

## 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 Title I program. 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 parent/guardians in their children's education. The evaluation must reflect Adequate Yearly Progress (AYP) 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.

This sample template is not an official Massachusetts Department of Elementary and Secondary Education document. It is provided only as an example.

### Title I Program Evaluation

*(Date)*

During the school year hypotheses were made, and data were collected and analyzed in several areas pertaining to Title I student achievement. Parents/guardians, teachers, and administrators carefully reviewed these data in order to inform the decisions that will be made concerning Title I program design and implementation.

There were several changes made to the Title I program this year. One was the elimination of Reading Recovery. It was hypothesized that students might do as well in English Language Arts in a small group, reading books on their instructional reading level, with the expertise of these specially trained teachers (K-3). It was also thought that if regular consultation time was set up between ELA's (former Reading Recovery teachers now called Early Literacy Specialists) and Title I teacher assistants, that the ELA's could provide training in the use of instructional strategies based on the NRPs recommendations resulting in increased student achievement. Another change was to provide supplemental services to students on IEPs. It was felt that because students in the subgroup Special Education were failing to make AYP on the MCAS in grade 3 that we should have Title I services to grade 3 students and in particular to qualifying Sped children, progress will be made toward making AYP in that subgroup.

Last year a formal analysis of MCAS data was conducted. Title I student learning proficiency standards were set based on this analysis. Student learning goals as stated on the Title I Progress Reports were based on the state standards that had been identified as weak areas for students. At the beginning of this school year, after reviewing the content and format of last year's grade three MCAS, and through current observations of students reading and writing behavior it was felt that one reason students at risk may not be exhibiting proficiency is because they do not understand the vocabulary and are unfamiliar with the format and process of MCAS tests. Title I teachers in grades 2 and 3 began teaching MCAS as a

genre. We also began to incorporate MCAS like open response questions into our guided reading lessons. We also began to use the language and vocabulary of the MCAS in daily Title I literacy groups. Evidence of student achievement will be the spring '05 MCAS results, which are currently available.

In order to determine the efficacy of Title I instructional practices at all grade levels, data was collected from several sources. Primarily we relied on the PM Benchmark Kit (leveled reader assessment), The Gates MacGinitie Reading test, and the classroom writing rubrics. We also relied on classroom teachers' observations of student achievement, daily/weekly running records. Observations were also employed in kindergarten. This report will discuss the results of data collection from the PM Benchmark Kit and the Gates MacGinitie Reading Test.

One source of data used to provide evidence of student achievement was the PM Benchmark leveled reader's kit. This data showed that in the spring of grade one 85% of Title I students read at grade level with accuracy and 93% read at grade level with comprehension. However, only 53% of grade 1 students achieved fluency. Data collected on grade 2 students showed that 85% of Title I students read at grade level with accuracy and 91% read at grade level with comprehension. However only 58% read at grade level with fluency. Data collected on grade three students showed that 81% of Title I students read a grade level with accuracy and comprehension. The impact on instruction for next year would be a stronger focus on teaching for fluency and providing professional development for teachers in the area of fluency instruction. In addition, fluency is affected by the ability to decode words quickly therefore another emphasis for instruction and professional development should be on the teaching of phonics.

We also used data from the Gates MacGinitie comprehension subtest, administered in the spring, to determine if Title I students were making progress towards meeting the state standards. We felt that a score at or above the 40th percentile would be one indicator that students were making good progress. Fifty-four grade 1 Title I students were tested. Thirty-two (59%) scored at or above the 40th percentile. In grade three, 48% of the thirty-one Title I students tested scored at or above the 40th percentile. Thirteen of the grade 3 students had IEPs and received Title I in addition to Special Education. Five grade 3 Special Education students (38%) scored at or above the 40 percentile. Data collected from grade 2 showed that of the thirty one students tested twenty (65%) scored at or above the 40 percentile. Six of those tested also had IEPs and received Title I in addition to special education. All six special education students (100%) scored at or above the 40th percentile. A conclusion that can be drawn from this data is that students who are receiving Title I in addition to special education are making gains toward meeting the standards especially in grade 2. A question to investigate would be why aren't grade 3 special education and regular education Title I students making similar progress to students in grade 2? An examination of curriculum instruction is advisable.

Because of the NRP recommendations many teachers and teacher assistants were trained in the Talian-Cas phonics method specifically to provide systematic, research based, phonemic awareness and phonics instruction to students in grades K-1. Data collected from Kindergarten students identified as being at risk on the Gates MacGinitie Reading subtest, "Letter/Letter-Sound Correspondence", showed an increase in the aggregate stanine score of + .35 (Spring 2004 to Spring 2005).

“Telian-Cas” is a research based program that is clinically proven to dramatically increase skills in phonemic awareness, phonics, and sight word acquisition. It is used as a critically important supplement to the core reading curriculum in grade K-2, and is also used as an effective intervention program for students of all ages. In this mnemonic program, letters are embedded as lively characters into colorful pictures that depict the mouth movements of the letter sounds. Comical stories, hand/body cues, music, and imagery make learning fun for students, while developing critical skills for successful reading and spelling.” ([www.readingwithtlc.com](http://www.readingwithtlc.com))

Phonics is also being systematically taught in grades 1-3 using the Phonics Lessons program by Fountas and Pinnell. Data was collected from the Gates MacGinitie reading test decoding section and comprehension section in grades 1 and 2 for the purpose of comparison. In grade 1, the aggregate average percentile score in word decoding for the 62 at risk students (at risk refers to students in Title I and students being referred to Title I for next year.) tested was 46.47. The students’ aggregate comprehension percentile score was 49.23. Thirty eight (38) of these students (61%) scored lower in the word decoding subtest and higher in the comprehension subtest. This would indicate that students at risk tend to be weaker in phonics skills than in comprehension. The impact on instruction for next year should be continued to provide professional development to teachers in research based phonics instruction in order to provide systematic phonics instruction to all students.

The data collected above have provided us with useful information. We will continue to focus instruction and professional development activities on the five areas of reading success identified by the NRP with a special emphasis for students on phonics and fluency. We will continue to provide services to eligible special education students in addition to their IEPs when applicable. We will continue using former Reading Recovery teachers as Early Literacy Specialists working with small groups of students and providing training in the NRPs recommendations for reading success to Title I Teacher assistants. We will continue incorporating MCAS-like vocabulary and language into Title I literacy lessons in grades 1-3.

Changes in the Title I program will have to be made due to a decrease in Title I funding and to the district’s restructuring of schools. It will be necessary to eliminate Title I in Kindergarten and the Title I math program in grades 2-3. Title I services will be targeted on the number one priority need as identified through the annual needs assessment survey. The number one priority need for Title I services is English language arts grades 1-3.