This document has been updated to reflect new fiscal, accountability, and program guidelines as of August 2015.
Introduction

This guide is intended to support local educational agencies (LEAs) in understanding and applying the requirements for allocating funds to campuses that are eligible to participate in the Title I, Part A program. The Elementary and Secondary Education Act (ESEA) outlines federal statutory requirements regarding how LEAs should reserve funds at the LEA level and allocate or distribute remaining funds to campuses. In Texas, the Texas Education Agency (TEA) is responsible for the oversight of all ESEA programs at the state level, including calculating funding entitlements to LEAs and monitoring how campus allocations are applied. Title I, Part A funds are intended to help schools with high concentrations of students from low-income families provide high-quality education that will enable all children to meet the state student performance standards. A large portion of these funds, therefore, should flow to the campuses to fund supplemental initiatives which improve student achievement.

Statutory rules and regulations are provided to clarify the allocation process. In addition, the “颏” symbol is used throughout the guide to indicate that documentation should be maintained for specific areas addressed, as appropriate. Please note that the instruction and information of this document is according to statute and does not address any flexibility waivers that may be in place.

State and LEA allocations are calculated as part of the overall allocation process for Title I, Part A funds. Figure 1 below illustrates that the Title I, Part A program is authorized through ESEA to provide funds to each state education agency, or TEA in Texas. The funds, based on specific formulas, flow from the United States Department of Education (USDE) to TEA. TEA then provides funding entitlements to LEAs based on specific funding formulas. The initial funding is provided through Title I, Part A planning entitlements. LEAs use this amount to initially plan programs and services at the LEA and campus levels prior to the completion of the funding application.

The LEA will then determine which eligible campuses will receive funds and how the funds are allocated, and which private non-profit schools are eligible for services, if applicable.

Figure 1: Flow of Title I, Part A Funds.
Campus Eligibility

The LEA determines campus eligibility and whether to serve a campus based on the level of poverty at each campus and campus allocation rules. Campus eligibility refers to whether a campus is eligible to receive funds and participate in the Title I, Part A program. ESEA statute allows the following measures of poverty to be used:

- Children (ages 5-17 inclusive) in poverty counted in the most recent census data approved by the Secretary of Education
- Children eligible for free and/or reduced-price lunches under the National School Lunch Act
- Children in families receiving assistance under the Temporary Assistance to Needy Families (TANF) program
- Children eligible to receive medical assistance under the Medicaid program
- A composite of any of the above measures

Once the LEA determines the measure of poverty, this same measure must be used to identify eligible school attendance areas, determine the ranking of each attendance area, and determine campus allocations. For example, the LEA cannot choose one measure to identify eligible attendance areas and a separate measure to rank campuses within the attendance area.

Whichever method is used, the LEA must maintain documentation regarding the data source and how the data was applied to determine campus eligibility.
Three Fiscal Requirements

The LEA must meet three fiscal requirements related to the expenditure of regular state and local funds and keep these in mind when making decisions regarding campus allocations, particularly with multiple attendance area LEAs where there are multiple campuses in any grade span. The three fiscal requirements are as follows:

1. Maintain state and local effort, or Maintenance of Effort (MOE).
2. Provide services in project areas with state and local funds that are at least comparable to services provided in areas not receiving Title I, Part A services, or Comparability of Services.
3. Use Title I, Part A funds to supplement, not supplant, regular non-federal funds, or Supplement, Not Supplant.

As TEA is determining planning entitlements, the Agency staff must review LEA compliance with MOE. Consequently, an LEA may receive its full allocation of Title I, Part A funds for any fiscal year only if TEA determines that the LEA has maintained its fiscal effort in accordance with Section 9521 of ESEA. This section of federal statute requires that LEAs receiving Title I, Part A funds must continue to maintain fiscal effort with state and local funds. In other words, state and local expenditures cannot be reduced because of the availability of federal funds. Title I, Part A MOE specifically stipulates that the combined fiscal effort per student or the aggregate expenditures for the preceding fiscal year was not less than 90% of the combined fiscal effort or aggregate expenditures for the second preceding fiscal year. This means that LEAs must maintain local and state effort from one year to the next at 90%. MOE is an LEA-level calculation which includes overall funding.

Before LEAs make decisions about federal funding allocations to campuses, staff must ensure that Title I, Part A campuses receive the share of state and local funds they would receive in the absence of Title I, Part A funds. LEAs cannot simply reduce the share of state and local resources because the campus is eligible for Title I, Part A program funds.

LEAs must maintain documentation regarding compliance with MOE calculations for the independent auditor.

While MOE is an LEA-level calculation, comparability of services is used to calculate the level of state and local funds for campuses. Therefore, ESEA requires that campuses receiving Title I, Part A funding must receive the same level of services through state and local funds as campuses that are not receiving Title I, Part A funding using comparability of services calculations. If all campuses in the LEA or charter school are receiving Title I, Part A funds, then the LEA or charter school must ensure that state and local funds used to provide services at the Title I, Part A campuses are substantially comparable, taken as a whole, at each Title I campus or that state and local funds used to provide services at the Title I, Part A campuses with higher percentages of low-income students are equal to or greater than the services provided at the Title I, Part A campuses with lower percentages of low-income students.

The comparability tests verify whether campuses are receiving their fair share of state and local funds; therefore, as LEAs are determining campus allocations, it is important to ensure that local and state funds provided to campuses are also reviewed using this filter.

Maintaining supporting documentation for data used in comparability calculations is critical to showing TEA how tests were derived and compliant on annual comparability reports.
The supplement, not supplant provision is applied once campuses receive their funding allocation and begin making decisions regarding obligation and expenditure of funds. This fiscal requirement stipulates that LEAs and campuses may only use Title I funds to supplement and, to the extent practical, increase the level of funds that would, in the absence of Title I funds, be made available from non-federal sources for the education of students participating in Title I programs. In no case may Title I funds be used to supplant—i.e., take the place of funds from non-federal sources. In Texas, any program activity required by state law, State Board of Education (SBOE) rules, or local board policy may not be paid with these funds. State or local funds may not be decreased or diverted for other uses merely because of the availability of these funds.

While supplement, not supplant applies to all ESEA programs, it differs in targeted assistance versus schoolwide program models for Title I, Part A.

Schoolwide Programs—A campus participating in a schoolwide program shall use Title I, Part A funds only to supplement the amount of funds available from non-federal sources for the campus including funds needed to provide services that are required by law for children with disabilities and children with limited English proficiency. A schoolwide campus does not have to demonstrate that activities are supplemental. The school is not required to identify particular children or to provide supplemental services to identified children. Other funds may be used on a schoolwide campus in combination with Title I, Part A funds. A schoolwide campus that coordinates funds pays for an activity using multiple fund sources and tracks each portion to an allowable program expenditure. A schoolwide campus that consolidates funds pays for an activity that improves its entire educational program using funds from the consolidated pool. Schoolwide programs that consolidate funds are exempt from statutory or regulatory requirements of other federal education programs, provided that the intent and purposes of such programs are met and the needs of the intended beneficiaries of the federal fund sources combined are met. The effectiveness of the program is measured by student performance.

Targeted Assistance Programs—Title I, Part A funds and services must supplement, not supplant, the services that would be provided, in the absence of Title I, Part A funds, from non-federal sources. Records must be maintained that document that Title I, Part A funds are expended on activities and services for only Title I, Part A eligible children identified as having the greatest need for special assistance. Any program activity required by local policy, state law, or SBOE rule may not be funded with Title I, Part A funds.

It is generally an LEA’s responsibility to ensure that the supplement, not supplant requirement is met and that a schoolwide program school receives all the state and local funds it would receive were it not a Title I schoolwide program school. In other words, an LEA may not reduce its allocation of state and local funds and resources to a schoolwide program school because the school receives federal funds to operate a schoolwide program. An LEA should be able to demonstrate, through its regular procedures for distributing funds and resources, that it distributes state and local funds fairly and equitably to all its schools—including schoolwide program schools—without regard to whether those schools are receiving federal education funds. For expenditures that are considered supplanting, the LEA must make the appropriate adjustments to bring all expenditures in compliance during a current fiscal year. If audits reveal that supplanting occurred in a prior fiscal year, these expenditures are considered questionable costs. The LEA may be required to refund those costs.

LEAs and campuses should maintain documentation to show that Title I, Part A programs and services are supplemental.
Preparing for Campus Allocations

The LEA and campuses conduct and document respective comprehensive needs assessments to identify how Title I, Part A funds will be used to assist the LEA and campuses in supporting eligible campuses and students who are failing, or most at risk of failing, to meet the state academic performance standards. On a targeted assistance campus, the strategies and activities funded through Title I, Part A must be supplemental to strategies and activities funded through state and local funds or mandates. This is how the supplement, not supplant provision begins and is applied to all expenditures for Title I, Part A. On a schoolwide campus, Title I Part A funds must supplement the amount of funds available from non-federal sources for the campus, but the schoolwide campus does not have to demonstrate that activities are supplemental.

**LEAs and campuses should maintain documentation to justify that a comprehensive needs assessment was conducted at the LEA and campus levels.**

The LEA and campuses revise the improvement plans at the LEA and campus levels to include goals, objectives, strategies, activities, and resources which are needed to improve LEA, campus, and specifically student performance outcomes. The plan ultimately serves to inform stakeholders about how the organization intends to close achievement gaps between subgroups of students, build school and district capacity, and make connections between the funds that flow to the organization and its intended actions. Therefore, a focused and well-developed plan provides clear direction, defines programming, and creates accountability for growth and improvement within the organization. It also serves as one of the primary financial and program audit documents for use of federal, state, and local funds. Campuses operating as Title I, Part A schoolwide or targeted assistance campuses are also required by
Title I, Part A federal law to annually develop or amend an annual plan that incorporates federal schoolwide and targeted assistance planning requirements, as applicable to the school's program status. The plans must clearly include the required components; describe how the school will use Title I, Part A resources to implement the components; list how state and federal funds are consolidated to implement the program, if applicable; and must include sufficient activities to address the needs of the intended beneficiaries of the federal program funds.

LEAs and campuses should maintain documentation to justify that improvement plans were revised and reflect the needs and priorities identified in the comprehensive needs assessment.

The LEA's Title I, Part A planning estimates are provided by TEA to begin the planning process for the next program year. This amount is provided mid- to late spring. The LEA will then meet with required members to consult about the application and program participation. At a minimum, teachers, paraprofessionals, principals, other relevant school personnel, and parents participate in planning Title I, Part A program activities to prepare the LEA's application for funding. Consultation will include private non-profit schools, if applicable. The results from these consultation meetings are used to guide funding decisions.

LEAs should maintain documentation for all consultation meetings and the outcomes for those meetings.

The LEA determines which reservation of funds will be included in the application, either because the reservation is required in statute or because the LEA has determined that the funding reservation is an LEA priority as outlined through the comprehensive needs assessment and improvement planning processes.

LEAs should maintain documentation to show which reservations of funds were used and the justification for the amounts included in the funding application.

The LEA determines the method it will use to allocate Title I, Part A funds to campuses and designates funds as required in statute. In addition, the LEA will determine which private non-profit schools are eligible to participate and will use the consultation process to determine which services will be provided. LEA campus allocations and private non-profit services will be discussed further in the guide.

LEAs should maintain documentation regarding the allocation methods used, including the campus allocation spreadsheet.
LEA Funding Process

ESEA requires that all states and LEAs submit applications to request and receive approval for federal funds. Title I, Part A funds must be used for programs, activities, and strategies that are scientifically based on research and meet needs identified through the comprehensive needs assessment process. The comprehensive needs assessment must be completed prior to applying for the funding because the application for funding must address identified priorities. This process is conducted for each campus served and at the LEA level if funding will also be used at this level. Expenditures must also be tied to the LEA or campus improvement plan, depending on how the expenditure will be used and coded, e.g., at the LEA or campus level.

These two documentation sources—comprehensive needs assessment and improvement plans—serve as the justification for program and supplemental Title I, Part A funding needs.

Reservation of Funds

ESEA statute outlines how LEAs should reserve funds to meet program requirements. Below is a list of the reservation options, followed by descriptors for each. Because the reservation of funds at the LEA level will reduce the amount of funds available for distribution to participating campuses, the LEA must consult with teachers, pupil services personnel (where appropriate), principals, and parents of children receiving services to determine, as part of the LEA plan, what reservations are needed. This must also be a part of the consultation with private school officials before the LEA makes any decisions that affect the opportunity for eligible private school children to participate in Title I, Part A programs.

The LEA must maintain documentation of the reservations taken for authorized Title I, Part A activities.

Reservation options that LEAs may be required to reserve to meet program requirements include:

- Parent Involvement
- Private Non-Profit Schools
- Preschool Programs
- Administration
- Professional Development
- Homeless Students
- Neglected
- Delinquent
- Other
1 **Parent Involvement Activities**—If the entitlement amount is greater than $500,000, the LEA must reserve at least 1% of funds for parent involvement activities. Of this 1%, 95% must be allocated to participating campuses. This amount becomes part of the campus allocation and is reflected in function 61 budget line item(s).

LEAs and campuses should maintain documentation to justify how parent involvement funds were allocated and expended to meet the intended purpose.

2 **Title I, Part A Services to Eligible Private School Students, Not Including Administration**—Note: This reservation is not applicable to charter schools. If eligible private non-profit schools choose to participate, the LEA must involve the participating private non-profit school officials during all phases of the development and design of the program through ongoing communication. The equitable services worksheet provided by TEA must be used to calculate the private non-profit school share of funds with this reservation. It is important to note that private non-profit schools only receive services and funds do not flow to these schools.

LEAs should maintain documentation to show ongoing consultation and how funds were allocated to eligible and participating private non-profit schools through the equitable services worksheet.

3 **Preschool Programs**—Funds may be reserved to supplement the LEA’s preschool program services.

LEAs should maintain documentation to show how funds were reserved for supplemental preschool programs.
4 **Administration of Title I, Part A Programs, Including Administration of Title I, Part A Programs for Eligible Private School Students and Students at Facilities for Neglected and Delinquent**—This reservation is intended for program administration costs.

LEAs should maintain documentation to show allowable administration costs.

5 **Districtwide Professional Development Activities**—The LEA has the option to reserve funds for districtwide professional development activities for participating Title I, Part A campuses. It is important to note that LEAs with both Title I, Part A served campuses and non-Title I, Part A campuses must ensure that these funds are used only for participating campuses and that supplanting does not occur because funds were used for Title I, Part A participating campuses and other state or local funds are used for non-participating campuses.

LEAs should maintain documentation to show how professional development was supplemental and provided to eligible campuses.

6 **Services to Homeless Students Attending Campuses Not Served by Title I, Part A**—The homeless reservation is meant for homeless students attending non-Title I campuses. These funds should be administered at the LEA level rather than included in any campus budget. If the LEA chooses to make an additional LEA-level reservation to provide services to homeless students attending Title I campuses, the LEA may include a description of this second reservation under reservation #11 for “Other.”

LEAs should maintain documentation to show how the needs of homeless students were addressed.

7 **Services to Students Residing in Local Facilities for the Neglected**—This reservation is for students residing in local facilities for neglected students within the LEA boundaries.

LEAs should maintain documentation regarding programs and services provided to neglected students.

8 **Services to Students Residing in Local Facilities for the Delinquent**—This reservation is for students residing in local facilities for delinquent students within the LEA boundaries.

LEAs should maintain documentation regarding programs and services provided to delinquent students.

9 **Other**—The LEA has the option to reserve funds for other LEA-wide activities, including summer school, technology initiatives, homeless, and others, as determined by LEA needs.

LEAs should maintain documentation regarding other programs and services provided to eligible campuses.
Amounts that are reserved by the LEA are not included in the determination of campus allocations (See Figure 3). Even though some of the activities may occur on specific campuses, the funds that are reserved do not become part of any campus budget. If the total reservations exceed 30% of the entitlement, TEA will contact the LEA for justification of reservations.

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{LEA Title I, Part A Entitlement} & \quad - \quad \text{LEA Reserved Funds} \\
\text{Funds for Campus Allocations}
\end{align*}
\]

Figure 3. LEA’s Title I entitlement, minus the reservations, equals the campus allocations.

**Participating Title I, Part A Campuses & SC5000 Application Schedule**

The LEA will initially determine campus eligibility using recent poverty measure data and maintain records to document the number of students from low-income families, the students who meet the eligibility criteria, and the students identified as having the greatest need for special assistance. Whichever poverty measure the LEA chooses to use, the LEA must use the same measure of poverty to:

- identify eligible school attendance areas,
- determine the ranking of each attendance area, and
- determine campus allocations.

This information is included in the SC5000 schedule of the application. The SC5000 schedule details for TEA the LEA’s campus data, including the enrollment at each campus, low-income percentages, and whether campuses will be served as schoolwide programs, targeted assistance programs, or not served at all. The data on this schedule should match what is entered in the campus allocation spreadsheet which the LEA develops to document, at a minimum, reservation of funds and campus allocations.

LEAs should maintain all documentation for data and figures entered in the SC5000 schedule of the funding application.
Single Versus Multiple Attendance Areas

LEAs fall into one of two categories: single or multiple attendance areas. These are defined as follows:

- A single attendance area LEA has **one campus per grade span**.
- A multiple attendance area LEA has **an enrollment of more than 1,000 students and more than one campus in any grade span**.

Single or multiple attendance areas are important because they guide how funds may be allocated to campuses.

LEAs should maintain documentation to show whether the LEA is a single or multiple attendance area LEA.

**Single Attendance Area**

If the LEA is a single attendance area (i.e., the LEA has only one campus per grade span) or if the LEA has a total enrollment of fewer than 1,000 students, then all campuses are eligible to receive Title I, Part A services. The LEA may choose to serve any or all of its campuses without regard to the percentage of students from low-income families. What does this mean? The LEA has the flexibility to serve one or all of its campuses and may decide how much the campuses receive after the reservations of funds are determined. The following apply to single attendance area LEAs:

- Any or all campuses may be served regardless of poverty percentages.
- A per pupil amount is determined and multiplied by the number of low-income students to determine the individual campus allocations.

The following two examples show how two single attendance LEAs allocated their funds:

**Example 1**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Campus Funds Available After District Reservation of Funds</th>
<th>Campus</th>
<th>Number of Students</th>
<th>Per Pupil Allocation</th>
<th>Total Campus Allocation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>$51,000</td>
<td>Elementary School</td>
<td>250</td>
<td>$92</td>
<td>$23,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Middle School</td>
<td>200</td>
<td>$90</td>
<td>$18,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>High School</td>
<td>200</td>
<td>$50</td>
<td>$10,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Example 2**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Campus Funds Available After District Reservation of Funds</th>
<th>Campus</th>
<th>Number of Students</th>
<th>Per Pupil Allocation</th>
<th>Total Campus Allocation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>$51,000</td>
<td>Elementary School</td>
<td>250</td>
<td>$124</td>
<td>$31,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Middle School</td>
<td>200</td>
<td>$100</td>
<td>$20,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>High School</td>
<td>200</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Multiple Attendance Area

If the LEA is a multiple attendance area (i.e., the LEA has more than 1,000 students and more than one campus per grade span), a school attendance area is eligible to receive Title I, Part A services if the percentage of low-income students residing in the school attendance area is equal to or greater than the LEA as a whole. In other words, the campus percentage is equal to or greater than the LEA average. The LEA must serve campuses according to campus allocation rules defined in statute. These include the following:

1. The LEA must rank its campuses according to the percentage—not number—of students from low-income families.
2. If Title I, Part A funds are insufficient to serve all eligible campuses, the LEA must, without regard to grade span, serve in rank order those campuses that exceed 75% poverty. This is necessary because the purpose of Title I, Part A is to serve students in poverty; these campuses must be served and not receive less than any campus below the 75% threshold.
3. If Title I, Part A funds remain after serving all campuses exceeding 75% poverty, the LEA shall a) rank the remaining eligible campuses either by grade span or by LEA as a whole, and b) serve these campuses in rank order, either within the selected grade span grouping or within the LEA as a whole.
   An LEA that chooses to serve campuses with 75% poverty or less using grade span groupings may determine different per-child amounts for different grade spans as long as those amounts do not exceed the amount allocated to any campus above 75% poverty. Per-child amounts within grade spans may also vary, as long as the LEA allocates higher per-child amounts to campuses with higher poverty rates than it allocates to campuses in the grade span with lower poverty rates.
4. The same districtwide poverty data must be used if the LEA chooses to continue with the districtwide ranking. In other words, the LEA cannot use one set of poverty data to fund some campuses and another set for other campuses.
5. For ranking by grade span groupings, the LEA may use (1) the districtwide poverty average or (2) the districtwide grade span poverty averages for the relevant grade span grouping.
6. If an LEA has no school attendance areas above 75% poverty, the LEA may rank districtwide or by grade span groupings, meaning elementary, middle, and high school groupings.
7. An LEA’s organization of its schools defines its grade span groupings. For example, if an LEA has elementary schools serving all elementary grades, middle schools, and high schools, the grade span groupings would be grades K-5, 6-8 and 9-12. To the extent an LEA has schools that overlap grade spans (e.g., K-5, K-8, 6-8), the LEA should include a school in the grade span in which it is most appropriate. This implies that there may be schools that don’t fit the general grade span groupings such as a K-8 school. The LEA will decide whether it is grouped with elementary or middle schools. The LEA is not required to allocate the same per-child amount to each campus; however, the LEA must not allocate a greater per-child amount to a campus with a lower poverty rate than it allocates to campuses with higher poverty rates.
### Multiple Attendance Area Campus Allocations

The table for **Figure 4** represents data entered in the SC5000 schedule of the Woodland ISD sample application and should be used to develop the LEAs campus allocation spreadsheet. This initial spreadsheet ranks the LEAs campuses by low-income percentage as noted in Column G. As described earlier, the LEA has the discretion to serve a campus up to the 35% poverty rate; therefore Catalpa Elementary is the final campus served at a poverty rate of 35.25%, as allowed in statute. Columns H and I indicate that the top three campuses will be served as schoolwide campuses and the next two will be served through a targeted assistance model. Because the district average is 32.05%, the LEA had the option to also serve Cedar Middle school, since it is at or above the district average. The number of students meeting low-income criteria for each campus is noted in red. These will be the figures used to determine the per pupil allocations for each campus. Oak and Birch must receive more funding **PER PUPIL** than any of the other campuses, because they are above the 75% threshold.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>List of ALL Campuses Operated by the LEA in Descending Order of Percentage of Students Meeting Low-Income Criteria (per Col. G) (Do not enter JJAEP campuses)</th>
<th>Campus No.</th>
<th>Grade Span</th>
<th>Total Number of Students ENROLLED at Each Campus</th>
<th>Number of Students RESIDING in Each Attendance Area</th>
<th>Low-Income Percentage (In General, Col. F / E)</th>
<th>Optional Method*</th>
<th>SW</th>
<th>TA</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>G</td>
<td>H</td>
<td>I</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oak Elementary</td>
<td>101</td>
<td>PK-5</td>
<td>500</td>
<td>480</td>
<td>384</td>
<td>80.00</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Birch Middle School</td>
<td>041</td>
<td>6-8</td>
<td>430</td>
<td>430</td>
<td>324</td>
<td>75.35</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aspen Elementary</td>
<td>102</td>
<td>K-5</td>
<td>325</td>
<td>300</td>
<td>177</td>
<td>59.00</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mesquite Middle</td>
<td>042</td>
<td>6-8</td>
<td>320</td>
<td>320</td>
<td>158</td>
<td>49.38</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Catalpa Elementary</td>
<td>103</td>
<td>K-5</td>
<td>510</td>
<td>505</td>
<td>178</td>
<td>35.25</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cedar Middle</td>
<td>043</td>
<td>6-8</td>
<td>458</td>
<td>458</td>
<td>150</td>
<td>32.75</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hackberry Middle</td>
<td>044</td>
<td>6-8</td>
<td>462</td>
<td>450</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>12.22</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Elm Elementary</td>
<td>104</td>
<td>PK-5</td>
<td>840</td>
<td>840</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>5.95</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maple High School</td>
<td>001</td>
<td>9-12</td>
<td>900</td>
<td>900</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>2.78</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>4683</strong></td>
<td><strong>1501</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Figure 4. Sample SC5000 for Woodland ISD.**
As the LEA makes decisions regarding allocations to campuses, Figure 5 shows that Woodland ISD begins with a Title I, Part A planning amount of $1,000,000. In this example, the planning committee arrived at decisions for reservations based on the LEA's current comprehensive needs assessment. Through the decision-making process in this example, the LEA has reserved $108,000 for LEA-wide activities. This leaves a balance of $892,000 to allocate to campuses.

Because the LEA received more than $500,000, the requirement to reserve at least 1% for parent involvement activities is applicable. Of the 1% reservation, 95% must be allocated to participating campuses. Each of the campuses on this spreadsheet will also receive parent involvement funds above the allocations noted in Figure 5.

Using the poverty data, the campuses noted in Figure 5 will participate in Title I, Part A. The LEA will provide Oak Elementary and Birch Middle School with a per-pupil figure of $850. This amount is multiplied by the number of low-income students at each respective campus to get the total campus allocation figures. Oak will receive a base amount of $326,400 and Birch will receive a base amount of $275,400. Because they are above the 75% poverty level, they must receive more per-pupil than the other participating campuses.

Aspen Elementary will receive $700 per pupil, Mesquite Middle will receive $550 per pupil and Catalpa Elementary will receive $446.07 per pupil. The total campus allocations reflect the $892,000 that was available for campuses at Woodland ISD.

**Woodland ISD:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Planning Entitlement</th>
<th>Reservations</th>
<th>Campus Allocations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>$1,000,000</td>
<td>- $108,000</td>
<td>$892,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Campus</th>
<th>Low Income %</th>
<th># Low-Income Students</th>
<th>Per-Pupil (LEA decision)</th>
<th>Campus Allocation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Oak Elementary</td>
<td>80.00</td>
<td>384</td>
<td>$850</td>
<td>$326,400</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Birch Middle</td>
<td>75.35</td>
<td>324</td>
<td>$850</td>
<td>$275,400</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aspen Elementary</td>
<td>59.00</td>
<td>177</td>
<td>$700</td>
<td>$123,900</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mesquite Middle</td>
<td>49.38</td>
<td>158</td>
<td>$550</td>
<td>$86,900</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Catalpa Elementary</td>
<td>35.25</td>
<td>178</td>
<td>$446.07</td>
<td>$79,400</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>$892,000</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure 5. Woodland ISD's Campus Allocation and Per Pupil Amounts.
Grade Span Groupings
For ranking by grade span groupings, the LEA may use (1) the districtwide poverty average or (2) the districtwide grade span poverty averages for the relevant grade span grouping.

Any campuses that are above the 75% threshold must receive more PER PUPIL than other campuses below the 75% poverty level. Figure 6 below illustrates that campuses above 75% will each receive $500. The subsequent grade span grouping shows that K-5 campuses will receive $300, 6-8 will receive $400 and 9-12 will receive $250 per pupil. For these campuses at 75% or below, an LEA may, but is not required to, allocate the same per-child amount to each campus.

The per-pupil amount may vary within a grade span grouping, as long as campuses with a higher poverty level receive more per pupil than those campuses with a lower poverty percentage.

Figure 6. Sample representation of per pupil amounts for multiple attendance area grade span groupings.

LEA Discretion
An LEA has local discretion and may designate as eligible:
- Any campus where at least 35% of the students are from low-income families.
- Any campus that is not in an eligible school attendance area using the residing method if the percentage of students from low-income families enrolled is equal to or greater than the percentage of students from low-income families in a Title I, Part A participating campus. This is called the “Optional Method.” This option can only be used if the percentage of low-income students enrolled at the campus is equal to or greater than the percentage of low-income students in a participating school attendance area.
- Any ineligible campus that was eligible last year and was served as a Title I, Part A campus, if the LEA elects to continue serving that campus as a Title I, Part A campus for one additional transition year. This means that this option may not be used for more than one year.

LEAs should maintain documentation for any LEA discretionary decisions.
Skipped Campuses

An LEA may choose NOT to serve—or skip—an eligible attendance area that has a higher poverty percentage if all of the following conditions are met:

- The “skipped” campus meets the comparability of services requirement.
- The “skipped” campus receives supplemental funds from other state or local sources that are expended according to the requirements of a targeted assistance or a schoolwide campus.
- The funds expended from such other sources equal or exceed the amount that would be provided to the campus under Title I, Part A.

If the LEA chooses to “skip” a campus, the LEA must provide the eligible private school children who reside within the boundaries of the “skipped” campus’ attendance area the opportunity to receive Title I, Part A services.

LEAs should maintain documentation to show which campuses were skipped and how the LEA met the fiscal requirements necessary when this option is applied.

125% Special Allocation Rule

An LEA may choose to serve a campus that falls below the 35% threshold. However, any LEA that provides Title I, Part A services to any campus that has a low-income percentage of less than 35% must apply the 125% special allocation rule to ALL its participating campuses. This means that the LEA must allocate to ALL participating campuses an amount for each low-income child in each participating campus that is at least 125% of the LEA’s allocation per low-income child. This rule applies regardless of whether the LEA is a single attendance area or a multiple attendance area.

LEAs should maintain documentation regarding campus percentages and whether any campus below the 35% threshold was served through Title I, Part A. If so, the 125% calculations should be documented.

**125% Calculation:**

Step 1: Total LEA Entitlement / Total Low-Income Students = Base Amount Per Pupil

Step 2: Base Amount Per Pupil x 125% = Minimum Amount Per Pupil to All Campuses Served

There is an exception to this rule. If an LEA uses the feeder pattern of an elementary school with a low-income percentage of 35% or more to establish the low-income percentage of a middle or high school whose original low-income percentage was below 35%, the LEA is not required to implement the 125% special allocation rule. However, if the LEA uses the feeder pattern to qualify a campus, the LEA is required to use the base funding for the campus on the number of low-income students projected by the feeder pattern.
Feeder Pattern Eligibility and Allocations

The feeder pattern for an LEA determines which campus a student attends when completing grades at one school and moving to the next. Generally, when students finish a particular elementary school, they attend a particular middle school, and then a particular high school. The elementary schools that are associated with a particular middle school are “feeder campuses” for that middle school. Likewise, there may be multiple middle schools that become the “feeder campuses” for the high school. Figure 7 illustrates that Elementary Schools 1 and 2 are the feeder campuses for Middle School 1, and Elementary Schools 3 and 4 are the feeder campuses for Middle School 2. Both middle schools are the feeder campuses to the single high school.

Feeder patterns may be used to establish a qualifying low-income percentage either for initial campus eligibility so that the campus may be served as a Title I campus or for schoolwide program eligibility. If the LEA uses a feeder pattern to project a low-income percentage for a particular campus, the LEA must use the feeder pattern percentage to project the number of low-income students for determining the appropriate allocation for that campus.

In the example shown in Figure 7, Middle School 1 has a poverty percentage of 33%. The campus cannot be served because it falls below the district average of 46.06% and below the 35% LEA discretion in statute. The district average was calculated by dividing the number of low-income students by the LEA’s total enrollment:

\[
\frac{2,837 \text{ Low-income students}}{6,159 \text{ Total enrollment}} = 46.06\% \text{ Low-income percentage}
\]

In order to use the feeder patterns, the combined enrollment for both elementary schools equals 950. The combined low-income students for both elementary schools equals 687. When we divide low-income students by total enrollment (687 divided by 950) the Middle School 1 new feeder pattern low-income percentage equals 72.31%. This campus is now eligible to be served using the feeder pattern methodology. If the LEA chooses to serve Middle School 1, it will be on the basis of the 72.31%, not the original 33%; therefore, serving this campus will not activate the 125% Special Allocation Rule.

LEAs should maintain documentation if the feeder pattern method is used to serve campuses.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Enrollment:</th>
<th>Low-income students:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Elementary #1</td>
<td>450</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Elementary #2</td>
<td>+500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>950</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\[
\frac{687 \text{ Low-income }}{950 \text{ Total enrollment}} = 72.31\% \text{ Low-income percentage}
\]
Figure 7. Examples of feeder patterns for elementary and middle schools.
Carryover Funds and Allocations

There are additional considerations for campus allocations based on carryover funds. Carryover funds are the funds that the LEA “carries over” from the previous year as unspent dollars. The Title I, Part A program has a 15% statutory limitation on carryover funds, unless the LEA is eligible for a waiver or receives less than $50,000 in any fiscal year. Per Title I, Part A statute, there is LEA discretion regarding how to use carryover funds from the prior year. Figure 8 provides some options for carryover funds.

LEAs should maintain documentation to outline how carryover funds were used.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Consideration</th>
<th>Option</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Allowing each campus to retain its carryover funds for use in the subsequent year.</td>
<td>If so, these funds are added to the LEA’s current year entitlement, once the previous year’s Title I, Part A final expenditure report is submitted to TEA. The LEA will allocate these funds to each respective campus above their current year allocation.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adding carryover funds to the LEA’s subsequent year’s entitlement and distributing to participating campuses in accordance with allocation procedures.</td>
<td>If so, the LEA will combine carryover and current entitlements to determine campus allocation figures.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Designating carryover funds for particular activities or campuses in greatest need.</td>
<td>If funds are assigned to campuses in greatest need, these funds will be designated in the LEA’s allocation spreadsheet as a separate allocation column (with a defined, designated need), or follow the allocation rules for campuses with the highest percentages of low-income students and provide additional funds to these campuses.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Allocating to schools with the highest concentrations of poverty in the LEA, thus providing a higher per-pupil amount to those schools.</td>
<td>If so, funds may appear as a separate column or follow the allocation rules if the funds are totaled with the planning entitlement for the current year.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Providing additional funds for specific activities such as school improvement activities.</td>
<td>If so, funds may or may not be noted in the LEA’s allocation spreadsheet, depending on the activity.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure 8. Options for using carryover funds.
TEA Funding Phases

The initial campus allocations are determined and documented using the Title I, Part A planning entitlements provided by TEA. If the LEA receives reallocation funds, the LEA may need to adjust the campus allocation spreadsheet when additional funds are provided to the campuses. Note that not every LEA will receive a reallocation amount. LEAs must meet specific TEA-established criteria to be eligible for reallocation of funds. When the maximum entitlement is provided to the LEA, the LEA may need to adjust the campus allocation spreadsheet if additional funds are allocated to campuses.

The campus allocations noted in the spreadsheet should match the appropriations entered in the LEA’s budget management system. Therefore, when additional amounts are added to campus allocations, the spreadsheet and budget management system should be adjusted and matched, accordingly.

The process of determining Title I, Part A campus allocations is critical. In addition to the allocation rules, where LEA discretion exists, it is important for the LEA to consider the following Title I, Part A statutory priority areas:

1. Ensuring that high-quality academic assessments, accountability systems, teacher preparation and training, curriculum, and instructional materials are aligned with challenging state academic standards so that students, teachers, parents, and administrators can measure progress against common expectations for student academic achievement.

2. Meeting the educational needs of low-achieving children in our nation’s highest-poverty schools, limited English proficient children, migratory children, children with disabilities, Indian children, neglected or delinquent children, and young children in need of reading assistance.

3. Closing the achievement gap between high- and low-performing children, especially the achievement gaps between minority and non-minority students, and between disadvantaged children and their more advantaged peers.

4. Holding schools, LEAs, and states accountable for improving the academic achievement of all students, and identifying and turning around low-performing schools that have failed to provide a high-quality education to their students, while providing alternatives to students in such schools to enable the students to receive a high-quality education.

5. Distributing and targeting resources sufficiently to make a difference to LEAs and schools where needs are greatest.

6. Improving and strengthening accountability, teaching, and learning by using state assessment systems designed to ensure that students are meeting challenging state academic achievement and content standards and increasing achievement overall, but especially for the disadvantaged.

7. Providing greater decision-making authority and flexibility to schools and teachers in exchange for greater responsibility for student performance.

8. Providing children an enriched and accelerated educational program, including the use of schoolwide programs or additional services that increase the amount and quality of instructional time.
9. Promoting schoolwide reform and ensuring the access of children to effective, scientifically based instructional strategies and challenging academic content.

10. Significantly elevating the quality of instruction by providing staff in participating schools with substantial opportunities for professional development.

11. Coordinating services under all parts of this title with each other, with other educational services, and, to the extent feasible, with other agencies providing services to youth, children, and families.

12. Affording parents substantial and meaningful opportunities to participate in the education of their children.
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