

Texas Education Agency
Division of NCLB Program Coordination

Title I Committee of Practitioners
SEDL First Floor Conference Room
4700 Mueller Blvd.
Austin, Texas
Monday, January 24, 2011
9:00 AM - 3:00 PM

Members Present: Mark Beaty, Ron Cavazos, Shirley Clark, Marti Couch, Arthur De La Cruz, John Emerich, Brenda Faz-Villarreal, Annette Gregory, Richard Mik, Dora Morón, Cris Muñoz, Belinda Rojas, Wilma Senigal-Vaughn, Mary Thomas, Michael Turner, and Jayne Tavenner

Members Absent: Martha Anderson, Tori Austin, Margaret McGettrick, Richard Vasquez, and Glenda Weddle

TEA Staff Present: Cory Green, Shannon Housson, Erica Coppic, Scott Lewis, Becca Marsh, Heather Mauzé, Ester Regalado, Vivian Smyrl, Anita Villarreal, and Dorothy White

SIRC Staff Present: Gwen Davis, Leticia Govea, Michael Greenwalt, Sally Partridge, and Martha Stone

Welcome

The meeting was called to order by Mr. Green at 9:02 a.m. Mr. Green recognized Terri Stafford for her service to the COP and informed members she would be stepping down from the committee due to her expanded role in statewide initiatives. Mr. Green welcomed the COP members present and introduced the new COP members. Brenda Faz-Villarreal and Northside ISD were recognized for being selected by the Texas Association of Parent Educators as one of two 2011 Best Practices Award Winners. Mr. Green also acknowledged the contributions of our two school board members in recognition of national school board appreciation month.

Reading and Review of November 15, 2010, Minutes

Mr. Green requested the COP members review the meeting minutes from November 15, 2010.

A motion was made by Ms. Tavenner to accept the minutes as read.

The motion was seconded by Mr. Beaty.

The motion carried.

Adequate Yearly Progress (AYP) Update – Shannon Housson, Director of the Division of Performance Reporting, and Ester Regalado, AYP Unit Manager, provided an overview and update on AYP, which included

an overview of the draft amendments to the 2010 AYP Workbook submitted to USDE on 12/21/2010. A scheduled phase-in of the Texas Projection Measure (TPM) and graduation rates annual targets was reviewed. The proposed Transition Plan and timeline for 2013 AYP meets statutory requirements for HB2. A link that provides the entire transition plan may be accessed at:

<http://www.tea.state.tx.us/student.assessment/hb3plan/>.

A handout was provided to members outlining the 2010 Final AYP State Summary. Ms. Regalado reminded committee members that one of the USDE's audit findings this past summer concerned the number of campuses in the state that are not evaluated for AYP. These include campuses that are not in the state accountability system (pre-k, new campuses, DAEPs, and JJAEPs). Although, the state of Texas has reduced the number of campuses missing AYP, it still needs to address the number of non-evaluated campuses. Pros and cons of alternate systems were discussed with committee members. Discussion ensued regarding exploring a hold-harmless option, using 11th grade calculations, and possible pairings. Evaluation of new campuses could look at implementing a progressive tiered response. It was determined that if AYP calculations changes are needed for 2011 the progressive tiered response could prioritize: new campuses, grade 11 assessments, and assign an LEA result (and/or the LEA could pair with campuses of their choice)

A motion was made by Mr. Vasquez to submit the proposal to USDE as determined.

The motion was seconded by Mr. Mik.

The motion carried.

Ms. Regalado opened the floor for questions.

COP Capacity Building - Anita Villarreal, State Program Director, Title I SIP, TEA Division of NCLB Program Coordination, provided a brief overview of Committee of Practitioners, outlining the basic purposes of Title I, Part A. Ms. Villarreal provided members with a one-page summary of the program, as well as an evaluation of the Capacity Building process. Evaluation responses were favorable, noting a possible need for web link when appropriate. This was the second presentation to members regarding the various programs that relate to COP.

Ms. Villarreal opened the floor for questions.

ICR Updates – Vivian Smyrl, State Program Director, Title I, Part D, TEA Division of NCLB Program Coordination, provided a brief update on the Initial Compliance Review.

Ms. Smyrl provided a draft of the proposed indicators for the 2011-2012 Initial Compliance Review. The questions that were part of the Program Review Checklists for Title I, Part C; Title I, Part D; and Title III, Part A in 2009-2010 are being added to the Compliance Reports for the coming year. As a result, this information will be available for ICR review in 2011-2012. Some items have been deleted, but the questions have not been renumbered. In February the document will be placed on the website for a 30-day public comment period.

Ms. Smyrl opened the floor for questions.

NCLB Management Institute Update – Cory Green, Senior Director, TEA Division of NCLB Program Coordination provided a brief update regarding the NCLB Management Institute.

Mr. Green reviewed the information provided to members at the last meeting. June 8-10, 2011, is the confirmed date for the NCLB Management Institute at the Embassy Suites in San Marcos, Texas. The structure of the Institute is to focus on Allowable Uses of Funds (Day One) and Documenting Compliance across the Programs (Day Two), with General Sessions and concurrent breakout sessions each day. Program-specific presentations (Day Three) will be provided as well.

The overall focus for the Management Institute is grant management and is geared at providing support and technical assistance to federal program staff, but is open to all. SEDL will host the registration site. It will be held on-line and offers flexibility to participants. Participants will have the option to register for days one and two, day three only, or for all three days. The NCLB Updates will announce the posting when it is available.

Mr. Green opened the floor for questions.

NCLB Report Card- Ester Regalado, AYP Unit Manager, and Vivian Smyrl, State Program Director of Title I, Part D, provided an overview and update on NCLB School Report Card. Ms. Regalado noted that in responding to requests from the field enhancements have been made to the new system. The data will be accessible and downloadable as one PDF document. Ms. Smyrl noted that the Letter to Administrator Addressed will be posted on January 31, 2011. LEAs will have 30 business days to post by March 1, 2011, on their local websites.

Ms. Regalado opened the floor for questions.

TTIPS Update –

Erica Coppic, State Coordinator for the Texas Title I Priority Schools (TTIPS), TEA Division of NCLB Program Coordination, provided the following updates on Cycle 1:

Seventy-two grant applications were selected for award. Sixty-three of the grants have been NOGA'd. The nine remaining schools chose delayed implementation resulting in the delay in awarding the grants. February 1st is the deadline for submitting information.

Quarterly Implementation Reports (QIR) - Principals, LEA Representatives, Professional Service Providers (PSPs), SIRC Case Managers, and TEA Program Specialists recently conducted their QIR conference calls.

TEA has worked collaboratively with SIRC on reporting from campuses. The second report, the End-of-year Performance Report, will be available soon. This report is regarding funding for year 2. In light of the funding climate, the intent is to roll out soon to LEAs. The report will be due August 1, 2011, and will determine year 2 funding. The intent is to give flexibility to LEAs to show other relevant data (benchmarks, local assessments, etc.) in addition to TAKS data so the LEAs may better address their funding issues.

Mrs. Coppic opened the floor for questions.

Dorothy White, State Coordinator for the Texas Title I Priority Schools (TTIPS), TEA Division of NCLB Program Coordination, provided the following updates on Cycle 2:

TEA has submitted the state application on 12/3/2010. We are currently waiting for USDE response. Fewer grants to be funded through this cycle (25-40) are more targeted based on prior COP input. Changes were made to the application. The budget page clarified it was a three-year grant, and more succinct directions regarding activities and the model chosen were outlined. Any Tier III campuses (effected 1 campus) would need to re-apply if not implementing a full model. There do not appear to be any problems with transitioning that campus. There have been two conference calls with USDE regarding pre-award (pre-implementation requirement placed on SIG Guidance). This is not a requirement, but is an option for campuses to get ready. We cannot award or deduct point in the scoring rubric so we want to insure the activities in guidance are not limiting. USDE wants greater distinction in the definition of PLA (persistently low achieving) in relation to the lowest 5% and those campuses that are not meeting graduation rates.

Cory Green, Senior Director, TEA Division of NCLB Program Coordination noted that most of Texas' lowest 5% also met graduation rate requirements. USDE wants this delineated. Originally points were assigned to pre-implementation because we needed to score campuses.

Ms. White went on to explain that once the Agency has a response from the USDE, we will have three weeks to post the Request for Application (RFA).

Ms. White opened the floor for questions.

School Improvement Program (SIP) – Becca Marsh, State Program Coordinator, Title I SIP, TEA Division of NCLB Program Coordination, provided a brief update regarding the SIP. NCLB has reorganized. Anita Villarreal and Becca Marsh will oversee SES and School choice (SC) with one other NCLB staff member. The School Improvement Resource center (SIRC) will be handling much of the technical assistance for SES. There will be no difference in service.

The SIP Application amendments are currently being processed. They reflect Maximum entitlements and actual roll forward. June 15, 2011, is the deadline for submission of the SIP amendments.

The second Parent Notification Letters (PNL) for SES are not currently at 100%. If a campus is not serving all eligible students and has not implemented their priority list or spent their 20% required reservation they must send out a second PNL. This is in addition to the first SES PNL and packet required by statute.

Website requirements were sent out to LEAs/campuses in October 2010. The SIP Listserv recently sent out notice regarding the 20% allocation of reserved funds. The deadline is May 1, 2011. Schools that fail to reallocate their funds and carryover the 20% set aside will be required to reserve 20% of their 2011-2012 budget in addition to the carryover amount.

Mrs. Marsh opened the floor for questions.

SES Provider Application Updates – Leticia Govea, SIRC SES Program Coordinator, and Gwen Davis, Program Specialist, provided the committee with changes made to the SES provider application. Pending TEA approval the proposed changes will go into effect. Electronic signatures will be a feature available to future applicants. The majority of changes that were made were due to alignment issues. The application is to be released April 1, 2011. Application and enrollment form discrepancies were addressed and streamlined. Science was not previously part of the application because it wasn't required under NCLB, but it has been added. Additionally the Provisions and Assurances were addressed.

Ms. Govea opened the floor for questions.

Variance Reports– Vivian Smyrl, State Program Director, Title I, Part D, TEA Division of NCLB Program Coordination, provided a brief update of the variance reports.

Overall there were favorable responses from the LEAs required to report. Other data elements may be added in the future.

Ms. Smyrl opened the floor for questions.

Other – Cory Green, Senior Director, TEA Division of NCLB Program Coordination provided the following information concerning Reauthorization:

It is anticipated that by continuing resolution, federal appropriations will remain at the current funding levels. Reauthorization does not appear to be on the immediate horizon. The National Title I Conference is next week, and there may be further discussion of Reauthorization timelines by representatives of USDE.

Mr. Green opened the floor for questions.

Action Items:

Ed-Flex State Assessment Goals – Mr. Scott Lewis, State Program Director Ed-Flex, Highly Qualified Teachers (HQT), TEA Division of NCLB Program Coordination provided an overview of Ed-Flex program and an update on the validation process. Mr. Lewis explained to members that Ed-Flex allows for the state to waive certain requirements. He then went on to describe the different types of waivers:

- Statewide Administrative Waiver (LEAs may use without having to apply)
- Statewide Programmatic Waiver (every three years)
- Individual Programmatic Waivers

Mr. Lewis provided members a table of the AEIS Report, noting that the state met the performance measure that the Committee had set in order to allow the state to continue implementing the Statewide waivers.

Mr. Lewis asked members to consider what performance measure should be set for next year and asked the floor to make a recommendation. Discussion ensued.

A motion was made by R. Cavazos to consider the standards are to remain the same for the next annual evaluation period.

The motion was seconded by R. Vasquez.

The motion passed.

Mr. Lewis provided members an update on the validation process to occur in the spring. Teacher status validation of HQT documentation for this year will focus on science. A random validation will occur. LEAs will be queried regarding their public reporting of highly qualified. The Validation unit is completing the Campus Needs Assessment (CNA) validation. Many LEAs are utilizing the ESC 20 documentation resources for their Campus Needs Assessment. Interim results reflect more accuracy in documentation and greater documentation overall.

Mr. Lewis opened the floor for questions.

Title I Funds (Criteria and Reallocation Criteria): Cory Green, Senior Director, TEA Division of NCLB Program Coordination provided the following information concerning the 2009-2010 Title I unobligated funds and requested recommendations from the committee.

Last year's approved general eligibility criteria for unobligated funds were as follows:

Eligibility criteria:

- No late refunds
- Program Compliance (Not High-risk, Suspended, Closed, MOE decline)
- A participant in both current and prior year grant

Reallocation criteria:

- For the Title I, Part A reallocation
 1. Local educational agencies (LEAs) with 0% carryover funds available in the current year
 2. Have an increase in free and reduced-price lunch (FRPL) counts in October PEIMS in current and prior-year Title I, Part A formula calculation process

A motion was made by Ms. Thomas to maintain the general eligibility criteria and the reallocation criteria for the 2009-2010 school years' reallocation of Title I, Part A funds.

The motion was seconded by Mr. Beaty.

The motion carried.

Mr. Green presented the general criteria and reallocation percentages for Title I, SIP (regular) funds, seeking an additional recommendation.

- For the Title I SIP (regular) reallocation
 1. LEAs with more than 0% carryover and less than the 15% carryover funds in the current year
 2. Have an increase in FRPL counts in October PEIMS in current and prior-year Title I, Part A formula calculation process
- Title I SIP reallocation percentage split three ways:
 - Title I, Part A 70% - to LEAs with 15% or less roll forward

Title I, SIP	20% - to campuses with 25% or less roll forward
SIRC	10% - for additional technical assistance

Committee members discussed the benefits of maintaining the criteria versus possible changes to the formula.

A motion was made by Ms. Tavenner to maintain the eligibility criteria for the allocation of funds and the percentage distribution in the same manner for the 2009-2010 school years' reallocation of Title I, SIP (regular) funds.

The motion was seconded by Mr. Mik.

The motion carried.

Mr. Green reminded committee members of the American Reinvestment and Recovery Act (ARRA) funding timeline, funding ends 9/30/2011. Mr. Green outlined the funding amounts for the Redistribution of 2009-2010 unobligated Title I ARRA funds (approximately \$574,446 and \$1.7M for Title I ARRA and Title I SIP ARRA, respectively) to current ARRA participants. He also noted that these unobligated ARRA funds (nonparticipants, MOE decline, etc) are not considered a reallocation, but rather a redistribution of funds. Mr. Green requested input from COP as to possible suggestions for redistribution of unobligated funds to current ARRA participants. Discussion ensued of possible criteria and percentage redistribution. The merits of using the same distribution process for the ARRA funds as the state uses for the Title I funds discussed.

- For the Title I ARRA redistribution
 1. LEAs with more than 0% carryover and less than the 15% carryover funds in the current year
 2. Have an increase in FRPL counts in October PEIMS in current and prior-year Title I, Part A formula calculation process

A motion was made by Mr. Cavazos to use the same criteria and redistribution formula for the Title I ARRA as the Title I regular funds.

The motion was seconded by Ms. Thomas.

The motion carried.

Mr. Green turned committee members' attention to the Title I, SIP ARRA funds. He informed committee members that last year approximately 150 schools in Texas exited school improvement. He requested a recommendation regarding the redistribution of funding. Members discussed the merits of maintaining similar criteria for the benefit of consistency. However, it was noted that rather than a three-way split of funds due to the shortened timeline to effectively use funds, a better split would be a two-way split.

- Title I SIP ARRA reallocation percentage split two ways:

Title I, Part A	60% - to campuses with 25% or less roll forward
SIRC	40% - for additional technical assistance

A motion was made by Mr. Beaty to use the criteria and implement a two-way split of funds.

The motion was seconded by Ms. Thomas.

Discussion ensued regarding the rollforward criteria. It was noted that there may be some benefit to split the reallocation two ways, but apply a criteria of 0-10% rollforward.

- Title I SIP ARRA reallocation percentage split two ways:

Title I, Part A	60% - to campuses with 0-10% or less roll forward
SIRC	40% - for additional technical assistance

A motion to amend was made by Ms. Tavenner to strike the regular criteria and insert the 0-10% criteria, so that the redistribution of funds goes to Title I, Part campuses with 0-10% or less roll forward.

The motion to amend was seconded.

The amendment carried.

The committee then voted on the amended motion.

The amended motion carried.

Title I School Improvement Program (SIP) Requirement Changes - Cory Green, Senior Director, TEA Division of NCLB Program Coordination provided the following information concerning the proposed changes to the state's technical assistance and program requirements for Title I, SIP and requested a recommendation from the committee:

Currently the School Improvement Resource Center (SIRC) provides technical assistance and support to campuses in the various stages of school improvement.

- Stage 1 – Presently schools in Stage 1 of school improvement are required to have a Professional Service Provider (PSP) previously identified as either a Campus Administrator Mentor (CAM) or Technical Assistance Provider (TAP).
 1. Stage 1, year 1 campuses must engage in a yearlong Campus Needs Assessment (CNA) and campus planning process culminating in a Campus Planning Event (CPE). Discussion ensued among committee members noting the need to increase the number of PSP hours. It was also recognized that the need to involve the campus principal in the determination of whether the PSP focus is that of a CAM or a TAP.
 2. Stage 1, year 2 –campuses have met AYP in the second year. These campuses may engage in an optional book study “Transforming Classroom Practice” (TCP). The focus is at the administrative level. Discussion ensued about offering an additional or another book that would be appropriate for educational staff/whole campus. The necessity to add hours to the CAM/TAP duties to facilitate the book study.
- Stage 2 – the proposed change is to require the TCP book study if it was not previously done on the campus.
- Stage 3, 4, & 5 – Require LEA person to attend the SIRC sponsored Texas School Improvement (TSI) Conference. It was noted that LEA should refer to a district or charter that maintains a separate central office as to avoid undue burden on a charter school operating without central office.
- Stage 5, years 2, 3, 4+ (5b, 5c, 5d) – Campuses that are at this stage of school improvement are required to participate in a CNA conducted by the TCDSS. This would be an external process since all Title I, Part A campuses are already required to do a Needs Assessment.

A description of the roles CAMs and TAPs play on campuses was provided by SIRC staff. Committee members discussed the requirement of teacher participation in the book study. SIRC staff provided the benefits of focusing on the administrative level and also noted that 50% of staff is required to participate in the C.P.E. Members discussed the merits of allowing the campus principal the choice of what type of PSP focus would best meet the needs of the campus/principal.

A motion was made to incorporate the changes listed below to the SIP Requirements:

- Increase the hours of the PSP based on the choice of the campus principal in stage 1, year 1,
- offer the TCP book study at the administrative level,
- offer whole campus vertical planning promoting buy in from staff members, and
- consider graduation rate.

The motion was seconded.

The motion carried.

The meeting adjourned at 2:05 p.m.