

**The Optional Extended-year Program:
Evaluation of Activities, FY 2004**

Project Staff

Andrew Moellmer

Sonia Castañeda

**Office for Planning, Grants, and Evaluation
Texas Education Agency
April 2005**

Texas Education Agency

Shirley Neeley, Commissioner of Education
Robert Scott, Chief Deputy Commissioner

Office of Planning, Grants, and Evaluation

Nora Ibáñez Hancock, Associate Commissioner

Office of Planning and Evaluation

Joseph Shields, Deputy Associate Commissioner

The Office for Planning, Grants & Evaluation wishes to thank all agency staff who contributed to this report, and all school districts and open-enrollment charter schools for the timely and accurate submission of their program progress reports to the agency.

Citation. Texas Education Agency. (2005). The Optional Extended-year Program: Evaluation of Activities, FY 2004. Austin, TX: Author.

Material in this publication is not copyrighted and may be reproduced. The Texas Education Agency would appreciate credit for the material used and a copy of the reprint.

Texas Assessment of Knowledge and Skills™ (TAKS™) is a registered trademark of the Texas Education Agency. Other product and company names mentioned in this report may be the trademarks of their respective owners.

Additional information about this report may be obtained by contacting the Texas Education Agency, Office of Planning, Grants, and Evaluation at (512) 463-8992 or by e-mail at opge@tea.state.tx.us.

This report is available at the Texas Education Agency's website at <http://www.tea.state.tx.us/opge/progeval/>.

Contents

List of Tables.....	iv
Executive Summary	v
I. Introduction	1
Background.....	1
Summary of Previous Findings on the Effectiveness of OEYP Programs.....	2
Organization of Report	3
II. Student Demographic Information	4
III. Profile of OEYP Programs	9
Student Participation.....	13
Student Grade Retention.....	15
Student TAKS Performance	17
IV. Common Problems Encountered and Grantee Solutions.....	20
Problems and Issues Encountered	20
Solutions to Common Problems and Issues.....	22
V. Concluding Observations.....	27
V. Appendix A: Data Collection Instrument	A-1
V. Appendix B: List of 2003-04 OEYP-Funded School Districts and Charter Schools	B-1

List of Tables

Table 1. Students Served through OEYP by Grade Level, 2003-04 School Year	5
Table 2. Total Number of OEYP Students Served, 1999-2004	5
Table 3. OEYP Student Demographic Information, 2003-04 School Year	6
Table 4. OEYP Student Ethnicity by Year, 2000-2004	7
Table 5. Selected OEYP Student Demographic Information by Year, 2000-2004.....	7
Table 6. Number of Students Served by OEYP Program Type, 2003-04 School Year	10
Table 7. OEYP Program Type by Year, 2000-2004	10
Table 8. OEYP Program Focus, 2003-04 School Year.....	11
Table 9. Percent of School Districts and Charter Schools Offering Various Professional Development Opportunities to OEYP Instructors and Staff, 2003-04 School Year	12
Table 10. Percent of OEYP School Districts and Charter Schools Offering Parental/Family Awareness Activities, 2003-04 School Year.....	13
Table 11. Average OEYP Instructional Days, Days Absent, and Days Present by Program Type, 2003-04 School Year.....	14
Table 12. Attendance Rates for Extended-Day, Extended-week, and Extended-year/Intercession Programs, 2000-2004 School Years.....	14
Table 13. Percent Retained Students by Grade, 2003-04 School Year	15
Table 14. OEYP Student Grade Retention, 1999-00 through 2003-04.....	16
Table 15. Percent of OEYP Students Retained by Percent OEYP Instructional Days Present, 2003-2004 School Year.....	17
Table 16. OEYP Student TAKS Passing Rates by Percent OEYP Instructional Days Present, 2002-2004 School Year.....	18
Table 17. Common Problems and Issues Encountered by OEYP School Districts and Charter Schools	21
Table 18. Common Solutions to Problems and Issues Encountered	23
Table 19. Sources of Alternate Funding Used to Support OEYP Programs, 2003-04 School Year	24
Table 20. Average Funds Expended by Funding Source, 2003-04 School Year	24

Executive Summary

The Optional Extended-Year Program (OEYP) provides additional support and instruction for students in Kindergarten through Grade 11 at-risk of not being promoted to the next grade level, and for students in Grade 12 who have been identified as unlikely to graduate before the next school year. This report examines OEYP projects for the 2003-04 school year, and presents information on student demographics, participation, and retention. It also describes problems that school districts and charter schools reported they encountered when implementing their programs and the solutions they found to address those problems.

Data provided by the school districts and charter schools indicate that the typical OEYP student in 2003-04 was enrolled in a public elementary school, Hispanic, and economically disadvantaged, suggesting that the school districts and charter schools were successful in reaching students most at-risk for not being promoted: The percentage of economically disadvantaged and ESL students in OEYP programs has increased over time, with the largest increases occurring between 2003 and 2004. The percentage of economically disadvantaged and ESL students increased by five percentage points and sixteen percentage points during this period, respectively.

In 2003, the Texas Legislature reduced funding for the OEYP program from an average of \$92 million appropriated in previous bienniums to approximately \$33 million for 2003-2004. Since then, there has been a shift in the types of OEYP programs implemented by grantees:

- Over two-thirds (69%) of 2003-04 OEYP programs were extended-year or intercession only programs, an increase of 11 percentage points since the previous school year.
- By contrast, in 2003-04 approximately 22% of OEYP programs were in an extended-day format, a decrease of seven percentage points since the previous school year.

- The most common program focuses were reading/language arts programs (99%), mathematics and/or science programs (98%), problem solving (92%), integration of technology (88%), and readiness for next grade (86%).
- The most common professional development opportunities were teaching strategies in content areas (88%), research-based practices (86%), and assessment strategies (85%).
- The most common parental/family awareness activities were conferences with parents (97%) and providing materials and meetings in the home language of parents (81%)

On average, 92% of students selected for participation in OEYP programs during the 2003-04 school year actually did so. The highest participation rates (93%) were in extended-year or intercession only programs, while the lowest participation rates were in extended-week programs (70%).

The purpose of the OEYP program is to help students most at-risk of not being promoted to the next grade level, or at-risk of not graduating on time. On average, 2003-04 OEYP student grade retention rates were higher than statewide averages by grade, and higher than grade retention rates in earlier years of the OEYP program, particularly for earlier grades.

- OEYP retention rates in Grade 1 (24%), Grade 2 (16%), and Grade 3 (11%) were each higher than statewide averages for the same grade, a difference of 18 percentage points, 12 percentage points, and 8 percentage points, respectively.
- Grade retention rates for students in Grade 1 through Grade 3 in 2003-04 were higher on average than retention rates for students participating in earlier years of the program. For example, in 2003-04, retention rates for these grade levels were 24%, 16%, and 11%, respectively. In 1999-00, retention rates for these grade levels were 18%, 12%, and 7%, respectively.

Unlike previous years of the OEYP program, which were funded at higher levels, no apparent statistical association was found between the number of instructional days attended and decreased grade retention rates. When considered alongside the substantially higher percentage of Grade 1-3 students retained in grade, this suggests that compared to earlier years, the 2003-04 OEYP program was less successful in achieving its primary goal— reducing student grade retention rates.

Similar to earlier years of the OEYP program, no statistical association was found between the number of instructional days attended and the percentage of students meeting Texas Assessment of Knowledge and Skills (TAKS) passing standards. This is consistent with expectations, indicating that 2003-04 grantees were successful in encouraging students with the most academic need to attend the greatest number of instructional days.

The school districts and charter schools reported that they encountered a number of problems and issues when implementing their grant programs, and reported a variety of solutions they found to address those problems:

- Not surprisingly, the most common problem – cited by 20% of the school districts and charter schools - was a lack of sufficient funds to support OEYP activities.
- Other common problems included: limited student attendance, lack of parent interest and involvement, student transportation issues, staff shortages, data quality and/or coding problems, and scheduling conflicts.
- To address funding shortages, the most common solution – cited by 13% of the school districts and charter schools - was to use funds from other sources.
- The most common alternate sources of funds were federal Title 1 funds, state compensatory education funds, local funds, and Accelerated Reading Initiative (ARI)/Accelerated Mathematics Initiative (AMI) funds.
- Federal Title 1 funds accounted for more than one-third (35%) of all 2003-04 program costs among all grantees. OEYP funds (23%) accounted for the second

highest percentage of program costs, followed by local funds (17%), state compensatory education funds (16%), and ARI/AMI funds (9%).

- Other common solutions to problems encountered by the school districts and charter schools included: varying instructional strategies/environments, increasing contact with parents, arranging transportation for students, changing program focuses and curricula, and revising scheduling.

School districts and charter schools reported frustration with the lack of funding and the lack of a concomitant reduction in the expected number of students served, as specified in program guidelines. School districts and charter schools that were unable to secure alternate sources of funding reported that they had to make significant changes to their OEYP programs, including eliminating some staff, reducing the grade levels served, eliminating professional development and student enrichment opportunities, reducing the number of days OEYP programs were in operation, and combining different grade levels into the same instructional groups. The various solutions that school districts and charter schools found to address the problems they encountered is important information to help future grantees, who will likely operate with similar funding constraints, achieve the important goal of providing instruction to students at-risk of not being promoted.

I. Introduction

Background

The Optional Extended-year Program (OEYP) is a district-level, formula-based grant program that was established by the 73rd Texas Legislature in 1993 and is authorized under Section 29.082 of the Texas Education Code. The program provides additional support and instruction for students in Kindergarten through Grade 11 at-risk of not being promoted to the next grade level, and for students in Grade 12 who have been identified as unlikely to graduate before the next school year.¹ School districts and charter schools that receive funds through this grant may extend the regular school day, the week, or the year to serve these students.

OEYP grants are awarded according to a formula-based allocation. School districts in which at least 35% of the students in Kindergarten through Grade 12 are classified as economically disadvantaged are eligible to receive funding through this program. Funding amounts are based on the amount necessary to provide extended-year instructional services to not more than 10% of the at-risk student population in Kindergarten through Grade 8.

The authorizing legislation specifies that school districts:

- 1) may not enroll more than 16 students in a class funded by the OEYP program;
- 2) must ensure that OEYP classes are taught by a teacher who has completed a professional development program that provides the training they need to help students in the program meet student performance standards;
- 3) must include a parent/family awareness component in the program;
- 4) must adopt a policy designed to lead to immediate reduction and ultimate elimination of student grade retention;
- 5) must provide transportation to each student who is required to attend OEYP activities and who is eligible for regular transportation services; and

¹ The OEYP program was originally established to serve first-grade students. The Texas Legislature expanded the program in 1995 to include students in Kindergarten through Grade 8 and in 2003 the program was expanded to include students in Kindergarten through Grade 12.

- 6) must incorporate effective instructional strategies into the design of the program to ensure students are provided with the skills needed to be successful in the following school year.

Grant funds may also be used to provide follow-up activities but only if the OEYP program is provided for no less than 30 instructional days and the activities are restricted to participants in the OEYP program. At a minimum, school districts must also provide services to the number of students identified on the entitlement notice used for funding. School districts that have fewer students participating than were identified when funding was determined will have their entitlement reduced on a per capita basis.

Summary of Previous Findings on the Effectiveness of OEYP Programs

Over the 2002 to 2004 period, the Texas Center for Educational Research (TCER) conducted a comprehensive evaluation of the OEYP program during the 1999-00 and 2002-03 school years for the Texas Education Agency (TEA).² The study, released in November 2004, also evaluated the effectiveness of two other state-level programs during this period with the goal of helping students at risk of failure to achieve academically: the Texas After School Initiative (TASI) and the Ninth Grade Success Initiative (NGSI).

TCER's evaluators found that between 1999 and 2003, OEYP had mixed results in achieving its primary goal – the reduction of student retention. Student retention rates increased across the four school years, especially for students in grades 1-3. Statistical tests of associations between OEYP funding levels and both student retention and achievement showed that there was no statistically significant relationship between OEYP dollars spent per pupil and improved student performance. On the other hand, the achievement gap between OEYP students and state averages in passing rates on state

² See Texas Center for Education Research, Texas Study of Students at Risk: Efficacy of Grants Supporting Academic Success from Elementary through High School, prepared for the Texas Education Agency, 2004. The report is available online at the following website: <http://www.tea.state.tx.us/opge/progeval/>.

assessments was narrowed for some OEYP students, particularly those in earlier years of the program (1999-00 and 2000-01 school years).

This evaluation report updates the TCER findings by examining student grade retention rates and OEYP program characteristics during the 2003-04 school year - the first year in which funds were provided to serve students in grades 9 through 12. For the 2003-04 school year, 598 Texas school districts received funding through the OEYP program. Approximately \$16.2 million was awarded, with a range of \$161 to \$1.1 million. On average, each district received \$29,986 for use during the grant period. This report describes the OEYP programs implemented during the 2003-04 school year and discusses the problems that school districts and charter schools encountered and solutions they found to address those problems.

Organization of Report

Following this introduction, the report is organized into several main sections. Section II provides demographic information on students participating in OEYP programs during the 2002-2004 school year. Section III profiles the OEYP programs, and describes program focuses, teacher training opportunities, parental/family awareness activities, student participation rates, and student grade retention rates. Section IV reports on problems and issues that school districts and charter schools encountered during the grant period and discusses the various solutions they found to address those problems. Lastly, Section V provides some concluding observations.

II. Student Demographic Information

The typical OEYP student in 2003-2004 was enrolled in a public elementary school, Hispanic, and economically disadvantaged. As shown in Table 1, more than half (60%) of the students participating in OEYP programs in 2003-04 were enrolled in Kindergarten through Grade 5. Approximately one-third (33%) of OEYP students were enrolled in middle school and the remainder (7%) was enrolled in high school. Nearly three-fourths (73%) of the students overall were enrolled in Grade 3 through Grade 8. These results differ from statewide results, where approximately 46%, 23%, and 28% of students, respectively, were enrolled in elementary school, middle school, and high school.

As shown in Table 2, there were substantially fewer students served by OEYP in 2003-04 as compared to earlier years of the grant program. The largest number of students was served during the 2002-03 school year, where 217,431 students participated in the program. One year later, there were nearly 44,000 fewer students served. It is likely that this reduction is related to reduction in OEYP funding passed by the Texas Legislature in the previous year.

Table 1
Students Served through OEYP by Grade Level,
2003-2004 School Year

Grade Level	Number of Students Served	Percent of Students Served	Statewide Student Enrollment
K	6,416	3.7%	7.5%
1	14,342	8.2%	7.9%
2	13,792	7.9%	7.6%
3	23,234	13.4%	7.5%
4	22,402	12.9%	7.5%
5	23,935	13.8%	7.5%
6	18,812	10.8%	7.6%
7	20,196	11.6%	7.6%
8	18,289	10.5%	7.5%
9	5,455	3.1%	8.7%
10	3,374	1.9%	7.2%
11	2,702	1.6%	6.2%
12	932	0.5%	5.6%
Total	173,881	100.0%	

Source: Texas Education Agency, Public Education Information System, 2003-04, and Academic Excellence Indicator System, 2003-04.

Note: Percentages were calculated from student PEIMS OEYP data. State grade level information was extracted from the AEIS state report.

Table 2. Total Number of OEYP Students Served, 1999-2004

School Year	Number of Students Served
1999-00	191,335
2000-01	187,550
2001-02	187,974
2002-03	217,471
2003-04	173,881

Source: Texas Education Agency, Public Education Information System, 2003-04, and Academic Excellence Indicator System, 2003-04.

Note: Percentages were calculated from student PEIMS OEYP data.

As Table 3 shows, approximately two-thirds (66%) of 2003-04 OEYP students were Hispanic, followed by African-Americans (19%) and Whites (14%). Only a very small percentage (1%) of students were Asian/Pacific Islanders or Native Americans. These results differ from the statewide distribution of students by ethnicity, where approximately 44%, 14%, and 39% of students, respectively, in the 2003-04 school year were Hispanic, African American, and White.

Most (85%) of the OEYP participants were identified as economically disadvantaged in 2003-04. Approximately 31% of the students were limited-English proficient (LEP) and 29% were enrolled in English as a Second Language (ESL) classes. Approximately 11% were special education students. By comparison, approximately 53% of students statewide were identified as economically disadvantaged, 15% were LEP, 14% were enrolled in ESL programs, and 12% were in special education programs.

Table 3
OEYP Student Demographic Information,
2003-2004 School Year

Grade Level	Number of Students Served	Percent of Students Served	Statewide Student Enrollment
African American	32,356	18.7%	14.3%
Hispanic	114,934	66.3%	43.8%
White	24,187	13.9%	38.7%
Asian/Pacific Islander	1,623	0.9%	2.9%
Native American	349	0.2%	0.3%
Total	173,449	100.0%	100.0%
Economically disadvantaged	147,996	85.3%	52.8%
Special education	19,447	11.2%	11.6%
Limited-English Proficient	53,155	30.7%	15.3%
ESL	50,035	28.9%	14.1%

Source: Texas Education Agency, Public Education Information System, 2003-04, and Academic Excellence Indicator System, 2003-04.

Note: Percentages were calculated from student PEIMS OEYP data. 432 students were missing ethnicity information.

As shown in Table 4, the percentage of Hispanic students in OEYP programs increased by approximately three percentage points between 2000 and 2004, while the percentage of White OEYP students decreased by the same amount. The percentage of other ethnic groups has remained relatively constant over this period. These trends reflect statewide demographic changes in Texas' student population.³

³ Statewide, the percentage of Hispanic students increased from 40% to 44% during this period, while the percentage of White students decreased from 43% to 39%. Statewide student demographic information for various years is available at the following website: <http://www.tea.state.tx.us/perfreport/aeis/>

Table 4
OEYP Student Ethnicity by Year, 2000-2004

Ethnicity	1999-00	2000-01	2001-02	2002-03	2003-04
Hispanic	63.8%	64.8%	63.5%	64.2%	66.3%
African American	17.9%	17.1%	18.0%	18.7%	18.7%
White	17.2%	17.0%	17.4%	15.8%	13.9%
Other	1.1%	1.1%	1.1%	1.2%	1.1%
Total	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	99.9%	100.0%

Source: Texas Education Agency, Public Education Information System, 2003-04, and Academic Excellence Indicator System, 2003-04.

Note: Percentages were calculated from student PEIMS OEYP data. Not all totals sum to 100% due to rounding. Data for 2000-2003 were obtained from the Texas Center for Education Research, Texas Study of Students at Risk: Efficacy of Grants Supporting Academic Success from Elementary through High School, prepared for the Texas Education Agency, 2004.

As Table 5 illustrates, between 2000 and 2004, the percentage of LEP students and special education students in OEYP programs remained relatively unchanged. These trends are similar to statewide trends for the same categories of students. The percentage of economically disadvantaged and ESL students increased over the same period. The largest increases in both categories occurred between 2003 and 2004, a difference of five percentage points and seventeen percentage points, respectively.

Table 5
Selected OEYP Student Demographic Information by Year, 2000-2004

Demographic Information	1999-00	2000-01	2001-02	2002-03	2003-04
Economically Disadvantaged	79.2%	79.0%	79.2%	80.2%	85.3%
ESL	12.1%	11.8%	11.4%	11.7%	28.9%
LEP	31.9%	30.8%	29.9%	29.5%	30.7%
Special Education	12.5%	11.8%	10.3%	9.2%	11.2%

Note: Percentages were calculated from student PEIMS OEYP data. Data for 2000-2003 were obtained from the Texas Center for Education Research, Texas Study of Students at Risk: Efficacy of Grants Supporting Academic Success from Elementary through High School, prepared for the Texas Education Agency, 2004.

These trends differ somewhat from statewide results.⁴ Between 2000 and 2003, the percentage of economically disadvantaged students statewide increased from 55% to 58%. By 2004, this percentage decreased to 53%. During the same period, the percentage of ESL students statewide remained relatively unchanged, with approximately 14% of all students in this category in both 2000 and 2004. The higher percentage of economically disadvantaged and ESL students in OEYP programs suggests that school districts and charter schools are reaching the students most likely to be at-risk of not being promoted, as specified in program guidelines.

⁴ Statewide percentages were obtained from Texas Education Agency, Academic Excellence Indicator System, annual report, various years.

III. Profile of OEYP Programs

State biennial funding for the OEYP program grew progressively between 1993 and 2001, with an average of \$92 million in funding appropriated by the Legislature for use during each biennium. In 2003 the Texas Legislature reduced the OEYP appropriation to \$33 million, a 72% reduction in available funding from the previous biennium when \$116 was appropriated for the program. There were no changes made to the rules governing the required number of students served to qualify for funding.

As shown in Table 6, over two-thirds (69%) of 2003-2004 OEYP programs were extended-year or intercession only. Another 22% were extended-day only programs. The high percentage of extended-year or intercession only programs differs from the distribution of program types in previous years. As Table 7 shows, between 2000 and 2003, a gradual trend was evident where OEYP school districts and charter schools implemented fewer extended-year or intercession programs from one year to the next and began implementing more extended-day programs. By 2003, this trend was halted. During the 2002-2003 school year, approximately 57% and 28% of OEYP activities were offered in extended-year/intercession or extended-day settings, respectively. By the 2003-2004 school year, approximately 69% and 22% of all OEYP programs were extended-year/intercession or extended-day, respectively. The higher percentage of extended-year/intercession programs could be associated with the reduction in the OEYP program's appropriation during the 78th Texas Legislature. This finding merits further research.

Table 6
Number of Students Served OEYP Program Type,
2003-2004 School Year

Program Type	Number of Students Served	Percent of All OEYP Students Served
Extended-day only	38,835	22.3%
Extended-week only	8,513	4.9%
Extended-year or intercession only	119,424	68.7%
Extended-day, week, & year or intercession	804	0.5%
Extended-day & extended-week	2,763	1.6%
Extended-day & extended. year or intercession	3,275	1.9%
Extended-week & extended. year or intercession	267	0.2%
Total	173,881	100.0%

Source: Texas Education Agency, Public Education Information System, 2003-04, and Academic Excellence Indicator System, 2003-04.

Note: Percentages were calculated from student PEIMS OEYP data.

Table 7
OEYP Program Type by Year, 2000-2004

Program Type	1999-00	2000-01	2001-02	2002-03	2003-04
Extended-day only	19.1%	22.8%	27.6%	28.2%	22.3%
Extended-week only	2.9%	4.1%	5.2%	6.0%	4.9%
Extended-year or intercession only	70.5%	64.6%	58.7%	57.3%	68.7%

Source: Texas Education Agency, Public Education Information System, 2003-04, and Academic Excellence Indicator System, 2003-04.

Note: Percentages were calculated from student PEIMS OEYP data.

Nearly all of the 2003-04 grantees emphasized reading/language arts programs (99%) and mathematics and/or science programs (98%) in their OEYP programs (Table 8). Most of the school districts and charter schools also emphasized problem solving (92%), integration of technology (88%), and readiness for next grade (86%). School districts and charter schools utilized accelerated mathematics instruction (55%) and accelerated reading instruction (59%) to serve their students to a far lesser extent than other types of mathematics and/or science or reading/language arts programs. The least common programs were mentoring (49%), and follow-up activities (49%). Given the overall purpose of the OEYP program to help students at-risk of not being promoted, it is not surprising that a relatively large percentage of the school districts and charter schools

implemented readiness for next grade activities. Given the growing presence of Hispanic students in OEYP programs, and the sudden large percentage increase of ESL students participating in OEYP activities, it is also not surprising that approximately two-thirds (66%) of districts focused on ESL activities.

Table 8
OEYP Program Focus, 2003-2004 School Year

Program Focus	Number of School Districts and Charter Schools	Percent of All School Districts and Charter Schools that Implemented the Activity
Reading/Language Arts Program(s)	580	98.6
Mathematics and/or Science Program(s)	574	97.6
Problem Solving	542	92.2
Integration of Technology	516	87.8
Readiness for Next Grade	507	86.2
Interdisciplinary Program	415	70.6
English as a Second Language	387	65.8
Parent Partnerships	381	64.8
Accelerated Reading Instruction	348	59.2
Accelerated Mathematics Instruction	326	55.4
Mentoring	290	49.3
Follow-Up Activities	287	48.8

Source: Optional Extended-year Program (OEYP), Final Evaluation Report, 2003-2004 School Year, Texas Education Agency.

Note: Results are based on final evaluation reports by 592 grantees. Grantees were allowed to report multiple program focuses; thus the cumulative number of grantees reflects duplicative counts.

Local education agencies (LEAs) receiving 2003-04 OEYP funding were required to provide professional development opportunities to school staff that would be involved in OEYP programs. As Table 9 shows, the most common training opportunities offered to school staff in 2003-2004 were teaching strategies in content areas (88%), research-based practices (86%), and assessment strategies (85%). Most school districts and charter schools also provided training in accelerated instruction (82%) and questioning strategies (82%). The least commonly utilized professional development opportunities were team teaching (58%) and mentoring (45%).

Table 9
Percent of School Districts and Charter Schools Offering Various Professional Development Opportunities to OEYP Instructors and Staff, 2003-04 School Year

Opportunity	Number of School Districts and Charter Schools	Percent of All School Districts and Charter Schools that Implemented the Activity
Teaching Strategies in Content Areas	518	88.1
Research-Based Practices	504	85.7
Assessment Strategies	498	84.7
Accelerated Instruction	482	82.0
Questioning Strategies	480	81.6
Integrating Technology	469	79.8
Learning Styles	446	75.9
Grouping Patterns	410	69.7
Interdisciplinary Instruction	388	66.0
Cultural and Linguistic Diversity	350	59.5
Team Teaching	339	57.7
Mentoring	262	44.6

Source: Optional Extended-year Program (OEYP), Final Evaluation Report, 2003-2004 School Year, Texas Education Agency.

Note: Results are based on final evaluation reports by 592 grantees. Grantees were allowed to report multiple opportunities; thus the cumulative number of grantees reflects duplicative counts.

LEAs receiving 2003-04 OEYP grant funding were also required to implement parental/family awareness activities when designing their grant programs. Parental awareness and support for the interventions provided to students through OEYP is thought to be critical for ensuring that eligible students actually attend program activities. As Table 10 shows, most of the school districts and charter schools offered conferences with parents (97%) and materials and meetings in the home language of parents (81%). The least common parent/family awareness activities were parent training in technology (27%) and child care for parents involved in parental activities (15%).

Table 10
Percent of OEYP School Districts and Charter Schools Offering Parental/Family Awareness Activities, 2003-04 School Year

Activity	Number of School Districts and Charter Schools	Percent of All School Districts and Charter Schools
Conferences with Parents	571	97.1
Materials and Meetings in Home Language of Parents	478	81.3
Parent Training in Study Skill Strategies and How to Assist with Homework Assignments	357	60.7
Parent Training on Reinforcing Reading Skills at Home	348	59.2
Survey of Parents	339	57.7
Parents as Partners in the Development of the Program	328	55.8
Parent Training on Making Math Manipulatives to Enhance Student Learning	195	33.2
Parents as Teacher Assistants in Classroom and Extension Activities	166	28.2
Parent Training in Technology	159	27.0
Child Care for Parents Involved in Parental Activities	88	15.0

Source: Optional Extended-year Program (OEYP), Final Evaluation Report, 2003-2004 School Year, Texas Education Agency.

Note: Results are based on final evaluation reports by 592 grantees. Grantees were allowed to report multiple activities; thus the cumulative number of grantees reflects duplicative counts.

Student Participation

On average, 96% of the students selected for participation in OEYP programs actually did so during the 2003-04 school year. This is one indicator of success for OEYP school districts and charter schools. Ensuring that eligible students actually participate in required OEYP activities is an important program goal.

This result varies by program type (Table 11). Extended-year or intercession only programs were attended by the highest percentage of students (93%), followed by extended-day and extended-year or intercession programs (92%) and extended-week and extended-year or intercession programs (91%). Extended-week only programs had the lowest student attendance rate (70%).

Table 11
Average OEYP Instructional Days, Days Absent, and Days Present by
Program Type, 2003-2004 School Year

Source: Texas Education Agency, Public Education Information System, 2003-04, and Academic

Program Type	Instructional Days	Days Present	Percent Days Present
Extended-day only	7.3	6.5	89.0%
Extended-week only	6.7	4.7	70.1%
Extended-year or intercession only	19.2	17.9	93.2%
Extended. day, week, & year or intercession	17.1	15.4	90.1%
Extended-day & extended-week	12.4	10.1	81.5%
Extended-day & ext. year or intercession	19.7	18.2	92.4%
Extended-week & ext. year or intercession	20.1	18.2	90.5%
Total	15.8	14.6	92.4%

Excellence Indicator System, 2003-04.

Note: Attendance rates were calculated from student PEIMS OEYP data.

Student OEYP attendance rates also vary over time. As Table 12 shows, average attendance in extended-year or intercession programs increased an average of approximately six percentage points between 2000 and 2004. Attendance in extended-week programs showed a similar, though less pronounced, trend to extended-day programs, increasing by approximately ten percentage points, with a slight decrease occurring between 2001 and 2002 and a gradual increase thereafter.

Table 12
Attendance Rates for Extended-Day, Extended-week, and Extended-
year/Intercession Programs, 2000-2004 School Years

Program Type	1999-00	2000-01	2001-02	2002-03	2003-04
Extended-day only	52.9%	80.0%	75.6%	75.7%	88.3%
Extended-week only	62.2%	69.9%	62.9%	66.2%	72.4%
Extended-year or intercession only	86.4%	87.9%	89.6%	89.8%	92.6%

Source: Texas Education Agency, Public Education Information System, 2003-04, and Academic Excellence Indicator System, 2003-04.

Note: Attendance rates were calculated from student PEIMS OEYP data.

Average student attendance in extended-day programs increased substantially between 2000 and 2004, from approximately 53% to 88%. This was not a consistently upward trend. There were large increases between 2000 and 2001, and between 2003 and 2004. But between 2001 and 2003 student attendance in extended-day programs declined

slightly, from 80% to approximately 76%. In 2004, this gradual decline was halted, resulting in a substantial increase in student attendance in extended-day programs. Interestingly, this increase occurred at the same time as the decline in the percentage of OEYP programs offered in an extended-day setting. Thus, although there was a smaller percentage of extended-day programs available by the 2003-04 school year, students in those programs were participating at a higher rate than was the case in prior years.

Student Grade Retention

On average, OEYP student grade retention rates were significantly higher in 2003-04 than statewide retention rates (Table 13). OEYP students in Grade 1 (24%), Grade 2 (16%), and Grade 3 (11%) had the highest retention rates overall. By comparison, statewide retention rates for these grades were 6%, 4%, and 3%, respectively. Grade 5 OEYP students had the lowest retention rate (3%), compared to approximately 1% of Grade 5 students statewide that were retained. These results are not surprising considering that the goal of the program is to provide services to students at risk of not being promoted to the next grade.

Table 13
Percent Retained Students by Grade,
2003-2004 School Year

Grade Level	Percent of OEYP Students Retained	Statewide Retention Rate
K	5.7%	2.9%
1	23.7%	5.9%
2	15.7%	3.5%
3	10.8%	2.9%
4	5.6%	1.6%
5	2.8%	0.9%
6	3.7%	1.4%
7	4.9%	2.3%
8	3.7%	1.7%

Source: Texas Education Agency, Public Education Information System, 2003-04, and Academic Excellence Indicator System, 2003-04.

Note: OEYP retention rates were calculated from student PEIMS OEYP data. State retention rates were extracted from the AEIS state report.

Table 14 depicts grade retention rates for OEYP students over time and indicates a trend where grade retention rates in earlier years of the program were generally lower than

retention rates in more recent years, particularly for students in grades 1-3. In 1999-2000, approximately 18%, 12%, and 7% of Grade 1, Grade 2, and Grade 3 students, respectively, were retained in grade. By 2002-03, grade retention rates in these grades had increased to approximately 25%, 17%, and 9%, respectively. In 2003-04, retention rates for students in Grade 1 and Grade 2 declined slightly, to 24% and 16%, respectively, while the Grade 3 retention rate remained approximately stable at 11%. Altogether, this evidence suggests that OEYP programs in past years may have been somewhat more effective in reducing retention rates among students in earlier grades.

These results could also be related to more stringent grade advancement requirements. The Student Success Initiative (SSI), created by SB 4 of the 76th Texas Legislature and expanded during the 77th and 78th Texas Legislatures, mandated that students advance to the next grade level only if they meet the passing standard of specified sections of the TAKS or if the student’s Grade Placement Committee determines unanimously that the student is likely to be successful at the next grade level with accelerated instruction. It could be that increased retention rates evident in later years of the OEYP program are related to these changes to academic standards.

Table 14
OEYP Student Grade Retention, 1999-00 through 2003-04

Grade Level	1999-00	2000-01	2001-02	2002-03	2003-04
Grade 1	18.3%	21.1%	25.5%	25.1%	23.7%
Grade 2	12.0%	16.4%	17.1%	16.9%	15.7%
Grade 3	7.1%	9.1%	8.8%	11.0%	10.8%
Grade 4	4.3%	4.9%	4.5%	5.0%	5.6%
Grade 5	2.8%	2.5%	2.7%	3.2%	2.8%
Grade 6	4.2%	3.9%	3.6%	4.6%	3.7%
Grade 7	4.9%	4.9%	4.6%	5.7%	4.9%
Grade 8	3.3%	3.2%	2.9%	3.7%	3.7%

Source: Texas Education Agency, Public Education Information System, 2003-04.

Note: Retention rates were calculated from student PEIMS OEYP data.

Table 15 shows the percentage of OEYP students who were retained in grade by the percentage of OEYP instructional days they attended during the 2003-04 school year. Students that attended less than half of OEYP instructional days had the highest retention

rate (16%) compared to students that attended a higher percentage of instructional days. Students that attended 90% or more of instructional days had the lowest retention rate overall (8%). A clear trend is evident where the percentage of students retained decreased as the percentage of instructional days in OEYP attended increased. This is consistent with the findings presented by TCER for student grade retention rates in earlier years of the OEYP program. TCER reported that an increase in the number of available OEYP instruction days attended was associated with reduced retention rates. This effect was the same for both extended-year/intercession participants and extended-day participants.

On the other hand, whereas TCER found that in earlier years of the program there was a strong statistical association between the number of instructional days attended and decreased chances of retention, for 2003-04 participants, a similarly strong statistical association is not evident. Although the data presented above show that there does appear to have been some association between instructional days attended and grade retention for 2003-04, as discussed above, the lack of a statistical relationship suggests that this finding should be interpreted cautiously.

Table 15
Percent of OEYP Students Retained by Percent OEYP Instructional Days Present, 2003-2004 School Year

0% to 49% of Days	50% to 74% of Days	75% to 89% of Days	90%-100% of Days
16.3%	13.2%	12.0%	7.6%

Source: Texas Education Agency, Public Education Information System, 2003-04.

Note: Retention rates were calculated from student PEIMS OEYP data.

Student TAKS Performance

TCER found that in earlier years of the OEYP program, students with the least academic need appeared to participate in OEYP for a smaller number of instructional days. In support of this conclusion, a trend was evident in which higher TAKS scores were associated with fewer instructional days attended. A similar trend is evident for 2003-04 participants.

As shown in Table 16, approximately 55% of students attending less than half of available instructional days met the TAKS passing standard in reading, with a decreasing percentage of students meeting the standard as the percentage of instructional days attended increases. Students attending 90% or more of available instructional days met the TAKS reading standard at the lowest rate (49%). The same trend is evident for the percentage of students meeting the TAKS mathematics standard and for the percentage of students receiving a commended performance rating on TAKS reading or mathematics tests. This suggests that students with the most academic need in 2003-2004 were required to attend a higher number of OEYP instructional days.

Table 16
OEYP Student TAKS Passing Rates by Percent OEYP Instructional Days Present, 2003-2004 School Year

Outcome	0% to 49% of Days	50% to 74% of Days	75% to 89% of Days	90%-100% of Days
TAKS Reading/ELA Met Standard	55.3%	53.8%	49.8%	48.8%
TAKS Reading/ELA Commended Performance	4.0%	3.4%	2.2%	2.4%
TAKS Mathematics Met Standard	47.9%	48.8%	41.6%	39.9%
TAKS Mathematics Commended Performance	3.4%	2.8%	2.1%	2.0%

Source: Texas Education Agency, Academic Excellence Indicator System (AEIS), 2003-04.

Note: TAKS passing rates were calculated from student AEIS data.

TCER found that there was no statistical relationship between the number of OEYP instructional days attended by students and student performance on state assessment tests. There is also no statistical relationship evident between these variables for 2003-2004 students.

TCER also reported that, for the 1999-00 and 2000-01 school years, extended-day participants had higher reading and math scores on state assessment tests than extended-year/intercession participants. These relationships were found to be highly statistically significant. A statistical association between OEYP program type and TAKS

performance was also found for the 2003-04 students. In that school year, a higher percentage of extended-day participants (62%) than extended-year/intercession participants (45%) met the TAKS reading standard, and a higher percentage of extended-day participants (59%) than extended-year/intercession participants (31%) met the TAKS mathematics standard. These differences are highly statistically significant.⁵

⁵ A T-test was conducted to determine the statistical significance of these results. Students were grouped into those participating in extended-day activities and those participating in extended-year/intercession activities. The average difference in the percentage of students who met TAKS passing standards was calculated for each group and compared. For TAKS reading performance, the t-value was 49.7. For TAKS mathematics performance, the t-value was 94.0. A t-value of approximately 2.0 or larger indicates statistical significance.

IV. Common Problems Encountered and Grantee Solutions

The school districts and charter schools were asked to describe common problems and issues encountered when implementing their OEYP programs and to discuss common solutions to the problem they encountered. Asking school districts and charter schools to describe their grant implementation experiences can provide invaluable information that future grantees can use to design effective programs at a time when program resources are limited.

Problems and Issues Encountered

As Table 17 shows, by far the most common problem identified by the school districts and charter schools was insufficient funding to support planned program activities. Approximately one in five (20%) identified this as the most significant challenge to successful program implementation. This result is not surprising given the reduction in the OEYP program's biennial appropriation in 2003. Many school districts and charter schools indicated that they were accustomed to a higher level of funding and reported difficulty in trying to provide the same level of service to the required number of students after funding levels were reduced.

Table 17
Common Problems and Issues Encountered by OEYP
School Districts and Charter Schools

Problem or Issue	Number of School Districts and Charter Schools	Percent of School Districts and Charter Schools
Limited Funding to Support Planned Program Activities	118	19.9%
Limited Student Attendance	18	3.0%
Lack of Parent Interest/Involvement	14	2.4%
Student Transportation to School Problems	13	2.2%
Staff Shortages	6	1.0%
Data Quality/Coding Problems	5	0.8%
Scheduling Conflicts	5	0.8%
Software Problems/Technical Issues	3	0.5%
Late NOGA	2	0.3%
Unexpected Student Enrollment	2	0.3%
Difficulty Meeting Multi-grade Students' Needs	2	0.3%
Inadequate Student Assessment Tool	2	0.3%
Limited Student Fluency/Comprehension	1	0.2%
Difficulty in Transition between OEYP Programs	1	0.2%

Source: Optional Extended-year Program (OEYP), Final Evaluation Report, 2003-2004 School Year, Texas Education Agency.

Note: Results are based on final evaluation reports by 592 grantees. Grantees were allowed to report multiple problems; thus the cumulative number of grantees reflects duplicative counts.

Other common problems mentioned by school districts and charter schools were limited student attendance, lack of parental interest or involvement, difficulties in finding sufficient transportation to get students to school for their OEYP activities, and technical issues such as data reporting and coding problems.

Many school districts and charter schools who responded to this question linked student attendance with parental awareness of and support for OEYP programs. School districts and charter schools reported such issues as parents' failure to respond to notes sent home, disconnected phones and conflicting work schedules. One district indicated that there was widespread resentment among parents over the fact that their students were required to attend summer school. Without parental support, getting the students to school for their activities became a problem for many school districts and charter schools, requiring schools to seek alternate means of transportation not originally planned for in the grant application. A related problem identified by five of the schools was conflicts between the times OEYP activities were offered to students and parents' work schedules. Even if

activities were offered on weekends or in the evenings, several school districts and charter schools indicated that some parents work more than one job making it difficult to contact them or encourage them to take an interest in OEYP programs. Parent work schedules were mentioned by several districts and charter schools as contributing to transportation problems and limited student attendance.

Other school districts and charter schools indicated that technical issues interfered with successful program implementation. The most common technical problem was data reporting and coding problems associated with decentralized data management processes. Five school districts and charter schools reported that they had difficulty collecting and interpreting data submitted by school staff due to non-standardized reporting requirements and the different types of forms used across schools to make reports. Several others indicated that data quality problems arose due to software glitches or network problems. School districts and charter schools attributed a lack of timely reporting to TEA to these technical problems.

Solutions to Common Problems and Issues

School districts and charter schools reported a variety of solutions designed to address the problems and issues they encountered (Table 18). Not surprisingly, to address the lack of sufficient funds, the highest percentage of school districts and charter schools reported that they needed to use a range of different grant funds and/or local money to pay for OEYP program costs. OEYP program guidelines allow school districts and charter schools to supplement their OEYP funding with funds from other sources and a substantial percentage of 2003-04 grantees indicated that they had availed themselves of this provision to address problems caused by cuts to their OEYP funding.

Many school districts and charter schools expressed frustration with reduced funding levels without a concomitant reduction in the expected number of OEYP students served as specified in program mandates, and many indicated that as a result of the funding cuts, and to prevent increases in student-teacher ratios beyond the ratio specified in program rules, they had to eliminate some services and professional development opportunities,

reduce the number of days OEYP programs were in operation, and reduce the number of grade levels served by the program. Most that were able to use alternate sources of funding did not report these problems.

Table 18
Common Solutions to Problems and Issues Encountered

Solution	Number of School Districts and Charter Schools	Percent of School Districts and Charter Schools
Supplemented with Other Funding Sources	74	12.5%
Varying Instructional Strategies/Environments	19	3.2%
Increased Contact with Parents	17	2.9%
Arranged Alternate Transportation for Students	13	2.2%
Changed Program Focus	11	1.9%
Revised Program Curriculum	5	0.8%
Revised Scheduling	5	0.8%
Used a Consolidated Reporting Form	4	0.7%
Offered Professional Development Opportunities	4	0.7%
Added Staff	3	0.5%
Reduced Staffing	2	0.3%

Source: Optional Extended-year Program (OEYP), Final Evaluation Report, 2003-2004 School Year, Texas Education Agency.

Note: Results are based on final evaluation reports by 592 grantees. Grantees were allowed to report multiple solutions; thus the cumulative number of grantees reflects duplicative counts.

Many school districts and charter schools described the sources of alternate funds they used to supplement reduced OEYP funding levels. As shown in Table 19, federal Title 1 funds were the most common source of alternate funding, followed by State Compensatory Education (SCE) funds, Accelerated Reading Initiative (ARI)/Accelerated Mathematics Initiative (AMI) funds, and local funds provided by school boards.⁶ School districts and charter schools also described their OEYP project costs by reporting the actual funds they expended by funding source. As Table 20 shows, federal, Title 1 program funds (35%) accounted for the highest percentage of OEYP program costs in 2003-04, followed by OEYP funds (23%), local funds (17%), SCE funds (16%), and ARI/AMI funds (9%).

⁶ Most grantees did not specify which federal Title 1 funds were used.

Table 19
Sources of Alternate Funding Used to Support OEYP Programs,
2003-2004 School Year

Funding Source	Number of School Districts and Charter Schools	Percent of All School Districts and Charter Schools
Federal, Title 1	18	3.0%
State Compensatory Education (SCE)	15	2.6%
Local Funds	12	2.0%
ARI/AMI	9	1.5%
Federal, Title II	1	0.2%
Federal, Title III	1	0.2%
State Bilingual Education	1	0.2%
High School Completion and Success	1	0.2%
21st Century Community Learning Centers (21st CCLC)	1	0.2%
Rural Education Achievement Program (REAP)	1	0.2%
Individuals with Disabilities Education Act (IDEA)	1	0.2%
Did Not Specify	13	2.2%

Source: Optional Extended-year Program (OEYP), Final Evaluation Report, 2003-2004 School Year, Texas Education Agency.

Note: Results are based on final evaluation reports by 592 grantees. Grantees were allowed to report multiple funding sources; thus the cumulative number of grantees reflects duplicative counts.

Table 20
Average Funds Expended by Funding Source, 2003-2004 School Year

Funding Source	Average Funds Expended	Percent of Total Project Costs
OEYP Formula-Based Allocation	\$23,747	23.4%
Local Funds	\$16,719	16.5%
State Compensatory Education Funds	\$15,970	15.8%
Federal, Title 1 Funds	\$35,733	35.3%
ARI/AMI Funds	\$9,183	9.1%
Total	\$101,352	100.1%

Source: Optional Extended-year Program (OEYP), Final Evaluation Report, 2003-2004 School Year, Texas Education Agency.

Note: Results are based on final evaluation reports by 592 grantees. Percentages do not sum to 100% due to rounding.

Funding constraints also led school districts and charter schools to change certain aspects of their OEYP programs. The second most common solution to problems encountered was varying instructional strategies and/or learning environments to keep student-teacher ratios low, cited by 19 of the school districts and charter schools. Some school districts

and charter schools reported that team teaching helped keep student-teacher ratios low. As indicated earlier, approximately 58% of all grantees provided training opportunities in team teaching to school staff. Some grantees reported that implementing team teaching as a strategy had the corollary effect of making it easier for teachers to participate in other staff development opportunities that may have conflicted with the times OEYP activities were offered. In many cases, these opportunities were created specifically to prepare teachers for the new environments necessitated by reduced funding levels. If team teaching was infeasible due to costs, a few school districts and charter schools reported that they provided teachers with a lower paid teaching aide to assist with classroom activities.

Another approach was to group students from different grades together and redesign classroom settings to reflect the age range of the students. Providing interdisciplinary instruction training to teachers involved in OEYP programs likely makes it easier for teachers to effectively manage multi-grade groupings of students. School districts and charter schools reported that multi-grade grouping had mixed results. Some reported that this strategy made it difficult to meet the diverse needs of students. Others reported that putting students from different grades into the same OEYP activities allowed the schools to spread their limited resources more efficiently and serve the appropriate number of students to fulfill grant requirements. Regardless, this approach was an important tool used by some to address funding shortages by redesigning their learning environments.

To increase student attendance and parental interest in OEYP activities, school districts and charter schools pursued several different strategies. One approach, cited by 17 school districts and charter schools, was to increase efforts to contact parents and schedule parent conferences. This included calling parents daily, sending notes home with students more frequently, or contacting parents and requiring them and their students to sign an attendance agreement form. Besides more frequent calling, some school districts and charter schools reported that school staff made personal visits to students' homes to increase parent awareness of OEYP activities, including the school principal in one case who visited the home of every student to inform students and

parents of the pitfalls and dangers of program non-completion. Another common strategy to increase student attendance, cited by thirteen school districts and charter schools, was to arrange for transportation for students, typically by creating additional bus routes. Five districts and charter schools revised school schedules for OEYP activities to accommodate parent schedules and make it easier for parents to bring their students to program activities.

Other school districts and charter schools changed their program focus or revised their program curricula to resolve problems they encountered. This approach was used by 16 school districts and charter schools. For example, one district reported that it consolidated resources and divided OEYP program into three phases: Phase I concentrated on students in danger of failing TAKS requirements; Phase II focused on students in danger of not being promoted to the next grade level; and Phase III served high school students working to recover failed credits during summer school. Several school districts and charter schools reported that they changed their program focus to provide more remedial and corrective instruction, in one case at the expense of student enrichment activities. Another district varied its summer curriculum by school type, as opposed to grade level, to focus on the academic subject areas most commonly found to be not mastered by students at the elementary and middle school levels. Previously, the district reported that a more extensive summer program had been offered.

To address data quality and coding problems, the school districts and charter schools that reported problems with this issue developed a consolidated reporting form to be used by all of the schools participating in the OEYP program. This enabled greater standardization of reporting requirements and resolved the data issues these districts had experienced.

V. Concluding Observations

The OEYP program was created to provide students most at risk of not being promoted to the next grade level with additional instruction and support in an extended-day, week, or year setting. In 2003, the Texas Legislature reduced funding for the program and school districts and charter schools receiving 2003-04 OEYP funding reported that a number of problems emerged due to fiscal constraints. This evaluation describes the solutions that school districts and charter schools found to address the problems they encountered, describes OEYP programs implemented during this period, and describes student demographics, participation rates, and retention rates. Note that OEYP program outcomes were well covered in the TCER study of OEYPs funded over the 1999-00 to 2002-03 period.

The majority of OEYP students in 2003-04 was Hispanic, economically disadvantaged, and enrolled in an elementary school. Approximately 31% of the OEYP participants were LEP and 29% of the students were enrolled in ESL programs, respectively. The percentage of economically disadvantaged and ESL students in OEYP programs has increased over time, suggesting that OEYP-funded school districts and charter schools are meeting an important requirement in program guidelines to serve those students most at risk of not being promoted to the next grade. It is likely that these trends are related to the growing percentage of Hispanic students in OEYP programs.

In 2003-04, more than two-thirds (69%) of the districts and charter schools implemented extended-year or intercession programs, a difference of approximately 12 percentage points since the previous school year. Slightly more than one in five (22%) of the 2003-04 grantees implemented extended-day programs, as compared to 28% in 2002-03. It is likely that these trends are related to the reduction in available program funding.

On average, 96% of the students required to participate in OEYP programs in 2003-04 actually did so. As expected, OEYP retention rates by grade were higher than statewide retention rates. The differences are most pronounced for lower grade levels.

Approximately 24%, 16%, and 11% of Grade 1 through 3 OEYP students were retained,

compared to 6%, 4%, and 3% of students in these grades statewide. These results are not surprising given the goal of the program is to provide services to students most at risk of not being promoted to the next grade.

Similar to results reported by TCER for earlier years of the program, the data suggest a relationship exists between increased instructional day attendance and the percentage of students that met TAKS passing standards. For example, approximately 55% of students attending less than half of available instructional days met the TAKS reading standard, compared to 49% of students that attended more than 90% of instructional days. The same trend was evident for TAKS mathematics standards. This is consistent with expectations since the program was designed to serve students with the greatest academic need. It is not surprising that students attending fewer program days met TAKS passing standards at a higher rate. This is an indicator that OEYP-funded school districts and charter schools were successfully serving the right students in 2003-04.

On the other hand, school districts and charter schools were less successful in achieving the most important goal of the OEYP program - to reduce student grade retention rates. The data indicate that OEYP interventions were more effective in earlier years of the program, especially for students in grades 1-3. As discussed in the TCER report, between 1999-00 and 2003-04, grade retention rates for these grade levels increased by 6%, 4%, and 4%, respectively. Retention rates for other grades remained essentially the same. Additionally, unlike previous years of the program, a strong statistical association between the number of instructional days and decreased retention rates was not evident for 2003-04. This indicates that 2003-04 OEYP programs were less successful in reducing student grade retention compared to earlier of the program.

School districts and charter schools reported that they encountered a number of problems including, but not limited to, significant funding constraints when implementing their grant programs. Districts and charter schools also reported such problems as limited student attendance, a lack of parent interest or involvement in OEYP activities, problems in providing transportation to students, staff shortages, data quality and coding problems,

and scheduling conflicts. Districts and charter schools linked many of these problems to funding shortages and limited staff, especially those related to having sufficient resources for increased parent contact, the requirement to provide transportation to all eligible students, and the inability to offer activities flexibly at different times to address scheduling conflicts.

The most common solution school districts and charter schools found to address the problems they encountered was to secure funding from other sources for their OEYP programs. This is not surprising since grantees were permitted to supplement OEYP funding with other funding sources. The most common source of alternate funding was federal Title 1 funds, accounting for approximately 35% of program costs among all school districts and charter schools. Four other funding sources accounted for the bulk of the remaining program costs: OEYP funds (23%), local funds (17%), state compensatory education funds (16%), and ARI/AMI funds (9%). If alternate funding sources were not available, grantees reported that they had to make significant changes to their OEYP programs, including eliminating some staff, reducing the grade levels served, eliminating professional development and student enrichment opportunities, and reducing the number of days OEYP programs were in operation.

Other solutions school districts and charter schools found included varying instructional strategies/environments, increased personal contact with parents – often teachers and/or the school principal would make home visits themselves, increasing district-provided transportation for students, changing program focuses and curricula, and revising scheduling to accommodate parents' work schedules. Interestingly, a substantial number of grantees reported that they adopted multi-grade grouping and implemented interdisciplinary instruction and team teaching. These were the most common measures that grantees adopted to keep student-teacher ratios low, a key requirement as specified in program guidelines.

The solutions reported by school districts and charter schools were adopted to address the interrelated, key issues of fiscal constraints, problems with student attendance, and

limited interest among parents in OEYP activities. This is invaluable information provided by the 2003-04 grantees that can be used by future grantees when implementing their OEYP programs, all of whom will likely be faced with similar fiscal constraints and other problems when designing and implementing their programs.

Appendix A:
Data Collection Instrument

**For informational purposes ONLY.
Report available in eGrants July 15, 2004.**

**Optional Extended Year Program
(OEYP)
Final Evaluation Report**

**Project Period
9/1/2003 through 8/31/2004**



**Texas Education Agency
William B. Travis Building
1701 North Congress Avenue
Austin, Texas 78701-1494**

**Program Contact: George Rislov, Managing Director
Division of Curriculum
eMail: curric@tea.state.tx.us
Phone: (512) 463-9581**

**Funding Contact: Rebecca Patterson, Grant Manager, OEYP
Division of Formula Funding
eMail: formulafunds@tea.state.tx.us
Phone: (512) 463-8525**

**Closing Date--5:00 P.M., Central Time
Thursday, September 30, 2004**

OEYPER04



Organization:
ESC Region: Vendor ID:

County-District:
School Year:

2003-2004 Optional Extended Year Program

Program Progress and Evaluation

ER3000 - Final Program Evaluation Report

Instructions

Amendment #	Version #

Part 1: Grantee Information

Help

Organization Information

Organization Name

Mailing Address Line-1	Mailing Address Line-2	City	State	Zip Code
				-

Primary Contact

First Name	Initial	Last Name	Title	
Telephone	Fax		E-Mail	
Mailing Address Line-1	Mailing Address Line-2	City	State	Zip Code
				-

Secondary Contact

First Name	Initial	Last Name	Title	
Telephone	Fax		E-Mail	
Mailing Address Line-1	Mailing Address Line-2	City	State	Zip Code
				-

Part 2: Authorized Official Certification and Evaluation Submission

Help

Certification and Incorporation Statement

I hereby certify that the information contained in this evaluation report is, to the best of my knowledge, correct and that the organization named above has authorized me as its representative to report on grant-funded activities. I certify that the program activities are being or have been conducted in accordance with all applicable federal and state laws and regulations; application guidelines and instructions; provisions, assurances, and certification requirements; and grant application submitted.

First Name	Initial	Last Name	Title	
Telephone	Fax	E-Mail	Approval ID	Submit Date and Time

Only the legally responsible party may submit this evaluation report.

Certify and Submit

FORMULA



Organization:

County-District:

ESC Region:

Vendor ID:

School Year:

2003-2004 Optional Extended Year Program

Program Progress and Evaluation

ER3000 - Final Program Evaluation Report

Instructions

Part 3. Program Configuration and Costs

Help

Program Design <i>(Estimated percent costs expended by program type)</i>		% Total Project Costs
1.	Extended Day	
2.	Extended Week (Saturdays)	
3.	Extended Year (Summer or Intersessions)	

Total		Total Project Configuration:
--------------	--	-------------------------------------

Project Costs <i>(Actual funds expended by funding source)</i>		Total Expenditures
1.	OEYP Formula-Based Allocation	
2.	Local Funds	
3.	State Compensatory Education Funds	
4.	Federal, Title I Program Funds	
5.	Accelerated Reading Instruction/Accelerated Math Instruction (ARI/AMI) Funds	
6.	Other (Please Specify)	
7.	Other (Please Specify)	
8.	Other (Please Specify)	
9.	Other (Please Specify)	

Total		Total Project Costs:
--------------	--	-----------------------------

*For Informational purposes ONLY. 2004.
Report available in eGrants July 15, 2004.*

FORMULA



Organization:

County-District:

ESC Region:

Vendor ID:

School Year:

2003-2004 Optional Extended Year Program

Program Progress and Evaluation

ER3000 - Final Program Evaluation Report

Instructions

Part 4: Program Focus

Help

#	Strategies	Not Used At All		Used Moderately		Used Extensively	
		1	2	3	4	5	
1.	Reading/Language Arts Program(s)	<input type="radio"/>					
2.	Mathematics and/or Science Program(s)	<input type="radio"/>					
3.	Interdisciplinary Program	<input type="radio"/>					
4.	Integration of Technology	<input type="radio"/>					
5.	Problem Solving	<input type="radio"/>					
6.	ESL (English as a Second Language)	<input type="radio"/>					
7.	Mentoring	<input type="radio"/>					
8.	Parent Partnerships	<input type="radio"/>					
9.	Accelerated Reading Instruction (ARI) Program	<input type="radio"/>					
10.	Accelerated Math Instruction (AMI) Program	<input type="radio"/>					
11.	Readiness for Next Grade	<input type="radio"/>					
12.	Follow-Up Activities	<input type="radio"/>					
13.	Other (Please Specify)	<input type="radio"/>					
14.	Other (Please Specify)	<input type="radio"/>					
15.	Other (Please Specify)	<input type="radio"/>					

For informational purposes ONLY. Report available in eGrants July 15, 2004.

FORMULA



Organization:
ESC Region: Vendor ID:

County-District:
School Year:

2003-2004 Optional Extended Year Program

Program Progress and Evaluation

ER3000 - Final Program Evaluation Report

Instructions

Part 5: Professional Development

Help

#	Activities	Not Used At All		Used Moderately		Used Extensively
		1	2	3	4	5
1.	Team Teaching	<input type="radio"/>				
2.	Mentoring	<input type="radio"/>				
3.	Cultural and Linguistic Diversity	<input type="radio"/>				
4.	Learning Styles	<input type="radio"/>				
5.	Grouping Patterns	<input type="radio"/>				
6.	Assessment Strategies	<input type="radio"/>				
7.	Accelerated Instruction	<input type="radio"/>				
8.	Interdisciplinary Instruction	<input type="radio"/>				
9.	Questioning Strategies	<input type="radio"/>				
10.	Integrating Technologies	<input type="radio"/>				
11.	Teaching Strategies in Content Areas	<input type="radio"/>				
12.	Research-Based Practices	<input type="radio"/>				
13.	Other (Please Specify)		<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
14.	Other (Please Specify)		<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
15.	Other (Please Specify)		<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

For informational purposes ONLY. Report available in eGrants July 15, 2004.

FORMULA



Organization:
ESC Region: **Vendor ID:**

County-District:
School Year:

2003-2004 Optional Extended Year Program

Program Progress and Evaluation

ER3000 - Final Program Evaluation Report

Instructions

Part 6: Parental/Family Awareness

Help

#	Activities	Not Used At All		Used Moderately		Used Extensively
		1	2	3	4	5
1.	Survey of Parents	<input type="radio"/>				
2.	Conferences with Parents	<input type="radio"/>				
3.	Child Care for Parents Involved in Parental Activities	<input type="radio"/>				
4.	Materials and Meetings in Home Language of Parents	<input type="radio"/>				
5.	Parents as Partners in the Development of the Program	<input type="radio"/>				
6.	Parents as Teacher Assistants in Classroom and Extension Activities	<input type="radio"/>				
7.	Parent Training on Reinforcing Reading Skills at Home	<input type="radio"/>				
8.	Parent Training on Making Math Manipulatives to Enhance Student Learning	<input type="radio"/>				
9.	Parent Training in Technology	<input type="radio"/>				
10.	Parent Training in Study Skill Strategies and How to Assist with Homework Assignments	<input type="radio"/>				
11.	Other (Please Specify)		<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
12.	Other (Please Specify)		<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
13.	Other (Please Specify)		<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
14.	Other (Please Specify)		<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
15.	Other (Please Specify)		<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

For informational purposes only. Report available in eGrants July 15, 2004.



Organization:

County-District:

ESC Region:

Vendor ID:

School Year:

2003-2004 Optional Extended Year Program

Program Progress and Evaluation

ER3000 - Final Program Evaluation Report

Instructions

Part 7: Project Implementation Issues and Solutions

Help

Problems/Issues Encountered:

(Max 3,500 Characters)

Resolution of Problems/Issues:

(Max 3,500 Characters)

For informational purposes ONLY.
Report available in eGrants July 15, 2004.

Check this box if no problems or issues were encountered during the implementation of your project.

Appendix B:
List of 2003-04 OEYP-Funded School Districts and Charter Schools

Grantee	Total Award Amount
A W BROWN-FELLOWSHIP CHARTER SCHOOL	\$2,356
ABERNATHY ISD	\$3,074
ABILENE ISD	59,066
ACADAMY OF ACCELERATED LEARNING, INC	\$447
AGUA DULCE ISD	\$1,426
ALBA-GOLDEN ISD	\$3,789
ALBANY ISD	\$1,925
ALDINE ISD	\$357,771
ALICE ISD	\$26,074
ALIEF ISD	\$341,765
ALPINE ISD	\$3,728
ALTO ISD	\$3,955
ALVARADO ISD	\$18,386
ALVIN ISD	\$45,063
AMARILLO ISD	\$158,875
AMERICAN YOUTH WORKS CHAR SCH	\$3,075
AMHERST ISD	\$855
AMIGOS POR VIDA-FRIENDS FOR LIFE C S	\$3,075
ANAHUAC ISD	\$6,572
ANDERSON-SHIRO CONS ISD	\$1,876
ANDREWS ISD	\$7,250
ANGLETON ISD	\$30,333
ANSON ISD	\$2,789
ANTHONY	\$3,943
ARANSAS CO ISD	\$15,634
ARANSAS PASS ISD	\$9,088
ARLINGTON ISD	\$346,513
ARP ISD	\$4,997
ATHENS ISD	\$17,853
ATLANTA ISD	\$6,571
AUSTIN ISD	\$421,710
AVALON ISD	\$1,227
AVERY ISD	\$1,215
BALLINGER ISD	\$3,256
BALMORHEA ISD	\$1,091
BANDERA ISD	\$12,165
BANGS ISD	\$3,897
BARTLETT ISD	\$2,021
BASTROP ISD	\$32,850
BAY CITY ISD	\$20,991
BEATRICE MAYES INSTITUTE CHARTER SCHOOL	\$2,344

Grantee	Total Award Amount
BEAUMONT ISD	\$104,110
BECKVILLE ISD	\$1,525
BEEVILLE ISD	\$19,242
BELTON ISD	\$31,047
BEN BOLT-PALITO BLANCO ISD	\$2,752
BIG SANDY ISD	\$2,604
BIG SPRING ISD	\$18,573
BISHOP CONS ISD	\$5,555
BLACKWELL CONS ISD	448
BLOOMING GROVE ISD	\$2,239
BLOOMINGTON ISD	\$6,274
BOLES ISD	\$1,114
BONHAM ISD	\$6,403
BOOKER ISD	\$2,244
BORGER ISD	\$8,909
BOVINA ISD	\$3,162
BOWIE ISD	\$5,701
BOYS RANCH ISD	\$3,248
BRACKETT ISD	\$2,567
BRAZOS ISD	\$2,832
BRAZOS RIVER CHAR SCHOOL	\$831
BRAZOSPORT ISD	\$47,896
BRECKENRIDGE ISD	\$6,318
BREMOND ISD	\$642
BRENHAM ISD	\$22,731
BRONTE ISD	\$3,311
BROOKS CO ISD	\$8,753
BROWNFIELD ISD	\$11,741
BROWNSBORO ISD	\$11,257
BROWNSVILLE ISD	\$348,311
BROWNWOOD ISD	\$18,027
BRUCEVILLE-EDDY ISD	\$7,481
BRYAN ISD	\$79,351
BUCKHOLTS ISD	\$955
BUFFALO ISD	\$3,401
BURNET CONS ISD	\$7,480
CALDWELL ISD	\$6,342
CALHOUN CO ISD	\$16,837
CAMERON ISD	\$7,216
CANADIAN ISD	\$2,021
CANUTILLO ISD	\$37,356
CAREER PLUS LEARNING ACAD	\$434
CARLISLE ISD	\$3,248
CARRIZO SPRINGS CONS ISD	\$11,444

Grantee	Total Award Amount
CARROLLTON-FARMERS BRANCH ISD	\$118,728
CARTHAGE ISD	\$13,980
CASTLEBERRY ISD	\$16,688
CENTER ISD	\$13,626
CENTER POINT ISD	\$1,984
CENTRAL HEIGHTS ISD	\$3,111
CENTRAL ISD	\$5,810
CHANNELVIEW ISD	\$43,465
CHAPEL HILL ISD	\$13,688
CHARLOTTE ISD	\$2,554
CHESTER ISD	\$1,114
CHILDREN OF THE SUN CHAR SCH	\$868
CHILDRESS ISD	\$2,893
CHILTON ISD	\$2,220
CHIRENO ISD	\$768
CISCO ISD	\$2,293
CLARENDON ISD	\$2,182
CLARKSVILLE ISD	\$3,707
CLEBURNE ISD	\$30,296
CLEVELAND ISD	\$17,816
CLIFTON ISD	\$4,575
CLINT ISD	\$68,811
CLYDE CONS ISD	\$5,398
COAHOMA ISD	\$2,082
COLDSPRING-OAKHURST CONS ISD	\$8,444
COLMESNEIL ISD	\$1,561
COLORADO ISD	\$6,968
COLUMBIA-BRAZORIA ISD	\$11,450
COLUMBUS ISD	\$4,043
COMANCHE ISD	\$5,344
COMMERCE ISD	\$8,332
COMO-PICKTON CISD	\$2,941
CONNALLY ISD	\$11,468
COOLIDGE ISD	\$632
COOPER ISD	\$2,506
COPPERAS COVE ISD	\$34,049
CORPUS CHRISTI ISD	\$223,843
CORRIGAN-CAMDEN ISD	\$5,542
CORSICANA ISD	\$18,238
COTTON CENTER ISD	\$595
COTULLA ISD	\$7,563
COVINGTON ISD	\$980
CRANE ISD	\$4,382
CROCKETT CO CONS CSD	\$2,939

Grantee	Total Award Amount
CROCKETT ISD	\$9,733
CROSBYTON ISD	\$3,211
CROSS PLAINS ISD	\$1,658
CROWELL ISD	\$1,128
CRYSTAL CITY ISD	11,866
CUERO ISD	\$9,841
CULBERSON CO-ALLAMOORE ISD	\$2,604
CUMBY ISD	\$1,537
DALHART ISD	\$6,707
DALLAS ISD	\$1,073,263
DAWSON ISD	\$1,649
DAYTON ISD	18,943
DE LEON ISD	\$2,579
DEKALB ISD	\$2,927
DEL VALLE ISD	\$40,456
DELL CITY ISD	\$1,153
DENISON ISD	\$13,423
DENTON ISD	\$59,043
DENVER CITY ISD	\$6,386
DETROIT ISD	\$1,477
DEVINE ISD	\$6,657
DIBOLL ISD	\$8,431
DICKINSON ISD	\$32,310
DILLEY ISD	\$5,927
DIME BOX ISD	\$1,227
DIMMITT ISD	\$7,142
DONNA ISD	\$89,629
DRISCOLL ISD	\$1,450
DUBLIN ISD	\$6,522
DUMAS ISD	\$20,631
DUNCANVILLE ISD	\$41,952
EAGLE PASS ISD	\$85,240
EAST CENTRAL ISD	\$36,699
EAST CHAMBERS ISD	\$5,229
ECTOR CO ISD	\$115,009
EDCOUCH-ELSA ISD	\$35,906
EDEN C I S D	\$1,215
EDGEWOOD ISD	\$97,452
EDINBURG CISD	\$148,621
EDNA ISD	\$7,057
EL CAMPO ISD	\$13,961
EL PASO ACAD	\$5,220
EL PASO ISD	\$436,824
EL PASO SCH OF EXCELLENCE	\$2,182

Grantee	Total Award Amount
ELECTRA ISD	\$2,009
ELGIN ISD	\$13,899
ENNIS ISD	\$26,743
EULA ISD	\$1,247
EUSTACE ISD	\$6,807
EVANT ISD	\$942
EVERMAN ISD	\$15,201
FABENS ISD	\$22,689
FAIRFIELD ISD	\$4,708
FAITH FAMILY ACAD OF OAK CLIFF	\$2,170
FARWELL ISD	\$1,065
FERRIS ISD	\$10,985
FLATONIA ISD	\$2,130
FLORENCE ISD	\$3,534
FLORESVILLE ISD	\$12,104
FLOUR BLUFF ISD	\$19,052
FLOYDADA ISD	\$5,765
FORT WORTH ISD	\$503,627
FRANKLIN ISD	\$4,043
FREDERICKSBURG ISD	\$9,828
FREER ISD	\$4,749
FRIONA ISD	\$5,208
FRUITVALE ISD	\$1,946
FT HANCOCK ISD	\$4,513
FT STOCKTON ISD	\$13,068
GAINESVILLE ISD	\$10,166
GALENA PARK ISD	\$103,998
GALVESTON ISD	\$41,969
GANADO ISD	\$2,344
GARLAND ISD	\$319,654
GARRISON ISD	\$3,002
GEORGE GERVIN ACAD	\$2,145
GHOLSON ISD	\$658
GIDDINGS ISD	\$7,480
GILMER ISD	\$6,936
GLADEWATER ISD	\$8,133
GLASSCOCK CO ISD	\$666
GOLIAD ISD	\$3,716
GONZALES ISD	\$13,626
GOODRICH ISD	\$2,220
GOOSE CREEK CISD	\$81,557
GORMAN ISD	\$1,239
GRAHAM ISD	\$9,889
GRAND PRAIRIE ISD	125,126

Grantee	Total Award Amount
GRAND SALINE ISD	\$5,931
GRAPE CREEK ISD	\$5,480
GRAPELAND ISD	\$2,628
GREENVILLE ISD	\$26,074
GROESBECK ISD	\$7,214
GROVETON ISD	\$3,384
GRUVER ISD	\$1,356
HALE CENTER ISD	\$2,232
HAMLIN ISD	\$1,698
HAPPY ISD	\$818
HARDIN ISD	\$3,885
HARLANDALE ISD	\$86,864
HARLINGEN CONS ISD	\$108,300
HARMONY ISD	\$3,135
HARPER ISD	\$968
HART ISD	\$1,674
HARTS BLUFF ISD	\$1,816
HASKELL CISD	\$2,170
HAWKINS ISD	\$2,844
HAWLEY ISD	\$1,719
HAYS CONS ISD	\$25,176
HEARNE ISD	\$7,290
HEMPHILL ISD	\$2,703
HEMPSTEAD ISD	\$7,067
HENDERSON ISD	\$15,905
HICO ISD	\$2,913
HIDALGO ISD	\$20,111
HIGGS, CARTER, KING G & T CHAR ACAD	\$2,182
HIGH ISLAND ISD	\$670
HIGHLAND PARK ISD	\$1,828
HILLSBORO ISD	\$9,708
HITCHCOCK ISD	\$5,580
HOLLAND ISD	\$1,525
HONDO ISD	\$10,241
HONEY GROVE ISD	\$1,816
HOOKS ISD	\$3,159
HOUSTON GATEWAY ACAD	\$1,339
HOUSTON ISD	\$1,428,109
HUBBARD ISD	\$1,959
HUGHES SPRINGS ISD	\$3,248
HUNTINGTON ISD	\$5,737
HUNTSVILLE ISD	\$25,116
IDALOU ISD	\$1,852
INGLESIDE ISD	\$8,013

Grantee	Total Award Amount
INGRAM ISD	\$10,130
IRAAN-SHEFFIELD ISD	\$2,130
IREDELL ISD	\$520
IRION CO ISD	\$1,525
IRVING ISD	\$204,277
ITASCA ISD	\$3,595
JACKSBORO ISD	\$3,050
JACKSONVILLE ISD	\$26,359
JARRELL ISD	\$3,498
JASPER ISD	\$14,332
JEFFERSON ISD	\$8,307
JIM HOGG CO ISD	\$10,030
JOHN H WOOD CHAR SCH	\$2,281
JOURDANTON ISD	\$6,398
JUDSON ISD	\$87,149
JUNCTION ISD	\$2,965
KARNES CITY ISD	\$4,079
KAUFMAN ISD	\$14,852
KEENE ISD	\$3,372
KEMP ISD	\$6,536
KENDLETON ISD	\$1,190
KENNARD ISD	\$1,885
KERMIT ISD	\$6,621
KERRVILLE ISD	\$21,388
KILGORE ISD	\$16,219
KILLEEN ISD	\$134,681
KINGSVILLE ISD	\$30,785
KNIPPA ISD	\$605
KNOX CITY-O'BRIEN ISD	\$1,314
KOPPERL ISD	\$1,054
KOUNTZE ISD	\$5,314
KRESS ISD	\$1,363
LA FERIA ISD	\$12,299
LA GRANGE ISD	\$6,597
LA JOYA ISD	148,546
LA MARQUE ISD	\$16,788
LA PRYOR ISD	\$2,988
LA VEGA ISD	\$13,997
LA VILLA ISD	\$4,686
LAKE WORTH ISD	\$10,018
LAMAR CONS ISD	\$62,069
LAMESA ISD	\$12,870
LANCASTER ISD	\$26,160
LAPOYNOR ISD	\$2,118

Grantee	Total Award Amount
LAREDO ISD	202,727
LASARA ISD	\$1,847
LATEXO ISD	\$2,506
LEAKEY ISD	\$992
LEGGETT ISD	\$1,277
LEON ISD	\$2,348
LEONARD ISD	\$3,183
LEVELLAND ISD	\$9,993
LEXINGTON ISD	\$4,079
LIBERTY ISD	\$8,739
LIBERTY-EYLAU ISD	\$11,468
LINGLEVILLE ISD	\$1,004
LITTLEFIELD ISD	\$8,196
LIVINGSTON ISD	\$14,125
LOCKNEY ISD	\$2,405
LOHN ISD	\$483
LOMETA ISD	\$1,475
LONGVIEW ISD	\$34,579
LORAIN ISD	\$744
LORENZO ISD	\$2,157
LOS FRESNOS CONS ISD	\$40,134
LUBBOCK ISD	\$107,929
LUBBOCK-COOPER ISD	\$8,993
LUFKIN ISD	\$32,174
LULING ISD	\$6,943
LYFORD CISD	\$9,658
LYTLE ISD	\$7,836
MABANK ISD	\$12,382
MADISONVILLE CONS ISD	\$7,452
MALAKOFF ISD	\$3,546
MANOR ISD	\$17,978
MARBLE FALLS ISD	\$13,181
MARFA ISD	\$4,103
MARLIN ISD	\$7,812
MARSHALL ISD	\$32,546
MART ISD	\$2,021
MARTINS MILL ISD	\$2,106
MARTINSVILLE ISD	\$992
MATHIS ISD	\$11,196
MCALLEN ISD	\$145,819
MCCAMEY ISD	\$2,058
MEDICAL CENTER CHAR SCH	\$1,283
MEDINA VALLEY ISD	\$13,157
MEMPHIS ISD	\$3,137

Grantee	Total Award Amount
MERCEDES ISD	\$33,340
MERKEL ISD	\$4,999
MEXIA ISD	\$14,978
MIDLAND ISD	\$79,499
MILANO ISD	\$629
MINEOLA ISD	\$6,342
MINERAL WELLS ISD	\$13,365
MISSION CONS ISD	\$93,038
MONAHANS-WICKETT-PYOTE ISD	\$4,975
MONTE ALTO ISD	\$2,220
MORAN ISD	\$533
MORTON ISD	\$3,384
MOTLEY CO ISD	\$682
MOUNT PLEASANT ISD	\$31,504
MOUNT VERNON ISD	\$5,096
MULESHOE ISD	\$5,914
MUMFORD ISD	\$2,157
MUNDAY ISD	\$1,761
NATALIA ISD	\$6,547
NAVASOTA ISD	\$14,172
NEW CANEY ISD	\$19,487
NEW DEAL ISD	\$3,595
NEW SUMMERFIELD ISD	\$3,298
NEW WAVERLY ISD	\$2,578
NEWTON ISD	\$6,212
NIXON-SMILEY CONS ISD	\$6,398
NOCONA ISD	\$2,504
NORMANGEE ISD	\$1,695
NORTH FOREST ISD	\$73,374
NORTH ZULCH ISD	\$775
NORTHSIDE ISD	\$296,572
ODEM-EDROY ISD	\$4,253
O'DONNELL ISD	\$1,277
OLNEY ISD	\$2,360
OLTON ISD	\$3,682
ONE STOP MULTISERVICE CHAR SCH	\$5,864
ORANGE GROVE ISD	\$5,777
ORE CITY ISD	\$2,182
PALACIOS ISD	\$8,927
PALESTINE ISD	\$15,386
PAMPA ISD	\$10,833
PARIS ISD	\$17,940
PASADENA ISD	\$243,692
PAWNEE ISD	\$448

Grantee	Total Award Amount
PEARSALL ISD	\$11,952
PECOS-BARSTOW-TOYAH ISD	\$8,915
PERRYTON ISD	\$9,274
PETERSBURG ISD	\$1,401
PETROLIA ISD	\$1,791
PETTUS ISD	\$2,728
PEWITT ISD	\$3,384
PHARR-SAN JUAN-ALAMO ISD	180,808
PITTSBURG ISD	\$9,374
PLAINS ISD	\$1,959
PLAINVIEW ISD	\$23,408
PLEASANTON ISD	\$17,692
POOLVILLE ISD	\$2,457
PORT ARTHUR ISD	\$65,787
POST ISD	\$4,054
POTEET ISD	\$9,336
POTH ISD	\$2,857
PRAIRIE LEA ISD	\$620
PRAIRILAND ISD	\$3,643
PREMONT ISD	\$5,356
PRESIDIO ISD	\$10,985
PRINCETON ISD	\$6,270
PROGRESO ISD	\$15,510
QUANAHA ISD	\$2,046
QUINLAN ISD	\$6,633
QUITMAN ISD	\$4,612
RAINS ISD	\$9,477
RALLS ISD	\$3,670
RANGER ISD	\$1,277
RANKIN ISD	\$932
RAUL YZAGUIRRE SCH FOR SUCCESS	\$4,327
RAYMONDVILLE ISD	\$12,411
REAGAN CO ISD	\$2,901
REFUGIO ISD	\$3,447
RICARDO ISD	\$2,281
RICE CONS ISD	\$6,968
RICHARDSON ISD	\$169,759
RIO GRANDE CITY CISD	\$79,425
RIO HONDO ISD	\$10,501
RISING STAR ISD	\$806
RIVIERA ISD	\$2,752
ROBSTOWN ISD	\$22,528
ROBY CONS ISD	\$670
ROCHESTER ISD	\$496

Grantee	Total Award Amount
ROCKDALE ISD	\$8,291
ROCKSPRINGS ISD	\$2,170
ROGERS ISD	\$2,978
ROMA ISD	\$47,201
ROOSEVELT ISD	\$5,951
ROSEBUD-LOTT ISD	\$4,285
ROYAL ISD	\$10,650
RULE ISD	\$658
RUSK ISD	\$6,585
SABINAL ISD	\$2,417
SALTILLO ISD	\$1,166
SAN ANTONIO ISD	\$396,021
SAN ANTONIO TECHNOLOGY ACAD	\$2,417
SAN AUGUSTINE ISD	\$5,170
SAN BENITO CONS ISD	\$62,240
SAN DIEGO ISD	\$9,819
SAN ELIZARIO ISD	\$29,372
SAN FELIPE-DEL RIO CONS ISD	\$47,288
SAN MARCOS CONS ISD	\$37,159
SAN SABA ISD	\$4,067
SANTA MARIA ISD	\$3,583
SANTA ROSA ISD	\$9,026
SCH OF EXCELLENCE IN EDUCATION	\$5,009
SCH OF LIBERAL ARTS & SCIENCE	\$719
SCHULENBURG ISD	\$3,353
SEAGRAVES ISD	\$3,384
SEALY ISD	\$10,712
SEGUIN ISD	\$44,498
SEMINOLE ISD	\$9,993
SENTRY TECHNOLOGY PREP SCH	\$2,331
SEYMOUR ISD	\$1,937
SHALLOWATER ISD	\$4,781
SHARYLAND ISD	\$31,790
SHEKINAH "RADIANCE" ACAD	\$1,822
SHELBYVILLE ISD	\$2,740
SHELDON ISD	\$20,098
SHEPHERD ISD	\$10,390
SHERMAN ISD	\$25,794
SHINER ISD	\$1,537
SIDNEY ISD	\$409
SILVERTON ISD	\$908
SINTON ISD	\$9,163
SKIDMORE-TYNAN ISD	\$2,616
SLATON ISD	\$8,282

Grantee	Total Award Amount
SLIDELL ISD	\$1,646
SMITHVILLE ISD	\$7,032
SMYER ISD	\$1,463
SNOOK ISD	\$2,616
SNYDER ISD	\$8,860
SOMERSET ISD	\$14,692
SONORA ISD	\$3,668
SOUTH PLAINS ACAD	\$2,203
SOUTH SAN ANTONIO ISD	\$89,455
SOUTHSIDE ISD	32,633
SOUTHWEST ISD	62,290
SPADE ISD	533
SPLENDORA ISD	\$13,581
SPRING BRANCH ISD	160,610
SPRING ISD	\$92,378
SPRINGLAKE-EARTH ISD	\$1,401
SPRINGTOWN ISD	\$7,698
SPUR ISD	\$843
SPURGER ISD	\$2,118
STAMFORD ISD	\$3,224
STANTON ISD	\$4,860
STOCKDALE ISD	\$2,869
STRATFORD ISD	\$2,244
STRAWN ISD	\$533
SULPHUR BLUFF ISD	\$1,114
SULPHUR SPRINGS ISD	8,507
SUNRAY ISD	\$2,554
SWEETWATER ISD	\$8,257
TAFT ISD	\$6,819
TAHOKA ISD	\$3,410
TATUM ISD	\$3,384
TAYLOR ISD	\$12,957
TEAGUE ISD	\$4,043
TEMPLE ISD	\$34,691
TENAHA ISD	\$2,393
TERRELL CO ISD	\$520
TERRELL ISD	19,987
TEXARKANA ISD	32,162
TEXAS CITY ISD	\$30,115
TEXHOMA ISD	\$1,128
THREE RIVERS ISD	\$3,789
TIDEHAVEN ISD	\$3,323
TIMPSON ISD	\$2,641
TORNILLO ISD	\$9,224

Grantee	Total Award Amount
TRENT ISD	\$719
TRINITY ISD	\$7,241
TROUP ISD	\$5,181
TULIA ISD	\$4,463
TULOSO-MIDWAY ISD	\$11,438
TURKEY-QUITAQUE ISD	\$1,128
TYLER ISD	\$97,155
UNION GROVE ISD	\$2,663
UNITED ISD	\$207,699
UVALDE CONS ISD	\$22,466
VALENTINE ISD	\$459
VALLEY MILLS ISD	\$2,203
VAN ISD	\$8,921
VAN VLECK ISD	\$4,140
VEGA ISD	\$557
VENUS ISD	\$7,650
VERNON ISD	\$11,667
VICTORIA ISD	\$55,618
VIDOR ISD	\$19,475
WACO CHAR SCH (EOAC)	\$1,066
WACO ISD	\$108,958
WAELDER ISD	\$2,009
WALCOTT ISD	\$8,384
WALLER ISD	\$18,555
WALNUT SPRINGS ISD	\$1,042
WASKOM ISD	\$4,674
WAXAHACHIE FAITH FAMILY ACAD	\$968
WAXAHACHIE ISD	\$26,471
WESLACO ISD	\$107,780
WEST ORANGE-COVE CONS ISD	\$15,423
WEST OSO ISD	\$15,945
WEST RUSK ISD	\$2,653
WEST SABINE ISD	\$3,075
WESTWOOD ISD	\$7,335
WHARTON ISD	\$10,018
WHITE SETTLEMENT ISD	15,433
WHITEFACE CONS ISD	\$1,101
WICHITA FALLS ISD	\$62,917
WILDORADO ISD	\$161
WILLIS ISD	21,787
WILLS POINT ISD	\$13,944
WILMER-HUTCHINS ISD	\$25,528
WINNSBORO ISD	\$4,854
WINONA ISD	\$4,454

Grantee	Total Award Amount
WODEN ISD	\$3,501
WOLFE CITY ISD	\$1,380
WOODSBORO ISD	\$1,912
WOODVILLE ISD	\$5,517
YOAKUM ISD	\$7,468
YORKTOWN ISD	\$2,663
YSLETA ISD	\$275,954
ZAPATA CO ISD	\$21,289