



Austin Independent School District

Department of Program Evaluation

Publication Number 05.07
September 2006

Martha Doolittle, Ph.D.
Evaluator

TITLE I, PART A SUMMARY REPORT: 2005-2006

The Title I, Part A program provides federal funds to state and local education agencies under the No Child Left Behind Act of 2001 (NCLB; Public Law 107-110). The purpose of Title I, Part A is to enable state and local educational agencies to support the improvement of elementary and secondary educational programs in both public and private, non-profit schools and institutions. According to NCLB, Title I funds may be used to support schools in providing opportunities for children to acquire the knowledge and skills outlined in the state content standards and to meet the state performance standards developed for all children. Title I, Part A funds help local education agencies serve schools with high concentrations of low-income students.

Title I, Part A funds in Texas are allocated by the U.S. Department of Education to the Texas Education Agency (TEA). Funds flow from the TEA to qualifying Texas school districts. According to the law, the level of Title I, Part A funding for a school *district* (local education agency, or LEA) is based on census data for the percentage of low-income students, ages 5 to 17, living in the district attendance area. Title I, Part A funding for a *school* is determined by the percentage of low-income students living in the school attendance area. For district purposes, a child is defined as low income if he or she is eligible for free or reduced-price meals. Schools are ranked in the spring of each year on the basis of the projected percentage of low-income children residing in the school's attendance area. Districts must serve schools with 75% or more low-income students residing in their attendance area. Remaining schools with less than 75% low-income students are served in rank order, as funding allows. A school's Title I, Part A program can be schoolwide if 40% or more of the children residing in the school's attendance zone are low income. In 2005-2006, Austin Independent School District (AISD) allocated Title I monies to 69 schoolwide campuses (53 elementary schools, 11 middle schools, and 5 high schools) where the percentage of low-income children was 51.5% or more. AISD's 2005-2006 total Title I allocation was \$24,961,011 (\$21,843,035 entitlement and \$3,117,976 roll-forward), most of which went directly to schools. Some funds were used to support programs and services across the district, such as parent involvement programs, homeless student services, curriculum and instruction, professional development, high quality staff, and grant administration.

TITLE I STUDENTS AND STAFF

STUDENTS

According to district student records submitted to TEA, the number of AISD Title I students has increased gradually over the past five years, from 35,641 in 2000 to 48,401 in 2005. Title I students represented 60% of the total AISD student population of 81,155 in 2005. AISD Title I schools tend to have higher proportions of African American (17%) and Hispanic (71%) students than do AISD non-Title I schools (8% and 32%, respectively). In addition, Title I schools tend to serve higher proportions of students who are at risk (62%) and have limited English proficiency (35%) than do non-Title I schools (37% and 26%, respectively).

Title I support services were provided to 3,025 homeless students during 2005-2006, of whom 67% were in AISD due to the recent Katrina and Rita hurricanes affecting the U.S. Gulf Coast. Title I funds also were used to provide services to 191 students at participating private schools and to 15 students at participating facilities for neglected youth, all within the AISD attendance zone.

STAFF

NCLB requires school districts to have a plan for all teachers in core academic subject areas (e.g., reading or English language arts, mathematics, science, social studies) to become highly qualified. In NCLB, "highly qualified" essentially means that teachers who teach in any core subject area must have a bachelor's degree or full state certification in that subject area. From 2002-2003 to 2005-2006, the percentage of AISD teachers who are highly qualified has increased. According to district and state records, at the end of

2005-2006, 99% of teachers in AISD and in all Texas school districts were highly qualified. No difference existed between the percentages of highly qualified teachers at AISD Title I schools and at non-Title I schools. Another requirement for all Texas public school teachers is that they complete annual professional development, and district records show that all AISD teachers completed some type of professional development in each of the past 4 years.

NCLB also requires that all paraprofessionals providing instructional support for core academic subject areas in schools be highly qualified. For 2005-2006, AISD reported that 484 paraprofessional staff provided instructional support at Title I schools and all were qualified to do so (e.g., had a higher education degree, passed a rigorous state/local exam).

STUDENT ACADEMIC ACHIEVEMENT

For more than 20 years, Texas schools have been required by law to assess students' skills in reading or English language arts, mathematics, writing, science, and social studies. Although a variety of tests are in use at this time, the focus in this report is on AISD's results of the Texas Assessment of Knowledge and Skills (TAKS). These tests are based on the state-mandated curriculum, the Texas Essential Knowledge and Skills (TEKS). TAKS are administered to Texas public school students in grades 3 through 11 in the following subject areas: reading (grades 3 through 9); English language arts (grades 10 and 11); writing (grades 4 and 7); mathematics (grades 3 through 11); science (grades 5, 10, and 11); and social studies (grades 8, 10 and 11). AISD results are reported in Table 1.

Table 1: Percentages of AISD Students Meeting TAKS Panel Recommended Passing Standards by Subject for Title I Schools, Non-Title I Schools, and All Schools, 2005 and 2006

| TAKS Subject by School Group | Percentages Passing TAKS 2005 (adjusted) | Percentages Passing TAKS 2006 | Percentage Point Change from 2005 to 2006 |
|---|---|--------------------------------------|--|
| Reading or English Language Arts | | | |
| Title I Schools | 73 | 76 | 3 |
| Non-Title I Schools | 90 | 91 | 1 |
| All Schools | 80 | 83 | 3 |
| Writing | | | |
| Title I Schools | 83 | 83 | 0 |
| Non-Title I Schools | 95 | 95 | 0 |
| All Schools | 87 | 87 | 0 |
| Mathematics | | | |
| Title I Schools | 59 | 62 | 3 |
| Non-Title I Schools | 82 | 81 | (1) |
| All Schools | 68 | 70 | 2 |
| Science | | | |
| Title I Schools | 51 | 55 | 4 |
| Non-Title I Schools | 80 | 79 | (1) |
| All Schools | 65 | 68 | 3 |
| Social Studies | | | |
| Title I Schools | 76 | 73 | (3) |
| Non-Title I Schools | 93 | 90 | (3) |
| All Schools | 84 | 83 | (1) |

Source: TEA Accountability Data Tables as of August 2006; AISD TAKS Records as of June 2006

Note: Data in this table summarize all students in AISD's accountability subset (non-mobile) with a scored test across appropriate administrations and with a scale score equal to or greater than 2100. Eighth graders who took the science test are not included because this test was administered for the first time in 2006. Data from 2005 TAKS were adjusted for 11th graders to Panel Recommended Passing Standards in order to make equivalent comparisons between years. Decreases from 2005 to 2006 are noted in parentheses. All percentages are rounded to the nearest whole number.

The TAKS results show that some small improvement occurred for all schools, considered collectively, from 2005 to 2006 in reading or English language arts, mathematics, and science; a slight decline occurred in social studies; and no change occurred in writing. Overall, the passing rates were higher at non-Title I schools than at Title I schools. Across the district, passing rates were lowest in mathematics at grades 7 through 10 and in science at grades 5 and 10. Passing rates also were lowest for students with limited English

proficiency and those receiving special education services.

ACCOUNTABILITY RATINGS

By law, under the state and federal accountability systems, each Texas public school and district is given accountability ratings annually. These systems include a variety of student participation and performance indicators that determine the schools' and districts' ratings. In the Texas accountability system, the main ratings a school and district can receive are exemplary,

recognized, academically acceptable, academically unacceptable, or not rated. The state accountability system indicators include academic performance by students in all subject areas on TAKS (grades 3 through 11) and on SDAA II (grades 3 through 8), dropout rates (grades 7 and 8), and completion rates (grades 9 through 12). The state accountability system requires that accountability subset data be examined for all students and for the following student groups: White, Hispanic, African American, and economically disadvantaged. In 2005-2006, 6 AISD schools were rated exemplary, 23 schools were rated recognized, 70 schools were rated academically acceptable, 8 schools were rated academically unacceptable, and 5 were not rated. The district's exemplary schools were non-Title I schools. Of Title I schools, 12% (n = 8) were recognized, and of non-Title I schools, 39% (n = 15) were recognized. The majority of Title I schools (81% or n = 56) were academically acceptable; 29% (n = 11) of non-Title I schools received this rating. Five of the eight academically unacceptable schools were Title I schools.

The federal accountability rating system evaluates schools annually for adequate yearly progress (AYP). Participation and performance in the state's reading or language arts and mathematics assessments are used, along with high school graduation rates and elementary and middle school attendance rates. Similar to the state accountability system, the federal accountability system uses the accountability subset of students and examines academic assessment results for all students (i.e., African American, Hispanic, White, and economically disadvantaged student groups). In addition, the AYP system

includes assessment data for limited English-proficient students and students served by special education. In 2006, 59 Title I and 34 non-Title I schools met AYP. In 2006, 9 Title I schools and 3 non-Title I schools missed AYP, mostly due to poor TAKS performance. Title I schools that missed AYP in the same area for two years in a row have been placed in Title I school improvement (i.e., these schools must offer students the choice to enroll at other AISD campuses and must revise their campus improvement plans). Title I schools that missed AYP for 3 or more consecutive years must offer their economically disadvantaged students access to supplementary educational services. Title I schools that missed the same subject-area standards for 4 consecutive years are being required to develop corrective action plans. The non-Title I schools that did not meet AYP also must address areas of need in their campus improvement plans.

SUMMARY AND RECOMMENDATIONS

Although AISD is making gains with respect to the percentages of students passing state-mandated assessments (e.g., TAKS), there is room for improvement, as evidenced by the disparity between performance at Title I schools and non-Title I schools in recent years (Doolittle, 2005, 2004). AISD must continue to focus on providing accelerated instruction and support for those students and subject areas in greatest need (i.e., mathematics and science, especially at middle school and beyond; for limited English-proficient students; and for those students receiving special education services).

The intent of NCLB's Title I, Part A program is to improve the entire educational

program at a school and to support all students in their efforts to acquire the knowledge and skills to meet state academic performance standards. Thus, those students who are in greatest academic need should be identified early and supported throughout the school year with academic interventions. If district and state educational goals for student success are to be met, AISD staff must attempt to identify key characteristics of successful schools—whether they are Title I or non-Title I schools—to improve student success throughout the district.

REFERENCES

Doolittle, M. (2004). *Title I evaluation, 2003-2004*. Austin, TX: Austin Independent School District, Department of Program Evaluation.

Doolittle, M. (2005). *Title I evaluation, 2004-2005*. Austin, TX: Austin Independent School District, Department of Program Evaluation.

No Child Left Behind Act of 2001, P.L. 107-110, U. S. 107th Congress. (2001). Retrieved from <http://www.ed.gov/policy/elsec/leg/esea02/107-110.pdf>

AUSTIN INDEPENDENT SCHOOL DISTRICT

SUPERINTENDENT OF SCHOOLS

Pascal D. Forgione, Jr., Ph.D.

DIVISION OF ACCOUNTABILITY

Maria Whitsett, Ph.D.

DEPARTMENT OF PROGRAM EVALUATION

Holly Williams, Ph.D.

AUTHOR

Martha Doolittle, Ph.D.



BOARD OF TRUSTEES

Mark Williams, President

Rudy Montoya, Vice President

Johna Edwards, Secretary

Cheryl Bradley

Annette Lovoi, M.A.

Lori Moya

Robert Schneider

Karen Dulaney Smith

Vincent Torres, M.S.