



# Austin Independent School District

## Department of Program Evaluation

Publication Number 06.27  
September 2007

Martha Doolittle, Ph.D.  
Evaluator

## TITLE I, PART A SUMMARY REPORT: 2006–2007

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 the 2006–2007 school year, Austin Independent School District (AISD) allocated Title I monies to 70 schoolwide campuses (54 elementary schools, 11 middle schools, and 5 high schools) where the percentage of low-income children was 53.58% or more. AISD's 2006–2007 total Title I allocation was \$28,696,455 (\$22,524,547 entitlement and \$6,171,908 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 5 years, from 35,641 in 2000 to 48,279 in 2006. Title I students represented 59% of the total AISD student population of 82,140 in 2006. AISD Title I schools tend to have higher percentages of African American (16%) and Hispanic (73%) students than do AISD non-Title I schools (8% and 34%, respectively). In addition, Title I schools tend to serve higher percentages of students who are at risk (64%) and have limited English proficiency (37%) than do non-Title I schools (38% and 8%, respectively).

Title I support services were provided to 1,697 homeless students during the 2006–2007 school year. Title I funds also were used to provide services to 172 students at participating private schools and to 16 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. Between 2002–2003 and 2006–2007, the percentage of AISD teachers who are highly qualified has increased. According to district and state records, at the end of 2006–2007, 99.8% of regular education teachers and 99.4% of special education

teachers were highly qualified. No difference existed between the percentages of highly qualified regular education teachers at AISD Title I schools and non-Title I schools. The percentage of highly qualified special education teachers was 100% at non-Title I schools and 99% at Title I schools. Another requirement for all Texas public school teachers is that they complete annual professional development activities, and district records show that all AISD teachers completed some type of professional development activity in the past year.

NCLB also requires that all paraprofessionals providing instructional support for core academic subject areas in schools be highly qualified. For 2006–2007, AISD reported that 441 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 or local exam).

### **STUDENT ACADEMIC ACHIEVEMENT**

Texas public schools are required by law to assess students’ skills in reading or English language arts, mathematics, writing, science, and social studies. This report reviews AISD’s results for the Texas Assessment of Knowledge and Skills (TAKS). These tests, based on the state-mandated curriculum, the Texas Essential Knowledge and Skills (TEKS), 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 Passing Standards, by Subject, for Title I Schools, Non-Title I Schools, and All Schools, 2006 and 2007

<b>TAKS Subject by School Group</b>	<b>Percentage Passing TAKS 2006</b>	<b>Percentage Passing TAKS 2007</b>	<b>Percentage Point Change from 2006 to 2007</b>
<b>Reading or English Language Arts</b>			
<b>Title I Schools</b>	76	77	1
<b>Non-Title I Schools</b>	91	91	0
<b>All Schools</b>	83	83	0
<b>Writing</b>			
<b>Title I Schools</b>	83	85	2
<b>Non-Title I Schools</b>	93	94	1
<b>All Schools</b>	87	89	2
<b>Mathematics</b>			
<b>Title I Schools</b>	62	64	2
<b>Non-Title I Schools</b>	80	81	1
<b>All Schools</b>	70	71	1
<b>Science</b>			
<b>Title I Schools</b>	55	56	1
<b>Non-Title I Schools</b>	79	77	(2)
<b>All Schools</b>	68	68	0
<b>Social Studies</b>			
<b>Title I Schools</b>	73	77	4
<b>Non-Title I Schools</b>	90	92	2
<b>All Schools</b>	83	85	2

Source: TEA Accountability Data Tables as of October 2006, August 2007; AISD TAKS Records as of July 2007

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. Decreases from 2006 to 2007 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 2006 to 2007 in writing, mathematics, and social studies. The lowest passing rates occurred in science and mathematics. Overall, the passing rates were higher at non-Title I schools than at Title I schools, but followed similar patterns. The highest passing rates observed were in reading or English language arts at grades 3 and 11, writing at grades 4 and 7, and social studies at grade 11. Across the district, passing rates were lowest in mathematics at grade 9 and in science at grade 10. Passing rates also were

lowest for limited English proficient (LEP) students 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, and not rated. The state accountability system indicators include academic performance by students in all subject areas on TAKS (grades 3 through 11) and on State Developed Alternative Assessment 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 2007, 7 AISD schools were rated exemplary, 18 were rated recognized, 69 were rated academically acceptable, and 10 were rated academically unacceptable. Five schools were rated academically acceptable in the alternative education accountability system, and 6 schools were not rated. The district's exemplary schools were non-Title I schools. Of Title I schools, 9% (n = 6) were recognized, and of non-Title I schools, 35% (n = 12) were recognized. The majority of Title I schools (77%, or n = 54) and non-Title I schools (44%, or n = 15) were academically acceptable. All 10 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 and multiple student groups (i.e., African American, Hispanic, White,

economically disadvantaged, LEP, special education). In addition, the AYP system includes non-TAKS assessment data for LEP students and students served by special education. According to preliminary 2007 ratings, 56 Title I and 32 non-Title I schools met AYP standards. Thirteen Title I schools and 6 non-Title I schools missed AYP, mostly due to poor test performance. Eight schools were not rated. Title I schools that missed AYP in the same area for 2 years in a row are 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 required to develop corrective action plans. Title I schools in their 5<sup>th</sup> consecutive year of missing AYP in the same area must develop a restructuring plan. 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), room for improvement exists, as evidenced by the disparity between students' performance at Title I schools and non-Title I schools in recent years (Doolittle, 2004, 2005, 2006). AISD must continue to focus on providing accelerated instruction and support for those students and subject areas in greatest need (i.e., for mathematics and science, especially

at middle and high schools; for LEP students; and for 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.
- Doolittle, M. (2006). *Title I Part A summary report, 2005-2006*. Austin, TX: Austin Independent School District, Department of Program Evaluation.
- No Child Left Behind Act of 2001, P. L. 107-110, U. S. 107<sup>th</sup> Congress. (2001). Retrieved August 24, 2007 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.

Publication Number 06.27

September 2007