

Optional Extended Year Program Summary Report: 2002-2003

Author: Wanda Washington,
Evaluation Specialist

The Optional Extended Year Program (OEYP) was initiated in 1995 as a result of Senate Bill 1 to provide extended learning opportunities for students in kindergarten through grade 8 who are at risk of academic failure. The primary focus of an OEY program is to immediately reduce and ultimately eliminate the need for student retention by providing additional instructional time for students to master the State's academic performance standards (Texas Education Code Section 42.152 & 29.082). OEY programs are designed to accommodate four school-day options: 1) extended day; 2) extended week; 3) intersession for year-round schools; and 4) summer school. A school district may provide instructional services during any of these programs for a period of time not to exceed 30 days. Since 1993, the Austin Independent School District (AISD) has used the OEY program in each of these options to reduce the number of AISD students at risk of being retained. AISD conducted OEY programs during the spring (4th-5th grades) and summer (4th-8th grades) of 2003 at 76 schools and served 2,312 students who would have been retained without the benefit of supplemental instructional.

The Texas Education Agency (TEA) sets the guidelines for promotion, and provides OEY program policy on class size (no more than 16 students to a class and no fewer than 8), attendance, staff development and parental involvement. This report provides a summary of operational and participant outcome (attendance, promotion, parent involvement, and staff development) data, as well as recommendations to assist district program planners, administrators (principals), grants staff, teachers, and school support services staff in the planning and delivery of services to students at risk of not being promoted to the next grade.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

A number of people worked with the AISD Department of Program Evaluation (DPE) in developing and carrying out the 2002-2003 OEYP evaluation. Many thanks go to our department's secretaries, AISD Accountability/PEIMS staff, AISD's School Support Services Staff, OEYP principals, teachers, their mentors, attendance clerks, grants staff, and other staff.

EVALUATION OBJECTIVES

1. To document and report AISD's OEY program activities and expenditures, per state law.
2. To summarize the participation of parents in AISD's OEYP activities.
3. To gather information from OEYP staff (teachers, their mentors, and principals) on the program's implementation, curriculum, and expectations for program participants.

4. To provide AISD decision-makers with recommendations to enhance the operation of the district's OEY program and its ability to foster academic success.

AISD OEY PROGRAM DESCRIPTION

AISD implemented an early intervention program (Accelerated Reading Instruction) in spring 2003 at 70 (95%) of 74 AISD elementary campuses. This program provided supplemental literacy instruction to students in 4th and 5th grades who were not meeting district academic performance standards by the end of the first semester. The OEYP instructional day was defined as four hours of supplemental instruction that took place beyond the regular instructional day. This segment of AISD's OEY program included students with eligibility scores of 60% or less on the Middle of the Year (MOY) benchmark test for reading only, who participated in sessions with a maximum class size of 10 in a specific program type (extended day, week, or the combination of the two). In addition, the spring program included parental involvement, staff development for teachers, and student performance evaluations (attendance, pre- and posttest information, classroom performance, and promotion and retention information).

The campuses used Corrective Reading (Levels B1 and B2) intervention for 4th and 5th grade students with low decoding skills. The Orchestrated Reading Success (ORS) intervention was used for 4th and 5th graders with low comprehension skills. Teachers provided assistance to struggling readers via modeled demonstrations, discussions, independent practices that included guided reading, expository text, TAKS passages from ORS materials, and other approaches. Students were assessed regularly with AISD's Graphic Organizer's rubric to determine the areas in which they needed additional academic support.

Summer school was the other segment of AISD's OEY program using 10 campuses as cluster sites. Four elementary sites provided literacy and mathematics classes through the Student Understanding Can Culminate in Excellence in Summer School (SUCCESS) curriculum to students in grades 4-5 who would have been retained without summer school. SUCCESS teachers used the SRA Corrective Reading and ORS and mathematics curricula provided by the AISD's curriculum office to bring students' reading and math skills up to grade level.

The Summer Math & Reading Time (SMART) program offered academic course grade recovery for promotion at 5 middle school sites for students who were at risk of being retained in grades 6-7 because they had failed to pass at least two of four core subjects during the regular school year. These core subjects were language arts, mathematics, science, and social studies.

At-risk students in grade 8 were served through the Bridges to 9th Grade summer program at the high school they would attend if promoted. OEYP funded only one Bridges summer site.

REPORTING REQUIREMENTS

During September, TEA requires each district that receives OEYP funds to submit OEYP information as part of the district's electronic Public Education Information Management System (PEIMS) report and in a separate OEYP Evaluation Report. The OEYP PEIMS data contain basic demographic information about the students who participated in OEY program activities (i.e., student's name, PEIMS ID number, campus enrollment number, grade level, OEY program type, attendance, and promotion or retention information).

Because a school district's OEY program funding allocation for the succeeding school year is dependent upon the total number of participants reported to TEA in the preceding school year, AISD's spring and summer data on daily attendance and class rosters were reconciled with the district's student database for OEYP participation prior to the electronic transmission of the PEIMS report to TEA. This process eliminated the risk of AISD staff reporting different participant totals for the district in both reports submitted to TEA.

Approximately 10 days after the PEIMS electronic data submission, districts are required to submit an OEY Program Evaluation report and a Final Expenditure report. The following information about AISD's students and parents who participated in 2002-2003 OEY programs was included in the program evaluation report to TEA:

- maximum number of students per grade level and grade configuration;
- numbers of students promoted or failed in grades 6-8 who took 1-3 courses in the summer that they had failed during the regular school year;
- number of teachers and staff other than teachers who worked with the OEYP; and
- number of parents involved in OEYP activities.

To substantiate the PEIMS count and gather the data for the TEA OEYP evaluation report, teachers provided information about their students on a roster provided by staff from the Department of Program Evaluation. Data requested were: 1) student demographics (name, student ID number, current grade); 2) daily attendance; 3) academic classes attended; 4) pre- and posttest data for program participants; and 5) student promotion or retention recommendations.

Program Evaluation staff also gathered data for the report from the district's student database; principals, teachers, and mentors at the OEYP spring and summer sites; and, the AISD Family Resource Center's parent support specialist.

EXPENDITURES

AISD received OEY program funds in January 2003. The Final Expenditure report submitted in September 2003 by AISD as part of the TEA OEYP Evaluation Report for 2002-03 did not include additional expenses posted after the 9/30/03 submission date. Therefore, the amounts shown in this report reflect expenditures as of 9/30/03 only. These expenditures show a project cost of \$831,137. Payroll costs for school staff and other program support staff made up the largest share of the project budget at \$606,529 (73%). Instructional and office supplies, textbooks, testing materials, and janitorial supplies cost \$141,962 (17%). Other operating costs such as refreshments, transportation, awards and incentives cost \$65,483 (8%). Contracted services (e.g., child care for parental involvement activities or nursing services) cost \$17,164 (2%).

STAFFING

In 2002-03, AISD used OEYP funds to support salaries of 318 staff members. Of these, 269 were teachers and 49 were other staff (e.g., principals, teacher aides, mentors, clerks, parent support specialists, curriculum specialists, and a portion of one evaluation specialist). Although Table 1 reflects only the number of teachers funded through OEYP, 13 additional teachers worked in the OEYP but were funded through other district resources. Also, when principals at Accelerated Reading Instruction campuses were asked if staff other than those funded with OEYP funds worked with their students, 51 (100%) of the responding principals named one or more persons, agencies, or other program staff who worked with them (e.g., St. Edward's University, Americorp, Prime Time, 21st Century, Communities In Schools, assistant principals, mentors, teachers, counselors, and others).

Table 1: OEY 2002-2003 Instructional Staff by Program

Optional Extended Year Programs	# of Teachers
Accelerated Reading Instruction, Spring 2003-Grades 4-5	190
SUCCESS, Summer-Grades 4-5	12
Project SMART Summer Middle School-Grades 6-7	62
Bridges to the 9 th Grade, Summer-Grade 8	5
Total	269

Source: AISD's OEYP Performance Report to TEA, September-2003

STAFF DEVELOPMENT

An OEYP principal survey was sent to 80 (spring and summer) OEYP principals. Sixty (75%) were returned. Of the 60 surveys returned, 51 were for principals who held an Accelerated Reading Instruction program on their campus. The other 9 surveys were from

summer school principals (SUCCESS-3, SMART-5, and Bridges-1). OEYP Accelerated Reading Instruction principals reported providing one or more staff development sessions on topics such as Orchestrated Reading Success strategies, SRA Corrective Reading, TAKS Success comprehension, fluency and vocabulary, using the Graphic Organizer's rubric for scoring, decoding comprehension skills, extending Orchestrated Reading Success into TAKS testing strategy format, delivery of lessons, and procedures and policy.

The content of OEYP summer school staff development included training in the use of Orchestrated Reading strategies, SRA Corrective Reading assessment with the Graphic Organizer's rubric, Mathematics and other forms of assessments for SUCCESS teachers; relevant curriculum materials (math, reading, social studies, and special education modifications) for secondary teachers; and TEKS and/or curriculum alignment for all teachers. AISD curriculum specialists provided training in assessment/testing techniques and portfolio expectations. Staff development also was provided on behavioral management, attendance, program schedules, pay, staff assignments, student registration, staff planning and preparation, and evaluation/data requirements.

PARENT INVOLVEMENT

All (60) responding OEYP principals reported providing parent involvement activities during 2002-03. The most common methods used by elementary and secondary schools to notify parents about the program and their child/children's eligibility for participation included: letters/flyer to parents, forms sent home to parents, phone calls to parents, parent/teacher conference, counselors' notices to parents, marquee messages, PTA/PTO meetings, and AISD's TV access channels.

Survey records completed by principals showed a duplicate count of 3,917 elementary and secondary parents participating in OEY program activities during 2002-03. AISD schools hosting OEY programs held a variety of activities to engage parents in their child's learning. The parents were notified through invitations, memos, newsletters, brochures, and phone calls about the activities. The following list includes the most common parent involvement activities reported by OEYP principals and the *attendance totals* for the categories in parentheses:

- Elementary Family Math or Literacy Night (470);
- Middle School Registration and Orientation (428);
- Summer School End of School Awards and Recognition Ceremony (425);
- Bully Proofing (200); and

- TAKS Testing and TEKS Standards (176).

PROGRAM INFORMATION, CURRICULA, AND PROCEDURES

Only principals of summer school (n=10) were asked whether they received adequate information about the program grant, whether their expectations for student success were high, whether the OEYP curriculum used at their school was adequate, and whether the program's student data would be useful to them in planning future activities for their students. Nine of the summer school principals returned the survey. All nine of the summer principals' responses were positive on each of these topics. On the statement concerning curriculum packets, one principal suggested that Read Naturally, a program used by 3rd grade teachers that seemed to help students with reading fluency, be used in future programs.

Several principals offered suggestions for improving program procedures such as hiring more counselors; providing a parent support specialist at each summer site; providing "review" sessions of staff development for teachers on student behavior management, attendance requirements, and payroll issues; and providing more training for campus staff on the student data system in areas such as grades and attendance. Principals also suggested that the OEYP school and class rosters include all data for a student on one spreadsheet and that the spreadsheets be distributed and returned electronically for verification.

PROGRAM COMPLETION, STUDENT PROMOTION AND RETENTION

Teachers in the OEY summer programs made recommendations for student promotion or retention based on their students' pre- and posttest scores (where available), academic work, and attendance. However, student promotion or retention is not necessarily predicated upon these types of data because state law (Senate Bill 1) allows students who attend the program's activities to be promoted to the next grade in one of four situations: 1) meeting program attendance requirements and district academic requirements; 2) meeting academic requirements only; 3) meeting attendance requirements only; or 4) meeting neither attendance nor academic requirement (*subjective student placement*). The final decision to promote or retain a student is made by the home school principal or the parent of the student.

At the end of the program, OEY program rosters with student data, including pre- and posttest scores, attendance information, and recommendations for promotion or retention, were provided to the home school principals who verified the teachers' recommendations for students. The verified data were analyzed to complete the TEA OEY Program Evaluation report and to

provide principals with promotion or retention data on their students. These student data summaries became a part of each student's cumulative record.

Table 2 shows that 2,312 students attended at least one day of an OEY program in 2002-03. Of that number, 2,245 (97%) were promoted. Table 3 shows 63 (2.7%) were retained by principal decision and 4 (0.2%) were retained by parent request.

Table 2: Number and Percent of AISD Students Served and Promoted in OEY Programs 2002-2003

OEY Programs	Grades					Attendance & Promotion Demographics	
	4	5	6	7	8	Total	Total Promoted
Accelerated Reading Instruction-Spring 2003	770	677	1	0	0	1,448	1,433 (99%)
Summer School-2003	92	44	238	422	68	864	812 (94%)
Totals	862	721	239	422	68	2,312	2,245 (97%)

Source: AISD's OEYP Performance Report to TEA, September 2003

Table 3: Number and Percent of AISD Students Served and Retained in OEY Programs 2002-2003

OEY Programs	Total Participants	Number & Percent of Students Retained By Principal Decision	Number & Percent of Students Retained By Parent Request
Accelerated Reading Instruction-Spring 2003	1,448	13 (0.9%)	2 (0.1%)
Summer School-2003	864	50 (5.7%)	2 (0.1%)
Totals	2,609	63 (2.7%)	4 (0.2%)

Source: AISD's OEYP Performance Report to TEA, September 2003

MIDDLE SCHOOL COURSE PERFORMANCE

Table 4 shows data (unduplicated counts) reported to TEA on the number of students in grades 6-8 taking courses in the summer that had been failed during the regular school year. Data for 16 elementary sixth graders are not included in Table 4 because they had no course data available. Overall, course passing rates for students taking one or more courses failed during the regular school year were high, with 99% (705) of middle school students passing summer courses. Although middle school students' eligibility for OEYP summer school began at a minimum failure of two core courses, four students in grade 8 were allowed to take only one course each that they had failed during the regular 2002-03 school year, and all 4 (100%) passed the needed courses.

Table 4: Course Pass/Fail Data for Students in Grades 6-8
 Taking Failed Regular-Term Courses During OEYP Summer 2003

Grade	One Course Failed Regular Term and Retaken During Summer		Two or More Courses Failed Regular Term and Retaken During Summer	
	Number & Percent Passed	Number & Percent Failed	Number & Percent Passed	Number & Percent Failed
6			229 (99%)	2 (1%)
7			408 (99%)	5 (1%)
8	4 (100%)	0	64 (98%)	1 (2%)
Total	4 (100%)	0	701 (99%)	8 (1%)

Source: AISD's OEYP Performance Report to TEA, September 2003

NOTE: Promotion totals and percentages contain some placements.

OEYP TEACHER SURVEY RESULTS

Only teachers who taught in the spring Accelerated Reading Instruction program and the summer programs, SUCCESS and SMART, were surveyed. Teachers who taught 8th grade in the OEYP-funded Bridges to 9th grade were excluded from the survey's administration because there were other high school sites not funded by OEYP who held the Bridges program. See Table 5 for a summary of teachers' responses to the survey. Although most staff perceived the OEY program positively, there were several areas of concern among staff. For instance, survey responses for summer school teachers showed that a majority of them either did not believe parent involvement at their school was good, or they were unsure. These results seem counter-intuitive, in light of the data from principals showing large numbers of parents participating in OEY program activities during 2002-03. Principals provided documentation (sign-in sheets) that supported their participant counts.

Other survey results suggest that some staff need more information on OEYP, and that some would like improvements made in staff development and curricula selected. When asked which staff development, curriculum and other OEYP-related activities they would like to see continued, the majority of teachers recommended continuation of the staff development (including more Saturday sessions) and use of the current OEYP curricula. However, they expressed frustration with the MOY benchmark eligibility score that was used as a pretest score and having to find a comparable posttest. A number of teachers wanted to minimize the paperwork required by program managers and evaluation staff.

Table 5: AISD OEYP Teacher Survey Results, 2003

Survey Item	% Agree	% Disagree	% Undecided	% No Response
Staff development on my campus' program was adequate.				
Accelerated Reading Inst. Teachers (n=135)	82	16	2	0
Summer SUCCESS Teachers (n=16)	82	12	6	0
Project SMART Teachers (n=63)	78	3	9.5	9.5
The curriculum was adequate to meet the program goals.				
Accelerated Reading Inst. Teachers (n=135)	83	15	1	1
Summer SUCCESS Teachers (n=16)	75	19	6	0
Project SMART Teachers (n=63)	73	18	7	2
The rigor/pace of the curriculum' delivery was comfortable.				
Accelerated Reading Inst. Teachers (n=135)	87	11	1	1
Summer SUCCESS Teachers (n=16)	75	25	0	0
Project SMART Teachers (n=63)	75	21	2	2
I received adequate assistance from the curriculum support staff.				
Accelerated Reading Inst. Teachers (n=135)	93	4	2	1
Summer SUCCESS Teachers (n=16)	94	0	6	0
Project SMART Teachers (n=63)	92	5	3	0
In general, I received adequate support from my school staff where I taught OEYP classes.				
Accelerated Reading Inst. Teachers (n=135)	94	5	0	1
Summer SUCCESS Teachers (n=16)	94	6	0	0
Project SMART Teachers (n=63)	95	2	0	3
I received adequate information about the grant (OEYP) that funded the program at my school.				
Accelerated Reading Inst. Teachers (n=135)	86	13	0	1
Summer SUCCESS Teachers (n=16)	75	0	25	0
Project SMART Teachers (n=63)	63	16	18	3
My expectation for student success was met.				
Accelerated Reading Inst. Teachers (n=135)	78	19	1.5	1.5
Summer SUCCESS Teachers (n=16)	75	19	6	0
Project SMART Teachers (n=63)	76	11	8	0
Parent involvement at my school for students participating in the OEYP was good.				
Accelerated Reading Inst. Teachers (n=135)	56	36	6	2
Summer SUCCESS Teachers (n=16)	25	50	25	0
Project SMART Teachers (n=63)	43	30	27	0

Source: AISD OEYP Teacher Survey, 2002-03

Legend: Accelerated Reading Instr. Teachers=Accelerated Reading Instruction Teachers

OEYP MENTOR TEACHER SURVEY RESULTS

Review of the mentor teachers’ survey data showed mixed responses for all but one statement on the survey (See Table 6). The majority of mentor teachers felt they had received adequate support from the school staff where they worked. However, some staff were not satisfied with staff development, grant information provided to them, the availability of assessment (pre and-posttest) information, or tools for Accelerated Reading Instruction staff. At the middle school level, there were concerns about the pace/rigor of the program, and many did not seem to have high expectations for student success.

Table 6: AISD OEYP Mentor Teacher Survey, 2003

Survey Item	% Agree	% Disagree	% Undecided	% No Response
Staff development on operations “specific” to the OEYP (e.g., class rosters, electronic attendance, attendance summaries, and payroll) was adequate.				
Accelerated Reading Inst. Mentors (n=53)	81	13	6	0
Summer Secondary Mentors (n=11)	27	46	27	0
I received adequate information on pre- and posttest assessments.				
Accelerated Reading Inst. Mentors (n=53)	43	32	25	0
Summer Secondary Mentors (n=11)	73	9	0	18
The rigor/pace of the program was appropriate for student learning.				
Accelerated Reading Inst. Mentors (n=53)	85	9	6	0
Summer Secondary Mentors (n=11)	55	18	27	0
In general, I received adequate support from the school staff where I worked.				
Accelerated Reading Inst. Mentors (n=53)	92	4	4	0
Summer Secondary Mentors (n=11)	100	0	0	0
I received adequate information about the grant (OEYP) that funded my program.				
Accelerated Reading Inst. Mentors (n=53)	83	6		11
Summer Secondary mentors (n=11)	36	46	18	0
My expectation for student success was met.				
Accelerated Reading Inst. Mentors (n=53)	75	8	17	0
Summer Secondary Mentors (n=11)	36	46	18	0

Source: AISD OEYP Mentor Teacher Survey, 2002-03

When asked what type of staff development, curriculum or other OEYP related activities they would like to see continued, the majority of mentor teachers suggested continuing the OEY program and the curriculum applicable to their grade level. Elementary mentor teachers suggested revising the pre- and posttest policy to allow the use of tests that are comparable. All

mentor teachers suggested revising the flow of paperwork received from program managers and evaluation staff.

SUMMARY

Review of the data shows very positive outcomes of AISD's 2002-03 OEY program, such as a 99% promotion rate for the 4th and 5th grade students who participated in the spring Accelerated Reading Instruction program. This outcome resulted in a reduction of summer costs (such as transportation, staff, and utilities) since these students did not need additional instruction. Also, 94% of the summer school participants in grades 4-8 were promoted to the next grade. Parent involvement (3,917) was relatively high, and classes were smaller in summer because there were fewer students.

RECOMMENDATIONS

Because the majority of 4th and 5th grade students who participated in the spring Accelerated Reading Instruction program were promoted at the end of the school year, fewer elementary summer resources were needed for the 136 students who attended summer school. Thus, early intervention seems to work well. However, strict promotion standards are in effect under the state's Student Success Initiative. Thus, the first recommendation is to continue the OEY spring and summer programs with more operational uniformity. For instance, stricter program guidelines should be given to campuses regarding required attendance and number of program days, to lessen confusion about reporting data. Secondly, consideration should be given to expanding grade levels served and courses offered because of the success of the early intervention program.

Since students' MOY test scores (<60%) in reading were used to determine their eligibility for the spring Accelerated Reading Instruction program (written as a percentage of items correctly answered and recorded as the pretest), a number of principals and mentors felt that the April 2003 TAKS test results were the only results comparable to use. This caused many mentor teachers in the Accelerated Reading Instruction program to say that they did not receive adequate information on pre- and posttest assessments. This may have generated a delay in posting and returning information to AISD departments or offices at the end of the school year. Therefore, a third recommendation is for program managers to provide a pre- and posttest assessment instrument for the spring program (as was done in the summer) or an approved list of standardized pre- and posttests that all campuses can use along with the MOY benchmark test eligibility measure. Several mentors suggested measures to use such as the TAKS Practice test

(available from Region XIII), the STEMS, a test whose questions are closely aligned to the TAKS information, and teacher-made end-of-unit tests.

Survey results showed that many teachers in both programs felt that parent involvement was less than satisfactory in their schools. Thus, a fourth recommendation is for program managers and campus administrators to offer teachers staff development about ways to involve parents in activities that are tailored to the OEY program that their school is implementing.

Although secondary school mentors/teachers were among the primary players in planning and working with the implementation of the summer OEY program, their self-reported lack of awareness of specific OEYP operations, policies, and procedures leads to another recommendation. Program managers need to provide mentors with specific information on OEY program operations, policies and procedures to help them do their jobs.

The sixth and final recommendation involves district and campus staff who work with student data for OEYP reporting. Coordination needs to occur for staff development on appropriate recording and verification procedures, so that campuses can accurately collect and record student information for the array of reports that must be sent to TEA. Efforts are underway now to address this last area in need to improvement.

Austin Independent School District	
Office of Accountability Maria Whitsett, Ph.D.	Board of Trustees Doyle Valdez, President Ingrid Taylor, Vice President Ave Wahrmond, Secretary Cheryl Bradley Johna Edwards John Fitzpatrick Rudy Montoya, Jr. Robert Schneider Patricia Whiteside
Department of Program Evaluation Holly Williams, Ph.D.	
Project Supervisor Martha Doolittle, Ph.D.	
Author Wanda Washington	Superintendent Pascal Forgione, Jr., Ph.D.
Austin Independent School District Department of Program Evaluation 1111 W. Sixth Street Austin, TX 78703 (512) 414-1724	