



Special School District

MEMORANDUM

BOARD MEMO

SUBJECT: Title I Evaluation

TYPE: Action

MOTION: Approve Title I Program Evaluation

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY:

As required by the Missouri School Improvement Plan (MSIP) standards, school districts must evaluate Title I programs biennially. The focus of the present report is: *Does SSD Title I meet MSIP, state and federal guidelines? Has the district implemented recommendations from previous Title I evaluation? What is the level of Title I implementation?*

Title I is one of the entitlement grants that make up the Consolidated Federal Programs, a set of grants funded by the federal government and administered by the state. Title I is designed to help achieve proficiency on challenging state academic assessments by improving reading and math skills.

The priorities and processes of the program are in total alignment with the goals of the program. Priorities ensure that reading and math specialists are responsible for key components that enable them to reach the goals of the program and helps students increase academic achievement, meet the Show-Me Standards, and close the achievement gap.

Strengths, opportunities for improvement and recommendations are based on staff and stakeholder review of the data.

COST: The costs are included in the budget.

ENCLOSURES: Title I Program Evaluation

ITEM PREPARED BY: Phyllis Kulp
Randy Barnes



Coordinator Name

Phyllis Kulp

Planning Team

1. Phyllis Kulp, Federal Programs Administrator and Chairperson
2. Paul Bauer, Director of Special Education Schools
3. Tricia Casalmir, Title I.A Reading Specialist at Southview School
4. Nikol Martin, Federal Programs Parent & Community Advisory Member, Community Member, and Litzinger Parent
5. Latrisa Morgan, Federal Programs Parent & Community Advisory Member, Community Member, and North County Tech Parent and parent of Townsend Elementary special education student
6. Missy Morris, Grant Accountant
7. Kathy Mueller, Title I.D Reading Specialist at Lakeside Center
8. Judy Presberg, Administrative Liaison/Family Services
9. Stephanie Valleroy, Principal of Northview High School
10. Jane Zerr, Federal Programs Parent & Community Advisory Member, Community Member, and Southview Parent

Description of the Program

Title I is one of the entitlement grants that make up the Consolidated Federal Programs, a set of grants funded by the federal government and administered by the state. Title I is designed to help achieve proficiency on challenging state academic assessments by improving reading and math skills

Description of How the Program's Services are Developed and Delivered

Special education schools qualify for Title I.A funds based upon free and reduced lunch percentages. Students in qualifying schools are selected each year for the program based on a set of weighted criteria selected by the district such as reading below grade level, not being identified as Learning Disabled (LD), and taking state Grade Level Assessments or End of Course Exams. The supplemental instruction is provided in pull-out (student receives one-to-one instruction in the Title I room) or push-in (services in the classroom) sessions. As students' skills reach expectancy (achievement commensurate with cognitive ability), they are exited from the program based on fall testing scores, ensuring they have maintained expectancy over the summer.

Court programs qualify for Title I.D funds based upon a survey of students taken in the fall of each year. The Juvenile Detention Center (JDC) and Lakeside Center, SSD's delinquent sites, provide supplemental reading instruction to students with the greatest needs. JDC also provides supplemental math services. All students in the court programs are eligible for Title I services. Students who receive the supplemental help are students with the lowest scores on the STAR reading and math assessments. Students receive Title I services mainly through pull-out, one-to-one instruction.

All programs use instructional strategies based on scientifically-based research and implement parent involvement activities. In consultation with parents, teachers, and district staff, schools receiving Title I funds design supports to the instructional program to meet the needs of qualifying students through annual evaluation meetings. Twice yearly a team consisting of the building administrator, the federal programs administrator, and the reading and math specialists meet to review/analyze Title I data, determine strengths/weaknesses, and establish recommendations and revisions, as well as plan for specific student needs. The results are shared with the building leadership team and building school improvement plans are revised as needed. In addition, a Federal Programs Parent and Community Advisory Committee meets 3 times a year to provide meaningful and ongoing consultation with, and input from, parents to aid in the development of the application and administration of the Title programs.

Key Program Stakeholder Groups

- Students
- Parents
- Staff
- Administrators

- Board of Education
- Taxpayers
- Other (OT)

Student and/or Stakeholder Needs Addressed by the Program

- Special School District's special education schools have students who qualify for Title I services whose reading and writing is not at expectancy (achievement commensurate with cognitive ability). The court programs have students whose reading and/or math skills are not at grade level. These students need assistance improving their reading and/or math skills so that they can master challenging curricula in order to meet the Show-Me standards in core academic areas.
- Collaborative staff (classroom teachers that do planning and/or teaching with the Title I teacher) have access to reading specialists to gain knowledge of research-based instructional strategies.
- Parents gain increased knowledge of their child's overall literacy skills through individual conferences, quarterly progress reports, and Title I Parent Newsletters.

Overall Goals of the Program

Goal 1: The Title I Program will meet all state and federal compliance requirements.

Goal 2: Students who receive Title I services in reading will increase their reading proficiency.

Goal 3: Students who receive Title I services in written language will increase their writing proficiency.

Expected Measureable Outcomes

SSD Title I programs will meet 100% of state and federal compliance requirements.

100% of participating students who receive Title I services in reading in the special education schools will maintain or increase their reading Standard Score on the Woodcock Johnson-III (WJ-III).

The percent of students in the special education schools who receive Title I services in reading who are reading at expectancy will increase 3 percentage points over the previous year. The target goal for 2009-2010 is 28% at expectancy, up 3 percentage points over the 25% achieved in 2008-2009.

Each year 100% of students at JDC and Lakeside who are at the facility 90 or more consecutive days will increase their STAR reading score by .5 grade levels or more or will maintain the highest possible level, 12.9 grade level.

100% of participating students who receive Title I services in written language in the special education schools will maintain or increase their written language Standard Score on the WJ-III.

The percent of students in the special education schools who receive Title I services in written language who are at expectancy in written language will increase 3 percentage points over the previous year. The target goal for 2009-2010 is 29% at expectancy, up 3 percentage points over the 26% achieved in 2008-2009.

Goal 4: Students at JDC and Lakeside will increase their math proficiency.

Each year 100% of students at JDC and Lakeside who are at the facility 90 or more consecutive days will increase their STAR math score by .5 grade levels or more or will maintain the highest possible level.

Evaluation Questions

- What is the status of the program’s progress toward achieving the goals?
- What do students and other stakeholders consider to be the strengths and weaknesses of the program?
- What do staff consider to be the strengths and weaknesses of the program?
- How does the program’s actual implementation compare with the program’s design?
- How should priorities be changed to put more focus on achieving the goals?
- How should goals be changed? Any added or removed?

Data Collection Methods

- Surveys and questionnaires
- Interviews
- Document reviews
- Observations

- Focus groups
- Case studies
- Assessments
- Other (Specify)



Evaluation Results

What is the status of the program’s progress toward achieving the goals?

Goal 1: The Title I Program will meet all state and federal compliance requirements.

Measureable Objective 1:	SSD Title I programs will meet 100% of state and federal compliance requirements.
Results: The 2010 No Child Left Behind (NCLB) Self-Monitoring Checklist was 95.7% district compliant. Two items out of 47 were marked as “district resolving”: Two minor expenditures from 2009-2010 were paid in the 2010-2011 fiscal year. The district did not meet the 100% (SSD was at 98.3% in 2009-2010) highly qualified teachers benchmark required by the state.	

Goal 2: Students who receive Title I services in reading will increase their reading proficiency.

Measureable Objective 1:	Each year 100% of participating students who receive Title I services in reading in the special education schools will maintain or increase their reading Standard Score on the Woodcock Johnson-III (WJ-III) by the spring Title I testing period.
Results: 86% (49/57) of students in the 2009-2010 school year either maintained or increased their reading standard score on the WJ-III.	

Measureable Objective 2:	Based on yearly pre/post testing results on the WJ-III (using reading Standard Score), the percent of students in the special education school who receive Title I services in reading who are reading at expectancy will increase 3 percentage points over the previous year. The target goal for 2009-2010 is 28% at expectancy in reading, up 3 percentage points over the 25% achieved in 2008-2009.
Results: 26% (15/57) of students in the special education schools who received services in reading were at expectancy based on April 2010 Title I testing results. Testing in FY10 occurred a month earlier than the previous years. The trend line has remained relatively flat over the last 3 years (27%=16/59, 25%=9/36, 26%=15/57). Of the students who received Title I services in reading and were not at expectancy, 81% (25/31) demonstrated progress on the Developmental Reading Assessment (DRA) or Qualitative Reading Inventory (QRI), informal reading inventories that measure instructional reading level.	

Measureable Objective 3:	Each year 100% of students at Juvenile Detention Center (JDC) and Lakeside who are at the facility 90 or more consecutive days will increase their STAR reading score by .5 grade levels or more or will maintain the highest possible level (12.9 grade level).
Results: 72% (54/75) of students who were at JDC and Lakeside 90 consecutive days or more increased their STAR reading score by .5 years or more, up from the previous year of 60% (40/67) and matching the level for 2007-2008. Trend line over the last 3 years in up and down (72%=49/68, 60%=40/67, 72%=54/75). One student maintained at the highest level in FY09.	

Goal 3: Students who receive Title I services in written language will increase their writing proficiency.

Measureable Objective 1:	Each year 100% of participating students who receive Title I services in written language in the special education schools will maintain or increase their written language Standard Score on the WJ-III by the spring Title I testing period.
Results: 76% (47/62) of students in the 2009-2010 school year either maintained or increased their reading standard score on the WJ-III from beginning of the year to the spring testing in April 2010.	
Measureable Objective 2:	Based on yearly pre/post testing results on the WJ-III (using written language Standard Score), the percent of students in the special education school who receive Title I services in written language who are at expectancy in written language will increase 3 percentage points over the previous year. The target goal for 2009-2010 is 29% at expectancy in written language, up 3 percentage points over the 26% achieved in 2008-2009.
Results: 34% (21/62) of students in the special education schools who received Title I services in written language were at expectancy based on the April 2010 Title I testing results. Testing in FY10 occurred a month earlier than the previous years. The goal was exceeded and there has been a positive trend line over the last three years (23%=12/51, 26%=9/34, 34%=21/62). Of the students who received Title I services in written language and were not at expectancy, 69% (27/39) demonstrated progress when comparing fall and spring writing sample results.	

Goal 4: Students at JDC and Lakeside will increase their math proficiency.

Measureable Objective 1:	Each year 100% of students at JDC and Lakeside who are at the facility 90 or more consecutive days will increase their STAR math score by .5 grade levels or more or will maintain the highest possible level (12.9 grade level).
Results: 61% (46/75) of students who were at JDC and Lakeside 90 consecutive days or more increased their STAR math score by .5 years or more. There is a slight negative trend line over the last 3 years (67%=44/66, 65%=42/65, 61%=46/75). Three students maintained at the highest level in FY08.	

What do key stakeholders (collaborative staff, parents, program evaluation committee, students who receive Title I services) consider to be the strengths and weaknesses/opportunities for improvement of the program? (Appendix of responses available on request)

<p>Strengths:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Collaborative staff indicated increased personal teaching growth and student growth from support by the Title I Reading Specialist/Literacy Coach. • Parents of students receiving Title I services indicated an increase in parent involvement, as well as their child's increased level of literacy at home. • The program evaluation committee (PEC) noted that the percentage of students who receive services in reading and written language and met expectancy over the last four years has been consistent or increased, despite the fact that testing was conducted a month earlier in FY10. Of those students who were not at expectancy in reading and written language, a large number still made progress based on informal assessments. • PEC indicated that the exiting process in Title I based on fall scores after summer vacation was a strength. • Students indicated that support they receive from Title I reading specialists, particularly the one-to-one instruction, has increased their reading skills and attitude towards reading.

Weaknesses/Opportunities for Improvement:

- The PEC commented on the fact that there are students who are not showing progress and are not reading at grade level.
- Students desire more individual assistance and increased time to work with the Title I teacher, as well as more choice in book selection and writing activities.

What does the program's staff consider to be the strengths and weaknesses/opportunities for improvement of the program? (Appendix of responses available on request)

Strengths:

- Reading specialists enhance their own instructional skills through monthly meetings where they use the data team process, share and refine research-based instructional strategies, and participate in high-quality professional development.
- Use of both pull-out (one-to-one Title I instruction in the Title I room) and push-in (Title I instruction delivered in the special education classroom) service delivery models helps to meet the complex needs of students and encourages staff collaboration.

Weaknesses/Opportunities for Improvement:

- At the delinquent sites where all students are eligible but only those with the severest need receive Title I services, funding does not allow for enough Title I staff to meet the needs of all the students who could benefit from supplemental help.

How well aligned are the program's priorities and processes with the goals of the program?

- The priorities and processes of the program are in total alignment with the goals of the program.
- Priorities ensure that reading and math specialists are responsible for key components that enable them to reach the goals of the program and helps students increase academic achievement, meet the Show-Me Standards, and close the achievement gap.

Deployment Level of Program Services: Services are fully deployed without significant weaknesses or gaps in any areas or schools.

Evaluation Implications

General Recommendation Resulting from the Evaluation

Select from the following possible recommendations resulting from the evaluation:

- Continue the program as is. It is meeting or exceeding all expected outcomes.
- Expand the program, replicating effective components.
- Streamline, refine, or consolidate elements of the program.
- Redesign the program.
- Reevaluate the purpose and/or goals of the program.
- Discontinue ineffective or nonessential program components.
- Discontinue the program.
- Other (Continue the program as is). The goals of the Title I program should be kept the same for the 2010-2011 school year. After 2011 spring testing data is available, use the PDSA process to review and revise the Title I program goals as needed.

Action Plan

1. Use PDSA process to review/revise Title I goals after spring 2011 testing.
2. Due to the change in program evaluation format, develop a simple student survey and change the Parent Phone Survey and Staff survey to include strengths and weaknesses/opportunities for improvement of the Title I program.
3. Continue monthly progress monitoring and the data team process to increase the number of students reaching expectancy and reading at grade level.
4. Continue to monitor changing Federal Programs guidelines and adjust the program as needed.

Cost and Funding Source

No additional funding needed.