

# NCLB Title I, Part A Program Summary, 2010–2011

## Overview

The purpose of this report is to summarize briefly compliance and service data from the federal Title I, Part A grant funds received by the Austin Independent School District (AISD) during 2010–2011. The Title I, Part A grant provides federal funds to state and local education agencies under the No Child Left Behind Act of 2001 (NCLB; Public Law 107-110, 2001) for the purpose of improving elementary and secondary educational programs in both public and private nonprofit schools and institutions.

## Funding

Title I, Part A funds flow from the U.S. Department of Education through the Texas Education Agency (TEA) to qualifying Texas school districts. A school's Title I, Part A funding is determined by the percentage of low-income students living in the school's attendance area. In AISD, a child is low income if he or she is eligible for free or reduced-price meals. Schools are ranked annually on the basis of the projected percentage of low-income children residing in the school's attendance area. Districts must use Title I, Part A funds to 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 allocation can be used school wide if 40% or more of the children residing in the school's attendance zone are low income.

In 2010–2011, more than 67% of AISD's \$31,965,391 Title I, Part A allocation went to its 67 Title I schools (50 elementary, 11 middle, and 6 high). About \$9.6 million was allocated for provision of support programs and services to students, staff, and parents at schools (e.g., school improvement at specific campuses, dropout prevention services, school choice transportation, services to eligible students at private schools and facilities for neglected students, summer school, homeless student services, health services, parent involvement, curriculum and instruction, staff professional development activities). Other funds, totaling \$1.4 million, were

## Program Highlights



**Students.** AISD students attending 67 Title I schools accounted for 51% of the total 2010–2011 student population. Most Title I students were economically disadvantaged (91%) and Hispanic (80%), and 45% were English language learners (ELLs).

**Teachers.** AISD teachers' average years of teaching experience was 11 years district wide, 10 years at Title I schools, and 12 years at non-Title I schools.

**Funding.** AISD Title I schools and district support services to schools received most of the district's \$31.9 million Title I allocation. The approximate Title I cost per student served was \$604 in 2010–2011.

allocated for indirect costs, human resources, accountability, program evaluation, and grant office compliance. Total grant expenditures for the year were \$29,446,122 (92%). Most expenditures were for salaries (67%).

### Students

AISD’s total student population in Fall 2010 was 85,697, and of that 51% attended Title I schools (Table 1). Among Title I school students, 91% were economically disadvantaged (64% district wide), 80% were Hispanic (60% district wide), and 45% were ELLs (29% district wide). By the end of the academic year, approximately 51,106 students had been served by AISD Title I schools. Title I services also were provided to 1,635 AISD homeless students, 86 private school students, and 97 students at facilities for neglected youth.

Table 1. AISD Student Demographics, Fall 2010

AISD student demographic	District (n = 85,697)	Title I schools (n = 43,999)	Non-Title I schools (n = 41,698)
<b>Ethnicity</b>			
American Indian / Alaska Native	0.3 %	0.3 %	0.4 %
Asian	3.3 %	1.1 %	5.6 %
Native Hawaiian/ Pacific Islander	0.1 %	0.05 %	0.1 %
Black	9.5 %	12.3 %	6.6 %
Hispanic	60.3 %	80.1 %	39.5 %
White	24.3 %	5.0 %	44.6 %
Two or more	2.2 %	1.1 %	3.3 %
Economically disadvantaged	63.8 %	90.7 %	35.4 %
English language learner/limited English proficiency (ELL/LEP)	28.6 %	45.4 %	10.9 %
Special education	9.7 %	10.2 %	9.3 %

Source. AISD Public Education Information Management System (PEIMS) records, Fall 2010

### Teaching Staff

According to data submitted to TEA by AISD about teacher qualifications, 100% of teachers in 2010–2011 were highly qualified. All 5,809 AISD teachers participated in and completed professional development activities during the school year, as required by statute. Among AISD teachers, average length of teaching experience was 11 years district wide, 10 years at Title I schools, and 12 years at non-Title I schools.

### Academic Performance

Because one of the major goals of Title I is to ensure all students are supported in achieving academic success, a comparison analysis was conducted to examine how students at AISD Title I schools performed on the Texas Assessment of Knowledge and Skills (TAKS), compared with how students at non-Title I schools performed. Texas public schools are required by law to assess students’ skills in reading or English language arts (ELA), mathematics (math), writing, science, and social studies. This report reviews AISD’s results for the 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); ELA (grades 10 and 11); math (grades 3 through 11); science (grades 5, 8, 10, and 11); and social studies (grades 8, 10, and 11). Table 2 provides a summary of AISD students’ TAKS performance by Title I and non-Title I school groups, as compared with the district’s results for each major subject area from 2009 through 2011.

Table 2. AISD Students Meeting Texas Assessment of Knowledge and Skills (TAKS) Passing Standards, by Subject and Title I School Status, 2009 Through 2011\*

TAKS subject and school groups	% Passing 2009	% Passing 2010	% Passing 2011	Percentage point change, 2009 to 2011	Percentage point gaps between Title I and non-Title I school groups		Percentage point change in gap from 2009 to 2011
					2009	2011	
<b>Reading/English language arts</b>					<b>13%</b>	<b>12%</b>	<b>- 1 %</b>
Title I	81%	81%	82%	+ 1 %			
Non-Title I	94%	94%	94%	0 %			
All schools	87%	88%	88%	+ 1 %			
<b>Writing</b>					<b>10%</b>	<b>7%</b>	<b>- 3 %</b>
Title I	86%	88%	89%	+ 3 %			
Non-Title I	96%	96%	96%	0 %			
All schools	90%	91%	92%	+ 2 %			
<b>Mathematics</b>					<b>16%</b>	<b>10%</b>	<b>- 6 %</b>
Title I	71%	76%	79%	+ 8 %			
Non-Title I	87%	88%	89%	+ 2 %			
All schools	78%	83%	84%	+ 6 %			
<b>Science</b>					<b>22%</b>	<b>18%</b>	<b>- 4 %</b>
Title I	62%	71%	70%	+ 8 %			
Non-Title I	84%	87%	88%	+ 4 %			
All schools	74%	81%	81%	+ 7 %			
<b>Social studies</b>					<b>11%</b>	<b>7%</b>	<b>- 5 %</b>
Title I	84%	90%	89%	+ 5 %			
Non-Title I	95%	97%	96%	+ 1 %			
All schools	91%	95%	94%	+ 3 %			

Source. AISD TAKS records 2009 through 2011

Note. Asterisk indicates accountability subsets of students were used in analyses. For 2011, all versions of TAKS (regular, alternate, modified) were included for the first time in the subset.

All school groups made progress in passing TAKS from 2009 to 2011, with greatest gains made in math and science. The gap between students' passing rates at Title I schools and at non-Title I schools remained, with the largest gap in science (18 percentage points). However, the gap was reduced between 2009 and 2011 in all subjects, especially math (by 6 percentage points). Narrowing of the achievement gap between Title I and non-Title I students has been found at the national level, as well (Center on Education Policy, 2011).

### Accountability Ratings

By state and federal laws, public school districts and schools are rated annually in an accountability system based on various student participation and performance indicators. In the Texas state accountability system, student indicators are performance on all TAKS subject areas (grades 3 through 11), dropout rates (grades 7 and 8), and high school completion rates (based on grades 9 through 12). A summary of the 2009 through 2011 state accountability ratings for AISD schools (by Title I status) are shown in Table 3. Comparing 2009 with 2011, Title I schools showed a loss in the percentage of schools attaining the recognized rating, gains in exemplary and academically acceptable ratings, and no change in the unacceptable rating. However, comparing 2010 with 2011, AISD Title I schools, non-Title I schools, and thus all AISD schools had decreases in the numbers and percentages of schools that earned exemplary ratings in 2011, while the numbers and percentages of schools that earned academically acceptable and unacceptable ratings increased. From 2010 to 2011, Title I schools had a decrease in the number and percentage receiving a recognized rating, while non-Title I schools saw an increase in the number and percentage receiving this rating. Overall, when examining 2011 state ratings, a greater percentage of non-Title I schools (40%) than of Title I schools (7%) had exemplary ratings. Similarly, a greater percentage of non-Title I schools (33%) than of Title I schools (27%) had recognized ratings. However, a greater percentage of Title I schools (55%) than of non-Title I schools (24%) had academically acceptable ratings. Finally, a greater percentage of Title I schools (10%) than of non-Title I schools (2%) received the academically unacceptable rating in 2011. Final accountability ratings after appeals will be published by TEA in late October or early November 2011.

Table 3. AISD Schools, by State Accountability Ratings, 2009 Through 2011

AISD schools and ratings	2009	2010	2011	Percentage point change 2009 to 2011
<b>Exemplary rating</b>				
Title I schools	6%	16%	7%	1 %
Non-Title I schools	57%	51%	40%	- 17 %
All schools	23%	29%	20%	- 3 %
<b>Recognized rating</b>				
Title I schools	34%	35%	27%	- 7 %
Non-Title I schools	20%	29%	33%	13 %
All schools	29%	33%	29%	0 %
<b>Academically acceptable rating</b>				
Title I schools	50%	48%	55%	5 %
Non-Title I schools	34%	20%	24%	- 10 %
All schools	45%	37%	43%	- 2 %
<b>Academically unacceptable rating</b>				
Title I schools	10%	1%	10%	0 %
Non-Title I schools	3%	0%	2%	- 1 %
All schools	8%	1%	7%	- 1 %

*Source.* Texas Education Agency state accountability ratings 2009, 2010, 2011

In the federal accountability system, student indicators used to determine school and district ratings include participation and performance in the state's reading/ELA and math assessments, high school graduation rates, and student attendance rates. In preliminary 2011 ratings, AISD as a district did not make adequate yearly progress (AYP). However, in 2011, 605 (50%) of Texas school districts did not make AYP. Final accountability ratings will be available from TEA in November 2011. Among the seven districts comparable to AISD (i.e., Corpus Christi, Dallas, El Paso, Fort Worth, Houston, San Antonio, Ysleta), five did not meet AYP. Of the 110 regular AISD schools rated in the standard federal accountability system, 74% made AYP (66% of Title I schools and 86% of non-Title I schools). Of regular AISD schools, 26% did not make AYP (34% of Title I schools and 14% of non-Title I schools). Table 4 summarizes the AYP ratings for AISD schools from 2009 to 2011. During this time, the percentages of regular AISD schools (regardless of Title I status) meeting AYP requirements decreased.

Table 4. AISD Schools, by Adequate Yearly Progress (AYP) Ratings, 2009 Through 2011

AISD schools and ratings*	2009	2010	2011	Percentage point change
<b>Met AYP</b>				
<b>Title I schools</b>	<b>94%</b>	<b>96%</b>	<b>66%</b>	<b>- 28 %</b>
<b>Non-Title I schools</b>	<b>94%</b>	<b>98%</b>	<b>86%</b>	<b>- 8 %</b>
<b>All schools</b>	<b>94%</b>	<b>96%</b>	<b>74%</b>	<b>- 20 %</b>
<b>Missed AYP</b>				
<b>Title I schools</b>	<b>6%</b>	<b>4%</b>	<b>34%</b>	<b>+ 28 %</b>
<b>Non-Title I schools</b>	<b>6%</b>	<b>2%</b>	<b>14%</b>	<b>+ 8 %</b>
<b>All schools</b>	<b>6%</b>	<b>4%</b>	<b>26%</b>	<b>+ 20 %</b>

*Source.* Texas Education Agency federal accountability ratings 2009, 2010, 2011

*Note.* The AISD school counts only include regular AISD schools.

Non-Title I schools that do not meet AYP must address areas of need in their campus improvement plan, but do not have other sanctions required of Title I schools. Title I schools that miss AYP in the same area for 2 years in a row (Stage 1) are placed in Title I school improvement status. These schools must offer students the choice to enroll at other campuses and must revise their campus improvement plans. During 2010–2011, approximately 246 middle and high school students used the NCLB choice option to transfer from Title I schools to non-Title I schools in the district, and approximately 287 students are scheduled to be using the school choice option in 2011–2012.<sup>1</sup>

Title I schools that miss AYP for 3 consecutive years (Stage 2) must provide school choice, revise their campus improvement plans, and offer their economically disadvantaged students access to free supplementary educational services. Title I schools that miss AYP in the same subject area for 4 consecutive years (Stage 3) are required to do all the prior-mentioned activities and must develop corrective action plans. Title I schools in their fifth consecutive year of missing AYP (Stage 4) in the same subject area also must develop a restructuring plan. If the Title I school reaches its sixth consecutive year of missing AYP (Stage 5), the school must implement an alternative governance arrangement, as stated in the campus restructuring plan (i.e., reopen as a charter school, replace all or most of the staff, contract for private management of the school, turn the school’s operation over to TEA, or some other restructuring arrangement). At this time, no AISD Title I schools are in any stage of school improvement status.

### Funding Considerations

AISD Title I expenditures as of August 31, 2011 are presented in Table 5. The majority of funds were spent on instruction (64%). In addition, other areas in which Title I funds were spent included curriculum and instructional staff development (13%), instructional leadership (2%), and school leadership (7%). As required by the grant, AISD spent more than 1% of its budget on parent

<sup>1</sup> School choice data are from information provided by AISD’s Student Services Department and from the superintendents’ board’s weekly update communication on 8/18/11.

involvement, using approximately 3% of total expenditures on these activities. The percentage of funds spent on instruction alone (64%) was close to the percentage (65%) required by the adopted amendments to the Texas Commissioner of Education’s rules regarding a district’s financial accountability rating system (Texas Education Code, 2006). If instructional resources, staff development, instructional leadership, and school leadership expenditures are added to instruction, then AISD Title I expenditures to support instruction (88%) exceeded the required amount. The approximate Title I cost per student in 2010–2011 was \$604.

Table 5. AISD Title I, Part A Estimated Expenditures, by Function, 2010–2011

Title I A expenditure function	Expenditure *	Percentage
Instruction	\$ 18,989,940	64%
Instructional resources and media services	\$ 655,591	2%
Curriculum and instructional staff development	\$ 3,682,234	13%
Instructional leadership	\$ 665,471	2%
School leadership	\$ 2,029,166	7%
Guidance and counseling services	\$ 256,522	1%
Social work services	\$ 699,347	2%
Health services	\$ 70,211	< 1%
Student transportation	\$ 171,815	1%
Co-curricular and extracurricular activities	\$ 2,141	< 1%
General administration	\$ 15,133	< 1%
Plant maintenance and operations	\$ 1,858	< 1%
Security and monitoring services	\$ 414	< 1%
Data processing services	\$ 570,937	2%
Parent/community services	\$ 930,050	3%
Indirect costs	\$ 705,293	2%
<b>Total expenditures</b>	<b>\$ 29,446,122</b>	<b>100%</b>

Source. AISD Finance records as of August 31, 2011

\* Expenditures are rounded to the nearest dollar.

## References

- Center on Education Policy. (2011). *Is achievement improving and are gaps narrowing for Title I students?* Retrieved from <http://www.cep-dc.org/>
- No Child Left Behind. (2001). *Title I: Improving the academic achievement of the disadvantaged.* Retrieved from <http://www2.ed.gov/policy/elsec/leg/esea02/pg1.html>
- Texas Education Code. (2006). *Adopted amendments to 19 TAC Chapter 109, Subchapter AA, Commissioner’s rules concerning Financial Accountability Rating System.* Retrieved from <http://ritter.tea.state.tx.us/rules/tac/chapter109/ch109aa.html>

## Austin Independent School District

### Superintendent of Schools

Meria J. Carstarphen, Ed.D.

### Office of Accountability

William Caritj, M.Ed.

### Department of Program Evaluation

Holly Williams, Ph.D.

### Authors

Martha Doolittle, Ph.D.



### Board of Trustees

Mark Williams, President

Vincent Torres, M.S., Vice President

Lori Moya, Secretary

Cheryl Bradley

Annette LoVoi, M.A.

Christine Brister

Robert Schneider

Tamala Barksdale

Sam Guzman

October 2011