

Title I Program Evaluation Summary

Title I program evaluations are conducted at the end of a program year and are intended to measure the efficacy and impact of the district's entire Title I program. This is to include primary services to students and their teachers as well as parent/guardian policies and activities and equitable services provided to private school students. Evaluation data—such as periodic and summative student assessment data—and staff and parent surveys are used to evaluate the strengths and weaknesses of the program's impact on raising student achievement and in productively involving parents/guardians in their children's education. The evaluation must reflect accountability data for the district and all Title I schools.

The program evaluation summary is each Title I school's written summary of the procedures used to evaluate the Title I program, a list of strengths and weaknesses of the program as indicated by findings from data analysis, and description of any consequent program changes made.

The sample templates are not official Massachusetts Department of Elementary and Secondary Education documents. They are provided only as examples.

Title I Program Evaluation – Sample 1

(June 2015)

Our annual program evaluation is based on four primary questions. (1) Has the Title I program produced positive growth and achievement? (2) What has worked well in the Title I program? (3) What has not worked well in the Title I program? (4) What needs to be changed? To answer these questions, collected data was analyzed and integrated into this document. These findings were then used to write our 2015-16 Title IIA and Title I grant.

1. Has the Title I program produced positive growth and achievement?

Our Title I program has produced positive growth and achievement in some areas of our educational programs offered at both the elementary school and the middle school.

At the elementary school, Title I partially funds our Reading Recovery instructor. The pre- and post-test data is comprised of several subtests, including concepts about print, dictation task, letter identification, OhioWord Test, writing, vocabulary, and multiple running records of text reading. Results for grade 1 and grade 2 students participating in Reading Recovery illustrate 100% of these students showed positive growth, whether they participated in the program for part or all of the year (Table A).

Table A: Reading Recovery Data Summary

	Number of Students	Range	Mean Change
All Grade 1 Participants	N = 23	+4 to +24	+ 14.70
Grade 1 Whole-Year	N = 16	+11 to +24	+ 15.81

Grade 1 Partial-Year	N=7	+4 to +17	+ 12.14
All Grade 2 Participants	N = 16	+2 to +20	+ 11.75
Grade 2 Whole-Year	N= 11	+8to+16	+ 11.45
Grade 2 Partial-Year	N=5	+2 to +20	+ 12.40

At the middle school, Title I partially funds our Math Specialist instructor. Grade six students are placed in this class for either a half- or full-year course. Grades seven and eight students are enrolled in this class for an entire year. Pre and post-test data is based on a past grade level MCAS exam, meaning grade six students took a past sixth grade MCAS exam. Scores represent the percent correct in September and in May; their difference indicates growth. Results indicate a large majority of these students showed positive growth (Table B).

Table B: Math Specialist Data Summary

	Number of Students	Range	Mean Change
Grade 6 Full-Year	N=8	+22 to +61	+44.8
Grade 6 Partial-Year	N=8	+11to+54	+ 30.3
Grade 7	N =35	-11to+72	+ 39.0
Grade 8	N = 31	+0 to +56	+ 32.4

On their surveys, both parents and staff reported an increase in students' confidences toward their work and abilities and more positive attitudes toward the subject matter.

At the middle school, Title I funds partially fund our reading specialist, as well. The Gates-McGintie assessment of vocabulary and comprehension is used as a pre- and post-test in September and May, respectively. Subtest scores are averaged together to create a total score for each student. Results indicate a large majority of these students showed positive growth (Table C).

Table C: Reading Specialist Data Summary

	Number of Students	Range	Mean Change
Grade 6	N=6	+6 to +35	+ 23.83
Grade 7	N = 13	+0 to +31	+ 14.00
Grade 8	N=9	-13 to +27	+ 9.33

2. What has worked well in the Title I program?

We are fortunate to have several positive aspects of our Title I program. Our partially funded math and reading specialists at the middle school have positively affected our accountability status. In addition, grade four and five elementary math teachers positively reported about their professional development experiences. Finally, the integration of instructional technology at the Elementary School appeared to be beneficial to teaching and learning.

At the middle school, our preliminary 2012 accountability data indicates that our math and reading specialists have a positive effect on our low-income status subgroup. In FY09, mathematics growth was

only awarded 25 points. By adding a math specialist, student growth earned 75 points in FY12, FY13, and FY14, along with earning the 25 extra credit points in FY14 for decreasing warning/failing by +10%. Our reading specialist has contributed to maintaining our low-income status subgroup's relatively steady ELA growth, earning 50 points in FY11 and FY14 and 75 points in FY12 and FY13.

In the second-half of FY15, a new math consultant was hired to work with elementary teachers on implementing their math program in a more hands-on, manipulative-based approach. Not only did the teachers enjoy the time they spent with her, but they started implementing her strategies that week in their classrooms, according to both the teachers and their principals. The teachers also requested this consultant return in FY16 prior to the start of their more difficult units, so she can give them ideas and strategies to implement in a timely manner.

The elementary school had some instructional technology scattered throughout the building, but it was only accessible to a few teachers. In our first FY15 Title I amendment, we designated more funds to the instructional technology line to increase the availability of instructional technology in classrooms where Title I students resided. The influx of equipment started to change the culture of the school overnight. Teachers reported students as more engaged and eager to learn. Due to this positive reaction, we decided to write a second FY15 Title I amendment in which we used remaining funds to purchase instructional technology for the middle school.

3. What has not worked well in the Title I program?

We are fortunate there are only a few aspects of our Title I program that were not as successful as we would like them to have been last year. One area of concern is that despite positive gains for our low-income status students on local assessments at both the elementary school and the middle school, in FY15, this subgroup still did not meet its overall target toward narrowing proficiency gaps at either school. In addition, although it was not required, we contracted with a Supplemental Educational Service to provide one-on-one tutoring for a select group of Title I students and the results were not as favorable as we expected. Finally, the math professional development that has occurred over the last three years is no longer acceptable.

At the elementary school, our English Language Arts CPI and annual PPI for low-income students have decreased over the last three years, resulting in a cumulative PPI of 69 for FY15 and therefore, we did not meet our target. Our CPI declined from 100, to 25, to 0 and our annual PPI declined from 150, to 75, to 25 over the last three years. Therefore, we need to reexamine how we are delivering ELA services and identify ways to earn an upward swing in FY16.

Despite the middle school's preliminary 2015 accountability data showing positive gains in mathematics and English Language Arts for our low-income status subgroup, we still have a lot of work to do. In FY14, this subgroup still did not meet its growth target and only earned a Cumulative PPI of 58, having had varying Annual PPIs of 81, 56, 69, and 44 over the last four years. The primary area of concern is the ELA CPIs for narrowing proficiency gaps, which earned 75 points in FY09, 25 points in FY12 and FY13, and 0 points in FY14. This downward trend raises a red flag as to the overall effectiveness of our approach to assisting students in English Language Arts.

In addition to educational programs within our schools, we contracted with ClubZ! to provide Supplemental Educational Services to some of our most struggling math and reading students. Five elementary students and seven middle school students took advantage of this weekly, one-on-one, in-home tutoring from approximately February through June. ClubZ! used the Kaufman Test of Educational Achievement, Second Edition to pre- and post-test assess students' mathematics, reading, and writing achievement. Results indicate some students showed positive growth, while others actually showed decline over the four-month time period (Table D). Considering we paid approximately \$51 per hour for this service, we were not pleased with these results.

Table D: ClubZ! Supplemental Educational Service Data Summary

	Number of Students	Range	Mean Change
All Math Participants	N=7	-9 to +18	+ 3.86
All Reading Participants	N =3	-3 to +20	+5.33
All Writing Participants	N=3	-7 to+12	+ 4.00

Over the last three years, the math professional development in both our elementary and middle school was not effective. One math consultant, who was hired by the former Director of Curriculum and Instruction, conducted all of their math professional development. He was respected because he had been in education for a long time, but after the new Director of Curriculum and Instruction observed him working with various grade levels, she questioned his effectiveness. In addition, she informally surveyed teachers he had worked with in the past and found the teachers did not find him helpful, they did not apply his suggestions to their teaching, and felt his sessions were a waste of their time. Therefore, his services were discontinued mid-year and the Director of Curriculum and Instruction found and hired another math consultant for the remainder of the year.

4. What needs to be changed?

Although we collected multiple data sets illustrating positive growth and achievement, we would like to change a few aspects of our program. Our suggested changes include better monitoring of student progress, eliminate Supplemental Educational Services, increase elementary extended day mathematics instruction, and provide quality math and English Language Arts professional development.

After our disappointing decline in narrowing the proficiency gap and not meeting our target, we know we must closely monitor our Title I students' progress. Due to a slow start last year, we were only able to administer one Galilee benchmark test and it was just to help teachers and students get used to the program. We know we must administer multiple tests in FY16, starting with a pre-test in early fall, to collect baseline data and set goals for these students, so we are not surprised by our FY16 MCAS results. Teachers will be given time to work together to analyze the Galileo results and target their instruction to meet these students' needs more carefully, with the intention of improving students' scores as the year goes on.

For our first experience with Supplemental Educational Services, it did not produce the dramatic results we had hoped for when spending a large amount of money per student. Therefore, we decided to

discontinue providing SES and instead, use the money toward increasing our elementary extended day mathematics instruction.

Last year, we had hoped to have a part-time math specialist as part of our elementary school academic program. However, it soon became apparent the students that needed the math specialist were already being pulled from their regular classroom for other services and therefore, had little to no time to be pulled out for math, as well. So, we amended last year's grant to pilot an extended day math instruction program after school using our own classroom teachers as the instructors. We received a lot of positive feedback on our surveys from parents and teachers stating they witnessed students' confidence levels in math increase and their attitude toward math become more positive, primarily because students were better understanding mathematics and were feeling better about their abilities and themselves as math learners. As a result, we decided to increase the number of teachers and students involved in the extended day math instruction in FY16 and to offer it from October through May, with the hopes that these students may see larger gains in narrowing their math achievement gap by having more time on learning.

Finally, our professional development offerings for teachers of Title I students needs to change. The original math consultant was discontinued when his presence was deemed ineffective and a new math consultant who was well received by teacher evaluations at the end of FY15 has already been contracted for FY16 to work with upper elementary and middle school math instructors. In addition, we sought and identified an elementary and secondary English Language Arts consultant to help improve instructional strategies at the elementary and middle school levels.

Title I Program Evaluation – Sample 2

(June 2015)

The effectiveness of [School's] Title I program is evaluated annually, according to our internally developed evaluation procedure. [School] gathers and analyzes data throughout the spring semester. With a small committee made up of various stakeholders within the [School] community, [School] determines the efficacy of Title 1 programming. This involves a full needs assessment by the administrative team, parent surveys, and feedback gathered from faculty and staff. The following captures the findings of this group as it relates to Title 1 programming.

Reading Intervention:

Throughout SY2014-2015, [School's] special educators facilitated reading intervention sessions for groups of three or four students for one hour per week. Included in the needs assessment was a comparison of school wide reading diagnostic scores at the beginning and the end of the school year. This data confirmed that though there were some successes, reading intervention sessions were not as effective as needed for students who placed in the bottom 20th percentile for comprehension. Student groups were too far removed from classroom reading objectives for strategies to carry over and impact independent reading abilities. FY15 Title I funding allowed administrators, the Reading Specialist, and special educators to participate in two different professional development opportunities and purchase sets of resources on Guided Reading for [School] faculty. Those who lead reading recovery efforts at [School] include the Reading Specialist, the Dean of Curriculum and Program, the Humanities Department Chair, a Humanities teacher, and the Director of Special Programs. This reading intervention team decided to move towards a flexible Guided Reading model, as directed by Irene Fountas and Gay Su Pinnell. This model promotes the collaborative work of both Humanities teachers and Special Educators in carrying out guided reading in an inclusion setting. Therefore, FY16 Title I funding includes a stipend for the Reading Specialist who will provide short trainings six times per year to reinforce previous professional development.

Extended Day Program:

FY15 Title I funding made it possible for [School] to pilot an extended day program for qualifying students on IEPs. The program was called After School Learning Lab (ASLL). It provided a place for students with the highest homework needs to complete work under the care and careful supervision of a member of the special programs department, trained in offering targeted assistance. Four students started the year in ASLL, but by the end of the year it had grown to six students. The Director of Special Programs observed the teacher(s) running ASLL multiple times, and examined grades for those students who participated. On average, higher percentages of homework completion from this group lead to a one letter grade increase each quarter for participating students. Observations demonstrated that the special educator was reinforcing strong work habits with students at the beginning of ASLL and checking for comprehension of homework through the remainder of ASLL. One participating student did not see an increase in GPA. Observation notes and attendance records show that this student did not attend

regularly, but also that a student to staff ratio did not make for optimal levels of productivity. Given the success of this program for the majority of participating students, [School] expanded this program for SY2015-2016. It was removed from Title I programming, however, and is now included in Special Education programming instead.

Kindles:

FY15 Title I funding made it possible for [School] to purchase 20 Kindle Fires for students with reading challenges. Kindle Fires allow students to use text to speech technology when reading books and articles that are above their reading level. The goal was to increase access for students to higher level texts that are often required Humanities curricula reading. Anecdotal data showed that students who used Kindles found them very helpful. One student said that the book she read on the Kindle was the first Humanities book that she finished in three years. Another stated that listening while reading helps him focus for longer periods of time. Sign out sheets show that only 18 students made use of Kindles in the first year of implementation. Overall, limited quantitative data was available for analysis of the efficacy of our Kindle Fire program. During SY2015-2016, the Special Programs office will purchase small lock boxes so that teachers can sign-out sets of Kindles and/or keep a small number in their room. Further, the Special Education department will spend one department meeting training teachers to use Kindles with students.

Counseling:

FY15 Title I funding allowed [School] to employ a part time counselor, and provided for a portion of the Director of Guidance and Counseling's salary. During SY2015, the counseling team provided weekly individual therapy for students and facilitated small group counseling sessions for eighty-six students. Students demonstrating higher needs received therapy more often than once per week. Further, the counseling team worked with special educators in building behavior plans, worked with families to find social and emotional support for students outside of school, and coordinated with several agencies in the Boston area, including: the Department for Children and Families, Home for Little Wanderers, Riverside Community Center, Faculty and Staff at partner schools, Cambridge Housing Authority's Workforce Program, and the Guidance Center. Students complete a request form when they would like to speak with a counselor. Logs show that for every one student who receives regular therapy, one more requests to meet with a counselor with relative frequency. To more closely meet this demand, [School] will increase the departments FTE capacity by .75, hiring the student intern who worked with [School] this year as a full-time counselor for SY2014-2016. A portion of this counselor's salary will come from FY16 Title I funding.

Title I Program Evaluation – Sample 3

(June 2015)

The 2014-2015 school year was the first year of implementation of a schoolwide Title I Program at the elementary school. The schoolwide model was designed based upon the theory of action that a systematic process of learning gap identification and remediation would enable the school to progress more effectively toward increasing overall growth and academic achievement for all students.

Students were identified for intervention based upon the results of universal screening assessments administered in the fall of 2014. Forty-three (43) students were identified as at-risk for reading problems and provided daily tutoring. Sixty-four (64) students were identified as at-risk for math learning problems and provided daily tutoring.

Successes

The students in the reading intervention increased their reading fluency about 33% over baseline during the year, and just over 40% improved enough to score within the typical range by the end of the year. Not all of the students in this group had an SGP from a previous year, but among those who did, the median growth percentile prior to the intervention was 21, whereas after the intervention it was 59.

Students in the math intervention significantly increased their speed and accuracy with the four basic operations. Not all of the students in this group had an SGP from a previous year, but among those who did, the median growth percentile prior to the intervention was 37, whereas after the intervention it was 67.

The strongest effects were obtained among the students who received a math intervention *and* participated in Morning Academy, the extended day component of the schoolwide program. Prior to implementation, 40% of these students were proficient or advanced in mathematics. After receiving this combination of treatments, 60% scored proficient or better.

Most importantly, the elementary school met its annual PPI Targets for All Students and for the High Needs and Students with Disabilities Subgroups.

Areas for Improvement

Math Tutoring:

The mathematics intervention includes 5-8 computation skills and 5-8 applied mathematics skills for each grade level. Even with daily tutoring, most of the students were only able to master two or three of the computational skills, and none of the students had even been exposed to any of the applied skills. In the second year of the program, an intranet-based monitoring system will be deployed to monitor students' progression through the various skills tutor meetings will be held on a regular basis with the goal of accelerating student progress through the skills.

Morning Academy/On-line Math Instruction:

Morning Academy was designed with capacity to accommodate all students in grades 4-6. Only half of the students eligible students chose to participate. This is especially vexing because the data showed that the combination of the math tutorial and on-line math instruction that is a component of Morning Academy was able bring most students identified as at-risk in mathematics to proficiency as measured by the Mathematics MCAS subtest. The program improvement efforts related to this will be two-fold: First, the district will directly address misinformation about the Morning Academy program, which many parents have identified as a reason for their students' non-participation. The elementary principal will include a "Morning Academy Myth-busting" section to his monthly newsletter in which he addresses one of the erroneous conceptions parents have identified about the program.

Also, the district will incorporate the same on-line instruction given in Morning Academy into the math tutorial provided for 4th grade students who have scored below proficient on the previous year's MCAS. This group is targeted for an enhanced tutorial because it is a group that has historically underperformed in the district.

Communication:

Last year, parents received an annual report summarizing their children's progress in the Title-I Program. The most pronounced finding of the parent survey sent home at the end of the last year was that parents wanted more frequent communication about their children's progress. This year, Title I reports will be sent with each trimester report card.