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Executive Summary

As required by the Missouri School Improvement Plan (MSIP) standards, school districts must evaluate Title I services biennially. The questions approved by the Board of Education for the present program evaluation were as follows:

1. Are students who are receiving services in the Title I programs meeting expectancy or showing progress in areas in which they are receiving services?
2. Has the extent/level of parent or guardian participation in the educational process of students who are receiving Title I services improved over previous years?

The present evaluation includes a review of achievement and survey data. Based on stakeholder review of the data, strengths, concerns and recommendations are noted.

Results

Strengths

Based on Achievement Data:

- Given the significant disabilities and challenges of the population served in the Title I program in the special education schools, of students receiving services in reading and/or writing, approximately one quarter are meeting their expectancy level (i.e., achievement commensurate with cognitive ability).
- For those students not at expectancy, progress is being demonstrated by a significant percentage of students.
- To guard against students being dropped from Title I service too soon, students are being retested in the fall to make sure they maintain expectancy levels before exiting the Title I program.
- The W-Score from the WJ-III is a reliable indicator of progress.
- The data supports that pull-out (one-to-one) service is an effective instructional model for helping students meet expectancy. Adding push-in to the pull-out services gives an additional advantage. Push-in combined with pull-out seems to suggest that best practice of teacher collaboration and consistency of sharing learner objectives benefits student outcomes the most.
- Despite the highly mobile court program population, the percent of students receiving a pre and post test is very high.
- Three quarters (n=70) of the students who were at JDC and Lakeside 90 days or more demonstrated progress in reading. Many of the students show a year or more gain in less than a year’s time.

Based on Title I.A Parent Phone Survey:

- Many parents still are not attending meetings at school; however they are involved with their child’s education in a variety of other ways. Parents indicate they have more involvement with their child’s education in activities in the community and at home.
- When parents/guardians attend activities at school, they state they find the experiences beneficial and enjoyable.
Concerns

- Despite improvements in students reaching expectancy, a large percentage of students are not reading at grade level.
- Fewer parents than the previous year conferenced with the Title I teacher prior to the IEP or talked with the reading specialist sometime during the school year. Of those who did not have a conference prior to the IEP, some did not want to schedule time to meet with the reading specialist.
- Parents indicate that a barrier to participation at school activities and trainings is that meeting times are not convenient.

Recommendations

- Develop a form for reading specialists to use to write an individualized reading and/or writing plan for caseload students based on the WJ-3 subtest scores, DRA, and writing rubric. The plan would be a vehicle for communication with administrators and classroom teachers and be a guide for focusing Title I and classroom instruction. The plan would also be used to frame conversations with parents.
- Develop a formative assessment process which enables Title I teachers to adjust instruction so to maximize the number of students reading at grade level.
- Utilize the Push In + Pull Out delivery model in schools for Title I students and continue to share disaggregated Title I assessment data (i.e., gains, instructional model differences, etc.) with principals.
- Find additional ways for parents to participate without actually being present at training such as CDs, podcasts, DVDs, wikis and making training handouts available.
- Through the Title I Newsletter, assist parents in accessing resources in the areas of friendship, social skills, and reading/writing strategies.
- Revise Parent Phone Survey question 5 to include a phone call as an option to scheduling a conference if the parent had not talked with the reading specialist or conferenced prior to the IEP. Also add an additional question to the parent survey to determine if the person answering the questions is the person who provides the most academic support for the child throughout the year. If the parent/guardian who answers the phone is not the person who provides academic support, then they will be asked how to contact the academic support provider. It should be noted that in making this change, the return rate may decrease due to not being able to reach the parent/guardian who provides the academic support, but the quality and reliability of the responses will hopefully be high.
- Continue to provide building summary results of the Parent Survey to building administrators, highlighting the parents’ responses on the barriers to participating so adjustments can be made when building level activities are planned. Share those results with the SSD Parent Education & Diversity Awareness Resource Center administrators so district planned activities are sensitive to the needs of parents, as well.
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Program Evaluation Question(s)
1. Are students who are receiving services in the Title I programs* meeting expectancy (i.e., achievement commensurate with cognitive ability) or showing progress in areas in which they are receiving services?

2. Has the extent/level of parent or guardian participation in the educational process of students who are receiving Title I services improved over previous years?

* The Title I programs are Title I.A: Improving the Academic Achievement of the Disadvantaged and Title I.D: Prevention and Intervention Programs for Delinquent and At-Risk Students.

I. Program/Service Information
1. Name of Program or Services:
   Federal Grant Program: Title I

2. Personnel Responsible for Evaluation and Program (list):
   Phyllis Kulp – Federal Programs Administrator

3. Demographic Description of 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 through the Federal Grants Management Division of the Department of Elementary and Secondary Education. Title I includes Title I.A funds for targeted assistance programs that qualify schools based on the number of students who receive free or reduced lunches and Title I.D that qualifies schools for funds based on being a delinquent institution. There are four sites that qualify for funding in 2008-2009 under Title I.A: Ackerman, Litzsinger, Neuwoehner, and Northview. Lakeside Center and the Juvenile Detention Center (JDC) receive funding under Title I.D. The district uses Title I funds to employ seven literacy coach/reading specialists and two reading specialists paid out of Title I, as well as partially fund an administrative assistant and a Federal Programs administrator. Approximately 43 students from Ackerman, Litzsinger, Neuwoehner, and Northview currently receive services under Title I.A. Students reading and writing below expected levels and not diagnosed as LD in reading or written language are eligible for service. Eligibility is determined each year. As students’ skills reach expectancy, they are exited from the program based on fall testing scores, ensuring they have maintained expectancy over the summer. All students at Lakeside and JDC are eligible for Title I services. On any given day, approximately 90 students are enrolled at JDC and Lakeside.

4. Date of Evaluation (Year/Duration):
   March 2007-April 2009
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5. Goal/Objective of Program/Services:
The goal of the Title I Program is to improve the academic achievement of
disadvantaged students and students in delinquent institutions by providing
supplemental reading and writing instruction to eligible students.

6. Brief description of relationship between program goals, CSIP and MSIP Standards:
Program goals are related to CSIP and MSIP standards. The questions submitted
by the committee were intended to review the progress of the Title I program after
its 2007 Standard Program Evaluation and to reflect the standards set by the
Missouri School Improvement Program (MSIP Standard 6.3, 6.3.1, 6.3.2, 6.3.3,
6.3.6, and 7.5) and District CSIP (Goal I.1.A, I.1.C, IV.1.B).

II. Evaluation Criteria for Programs/Services Offered

Achievement Data:
Title I.A Woodcock Johnson-R - FY03-FY05
Title I.A Woodcock Johnson-III- FY06-FY08
Title I.A Developmental Reading Assessment (DRA) – Spring FY04-FY08
Title I.A Writing Rubric Achievement Data – Spring FY05-FY08
Title I.A Full Scale Intelligence Quotient (FSIQ) Data – FY04-FY08
Title I.D Standardized Test for the Assessment of Reading (STAR) Data – Spring
FY06-FY08
Title I.A Parent Phone Survey – Spring FY07-FY08

Program Evaluation for Title I, February 2007

III. Description of Stakeholders Engagement in Program Evaluation:
The stakeholders listed below met on November 3, 2008 to discuss the outcomes from the 2007
Federal Programs evaluation and to define the questions for the April 2009 program evaluation.
The committee met again on December 12, 2008 and January 12, 2009 to analyze the data and
determine strengths, concerns, and recommendations. Information was shared with members
who were not able to attend and notes of the meetings along with any handouts were mailed or e-
mailed. All participants received the notes from each meeting. Additional information was
shared via e-mails, phone conversations, and smaller group meetings.

1. Phyllis Kulp, Federal Programs Administrator and Chairperson
2. Paul Bauer, Director of Special Education Schools
3. Missy Morris, Grant Accountant
4. Kathy Mueller, Title I.D Reading Specialist at Lakeside Center
5. Sharon Campione, Assistant Principal at Ackerman School
6. Judith Lonigro, Federal Programs Parent Advisory Member, Community Member, and
   Neuwoehner Parent
7. Judy Presberg, Administrative Liaison, Parent Education and Diversity Awareness
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IV. Results

Title I.A - Achievement Data: Reading

Woodcock-Johnson-III

Figure 1 shows the cumulative expectancy results for broad reading on the Woodcock-Johnson Psycho-Educational Battery (WJ) for students in the Title I.A program in the following special education schools: Ackerman, Litzsinger, Neuwoehner, and Northview. The WJ-Revised was used in FY03, FY04, and FY05. The WJ-III was used in FY06, FY07, and FY08 and included additional subtests in reading fluency and writing fluency. It should be noted that norms for the WJ were established based on the general education population of children. By definition, eligible Title I students are those identified at the beginning of the year as reading below expectancy based on standard score analyses. For these students to reach expectancy, their reading achievement must increase to a level commensurate with their cognitive ability. Due to the normative nature of standard scores and the delayed reading skills of eligible students, meeting expectancy requires the eligible student to make substantial skill gains during the year that exceed the norm for same-aged peers.

At the end of the 2007-2008 school year, 27% (16 out of 59) of the students who received instruction from the Title I.A reading specialist in the area of reading were reading at expectancy, a level commensurate with their ability. Students achieving expectancy declined steadily between FY03 and FY05, and then increased in the last 2 years (Figure 1).
One possible explanation for the change from a negative to a positive trend line over the last 6 years may have to do with a change in the prevailing instructional model used in the Title I.A program. The decline noted from 03-06 corresponded with the increase in the use of the push-in instructional model. The push-in model is the instructional model Federal Grants management of DESE has recommended since the Improving America’s Schools Act (the predecessor to the No Child Left Behind) was authorized. The push-in model eliminates students missing content classes to receive Title I services, increases the instructional skills of the classroom teacher, eliminates students being singled out, and benefits all students in the classroom, not just the Title I students. However, the push-in model dilutes the instructional focus for identified students. The data used to assess the Title I.A program centers only on the eligible students.

One of the action steps resulting from the 2006-2007 Title I Program Evaluation was to try to determine if push-in and/or pull out instruction has an impact on whether a student reaches expectancy. Instructional model, along with a number of other factors, were analyzed. Analysis of the data from FY07 and FY08 indicates the only factor that appeared to make a difference was the type of instructional model that was being used (Figure 2).

Figure 2.

Students who received just pull out (one-to-one) instruction, or pull out (one-to-one) instruction combined with push-in instruction, were more likely to reach expectancy than those who received just push-in instruction alone (Figure 2). Over the past 2 years, when possible, Title I teachers have increased pull out (one-to-one) instruction.
Another possible explanation for the increase in students achieving expectancy in the last two years may be a change in instructional focus with an increased emphasis on reading fluency as a result of subtest analysis. The WJ-III includes an additional subtest in reading fluency that the WJR did not. Reading specialists, after analyzing the WJ-III scores for their students, responded by providing targeted instruction on reading fluency for those students who had weak scores on the WJ-III.

Assessing Reading Progress: Additional Indicators
Performance on the Developmental Reading Assessment (DRA) is an additional achievement measure used to track reading progress. Progress is defined as moving upward with regard to the level of DRA assessment successfully completed. Of the 34 students who were not at expectancy in reading at the end of FY08 and had received services for at least six months, 30 (88%) made progress as measured by their performance on the DRA (Figure 3).

As a result of the 2006-2007 Title I Program Evaluation, the WJ-III “W” score was identified as an alternative measure of determining progress for students who were not at expectancy at the end of the year. Unlike a Standard Score, the “W” score is a scale score represented as a 3-digit number which increases as students demonstrate increased knowledge in a subject area. Based on spring 2008 WJ-III “W” scores in Broad Reading for students who had been served for 6 months
or more, 84% (26 out of 31 students) showed progress. This figure is generally consistent with the results of the DRA assessment.

Title I.A - Achievement Data: Written Language

Woodcock-Johnson-III
Fifty-one students received Title I assistance in writing during FY08. Expectancy results are illustrated in Figure 4.

Figure 4.

For the 51 students who received Title I assistance with writing, 23% were at expectancy (showed more than a year’s growth in a year’s time) at the end of the 2007-2008 school year as measured by the WJ-III broad written language score. Significant increases in writing were achieved between FY03 and FY04. Students achieving expectancy remained fairly even over the next two years, and then declined in the last 3 years. The drop in scores in FY06 corresponds to the change from the WJ-R to the WJ-III. The addition of the written fluency subtest in the WJ-III negatively impacted student scores as it is a component of the Broad Written Language standard score.
Assessing Written Language Progress: Additional Indicators

Performance on the Writing Rubric, an assessment using writing samples done in the fall and spring with students who receive written language Title I.A service, is an additional achievement measure used to track progress in written language. Progress is defined as an increase in score on the Writing Rubric. Of the 38 students who were not at expectancy in written language at the end of the year and had received services for at least six months, 27 (71%) made progress (Figure 5).

Figure 5.

As indicated earlier, the WJ-III “W” score was identified as an alternative measure of determining progress for students who were not at expectancy at the end of the year. The “W” score from the WJ-III for Broad Written Language was used as an additional measure for students who were not at expectancy in writing. Based on spring 2008 WJ-III “W” scores in Broad Written Language for students who had been served for 6 months or more, 73% (22 out of 30 students) showed progress. This figure is generally consistent with the results of the Writing Rubric reported above.
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Disaggregated Analysis
Title I.A reading at expectancy results disaggregated by race (Figure 6) and written language expectancy results disaggregated by race (Figure 7) are presented below.

Figure 6.

Over the past 2 years the reaching expectancy scores remained fairly consistent with black students outperforming white students on the WJ-III in Broad Reading. Hispanic and Asian subgroups are not represented due to small sample size.

Figure 7.

In the area of written language over the past 3 years the scores of black and white students
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achieving expectancy on the WJ-III are very close. Hispanic and Asian subgroups are not represented due to small sample size.

Title I.A reading at expectancy results disaggregated by gender (Figure 8) and written language expectancy results disaggregated by gender (Figure 9) are presented below.

Figure 8.

Disaggregated gender data was difficult to interpret because of the small sample size for females.

Figure 9.

Disaggregated gender data was difficult to interpret because of the small sample size for females.
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Title I: Maintenance of Skills
Students receiving Title I services are not exited from the program based on their spring WJ-III scores. Students who are at expectancy in the spring are retested in the fall to make sure they have maintained their skills. If a student is at expectancy again in the fall, they are exited from Title I. Results of the maintenance of skills assessment are presented in Figure 10 for those students who were at expectancy in the spring and returned in the fall. Thus, this data represents a subset of students reported in Figures 1 and 4.

Figure 10.

In the fall of FY09, for students who received services in reading and were at expectancy the previous spring, 91% (10 out of 11 students) maintained expectancy. Students maintaining expectancy remained fairly even for two years, declined for two years, then increased over the last two years. In the fall of FY09 students who received services in written language and were at expectancy the previous spring, 75% (3 out of 4 students) maintained expectancy. For three years maintenance scores declined, increased over the following two years, and then remained generally consistent over the last two years. Due to the small sample sizes, caution should be noted when interpreting results.
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Title I.A - Achievement Data: Reading at Grade Level
Measuring students’ progress based on reaching expectancy is consistent with determining eligibility for Title I services and takes into consideration the cognitive functioning level of the students. However, looking at the percent of Title I students who are reading at grade level is an indicator of how those students will perform on the MAP test. Furthermore, all students reading at grade level is an expectation of No Child Left Behind (NCLB). Performance on the Developmental Reading Assessment (DRA) is an additional achievement measure used to track reading progress to determine if students are reading at grade level. Using the DRA results from the spring Title I testing and comparing that to the student grade level gives a different picture of reading achievement for Title I students (Figure 11).

Figure 11.

![Graph showing percentage of Title I students reading at grade level](image)

Twelve percent of Title I students were reading at grade level (7 out of 57 students) in FY08. Over the past 4 years there has been a positive trend line. Although the district trend line is positive, there is still a concern that 88% of students were not reading at grade level, indicating they would likely struggle with the state assessment and not meet the NCLB goal.

Upon further analysis of the cognitive functioning levels of Title I students who had pre and post DRA scores, only 30% (17 out of 57 students) had a Full Scale Intelligence Quotient (FSIQ) of 90 or above (90-109 is considered average). These results are displayed in Figure 12.
Recognizing that FSIQ score is not a perfect measure of a student’s intelligence or academic ability, the students in the 90 or above range have the best chance of reading at grade level. Keeping in mind the relationship between FSIQ and reading level, one of the challenges going forward will be to look closely at the students in the average range of intellectual functioning and provide more effective instruction to move them to read at grade level. An equally important challenge will be to maximize the learning of all students, regardless of cognitive functioning level.
STAR
Due to a change in Federal regulations for delinquent programs, Title I.D Standardized Test for the Assessment of Reading (STAR) data was collected at JDC and Lakeside Center starting in FY06. Upon entry to JDC and Lakeside students were given the STAR Reading assessment, which measures the students’ grade level equivalent in reading. If a student exited the school any time after 90 consecutive calendar days, a posttest was given. Results were reported to the Department of Elementary and Secondary Education (DESE). Due to the nature of the court programs, a highly mobile population; some students do not receive post testing because they depart unexpectedly. Over the past 3 years the percentage of students taking both the pre and post test has increased to 96% (70 out of 73) for both sites. Results for Lakeside (Figure 13) and JDC (Figure 14) are presented below.

Figure 13.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>FY06 22/58</th>
<th>FY07 36/58</th>
<th>FY08 42/57</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Students Took Pre &amp; Post Tests</td>
<td>59/66</td>
<td>58/63</td>
<td>57/59</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Students Did Not Improve</td>
<td>17/59</td>
<td>22/58</td>
<td>15/57</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Students Improved</td>
<td>42/59</td>
<td>36/58</td>
<td>42/57</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Of the 57 students at Lakeside who were there 90 days or more in FY 08 and received pre and
post testing, 42 (74%) showed an increase in reading level (Figure 14). It should be noted that 49% of the Lakeside students made more than 1 grade level of improvement in FY08 (see Appendix A).

Figure 14.

Of the 13 students at JDC who were there 90 or more days in FY08 and received pre and post testing, 11 (85%) showed an increase in reading level (Figure 16). Thirty-eight percent of JDC students (5 out of 13) improved more than 1 grade level in FY08 (see Appendix B).

Title I.A Parent Phone Survey – Spring FY07-FY08

As a result of the 2007 Program Evaluation, the annual Title I.A Parent Phone Survey (Appendix C) was revised by a group of stakeholders to sharpen and clarify questions. The revised survey was administered in the spring of FY07 and FY08. Only parents of students in the Title I.A reading program in the special education schools were surveyed. Prior to making the phone calls in April, a copy of the survey was mailed to parents/guardians with the Title I Parent Newsletter. Parents/guardians had the opportunity of filling out the survey and returning it to school in lieu of getting a phone call. Mailing it home also gave them a chance to become familiar with what was going to be asked. At least 3 attempts, and often more, were made to contact the
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parent/guardians during the month of April. Calls were made at various times of the day and evening to fit the schedules of parents/guardians and capture the opinions of as many as possible. The return rate decreased over the 2 year period: FY07 return rate was 81% (74 of 91 surveyed); FY08 return rate was 76% (53 of 69 surveyed). When analyzing parent survey results, it should be remembered that the individuals surveyed represent a small sample of the population in the schools surveyed, and may not be representative of the school population as a whole.

There were a total of 34 items on the parent phone survey. The ratings for 32 of the items were based on yes/no answers and are reported as the percent of parents who responded “yes” (Table 1, 4, and 6). Four of the 32 questions dealt with barriers to parent participation; thus a yes response to these items reflected a negative response (Table 2, 5). One survey item concerning the usefulness of the Title I Newsletter was based on a Likert scale, with a rating of 1 representing not useful and a rating of 5 denoting very useful (Table 3). The remaining survey item requested parent input for the Title I newsletter topics. Parents indicated accessing resources related to friendship, social skills, and reading/writing strategies as most helpful.

Parent Survey: Strengths
An area of strength is one that is considered a success and meets or exceeds the target/benchmark. There were nine areas of strength on the “yes” indicators for which scores were above 70%. Nine of the eleven indicators that were strengths in FY07 remained so across both years, however slight dips were noted from FY07 to FY08. Two indicators remained the same from FY07 to FY08; two increased, and five decreased. The strengths are noted in Table 1 below.

Table 1. Strength Areas on Parent Phone Survey: Participation

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Indicator (70% or above)</th>
<th>Yes 2007 (n=74)</th>
<th>Yes 2008 (n=53)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Parent discusses the school day with child.</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parent involvement activities were very enjoyable.</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parent communicates with teacher or school</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>96%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parent reads school newsletters</td>
<td>92%</td>
<td>94%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parent willing to be called to get their perspective if changes were being made.</td>
<td>91%</td>
<td>92%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parent feels child better understands what is read.</td>
<td>87%</td>
<td>83%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attended their child’s IEP</td>
<td>86%</td>
<td>81%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parent indicated having read monthly Title I.A Newsletters.</td>
<td>80%</td>
<td>75%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parent says child reads independently.</td>
<td>75%</td>
<td>71%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Title I.A only

Even though parents may not attend activities at school, survey results indicate parents are still very involved and interested in the academic activities of their children.
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There were three areas of strength noted for which scores were 30% or below on items related to barriers to participation. Thus, lower numbers of parents responding “yes” to these items are positive. Two indicators improved and one remained unchanged from the previous year. These strengths are noted in Table 2 below.

Table 2. Strength Areas on Parent Phone Survey: Barriers

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Indicator (30% or below)</th>
<th>Yes 2007 (n=74)</th>
<th>Yes 2008 (n=53)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Transportation is a barrier to parent participation.</td>
<td>38%</td>
<td>18%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lack of child care is a barrier to parent participation.</td>
<td>24%</td>
<td>24%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Topics that are not interesting or applicable are a barrier to parent participation.</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Title I.A only

Transportation is much less of a barrier to participation than the previous year. A possible explanation for the change in this indicator is that the SSD buildings are offering transportation to more school activities. Title I continues to provide transportation when needed and more SSD schools took advantage of the service in 2007-2008.

Parent Survey: Progressing
Tables 3, 4 and 5 show “progressing” indicators that fell below the strength range, but are still above average. Progressing does not necessarily denote an increase in the mean from one year to the next. There was one indicator for which the score was still above average, but fell between 3.0 and 4.0 (Table 3). Eleven of the fourteen indicators that were progressing in FY07 remained so across both years, however slight dips were noted from FY07 to FY08. One indicator moved from a concern in FY07 to progressing in FY08. Three progressing indicators increased from FY07 to FY08, while eight decreased slightly during the same time frame.

Table 3. Progressing Area on Parent Phone Survey

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Indicator (mean between 3.0-4.0)</th>
<th>Mean 2007 (n=74)</th>
<th>Mean 2008 (n=53)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The degree to which the Title I Newsletter was useful.</td>
<td>3.72</td>
<td>3.71</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Title I.A only

Parents continue to find the Title I Newsletter useful. Topics used in the newsletter are based on phone survey results and parent input from the Federal Programs Parent Advisory Committee.
There were ten “yes” indicators that fell in the 50 to 70 percent range (Table 4).

Table 4. Progressing Areas on Parent Phone Survey

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Indicator (50-70%)</th>
<th>Yes 2007 (n=74)</th>
<th>Yes 2008 (n=53)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Parent assists with homework.</td>
<td>68%</td>
<td>69%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parent indicates the child reads more often.</td>
<td>72%</td>
<td>67%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parent indicates the child reads harder level material.</td>
<td>54%</td>
<td>62%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parent assists child with organizing materials.</td>
<td>68%</td>
<td>62%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parent indicates the child reads with or to other people.</td>
<td>68%</td>
<td>60%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parent reads to their child or their child reads to them.</td>
<td>70%</td>
<td>60%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parent takes their child to the library.</td>
<td>49%</td>
<td>58%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parent indicates the child writes more often.</td>
<td>61%</td>
<td>54%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parent sends snacks for school activities.</td>
<td>55%</td>
<td>54%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parent uses a school communication notebook/log.</td>
<td>54%</td>
<td>50%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Title I.A only*

As noted above, parents continue to provide academic support for their children through a variety of means. Three of the indicators increased: assistance with homework, students able to read harder level material, and parent takes child to the library. Seven of the indications decreased from the previous year. One possible reason for the drop may be that the parent/guardian answering the questions was not the family member who provided the most academic support for the child throughout the year.

There was one “yes” indicator that fell in the 31-50 % and was considered progressing (Table 5).

Table 5. Progressing Area on Parent Phone Survey

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Indicator (31-50%)</th>
<th>Yes 2007 (n=74)</th>
<th>Yes 2008 (n=53)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Meeting times not convenient was a barrier to parent participation.</td>
<td>36%</td>
<td>45%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Title I.A only*
There was a sharp increase in this indicator over the last two years. During the phone survey, respondents did not indicate why meeting times were a barrier.

Parent Survey: Concerns
An area of concern is one that is identified as an opportunity for growth or improvement. There were nine “yes” indicators that fell below 50% and were considered areas of concern. Scores decreased in all nine indicators from FY08 and FY09. The concern indicators are itemized in Table 6.

Table 6. Concern Areas on Parent Phone Survey

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Indicator (below 50%)</th>
<th>Yes 2007 (n=74)</th>
<th>Yes 2008 (n=53)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Have met or talked with the reading specialist.</td>
<td>58%</td>
<td>47%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parent indicates the child reads for enjoyment.</td>
<td>53%</td>
<td>43%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parent indicates the child uses reading and writing in technology.</td>
<td>47%</td>
<td>43%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parent conferenced with the reading specialist at the time of the IEP.</td>
<td>51%</td>
<td>40%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parent would like to schedule a conference with the reading specialist if they did not do so at the time of the IEP.</td>
<td>45%</td>
<td>30%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parent participated in parent activities at their child’s school or attended an SSD workshop this year.</td>
<td>32%</td>
<td>29%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parent was interested in serving on a school or district parent committee.</td>
<td>32%</td>
<td>27%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Family listened to Dial-A-Story.</td>
<td>23%</td>
<td>10%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parent volunteered in child’s classroom.</td>
<td>12%</td>
<td>10%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Title I.A only*

Six of the 9 indicators above deal with parents attending meetings. Survey results indicate that parents provide educational support through a variety of means other than attending meetings at school.

V. Summary

**Strengths of Title I.A and Title I.D program/service:**

Based on Achievement Data:

- Given the significant disabilities and challenges of the population served in the Title I program in the special education schools, of students receiving services in reading and/or writing, approximately one quarter are meeting their expectancy level (i.e., achievement commensurate with cognitive ability).
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- For those students not at expectancy, progress is being demonstrated by a significant percentage of students.
- To guard against students being dropped from Title I service too soon, students are being retested in the fall to make sure they maintain expectancy levels before exiting the Title I program.
- The W-Score from the WJ-III is a reliable indicator of progress.
- The data supports that pull-out (one-to-one) service is an effective instructional model for helping students meet expectancy. Adding push-in to the pull-out services gives an additional advantage. Push-in combined with pull-out seems to suggest that best practice of teacher collaboration and consistency of sharing learner objectives benefits student outcomes the most.
- Despite the highly mobile court program population, the percent of students receiving a pre and post test is very high.
- Three quarters (n=70) of the students who were at JDC and Lakeside 90 days or more demonstrated progress in reading. Many of the students show a year or more gain in less than a year’s time.

Based on Title I.A Parent Phone Survey:
- Many parents still are not attending meetings at school; however they are involved with their child’s education in a variety of other ways. Parents indicate they have more involvement with their child’s education in activities in the community and at home.
- When parents/guardians attend activities at school, they state they find the experiences beneficial and enjoyable.

Concerns regarding program/service
- Despite improvements in students reaching expectancy, a large percentage of students are not reading at grade level.
- Fewer parents than the previous year conferenced with the Title I teacher prior to the IEP or talked with the reading specialist sometime during the school year. Of those who did not have a conference prior to the IEP, some did not want to schedule time to meet with the reading specialist.
- Parents indicate that a barrier to participation at school activities and trainings is that meeting times are not convenient.

Recommendations regarding program/service
- Develop a form for reading specialists to use to write an individualized reading and/or writing plan for caseload students based on the WJ-3 subtest scores, DRA, and writing rubric. The plan would be a vehicle for communication with administrators and classroom teachers and be a guide for
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focusing Title I and classroom instruction. The plan would also be used to frame conversations with parents.

- Develop a formative assessment process which enables Title I teachers to adjust instruction so to maximize the number of students reading at grade level.
- Utilize the Push In + Pull Out delivery model in schools for Title I students and continue to share disaggregated Title I assessment data (i.e., gains, instructional model differences, etc.) with principals.
- Find additional ways for parents to participate without actually being present at training such as CDs, podcasts, DVDs, wikis and making training handouts available.
- Through the Title I Newsletter, assist parents in accessing resources in the areas of friendship, social skills, and reading/writing strategies.
- Revise Parent Phone Survey question 5 to include a phone call as an option to scheduling a conference if the parent had not talked with the reading specialist or conferenced prior to the IEP. Also add an additional question to the parent survey to determine if the person answering the questions is the person who provides the most academic support for the child throughout the year. If the parent/guardian who answers the phone is not the person who provides academic support, then they will be asked how to contact the academic support provider. It should be noted that in making this change, the return rate may decrease due to not being able to reach the parent/guardian who provides the academic support, but the quality and reliability of the responses will hopefully be high.
- Continue to provide building summary results of the Parent Survey to building administrators, highlighting the parents’ responses on the barriers to participating so adjustments can be made when building level activities are planned. Share those results with the SSD Parent Education & Diversity Awareness Resource Center administrators so district planned activities are sensitive to the needs of parents, as well.

VI. Action Plan for Recommendations as A Result of Program Evaluation

Person responsible to champion action plan: Phyllis Kulp
Timeframe for reporting updates to Board of Education: Bi-Annually

_________________________________________  Date:_________
Signature of Administrator Responsible for Chairing Evaluation

Board Approved: 5/12/2009
Appendix A. Lakeside Grade Level Equivalent Data
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Neglected and Delinquent Placement Breakdown
Reading FY06 to FY08
Lakeside
90 or More Days

Students Took Pre & Post Tests
Students Negative Grade Level Change
Students No Change in Grade Level
Students Improved Up to 1/2 Grade Level
Students Improved 1/2 to 1 Grade Level
Students Improved Over 1 Grade Level

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>FY06</th>
<th>FY07</th>
<th>FY08</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Students</td>
<td>1059</td>
<td>6159</td>
<td>5759</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Negative</td>
<td>1157</td>
<td>1157</td>
<td>1157</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grade Level</td>
<td>1157</td>
<td>1157</td>
<td>1157</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No Change</td>
<td>159</td>
<td>159</td>
<td>159</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grade Level</td>
<td>159</td>
<td>159</td>
<td>159</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Improved Up</td>
<td>159</td>
<td>159</td>
<td>159</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>to 1/2 Grade</td>
<td>159</td>
<td>159</td>
<td>159</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Level</td>
<td>159</td>
<td>159</td>
<td>159</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Improved</td>
<td>159</td>
<td>159</td>
<td>159</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1/2 to 1 Grade</td>
<td>159</td>
<td>159</td>
<td>159</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Level</td>
<td>159</td>
<td>159</td>
<td>159</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Improved</td>
<td>159</td>
<td>159</td>
<td>159</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Over 1 Grade</td>
<td>159</td>
<td>159</td>
<td>159</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Level</td>
<td>159</td>
<td>159</td>
<td>159</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Neglected and Delinquent Placement Breakdown
Reading FY06 to FY08
JDC
90 or More Days

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Percentage</th>
<th>FY06</th>
<th>FY07</th>
<th>FY08</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Students Took Pre &amp; Post Tests</td>
<td>14/18</td>
<td>3/14</td>
<td>1/11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Students Negative Grade Level Change</td>
<td>78%</td>
<td>79%</td>
<td>93%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Students No Change in Grade Level</td>
<td>36%</td>
<td>21%</td>
<td>15%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Students Improved Up to 1/2 Grade Level</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Students Improved 1/2 to 1 Grade Level</td>
<td>23%</td>
<td>23%</td>
<td>23%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Students Improved Over 1 Grade Level</td>
<td>21%</td>
<td>21%</td>
<td>38%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Board Approved: 5/12/2009
Every spring the Title I reading specialist program conducts a parent phone survey to gather information from parents and guardians on how we are meeting the needs of students and their families.

Sometime after the middle of April you will receive a phone call and will be asked the questions listed on this survey. You are being sent the survey in advance, so you will be aware of what you will be asked. You can, if you prefer, complete the survey now and return it by April 11, 2008, to the Title I reading specialist at your child's school or mail it to Phyllis Kulp, 12110 Clayton Rd., St. Louis MO 63131. If you prefer to do the the survey now, you will not receive a phone call in April; however, you must complete the following information:

Name: __________________________________________________________________________________________________

1. What school does your child attend?
   ○ Ackerman  ○ Litzsinger  ○ Neuwoehner  ○ Northview  ○ Southview

2. Have you or someone in your family talked with your child's Title I Reading Specialist this year?
   ○ Yes  ○ No  ○ Don't know/remember

3. Did you attend your child's IEP in the past year?
   ○ Yes  ○ No  ○ Don't know/remember

4. Were you able to conference with your child's Title I Reading Specialist at the time of the IEP?
   ○ Yes  ○ No  ○ Don't know/remember  ○ Not Applicable

5. If no to question 4, would you like to schedule a conference with her?
   ○ Yes  ○ No  ○ N/A

6. Have you observed improvement in your child's reading and writing in the following areas:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Response Definition: Y=Yes  N=No  NA=Not Applicable</th>
<th>Y</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>NA</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a. reads more often... .................................................................</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b. reads independently ...............................................................</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c. reads harder level materials ..................................................</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d. reads with or to other people ................................................</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e. uses reading and writing in technology...text message, email ....</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>f. better understands what is read ..............................................</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>g. reads for enjoyment ...............................................................</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>h. writes more often .................................................................</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

7. Did you or another family member participate in any parent activities at your child's school or attend an SSD workshop this year?
   ○ Yes  ○ No  ○ Don't know/remember

8. If yes to question 7, was the experience at the school activity or workshop enjoyable and/or beneficial?
   ○ Yes  ○ No  ○ N/A
9. If no to question 7, of the following, what makes it difficult for you to participate:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Response Definition: Y=Yes  N=No  NA=Not Applicable</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a. transportation..................................................</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b. meeting times not convenient..................................</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c. lack of child care...............................................</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d. topics not interesting or applicable..........................</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e. other ........................................................................</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

If (e.) other, please explain:

<p>| |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

10. We recognize that parent involvement means more than just attending events at school. What other ways have you been involved with your child's education: (Response: Y=Yes  N=No  NA=Not Applicable)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Y</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>NA</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a. assist with homework........................................</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b. use communication notebooks/logs..........................</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c. communicate with teacher or school..........................</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d. volunteer in classroom........................................</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e. send snacks for school activities............................</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>f. read school newsletters........................................</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>g. read to your child or have child read to you..............</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>h. take your child to the library..................................</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>i. discuss the school day with your child......................</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>j. help child organize materials..................................</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>k. listen to Dial-A-Story..........................................</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

11. We have sent the monthly **Title I newsletters** home to parents/guardians. Have you had a chance to read it?

- Yes
- No
- Don't know/remember

12. How useful is the newsletter?

- Not useful
- Somewhat useful
- Moderately useful
- Useful
- Very useful
- Not applicable

13. Which **ONE** of these topics would be the most helpful to you to see in the **Title I newsletter**?

- School activities and workshop opportunities
- Homework help
- Reading and writing strategies
- Parenting tips
- Behavior
- Friendship and social skills
- Transition issues
- Other________________________

14. Would you be interested in serving on a school or district parent committee?

- Yes
- No
15. If we're making changes in the Title I program and need a parent's perspective, would you be willing for us to call you to get your opinion?

☐ Yes  ☐ No