107-110, Section 4115(a)(1)(A-E)]</p>	<p>Did the LEA conduct Title V, Part A activities/services which were approved in the 2008-2009 NCLB Consolidated Application for Federal Funding?</p>	<p>Were the Title V program activities based on credible locally identified needs? [P.L. 107-110, Section 5133(b)(1)]</p>
2008-2009 SAS-NCLBAA09 <i>(Consolidated Application for Federal Funding)</i>					PS3108 – Title V, Part A <i>(Part 2 – Planned Expenditures)</i>	
2008-2009 SAS-NCLBAA09 <i>(Consolidated Compliance Report)</i>	PR4000 – Title IV, Part A <i>Part 1 – Funding Transferability Part 2 – Section 6211 – REAP Part 9 – Program Implementation</i>	PR4000 – Title IV, Part A <i>Part 1 – Funding Transferability Part 2 – Section 6211 – REAP Part 9 – Program Implementation</i>	PR4000 – Title IV, Part A <i>Part 1 – Funding Transferability Part 2 – Section 6211 – REAP Part 9 – Program Implementation</i>	PR4000 – Title IV, Part A <i>Part 1 – Funding Transferability Part 2 – Section 6211 – REAP Part 9 – Program Implementation</i>	PR5000 – Title V, Part A <i>Part 1 – Funding Transferability Part 2 – Section 6211 – REAP Part 4 - Participation and Expenditures</i>	PR5000 – Title V, Part A <i>Part 1 – Funding Transferability Part 2 – Section 6211 – REAP Part 5 – Program Implementation</i>
Requirements for “Met Standard”	LEA indicated compliance with this indicator.	LEA indicated compliance with this indicator.	LEA indicated compliance with this indicator.	LEA indicated compliance with this indicator.	LEA reported fund expenditures and/or participation on innovative activities in the PR5000 and same activities approved in the PS3108.	LEA indicated compliance with this indicator.

Initial Compliance Review Crosswalk 2009-2010

	Compliance Item					
	67 * (NEW)	68 * (NEW)	69 (NEW)	70 *	71	72
Data Source	Did the LEA systematically consult with parents, teachers, administrators, and other appropriate school personnel (such as librarians, school counselors, and other pupil services personnel), in both public and participating private nonprofit schools, in designing, planning, and implementing the Title V program? [P.L. 107-110, Section 5133 (7)]	Are the LEA's Title V programs evaluated annually, and is the evaluation used to make decisions about appropriate program changes for the subsequent year? [P.L. 107-110, Section 5133 (8)]	Was the LEA's consultation with participating private nonprofit school officials regarding the development and implementation of the Title V, Part A program timely and meaningful? Did the consultation occur before the LEA made any decision that affected the opportunities of eligible private school children, teachers, and other educational personnel to participate in the program, and did the consultation continue throughout the implementation and assessment of program activities? [P.L. 107-110, Section 5142(a)(1)]	Did the LEA transfer the allowable percentage of applicable fund sources if implemented Funding Transferability and/or REAP flexibility?	Did the LEA report private nonprofit participation for applicable fund sources as approved in the 2008-2009 NCLB Consolidated Application for Federal Funding?	Did the district publicly report highly qualified teacher status by 12/15/2008?
2008-2009 SAS-NCLBAA09 <i>(Consolidated Application for Federal Funding)</i>				PS3109 – REAP/Funding Transferability <i>Part 1 – REAP Part 2 – Funding Transferability</i>	PS3101 and PS3103 <i>Part 5 – PNP Schools</i> PS3104 and PS3105 <i>Part 3 - PNP Schools</i> PS3106 <i>Parts 6 and 7 – PNP School</i> PS3107 <i>Part 5 – PNP Schools</i> PS3108 <i>Part 3 – PNP Schools</i>	
2008-2009 SAS-NCLBAA09 <i>(Consolidated Compliance Report)</i>	PR5000 – Title V, Part A <i>Part 1 – Funding Transferability Part 2 – Section 6211 – REAP Part 5 – Program Implementation</i>	PR5000 – Title V, Part A <i>Part 1 – Funding Transferability Part 2 – Section 6211 – REAP Part 5 – Program Implementation</i>	PR5000 – Title V, Part A <i>Part 3 – Private Nonprofit School Participation Part 5 – Program Implementation</i>	PR3000 – Title II, Part A <i>Part 1 – Funding Transferability Part 2 – Section 6211 – REAP</i> PR8000 – Title II, Part D <i>Part 1 – Funding Transferability Part 2 – Section 6211 – REAP</i> PR4000 – Title IV, Part A <i>Part 1 – Funding Transferability Part 2 – Section 6211 – REAP</i> PR5000 – Title V, Part A <i>Part 1 – Funding Transferability Part 2 – Section 6211 – REAP</i>	PR1000 – Title I, Part A <i>Part 1 – PNP Participation</i> PR1200 – Title I, Part C <i>Part 1 – PNP Participation</i> PR3000 – Title II, Part A <i>Part 3 – PNP Participation</i> PR8000 – Title II, Part D <i>Part 3 – PNP Participation</i> PR3002 – Title III, Part A <i>Parts 1 and 2 – PNP Participation</i> PR4000 – Title IV, Part A <i>Part 3 – PNP Participation</i> PR5000 – Title V, Part A <i>Part 3 – PNP Participation</i>	PR1000 – Title I, Part A <i>Part 9 – Program Implementation</i>
Requirements for “Met Standard”	LEA indicated compliance with this indicator.	LEA indicated compliance with this indicator.	LEA indicated compliance with this indicator.	For each fund source, the percentages in the PS3109 and the compliance report match OR the percentages in the PS3109 are greater than the percentages on the compliance report.	LEA reported PNP participation in the SAS-NCLBAA09 and reported participation in the compliance report OR LEA reported no PNP participation in the SAS-NCLBAA09 and reported no participation in the compliance report.	LEA indicated compliance with this indicator.

Initial Compliance Review Crosswalk 2009-2010

	Compliance Item					
	73	74	75	76	77	78
Data Source	Did the district ensure that the campus highly qualified teacher plan included strategies to ensure teachers, who are not highly qualified in all core academic subject areas taught, become highly qualified in a reasonable timeframe?	Were all campus highly qualified reports submitted by 11/5/2008 deadline?	Did the SIP campus principal attend the required SIP Introductory Meeting and campus staff attend the Texas School Improvement Conference provided by the School Improvement Resource Center?	Did the SIP campus disseminate a copy of the parent notification letter for school choice and SES, within 10 days from the date of the letter to the Texas Education Agency's School Improvement Unit?	Did the LEA indicate use of grant funds to carry out the requirements of section 1116 if the LEA has been eligible for Rural and Low Income Grant for 3 consecutive years and did not meet AYP as approved on the Rural and Low Income Program RLISAA09 Application?	If the LEA had fewer than 100% of its teachers meeting the Highly Qualified requirements, did the LEA submit the required highly qualified plans to TEA on time?
2008-2009 SAS-NCLBAA09 (Consolidated Application for Federal Funding)						
2008-2009 SAS-NCLBAA09 (Consolidated Compliance Report)	PR1000 – Title I, Part A Part 9 – Program Implementation					
Other		PR1100 - Highly Qualified Teacher Report Part 10 - Certification and Incorporation	School Improvement Resource Center (SIRC) sign-in sheets	TEA receipt date	2006-2007 to 2008-2009 LEA AYP List TEA website 2006-2007 SAS-650-07 Schedule #4C - Part 2 2007-2008 RLISAA08 Part 1 – Goals and Objectives to Be Achieved through Use of Grant Funds 2008-2009 RLISAA09 Part 1 – Goals and Objectives to Be Achieved through Use of Grant Funds	TEA receipt date
Requirements for “Met Standard”	LEA indicated compliance with this indicator.	LEA submitted all campus highly qualified reports on or before 11/5/2008.	LEA attended the SIP Introductory Meeting and campus staff attended the Texas School Improvement Conference as indicated in the SIRC sign-in sheets.	TEA received a copy of the notification letter within 10 days of the TEA designated date as specified in instructions.	The LEA did not meet AYP and indicated the use of grant funds to meet the requirements of section 1116 OR The LEA met AYP.	TEA received the report on or before 1/15/2009.

Initial Compliance Review Crosswalk 2009-2010

	Compliance Item					
	79	80 (NEW)	81 * (NEW)	82 (Report Only)	83 (NEW)	84 (Report Only)
Data Source	If the LEA was selected for random validation, did the LEA submit the requested highly qualified teacher data to TEA on time?	Did the charter school submit the Data Request for Federal Funding by the established deadline?	Did the LEA exceed the 3% limitation on administrative costs charged to the Title II, Part D program?	Did the LEA conduct Title I, Part C activities/services as approved in the NCLB Consolidated Application for Federal Funding?	Did the LEA conduct Rural and Low Income activities/services as approved in the Rural and Low Income School Program Application?	Did the LEA submit PNP affirmations for the number of participating PNP reported on the NCLB Consolidated Application for Federal Funding?
2008-2009 SAS-NCLBAA09 <i>(Consolidated Application for Federal Funding)</i>				PS3103 – Title I, Part C <i>Part 2 – Required Program Activities</i> <i>Part 4 – Planned Supplemental Activities</i>		PS3500 – Private Nonprofit School Participation <i>Part 2 – Consultation and Equitable Services</i>
2008-2009 SAS-NCLBAA09 <i>(Consolidated Compliance Report)</i>			PR8000 – Title II, Part D <i>Part 1 – Funding Transferability</i> <i>Part 2 – Section 6211 – REAP</i> <i>Part 4 – Funds Received and Expenditures for Professional Development and Administrative Costs</i>	PR1200 – Title I, Part C <i>Part 6 – Estimated Expenditures from Title I, Part C</i>		
Other	TEA receipt date	SC5010 – NCLB Data Request for Federal Funding <i>Part 5 – Report Submission Authorization</i>			2008-2009 - RLISAA09 Application <i>Part 2 – Program Activities Used to Achieve Goals</i> 2008-2009 - RLISAA09 Compliance Report <i>Part 3 – Program Activities Used to Achieve Goals</i>	2008-2009 - Affirmations of Consultation with Private Nonprofit School Officials
Requirements for “Met Standard”	TEA received the report on or before July 15, 2009.	TEA received the report on or before April 30, 2008.	LEA reported expending more than or equal to the statutory requirement of 3% in the PR8000.	LEA indicated expenditures or services for same activities in the PR1200 as approved in the PS3103.	LEA indicated expenditures or services for same activities in the RLIS compliance report that was approved on the RLIS application.	LEA submitted the same number of PNP Affirmations for the same programs as approved in the PS3500.

Initial Compliance Review Crosswalk 2009-2010

Data Source	Compliance Item					
	85 (Report Only)	86 (Report Only)	87 (Report Only)	88 (Report Only)	89 (Report Only)	90 (Report Only)
	Was the LEA reduced to the 15% roll forward statutory limitation for Title I, Part A?	Did the LEA roll forward greater than 25% in Title I, Part C?	Did the LEA roll forward greater than 25% in Title I, Part D?	Did the LEA roll forward greater than 25% in Title II, Part A?	Did the LEA roll forward greater than 25% in Title II, Part D?	Did the LEA roll forward greater than 25% in Title III, Part A?
2008-2009 SAS-NCLBAA09 <i>(Consolidated Application for Federal Funding)</i>	BS6001 – Program Budget Summary and Support Schedule <i>Part 1 – Available Funding</i>	BS6001 – Program Budget Summary and Support Schedule <i>Part 1 – Available Funding</i>	BS6001 – Program Budget Summary and Support Schedule <i>Part 1 – Available Funding</i>	BS6001 – Program Budget Summary and Support Schedule <i>Part 1 – Available Funding</i>	BS6001 – Program Budget Summary and Support Schedule <i>Part 1 – Available Funding</i>	BS6001 – Program Budget Summary and Support Schedule <i>Part 1 – Available Funding</i>
2008-2009 SAS-NCLBAA09 <i>(Consolidated Compliance Report)</i>						
Other	Formula Funding Calculated roll forward percentage	Formula Funding Calculated roll forward percentage	Formula Funding Calculated roll forward percentage	Formula Funding Calculated roll forward percentage	Formula Funding Calculated roll forward percentage	Formula Funding Calculated roll forward percentage
Requirements for “Met Standard”	The LEA roll forward was less than or equal to 15% <u>OR</u> The LEA was eligible and used a roll forward statutory waiver.	The LEA roll forward was less than or equal to 25%.	The LEA roll forward was less than or equal to 25%.	The LEA roll forward was less than or equal to 25%.	The LEA roll forward was less than or equal to 25%.	The LEA roll forward was less than or equal to 25%.

Initial Compliance Review Crosswalk 2009-2010

Data Source	Compliance Item			
	91 (Report Only)	92 (Report Only)	93 (Report Only)	94 (Report Only)
	Was the LEA reduced to the 25% roll forward statutory limitation for Title IV, Part A?	Did the LEA roll forward greater than 25% in Title V, Part A?	Did the LEA roll forward greater than 25% in Rural and Low Income Program?	Did the LEA roll forward greater than 25% in School Improvement Program?
2008-2009 SAS-NCLBAA09 <i>(Consolidated Application for Federal Funding)</i>	BS6001 – Program Budget Summary and Support Schedule <i>Part 1 – Available Funding</i>	BS6001 – Program Budget Summary and Support Schedule <i>Part 1 – Available Funding</i>	BS6004 – Program Budget Summary and Support Schedule <i>Part 1 – Available Funding</i>	BS6004 – Program Budget Summary and Support Schedule <i>Part 1 – Available Funding</i>
2008-2009 SAS-NCLBAA09 <i>(Consolidated Compliance Report)</i>				
Other	Formula Funding Calculated roll forward percentage	Formula Funding Calculated roll forward percentage	Formula Funding Calculated roll forward percentage	Formula Funding Calculated roll forward percentage
Requirements for “Met Standard”	The LEA roll forward was less than or equal to 25% <u>OR</u> The LEA was eligible and used a roll forward statutory waiver.	The LEA roll forward was less than or equal to 25%.	The LEA roll forward was less than or equal to 25%.	The LEA roll forward was less than or equal to 25%.