

**Texas Education Agency  
Division of NCLB Program Coordination**

**Title I Committee of Practitioners  
Tuesday, January 22, 2008  
MINUTES**

**Members Present:** Ronald Cavazos, Mitzi Doggett, Carole Hagler, Leslie Christian (for Vicki Holland), Mike McCallum, Richard Mik, Belinda Rojas, Margaret Parks Conner, Linda Roper, Terri Stafford, Jayne Tavenner, and Mary Thomas

**Members Absent:** Martha Anderson, Barbara Martin, Margaret McGettrick, and Michael Turner

**TEA Staff Present:** Cory Green, Anita Villarreal, Christina Villarreal, Didi Garcia, Annie Molina, Heather Christie

**SIRC Staff Present:** Sally Partridge, Michael Greenwalt, and Heidi Wagner

The meeting was called to order by Terri Stafford. The minutes from the September meeting and the specially called October meeting were reviewed. A motion was made and seconded to accept the minutes as read. The motion passed.

Cory Green explained that due to the large number of items on the agenda there would be a working lunch. Participants were given a menu from a local restaurant and ordered lunch to be delivered.

**AYP Update** – Shannon Housson and Ester Regalado, TEA Division of Performance Reporting

Mr. Housson provided handouts and an overview of the summary of the final 2007 AYP results after appeals and exceptions were granted. He then discussed AYP for 2008.

- Performance standards for 2007-2008 will remain the same as for 2006-2007,
- USDE has given tentative approval to a delayed AYP release in early October, 2008. This delay is due to the standard setting for the TAKS-M assessment not being completed until August 2008.
- Final AYP timelines will be submitted to USDE by February 15, 2008 as workbook amendments to the Texas AYP Workbook for approval by USDE.
- The AYP Guide will be available on the TEA website in late spring 2008.

**Federal Cap**

Ms. Regalado provided a handout and discussed the development of the Federal Cap for AYP on proficient results on the alternate assessments, TAKS-M and TAKS-Alt. The federal cap for the TAKS-Alt is 1%, and the federal cap for TAKS-M is 2%. Districts cannot exceed the 1% cap for TAKS-Alt. However, if they do not fully use the 1% cap, then they can exceed the 2% cap (up to 3%). It is anticipated that student performance on the TAKS-M assessment will be a greater factor in determining the 2008 AYP status than the impact of a federal cap limit on proficient results. Ms. Regalado then gave an

overview from a handout on the options being discussed for sorting the results for the TAKS-A (1%), and the TAKS-M (2%) in determining the Texas Federal Cap for 2008.

**2008-2009 Appropriations** – Liz Garrett, TEA Division of Formula Funds Administration

Each year the allocation formula is presented to the COP to accept or reject. The formula has not changed from last year. Only the districts that did not roll forward funds in 2006-2007 are eligible for reallocation.

A motion was made and seconded to maintain the allocation formula.

The motion passed unanimously.

Ms Garrett informed the COP that in the past, reallocated SIP funds went into Title I, Part A funds. Do we want to start reallocating SIP funds back into the SIP grant?

A motion was made and seconded to reallocate SIP funds back into Title I, Part A

The motion passed unanimously.

**Migrant Education Program Updates** – Christina Villarreal, TEA Division of NCLB Program Coordination

Service Delivery Plan

There is a copy of the Statewide Service Delivery Plan in the members' packet and on the NCLB web site. This Plan was shared at the September meeting, was completed and submitted to OME in November. Ms. Villarreal discussed the key points of the Plan that would affect the Migrant Application.

\*Page 1 lists the eight needs identified through the Statewide CNA

\*Thirty nine services/strategies are described in this Plan. Thirteen of them are required for local implementation at all district MEP projects, thirteen may be selected for local implementation at district MEP projects where appropriate, and the remaining thirteen strategies are to be implemented at the State level.

\*Page 11 lists Seven Areas of Concern. There are no longer Seven Areas of Focus

\*Section 4 begins on page 13. Section 4 lists the strategies and services that will address the identified needs

\*Section 5 begins on page 33. Section 5 discusses the evaluation that has been developed in response to the audit. The MEP is currently searching for an evaluator.

When one is hired, they will begin a two year study.

Ms. Villarreal will bring updates on the interim report.

Response to Onsite Monitoring Review

Ms. Villarreal then gave an overview of Texas' Response to the Onsite Monitoring Review. The Response document was submitted to OME on November 30, 2007.

She gave highlights of some of the corrective action activities and timelines. Some of the activities are already being implemented, and some will be implemented over the next three or four years.

**NCLB Updates** – Cory Green, TEA Division of NCLB Program Coordination

January 2008 Monitoring Visit

TEA thinks it was a good visit, however, a few years ago, the exit conference was very favorable and the written report had twenty five findings.

There were four USDE teams. Two teams monitored Title I, Part A, and two teams monitored Title I, Part D. USDE was very complimentary about the preparation done for their visit.

The Title I, Part A teams spent 1.5 days in the LEA and 1 day with TEA.

The Title I, Part D teams spent 1 hour in the LEA, and 1 hour with TEA

USDE had two main areas of concern:

1. No evidence of compliance in statute
2. No evidence of adequate monitoring

A couple of things they said were out of compliance, even though they had previously been approved by USDE. This might have happened due to different people being in charge at USDE, and different people being on the monitoring teams than three years ago.

1. The Private School Certification form – USDE wants this submitted to the state, not just kept on file at the district level.
2. The NCLB report card which was also cited in the Migrant audit two years ago. There are many different ways to look at what should be in the NCLB report card.

#### Program Improvement, Parent Involvement, SW & TA, and SST

\*USDE felt all the LEAs they visited were very knowledgeable about AYP.

\*USDE says parents need easier access to the information on the State report card, LEA report card and Campus report card.

\*TEA expects to be cited on the Title I Paraprofessional issue. Texas is not at 100% compliance regarding paraprofessional qualifications; we are closer to 96.3%. Texas was closer to 100% in 2005-2006 than we were in 2006-2007. There are currently about 1,208 paraprofessionals out of compliance in Texas. USDE thinks we should send a letter to the LEAs saying to remove the paraprofessional that are out of compliance.

\*USDE like what Texas is doing with parental involvement through Region 16. They liked the PIES Manual, and the laminated check lists.

However, they were concerned about the parent involvement policy at both the LEA and campus level. The LEAs were proud of their PI policies, and mentioned that this was the first year they had one. USDE was not happy. One particular district had no parent input in their plan.

\*There were 3 programs in 1 LEA that were not using proper criteria for determining student eligibility for Targeted Assistance.

\*USDE felt that the principals could not adequately define what being a Schoolwide program means and the benefits of being Schoolwide are. In Texas, 94% of our campuses are Schoolwide, but in the Nation only 64% are Schoolwide. We feel like it is just a way of life to be Schoolwide, so the principals take it in stride.

\*USDE was very complimentary of our Statewide System of Support. They liked the seriousness of purpose and the sense of joy that were evident.

\*Terri Stafford and Sally Partridge did an excellent job of talking about their programs. USDE really liked the EZSES Management System, but some of the SES providers told them they were not using it.

\*USDE was very complimentary of the ESC staff all across the state.

#### Fiduciary, Fiscal

\*USDE felt any problem in this area was a monitoring issue

\*They think our NCLB Consolidated Application for Federal Funding is too streamlined they do not think we have enough information in our application.

\*Reservation of Funds is an issue – we ask for % reserved, USDE wants to know the dollar amount.

#### Private Non Profit Schools

\*USDE felt the LEAs were not allocating funds to the PNPs properly because it did not look like the USDE worksheet. They finally saw how the LEAs were doing it, and agreed that it was ok.

\*Texas will probably be hit on equitable services for PI & Professional Development.

\* USDE was pleased with the good rapport between the ESC consultants and the PNP personnel.

\*USDE felt like services to the PNP students were not starting in a timely manner.

\*Labeling of equipment was not being done correctly. The label should specify “Property of Sample ISD, Title I, Part A Program”

\*Evaluation by LEA of PNP program is not being done.

\*TEA will offer PNP training at SEDL in May. We will invite LEAs and PNP to the meetings.

#### Fiduciary at TEA

USDE commended TEA about COP looking at more than just Title I, Part A issues.

However, we will be cited for not having parents or School Board members.

Mr. Green acknowledged there is an issue about parents missing work to come, and that previous parent members stated that the issues discussed were over their heads. He asked the COP members if they had any ideas about how to correct these issues.

Mr. Green says he needs two parents, pupil service, and two school board members. He requested the COP to please think about this, and turn names into Becca Marsh.

#### Monitoring of Even Start – Elizabeth Thompson, Even Start State Coordinator

This was very much a compliance visit. USDE did not discuss student achievement or fiscal issues. The main issue with USDE was they said Even Start did not monitor enough.

There were two main findings:

1. Training for local coordinators – one coordinator had not been trained yet
2. Full participation at the same rate for the four Even Start Components.

She is going to investigate this. USDE told her there is a provision in statute for screening participation. Families are to be exposed to all four components of Even Start before they decide whether to belong to Even Start. USDE said the written attendance policy is not strong enough to encourage higher participation in the four components.

#### Monitoring of Homeless – Cory Green

\*USDE was looking for coordination between Title I, Part A, and Homeless.

In Texas, 4611 LEAs have identified homeless students.

\*USDE wants the State to verify the homeless population.

\*USDE wants documentation on how LEAs reserve funds for Homeless

\*USDE felt Texas does not monitor this enough.

#### **Appropriation Estimate** – Cory Green, TEA Division of NCLB Program Coordination

Mr. Green explained about the Basic and Concentration formulas. He then explained about the Targeted and Incentive formulas

He then discussed the School Improvement Fund. During the monitoring visit, it was nice to be able to say that COP had a special meeting to discuss this Grant. USDE

asked why Texas chose schools in Level 2 to apply for the grant. He was able to explain this.

**School Improvement Resource Center Report** – Sally Partridge – Coordinator, SIRC, housed at Region 13 ESC

Ms. Partridge gave an overview of SIRC activities. SIRC offers technical assistance to the schools in Texas that are in School Improvement for missing AYP. The assistance they offer are the fall Introductory Meetings, the TSI December Conference, placement of CAMs for Stage 1 campuses and TAPs for Stage 2 and above campuses, annual on-site visits to campuses in School Improvement, publishing and distributing Principal Guides, publishing and distributing the SIRCular Newsletter, Share Fairs, evaluating SES Providers, and managing the EZSES Management System.

Ms. Partridge discussed the evaluation from spring 2007. SIRC sent out a survey to all of the SIP campuses and SES providers. The surveys returned were very positive. The predominant request was for more networking time. Responding to that request, SIRC allotted more time at their Intro meetings, at the SES workshops, and the TSI Conference.

**Title I Statewide School Support/PI Initiative Report** – Terri Stafford, Coordinator, TISSS/PI, housed at Region 16 ESC

Ms. Stafford gave an overview of TISSS/PI activities. Their purpose is to provide ESCs with opportunities for professional development, TEA program updates, and training opportunities. Districts and campuses that did not meet AYP for the first time are offered support through professional development opportunities. TISSS/PI offers assistance in various ways. They coordinate professional development for Title I LEAs in the areas of school support and parental involvement, develop school support and parental involvement materials and publications, coordinate statewide Title I Parental Involvement activities, coordinate a statewide PI Conference and arranges programmatic days for ESC Title I Contacts at the three TEA/ESC coordinated NCLB meetings. Part of their professional development is available at a Fall Summit and Spring Summit held in Austin each year where the opportunity is given to hear national speakers.

**COMMITTEE ACTION ITEMS**

**Review Additions/Changes to Compliance Reports** - Didi Garcia, Division of NCLB Program Coordination

Ms. Garcia reviewed the projected changes for the 2007-2008 Compliance Reports listed on the handout. She discussed the changes in each program on the Coordinated Compliance Report. She brought attention to the New Data Collection by unduplicated number and grade of homeless students enrolled that is required this year. There were no questions.

Ms. Garcia then discussed the 2008-2009 Initial Compliance Review handouts. She informed the COP that the ICRs will be posted to the web for comments, and encouraged the COP members to share that information with everyone at their school.

**Review of 2008-2009 NCLB Consolidated Application** – Annie Molina, Division of NCLB Program Coordination

Ms. Molina reviewed the changes for the NCLB Application listed on the handout. A new check box has been added to Title I, Part A under Par 1 on the line for neglected, and

clarification has been added in the drop down box on SC5000 for “not served”. She also informed the COP that there may be a section added on the 10 components for SW.. Ms. Molina continued reviewing the changes on the application with changes found in Title I, Part C. She said more detail has been added due to the Migrant audit. The verbiage has changed. A lot of work has gone into this section, so she asked that everyone pay close attention when completing the application. Ms. Molina brought attention to the fact that on the application schedule PS 3101 for Title I, Part A, Part 1(a) – Reservation of Funds the reserved amount is listed as a percentage. However, on the Compliance Report, the amount is listed in dollars. Make certain that your dollar amount matches the percentage amount. If an amendment is needed, remember May 1 is the deadline.

Cory Green then gave Carol Hagler an opportunity to give an LEA perspective on the recent USDE Title I Audit.

Ms. Hagler stated that it really did feel like her LEA was being audited. She had to keep reminding herself that USDE was really looking at TEA. The USDE team broke up into three groups. Two of the USDE members were great. It was obvious they had done this before. One of the USDE members was brand new, so she really drilled down in the area she was looking at.

Mr. Green thanked Ms. Hagler.

Mr. Green reminded the COP members to bring their calendars to the March 25 meeting so they could plan for 2008-2009

**SES Provider Application Reviews** – Mary Liz Singleton, SIRC Program Specialist  
Ms. Singleton distributed SES binders to the COP members, and gave a review on how to read and evaluate the SES Provider Applications. She then distributed the Applications to the COP members to begin reading and evaluating.

A motion was made and seconded for a letter to be prepared and distributed to all COP members requiring their attendance at all COP meetings until 3PM, or later when required.

The motion passed unanimously.

The meeting was adjourned at 4PM.