

Title I Evaluation Report, 2001-02



Austin Independent School District
Office of Program Evaluation

September 2002

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

Title I is a compensatory education program supported by funds from the U. S. Department of Education. The purpose of Title I is to enable schools to provide opportunities for children served to acquire the knowledge and skills described in the state content standards and to meet the state performance standards developed for all children. In 2001-02, the Texas Education Agency allocated Title I Part A funds to the Austin Independent School District (AISD) in the amount of \$13,541,075 (\$11,817,092 entitlement plus \$1,723,983 roll-forward from previous year). Of these funds, \$10,671,002 (79% of district allocation) was allocated to schools: 60 AISD public schools (with 55% or more students from low-income families), nine eligible private schools and three eligible facilities for neglected youth within AISD's attendance zone. Of all campus allocations, \$9,813,252 (92%) was spent at these schools. A total of 39,039 students were served through Title I Part A funds at these schools and facilities during 2001-02, including 38,492 (98.6%) AISD public school students, 328 (0.8%) private school students, and 219 (0.6%) neglected youth. Other funds were set aside to support parent involvement activities and coordination, and administrative and grant support throughout the district. Of all Title I Part A funds that were made available to AISD in 2001-02, approximately \$12,041,366 (89%) was expended.

AISD Title I Achievement

Student academic achievement is the common goal of Title I, the state, and the district. Student academic achievement in AISD and especially in Title I schools has improved over the past decade. Observing the state-mandated test results for TAAS over the past four years, the biggest gains for AISD and its Title I campuses have been in TAAS reading (7-11 percentage points) and TAAS mathematics (12-16 percentage points). In fact, in every case, AISD Title I campuses have shown the greatest percentage point gains in TAAS passing rates. Thus, Title I students have benefited academically from the focus on TAAS performance. During the past three years, TAAS achievement gains also have been made among Title I campus student subgroups (ethnicity, low-income). For instance, from 2000 to 2002, Hispanic students gained 11.5 percentage points in TAAS mathematics, and African American students gained 6.7 percentage points in TAAS reading. However, despite these gains, there is still the need for district and campus staff to find means of improving the academic performance of children. Student performance gaps remain: overall AISD TAAS passing rates are below the state passing rates, and AISD Title I campus passing rates are below the overall district passing rates. In addition, the percentages of students at Title I campuses passing TAAS remain lower than that of students at non-Title I campuses within AISD. In 2002-03, the new, more stringent state tests (TAKS) begin, and the state will be implementing its student success initiative that will require grade three students to pass TAKS reading in order to be promoted to fourth grade.

Other concerns arise based on district and campus use of funds as well as teacher quality. Over the past few years, some Title I funds allocated to the district have not been spent (a little over one million dollars), although the funds have been within the limit approved by the Texas Education Agency for roll forward to the following school year. In addition, the percentages of

certified teachers and highly experienced teachers were lower at AISD Title I campuses than at non-Title I campuses during 2001-02. This points to a need to provide Title I campuses with a comparable number of experienced and certified teachers for instruction of students, especially those students in academic need.

Efforts to address students' academic needs must be made early through diagnostic measures, and then constant support must be made available to those students through highly qualified teachers and supplemental academic activities (e.g., tutoring, intensive specialized instruction). The district has already begun plans to target those students and schools in most academic need, initiate more frequent diagnostic assessments, and plan for ongoing supplemental instructional assistance to those students who need it. The district has identified six schools in its "Blueprint" initiative, many of which have been or still are identified by the state as low performing. These schools are among those AISD campuses that will be receiving additional support to help its students who are in academic need.

Recommendations

Based on the findings of this report, several recommendations for the district's Title I grant program can be made to address the most important grant goal of assisting students in reaching the state's high academic achievement standards:

- Identify early those students and campuses where students are in most academic need (e.g., low performing schools, students who have failed one or more TAAS tests, students who are in at-risk groups such as limited English proficient, economically disadvantaged, retained).
- Offer a variety of intensive supplemental instructional assistance to those students in the identified curricular areas of need. Provide this assistance early in the school year rather than waiting until the next administration of the state tests (TAKS) or until students are at risk of failing the grade level and must attend summer school. AISD is taking steps to plan and offer intensive extra instruction to those students with problems in reading beginning in 2002-03 through specialized reading interventions, after-school tutoring, and teacher training.
- Ensure campuses and the district are spending their Title I funds and other funds appropriately to ensure students in academic need are being assisted. Better campus planning along with improved district monitoring of expenditures can improve this process. Only allow campuses to expend funds for programs, curricula, and activities that are aligned with district goals and curriculum standards.
- Improve overall quality of AISD instruction by increasing teachers' opportunities for professional development, thereby enabling 100% of AISD teachers to be certified in their area of instruction. Also, assure that all teachers assigned to Title I campuses are certified and experienced in order to bring high quality instruction to those campuses.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY	I
TABLE OF CONTENTS	III
TABLE OF FIGURES	IV
TABLE OF TABLES	V
PREFACE.....	VI
PROGRAM OVERVIEW.....	1
The Title I Part A Program at the Federal, State, and Local Level	1
AISD Title I Schoolwide Programs and Summer Programs	1
AISD Title I Students and Staff	2
Private Schools Participating in Title I	6
Facilities for Neglected Youth Participating in Title I.....	6
Parent Involvement	7
Budget.....	8
STUDENT ACHIEVEMENT.....	10
Texas Assessment of Academic Skills.....	10
TAAS Performance 2001-02	10
ITBS.....	14
SDAA	15
Other Factors Related to Academic Performance	17
Accountability Ratings	18
SUMMARY	22
RECOMMENDATIONS	22
APPENDICES	24
Appendix A: 8 Components of a Title I, Part A Schoolwide Program	24
Appendix B: Title I A Private Schools Student Data, 2001-02.....	25
Appendix C: TAAS Achievement	27
Appendix D: TEA Accountability Ratings for Austin ISD Title I Campuses, 1999 Through 2002	30
Appendix E: AISD Board Results Policy	32
REFERENCES	34

TABLE OF FIGURES

FIGURE 1: AISD CAMPUS EMPLOYEES' PERCEPTIONS OF WHETHER OTHER CAMPUS STAFF HAVE HIGH EXPECTATIONS FOR STUDENT ACADEMIC ACHIEVEMENT, 2002	5
FIGURE 2: AISD CAMPUS EMPLOYEES' PERCEPTIONS THAT OTHER CAMPUS STAFF HAVE HIGH EXPECTATIONS FOR STUDENT ACADEMIC ACHIEVEMENT, BY TITLE I AND NON-TITLE I SCHOOLS, 2002	6
FIGURE 3: TITLE I PART A GRANT EXPENDITURES IN AISD BY ACCOUNT TYPE, 2001-02	8
FIGURE 4: PERCENTAGES OF AISD TITLE I PART A FUNDS SPENT BY FUNCTION, 2001-02	9
FIGURE 5: TAAS MATHEMATICS PERCENTAGES PASSING, STATE, ALL AISD CAMPUSES, AND TITLE I CAMPUSES, 1999-2002	12
FIGURE 6: TAAS READING PERCENTAGES PASSING, STATE, ALL AISD CAMPUSES, AND TITLE I CAMPUSES, 1999-2002	13
FIGURE 7: TAAS WRITING PERCENTAGES PASSING, STATE, ALL AISD CAMPUSES, AND TITLE I CAMPUSES, 1999-2002	13
FIGURE 8: AISD DISTRICT AND TITLE I CAMPUSES GRADE 2 ITBS READING AND MATH AVERAGE STANDARD SCORES, 2000-01 AND 2001-02	14
FIGURE 9: AISD DISTRICT AND TITLE I CAMPUSES GRADE 5 ITBS READING AND MATH AVERAGE STANDARD SCORES, 2000-01 AND 2001-02	15
FIGURE 10: AISD DISTRICT AND TITLE I CAMPUSES GRADE 8 ITBS READING AND MATH AVERAGE STANDARD SCORES, 2000-01 AND 2001-02	15
FIGURE 11: PERCENTAGES OF STUDENTS MEETING ARD EXPECTATIONS FOR SDAA MATHEMATICS, STATEWIDE AND AISD STUDENTS, 2002.....	16
FIGURE 12: PERCENTAGES OF STUDENTS MEETING ARD EXPECTATIONS FOR SDAA READING, STATEWIDE AND AISD STUDENTS, 2002.....	17
FIGURE 13: PERCENTAGES OF STUDENTS MEETING ARD EXPECTATIONS FOR SDAA WRITING, STATEWIDE AND AISD STUDENTS, 2002.....	17
FIGURE 14: ACCOUNTABILITY RATINGS, ALL AISD CAMPUSES, 2000 TO 2002.....	20
FIGURE 15: ACCOUNTABILITY RATINGS, AISD TITLE I CAMPUSES, 2000 TO 2002.....	20

TABLE OF TABLES

TABLE 1: DEMOGRAPHICS FOR AISD TITLE I AND NON-TITLE I STUDENTS, 2001-02.....	2
TABLE 2: EDUCATIONAL PROGRAM CLASSIFICATION FOR AISD STUDENTS, TITLE I AND NON-TITLE I STUDENTS, 2001-02.....	3
TABLE 3: TEACHER EXPERIENCE IN AISD: AVERAGE YEARS OF EXPERIENCE AND RANGE OF YEARS OF EXPERIENCE IN ALL AISD SCHOOLS, IN TITLE I SCHOOLS, AND IN NON-TITLE I SCHOOLS, FALL 2001	5
TABLE 4: OVERALL TAAS PERCENTAGES PASSING, ALL AISD CAMPUSES, AISD TITLE I CAMPUSES, AND AISD NON-TITLE I CAMPUSES, 2002	10
TABLE 5: TAAS PERCENTAGES PASSING BY DISAGGREGATED GROUPS, ALL AISD CAMPUSES, TITLE I CAMPUSES, AND NON-TITLE I CAMPUSES, 2002	11
TABLE 6: PERCENTAGES OF AISD STUDENTS GRADUATING, TITLE I AND NON-TITLE I SCHOOLS, 1999-2000 AND 2000-01	18
TABLE 7: PERCENTAGES OF AISD STUDENT DROPOUTS, 1998-99 THROUGH 2000-01	18
TABLE 8: TEA ACCOUNTABILITY RATING STANDARDS FOR 2002.....	19

PREFACE

Evaluation Mandate

By law, each school district receiving Title I Part A funds must annually review the progress of each Title I campus to determine if the campus is enabling its children to meet or make adequate progress toward meeting the state's student performance standards. In addition, the district is required to publicize and disseminate the results of the annual review to parents, students, and the community in individual school performance profiles that include statistically sound disaggregated results. The district must provide the results of the review to schools so that they can continually refine their instructional program [P.L. 103-382, Section 1116(a)(2,3,4)]. The Austin Independent School District accomplishes these tasks via campus report cards, district and campus informational reports, district and campus improvement plans, and public news/media channel broadcasting.

The district is required to provide an annual performance report to the Texas Education Agency that contains information about the types of services and program components provided with Title I Part A funds as well as demographic information about the students served. Additional data related to the Title I A program is collected through the state Public Education Information Management System (PEIMS). For more information, please review the Texas Education Agency Student Support Division website at www.tea.state.tx.us/student.support.

PROGRAM OVERVIEW

THE TITLE I PART A PROGRAM AT THE FEDERAL, STATE, AND LOCAL LEVEL

The Title I, Part A program is a compensatory education program supported by funds from the U.S. Department of Education through the *Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965 (ESEA)* as amended by the *Improving America's Schools Act of 1994 (IASA)* (P.L. 103-382). The U.S. Congress reauthorized this legislation in the *Leave No Child Behind Act of 2001* (P.L. 107-110) that was signed into law by the President in January 2002. The purpose of the Title I Part A program is to enable schools to provide opportunities for children served so they may acquire the knowledge and skills described in state content standards and meet the state performance standards developed for all children. Title I provides funds to state and local education agencies that have high concentrations of low-income children in participating schools.

For school district purposes, a low-income child is defined as one who is eligible for free or reduced-price lunch based on family income. Schools are ranked annually on the percentage of low-income students residing in their attendance zones. Using Title I funds, school districts must serve schools with 75% or more low-income students, and the remaining schools that have less than 75% low-income students are served in rank order as funding allows.

In 2001-02, the Austin Independent School District (AISD) was allocated \$13,541,075 (\$11,817,092 entitlement and \$1,723,983 roll-forward from the previous year) in Title I Part A funds to support students at 60 AISD public schools, 9 participating private schools, and 3 participating facilities for neglected youth within the AISD attendance zones that had students eligible for Title I Part A funded services. In addition, Title I funds were used to serve the homeless student population across AISD and to provide support for parent involvement activities. Finally, Title I funds were used to provide curriculum, administrative, and grant support throughout the district. Other types of Title I funds received by AISD are used to serve migrant students (Title I Part C) and students who attend facilities for delinquent youth (Title I Part D). For a historical perspective on AISD's Title I programs and services, see the Reference section of this report for a list of past reports (Curry, Washington, & Zyskowski, 1999, 2000; Curry, Doolittle, Huskey, Koehler, & Washington, 2002). For evaluation reports summarizing the Title I grant support for migrant students and for students who attend facilities for delinquent youth, see publications on these grants listed in the Reference section of this report.

AISD TITLE I SCHOOLWIDE PROGRAMS AND SUMMER PROGRAMS

According to the U. S. Department of Education, a school can be designated a Title I schoolwide program if 50% or more of the children in the school's attendance zone are low-income students (see Appendix A for a more complete definition of a Title I schoolwide program). AISD provided Title I schoolwide program services to all students at its 60 Title I campuses in 2001-02. According to preliminary PEIMS records, 38,492 AISD students (26,569 elementary, 7,580 middle/junior high, 4,343 high) were served by Title I funds. This number represents 49.5% of all AISD students.

During summer 2002, there were seven Title I schools that held summer extended learning and enrichment programs and served approximately 996 students. In addition, Title I

students who were considered at risk of retention at the end of the regular school year in May 2002 were eligible to attend other summer programs offered to students in grades prekindergarten through 12. See the following reports listed in the Reference section for detailed descriptions of these summer programs: AISD's Optional Extended Year Program Report, and SOAR Report.

AISD TITLE I STUDENTS AND STAFF

Students

Demographic information on the district's Title I students and non-Title I students for 2001-02 is presented in Table 1. Besides being predominantly low income, the Title I population tends to have a higher percentage of students with limited English proficiency, African American or Hispanic ethnicity, and immigrant status, as compared to the AISD non-Title I population. AISD has experienced a growth in its Title I student population. According to preliminary TEA PEIMS records, the number of AISD Title I students has risen from 35,641 in 2000-01 (45.8% of the district population) to 38,492 in 2001-02 (49.5% of the district population). Similarly, of all AISD students enrolled, the percentage of low-income students has risen from 48% in 2000-01 to 50% in 2001-02. Another area of growth in AISD's student population has been in the percentage of students that are limited English proficient: 17.8% in 2000-01, and 20.1% in 2001-02. The Title I schools serve the majority of these students.

Table 1: Demographics for AISD Title I and Non-Title I Students, 2001-02

	Number Enrolled	% Low-Income	% Limited English Proficient	% African American	% Hispanic	% White	% Asian, Pacific Islander, Native American*	% Immigrant
All AISD Students	77,805	50.2%	20.1%	15.0%	49.7%	32.4%	2.9%	5.6%
All Title I Students	38,492	78.2%	33.4%	20.6%	68.1%	9.5%	1.8%	9.1%
All Non-Title I Students	39,313	22.7%	7.0%	9.5%	31.8%	54.8%	4.0%	2.2%

Source: AISD PEIMS Records, 2001-02 – Unofficial (until TEA AEIS published October 2002)

Using PEIMS data submitted to TEA, Table 2 shows the 2001-02 percentages of AISD students served in bilingual or English as a second language (ESL), special education, and gifted programs. Based on these data for 2001-02, a larger percentage of Title I students participated in bilingual or ESL program services (33%), while a larger percentage of non-Title I students participated in gifted program services (10.1%). There was about the same rate of participation for Title I and non-Title I students in special education.

Table 2: Educational Program Classification for AISD Students, Title I and Non-Title I Students, 2001-02

	Total Number Enrolled	% Bilingual or ESL	% Special Education	% Gifted
All AISD Students	77,805	19.3%	11.9%	7.4%
All Title I Students	38,492	33.0%	12.2%	4.5%
All Non-Title I Students	39,313	5.8%	11.6%	10.1%

Source: AISD PEIMS Records, 2001-02 – Unofficial (until TEA AEIS published October 2002)

Homeless Student Support

All students who experience homelessness are eligible to receive Title I services regardless of the school they attend. A homeless person is defined according to the Stewart B. McKinney Homeless Assistance Act [USC 42 Section 11302 (a)] as an individual lacking fixed, regular and adequate nighttime residence, or an individual who has a primary nighttime residence that is (a) a supervised shelter for temporary accommodations; (b) an institution providing temporary residence for individuals about to be institutionalized; or (c) a place not designated for or ordinarily used as a regular sleeping accommodation. This open-ended definition ensures that all students who are homeless are not excluded from school.

Through school records and with the assistance of records kept by the district's Project HELP staff (whose salaries are paid through McKinney grant funds received by AISD), a total of 419 homeless students were identified at Title I campuses as having been served by Title I. There were 210 males (50%) and 209 females (50%), and the majority of homeless students identified (65.2%, n=273) were at elementary Title I schools. At Title I middle schools, 66 students (15.8%) were identified and served, and at Title I high schools, 80 students (19.1%) were identified and served.

District support for homeless students came from several sources. At Mathews Elementary (a Title I campus where many homeless students are enrolled), Title I funds supported a staff person to work with all elementary homeless students who were sent to the school. This person helped with student orientation, registration, transportation, school supplies, clothing, and after-school activities. Support for all AISD campuses came from staff at Project HELP who are located in an office at the district's Alternative Learning Center. The Project HELP staff provided information and training resources to all AISD campuses on identification and service to homeless students. In addition, Project HELP staff acted as liaison between schools and homeless individuals/families, assisting them with registration, transportation, access/referral to social services, provision of school supplies, and other needs.

With a new district student data system in 2001-02, and with Project HELP staff keeping their own records of homeless students they had identified and served throughout AISD, there were some difficulties in determining the total number of AISD students who were homeless.

District staff in the Accountability and Program Evaluation offices compiled and reconciled data from school staff, the district student database, and Project HELP staff in order to come up with a verifiable number of homeless students served during 2001-02. For 2002-03, Project HELP staff has proposed to provide and deliver to all campuses a uniform procedure and residency form to be used by campus staff in screening and identifying students who may be homeless. This form and procedure would provide campus staff with the data to enter homelessness accurately in the district's student database, and the form could be forwarded to the Project HELP staff for follow up. As the 2002-03 school year begins, the new federal Title I legislation [and the reauthorized McKinney-Vento Homeless Assistance Act, P.L. 107-110 (2001)] requires that all homeless students be served with Title I funds regardless of their campus location. Thus, identification, record keeping, and referral will be critical to all campuses, the district student database (for tracking and reporting), and for appropriate service provision to those students.

AISD Teaching Staff

Highly Qualified Staff

As the new federal law goes into effect, some of the Title I requirements point to the need for school districts to have highly qualified teachers. The definition of highly qualified is still being refined through federal and state regulatory review. However, at a minimum, school districts must ensure that all teachers hired after the enactment of the *Leave No Child Behind Act* (2001) must be highly qualified, which means being state certified, holding a bachelor's degree, and passing a rigorous state test on subject knowledge and teaching skills. In addition, school districts must set aside part of their Title I allocations for the next few years to ensure that all teachers become highly qualified. Districts must annually report progress toward the goal of having all teachers highly qualified. With these impending requirements, a review of current certification and years of experience was done for AISD campus teaching staff. For 2001-02, the total number of AISD campus teaching staff is 5,245 according to preliminary district records assembled in fall 2001. Of those, the percentage of all AISD teaching staff who are fully certified is 90% (n=4,732), while the rate for Title I campuses is 87% (2,438) and the rate for non-Title I campuses is 94% (2,262). In order to abide by the new federal law encompassing Title I, the district will seek to have all teachers certified within the next few years. As shown in Table 3, among all AISD teaching staff, the average number of years of teaching experience is 10.6, while the average for staff at Title I schools (9.1) is lower than the district average and the average for non-Title I schools (12.4). Furthermore, fewer years of experience (e.g., less than 5) and no prior experience (i.e., brand new teachers) is more typical among teachers at Title I schools than at non-Title I schools.

Table 3: Teacher Experience in AISD: Average Years of Experience and Range of Years of Experience in All AISD Schools, in Title I Schools, and in Non-Title I Schools, Fall 2001


	Average Years of Teaching Experience	% No Prior Teaching Experience	% 1-5 Years Teaching Experience	% 6-10 Years Teaching Experience	% 11-20 Years Teaching Experience	% 20+ Years Teaching Experience
All AISD Schools	10.6	11.07%	30.95%	16.20%	21.95%	19.54%
All Title I Schools	9.1	7.72%	19.24%	8.25%	9.96%	8.38%
All Non-Title I Schools	12.4	3.65%	11.71%	7.95%	11.99%	11.16%

Source: AISD Records, Fall 2001

Staff Perceptions of Student Achievement


In addition to staff qualification, campus staff's opinions about their expectations for student achievement were examined to find out whether there are differences by staff position or by campus type. In a districtwide survey of a sample of campus staff (n=320), responses were obtained on staff expectations of students' academic achievement. When asked if staff at their campus had high expectations for academic achievement for all students, most staff (regardless of their position) agreed (see Figure 1). However, the percentage agreeing among secondary school teachers (83.4%) was lower than it was for other staff groups, and 15% of secondary teachers responded that they did not think other staff had high expectations for student achievement at their campus. When examining staffs' perceptions of expectations for student achievement (see Figure 2), most staff agreed that other campus staff had high expectations. The exception was among Title I secondary teachers who had the lowest percentage (64.7%) reporting that other staff at their campus had high expectations.

Figure 1: AISD Campus Employees' Perceptions of Whether Other Campus Staff Have High Expectations for Student Academic Achievement, 2002



AISD Employee Coordinated Survey Results, 2002

Figure 2: AISD Campus Employees' Perceptions That Other Campus Staff Have High Expectations for Student Academic Achievement, by Title I and Non-Title I Schools, 2002



AISD Employee Coordinated Survey Results, 2002

PRIVATE SCHOOLS PARTICIPATING IN TITLE I

Eligible students who attend private schools within the AISD boundary were served using Title I Part A funds in 2001-02. In order to receive Title I services, private school students must meet two eligibility requirements: they must attend a school in a Title I school attendance area, and they must have been determined to be low income. Title I Part A funds awarded to a private school are used only for services to qualifying students. In 2001-02, \$51,252 in Title I services were allocated to eligible students at nine private schools within the AISD boundary. These schools were: Abundant Life Learning Center, Ebenezer Child Development Center, Greater Calvary Academy, Griffin School, Mt. Sinai Christian Academy, Peace Elementary School, Sacred Heart Catholic School, St. James Episcopal School, and St. Mary's Cathedral School. Based on a survey of these schools, a total of 328 private school students were served with Title I Part A funds.

Of the Title I Part A funds allocated for private schools, approximately 89.6% (\$45,929) was expended during the year. Based on district finance records, most of these funds (82%) were used to purchase instructional supplies and materials. Staff at these schools reported using Title I funds on instructional (reading, language arts, mathematics, social studies, science) and support (guidance, medical) services for students.

Of the 328 students served at these private schools, 49% were male and 51% were female; 69% were African American, 16% were Hispanic, and 15% were White. Students served ranged from early childhood (infants) through grade 12, with the majority of the students in elementary grades (79%). For more details on Title I private school students and services in 2001-02, see Appendix B.

FACILITIES FOR NEGLECTED YOUTH PARTICIPATING IN TITLE I

Three facilities for neglected youth were allocated \$9,000 in Title I Part A funds in 2001-02 based on the estimated number of eligible students they serve. The facilities included

Settlement Home, Lifeworks Shelter, and Helping Hand Home. Of the funds allocated, approximately 99% (\$8,913) was expended during the year, mostly on instructional supplies and materials (81%). Staff at these schools reported using Title I Part A funds on instructional (reading, language arts, mathematics, social studies, science) and support (guidance, medical) services for students.

During 2001-02, 219 youth were served at these facilities using Title I A funds. Of the students served, 35% were male, 65% were female; 27% were African American, 30% were Hispanic, and 43% were White. Students served ranged from prekindergarten through grade 12, with the majority of the students in secondary grades (78%). For more detailed information on facilities for neglected youth and the students served, see the Reference section of this report for AISD's evaluation report on Title I Facilities for Neglected or Delinquent Youth 2001-02.

PARENT INVOLVEMENT

Parent involvement is an integral part of the Title I program and all AISD campus operations. The district's policy on parent involvement requires campuses to support and enhance parent involvement through the following standards of involvement opportunities: communication, parent training, student learning, community collaboration, decision-making, and volunteering. The district has parent membership on its District Advisory Committee, and parent involvement is an essential element in the District Improvement Plan. Likewise, every campus must have parent representation on its Campus Advisory Committee, and parental input must be obtained on the development of each Campus Improvement Plan. The Campus Improvement Plan itself must have a parent involvement component in which the campus staff members state specific goals and resources for improving parent involvement.

There are a number of requirements in the Title I grant regarding parent involvement. Districts that receive a Title I Part A allocation over \$500,000 must set aside at least 1% of the district's total Title I Part A allocation to expend on parent involvement activities. AISD is such a district, and in 2001-02 AISD set aside more than \$441,000 in Title I Part A funds for the support of parent involvement. Another requirement (in addition to having a written district parent involvement policy) is that each campus must have a written and signed school-parent compact for each child on file. This compact describes the responsibilities of the school and the parents to improve student performance, and it describes how communication will occur. At both the district and campus levels, a requirement is to build capacity for parent involvement. This can be done through offering special programs, classes or training, materials, coordination with other programs, and use of the primary (written and spoken) language parents use and understand.

In AISD, some of the coordination and support services provided come from the Department of School Support Services and from the campuses themselves. For example, with the support of both local and Title I Part A funding, the district's Family Resource Center staff and the parent support specialist staff at 58 campuses provide a variety of ways to coordinate and support parent involvement in AISD. The Family Resource Center and the campus parent support specialists have provided the following during the school year: professional staff development, representation on campus councils, coordination of district/campus parent involvement activities, facilitation of parent advisory council meetings, dissemination of parent


involvement periodicals, provision of adult literacy classes, Spanish language translation, and support to area private schools participating in the Title I program. For more detailed information on the evaluation of parent involvement in AISD, please refer to AISD's Parent Involvement evaluation report that is cited in the Reference section of this report.

BUDGET

During 2001-02, AISD spent approximately \$12,041,366 or 89% of the district's allocation of Title I Part A funds. Thus, approximately \$1,499,709 was unspent for 2001-02 and is to be rolled forward for 2002-03. Title I Part A funds unspent in the prior two years were \$1.7 million in 2000-01 and \$1.4 million in 1999-2000. In all of these cases, the unspent amounts were within the allowable 15% maximum amount that TEA will let school districts roll forward for use in the next school year.

Figure 3 shows how the 2001-02 Title I Part A funds were expended in AISD according to the following account categories: salaries (76%), instructional supplies and materials (18%), other operating costs (4%), professional and contracted services (1%), and indirect costs (1%).


Figure 3: Title I Part A Grant Expenditures in AISD by Account Type, 2001-02



Source: AISD Finance Records, 2002

The district's 2001-02 financial records show that the majority of Title I Part A funds (more than \$8 million, or 72%) was spent on instruction, curriculum, and staff development (see Figure 4). Over \$1.6 million (15%) was spent on instructional or campus leadership. Support services to students (6%), parent and community services (4%), and plant maintenance and operations (3%) comprised the other areas of expenses.

Figure 4: Percentages of AISD Title I Part A Funds Spent by Function, 2001-02



Source: AISD Finance Records, 2002

Of all AISD Title I Part A expenditures in 2001-02, the majority (more than \$9.8 million, or 89%) was expended at the campus level at 60 AISD public campuses, 9 private schools, and 3 facilities for neglected youth. Most (93%) Title I campuses (public, private, neglected) spent most or all (82-100%) of their Title I allocations. The remaining expenditures (more than \$1.3 million, or 11%) went toward program coordination and support through grant management, parent involvement, curriculum and instruction (including prekindergarten, bilingual, language arts, mathematics, science, social studies, dyslexia, translation services, library media, vision/hearing), social services (visiting teachers), homeless liaison services, area superintendents, evaluation, testing, and indirect costs.

STUDENT ACHIEVEMENT

TEXAS ASSESSMENT OF ACADEMIC SKILLS

The Texas Essential Knowledge and Skills (TEKS) is the state mandated curriculum for students in grades prekindergarten through grade 12 in all core academic subject areas, such as reading and language arts, writing, mathematics, social studies, and science. The Texas Assessment of Academic Skills (TAAS) measures students' academic knowledge and skills according to these statewide curricula: in reading and mathematics at grades 3 through 8 and the exit level; in writing at grades 4, 8, and the exit level; and in science and social studies at grade 8. Spanish-version TAAS tests are administered to students at grades 3 through 6. Satisfactory performance on the TAAS exit level tests is prerequisite to a high school diploma. The TAAS has been administered in Texas public schools since 1990. Due to Texas Senate Bill 103, starting in 2002-03, a new assessment system, the Texas Assessment of Knowledge and Skills (TAKS), will begin. The TAKS are designed to incorporate more of the TEKS, better reflect good instructional practice, and more accurately measure student learning (TEA, 2002). In addition, due to Texas Senate Bill 4, third graders must pass TAKS reading for grade promotion.

TAAS PERFORMANCE 2001-02

Improved student achievement is the major goal of Title I, the state, and the district. As part of the statewide assessment system, students in AISD participated in TAAS. The four major subject area tests that are included as part of the state accountability system for public schools are reading, mathematics, writing, and social studies. TAAS social studies was included in the accountability system for the first time in 2001-02. In 2002, the overall TAAS percentages passing rates for all AISD students (based only on the PEIMS October 2001 accountability subset) were above the minimum requirement of 55% as shown in Table 4. The overall TAAS percentages passing rates for all students at Title I campuses were lower than for all AISD campuses and for non-Title I campuses.

Table 4: Overall TAAS Percentages Passing, All AISD Campuses, AISD Title I Campuses, and AISD Non-Title I Campuses, 2002

	TAAS Reading Percentages Passing	TAAS Mathematics Percentages Passing	TAAS Writing Percentages Passing	TAAS Social Studies Percentages Passing (8 th grade only)
All AISD Campuses (n=103)	86.7%	87.7%	84.2%	74.6%
AISD Title I Campuses (n=60)	79.1%	82.6%	76.2%	64.4%
AISD Non-Title I Campuses (n=43)	93.6%	92.4%	90.1%	83.8%

Source: TEA AEIS TAAS Information, 2002

The TAAS performance of AISD students (based on the PEIMS October 2001 accountability subset) disaggregated by ethnic groups and economically disadvantaged groups (see Table 5) showed that:

- There were small percentage point differences in overall passing rates between students at all AISD campuses and at Title I campuses. However, students at non-Title I campuses often had higher percentage passing rates than students at Title I campuses and at the district level.
- In TAAS reading and TAAS writing, economically disadvantaged students at Title I campuses had the lowest overall passing rates (75.7%, and 72.9%, respectively).
- In TAAS mathematics, African American students at Title I campuses had the lowest overall passing rate (75.9%).
- In TAAS social studies, African American students at Title I campuses had the lowest overall passing rates (55%).

Table 5: TAAS Percentages Passing by Disaggregated Groups, All AISD Campuses, Title I Campuses, and Non-Title I Campuses, 2002

	TAAS Reading Percentages Passing	TAAS Mathematics Percentages Passing	TAAS Writing Percentages Passing	TAAS Social Studies Percentages Passing (8 th grade only)
African American				
All AISD Campuses	78.2%	76.5%	76.6%	56.4%
Title I Campuses	76.3%	75.9%	73.9%	55.0%
Non-Title I Campuses	83.5%	78.1%	82.1%	62.3%
Hispanic				
All AISD Campuses	80.6%	83.7%	76.9%	64.3%
Title I Campuses	77.3%	82.6%	74.0%	60.1%
Non-Title I Campuses	87.5%	85.9%	81.4%	71.3%
White				
All AISD Campuses	96.9%	96.4%	94.6%	91.4%
Title I Campuses	93.4%	93.3%	89.8%	88.7%
Non-Title I Campuses	97.6%	96.9%	95.4%	92.0%
Economically Disadvantaged				
All AISD Campuses	77.2%	80.5%	73.7%	58.6%
Title I Campuses	75.7%	80.4%	72.9%	57.2%
Non-Title I Campuses	82.6%	81.1%	75.9%	62.9%

Source: TEA AEIS TAAS Information and AISD Records, 2002


An examination of TAAS performance by grade levels, as detailed in Appendix C, shows that the percentages of students passing TAAS are lower for Title I students than for non-Title I students at every grade level. For example, in TAAS mathematics, the range of percentages passing for Title I students in elementary grades three through six is from 78.8% to 90.7% (see

Appendix C). However, for elementary non-Title I students, the range on the same test is from 93.6% to 98.5%. The same is true at the middle and high school levels: Title I students in middle school grades six through eight and high school grade ten (exit level) had percentages passing in TAAS mathematics from 73.8% to 80.9%, while the non-Title I students in those same grades had a range of percentages passing from 87.5% to 91.4%. Similar trends are seen in TAAS reading and writing tests, with the largest gap between Title I students (69.7% passing) and non-Title I students (90.3% passing) seen in TAAS reading at middle school sixth grade.

Longitudinal Progress


In general, TAAS passing rates for all AISD campuses, including AISD Title I campuses, have shown improvement in recent years, mirroring the increases in student TAAS performance statewide. A comparison of overall state, district, and Title I campus TAAS passing rates from 1999 through 2002 is presented in Figures 5-7. In every year, the state passing rates have been higher than the district passing rates, and the district passing rates have been higher than the Title I campus passing rates. Increases occurred at all levels in percentage points passing during this period in TAAS mathematics – at state (6.3 percentage points), district (12.1 percentage points), and Title I campuses (16.6 percentage points). Similar increases were observed in TAAS reading (state - 4.5 percentage points, district - 7.4 percentage points, and Title I campuses - 11.1 percentage points). Much smaller increases occurred in TAAS writing (state – 0 percentage points; district – 2.2 percentage points; Title I campuses – 5.2 percentage points). In every case, from 1999 to 2002, the gains made by Title I campuses were larger than those for the district and the state. Progress made by AISD Title I campuses was greater than for AISD non-Title I campuses during the same period (see Appendix C for a table of passing rates and percentage gains). Thus, even though overall passing rates at Title I campuses are lower than for the district, students at those campuses have shown the most progress in improved TAAS performance over the past four years.

Figure 5: TAAS Mathematics Percentages Passing, State, All AISD Campuses, and Title I Campuses, 1999-2002




Source: TEA TAAS Information, 1999-2002

Figure 6: TAAS Reading Percentages Passing, State, All AISD Campuses, and Title I Campuses, 1999-2002



Source: TEA TAAS Information, 1999-2002

Figure 7: TAAS Writing Percentages Passing, State, All AISD Campuses, and Title I Campuses, 1999-2002



Source: TEA TAAS Information, 1999-2002


In Appendix C, changes over time in TAAS performance can be seen among Title I student subgroups when the data are disaggregated by ethnicity and economically disadvantaged status. Between 2000 and 2002, significant percentage point gains occurred among African American, Hispanic, White, and economically disadvantaged Title I students passing TAAS mathematics. For instance, Title I Hispanic students went from 71.1% passing TAAS mathematics in 2000 to 82.6% passing on that test in 2002 (an 11.5 percentage point gain). During this same two-year period, similar increases were seen among these Title I student subgroups in TAAS reading. For instance, Title I African American students went from 69.6% passing TAAS reading in 2000 to 76.3% passing on that test in 2002 (a 6.7 percentage point gain). Although there were increases in the percentages passing for Title I student subgroups in TAAS writing from 2000 to 2002, the increases were small. For example, there were virtually no changes in TAAS writing percentages passing among Title I African American students (73.7% in 2000 to 73.9% in 2002), Hispanic students (73% in 2000 to 74% in 2002), and

economically disadvantaged students (73.5% in 2000 to 72.9% in 2002). There was a small increase among Title I White students during this two-year period (85.4% in 2000 to 89.8% in 2002).

ITBS

The Iowa Tests of Basic Skills (ITBS) are nationally normed academic achievement tests in reading, language arts, mathematics, social studies and science. These tests are given annually to most AISD students at grades two, five, and eight. Results discussed here and presented in Figures 8-10 include those for reading and mathematics for 2000-01 and 2001-02. In most cases, AISD students (districtwide and at Title I campuses) performed within the average national percentile range (25% to 75%) on the ITBS. However, as shown in Figure 10, in 2001-02, at the district level, the average standard score for grade eight students taking ITBS mathematics was 215, whereas the bottom of the average national range was a standard score of 220. In addition, among Title I students taking ITBS mathematics, students in grade 5 (average standard score 185) and grade 8 (average standard score 211) performed below the 25% average national standard scores for those grades (189 at grade 5 and 220 at grade 8).


Figure 8: AISD District and Title I Campuses Grade 2 ITBS Reading and Math Average Standard Scores, 2000-01 and 2001-02



Note: Number of students tested in 2000-01 is 4,951 and in 2001-02 is 4,580.

Source: AISD Records, 2000-01, 2001-02


Figure 9: AISD District and Title I Campuses Grade 5 ITBS Reading and Math Average Standard Scores, 2000-01 and 2001-02



Note: Number tested in 2000-01 is 5,127 and in 2001-02 is 5,303.

Source: AISD Records, 2000-01, 2001-02

Figure 10: AISD District and Title I Campuses Grade 8 ITBS Reading and Math Average Standard Scores, 2000-01 and 2001-02



Note: Number tested in 2000-01 is 4,713 and in 2001-02 is 1,056.

Source: AISD Records, 2000-01, 2001-02


SDAA

The State-Developed Alternative Assessment (SDAA) is a state-mandated academic assessment for students in Texas school districts who receive special education support and services, are enrolled in grades 3 through 8, and are receiving instruction in the state-mandated curriculum (Texas Essential Knowledge and Skills, or TEKS), but for whom TAAS is not an appropriate measure of achievement. Tests are given in reading, mathematics, and writing. The first administration of the SDAA in 2001 was considered a baseline test for the state with only the numbers tested and numbers of students at each of three achievement levels (I, II, III) reported to districts. The achievement levels were defined as follows: Level I - few test items answered correctly; Level II – many test items answered correctly; Level III – most or all test items answered correctly. However, SDAA results are not to be included in the statewide accountability system until 2003. Results for 2002 returned to districts included data on students

tested in both 2001 and 2002 for reading and mathematics (only 2002 data available for writing), and the data reported also summarized the percentages of students districtwide and at each grade level that met the ARD (admission, dismissal, and review) committee expectations.

Figures 11-13 show statewide SDAA results as compared to AISD results for all students and for Title I students. For students enrolled in grade three, AISD students (all and Title I) met ARD expectations at slightly higher percentages than did students statewide (all and Title I) on SDAA mathematics (Figure 11). However, AISD performance was slightly lower than that statewide on this test at grade six. AISD Title I students did slightly better than all AISD students on SDAA mathematics in grades five and eight. On SDAA reading (Figure 12), AISD students' performance at grades three and eight was lower than for students statewide. On SDAA writing (Figure 13), AISD students' performance at grade four was higher than for students statewide, with AISD Title I students having the highest percentage of students meeting ARD expectations. In addition, among eighth graders who took SDAA writing, AISD Title I students performed higher than all AISD students and all students statewide.


Figure 11: Percentages of Students Meeting ARD Expectations for SDAA Mathematics, Statewide and AISD Students, 2002



Note: Includes students tested in both 2001 and 2002. Total AISD tested = 1,784.


Source: TEA SDAA Summary Reports, 2002

Figure 12: Percentages of Students Meeting ARD Expectations for SDAA Reading, Statewide and AISD Students, 2002



Note: Includes students tested in both 2001 and 2002. Total AISD tested = 1,879.
 Source: TEA SDAA Summary Reports, 2002

Figure 13: Percentages of Students Meeting ARD Expectations for SDAA Writing, Statewide and AISD Students, 2002



Note: Total AISD tested = 1,143.
 Source: TEA SDAA Summary Reports, 2002

OTHER FACTORS RELATED TO ACADEMIC PERFORMANCE

There are other academic progress data available for comparing Title I schools to non-Title I schools within AISD. For instance, in 1999-2000 and 2000-01, for students eligible to graduate, the AISD graduation rates at Title I schools have been lower than that at non-Title I schools or at the district level (see Table 6). In fact, the 2000-01 graduation rate at Title I schools decreased about four percentage points while the graduation rates for the district and for non-Title I schools rose about one percentage point.

Table 6: Percentages of AISD Students Graduating, Title I and Non-Title I Schools, 1999-2000 and 2000-01

	1999-2000	2000-01
District*	87.3%	88.5%
Title I Schools	77.7%	73.1%
Non-Title I Schools	87.9%	89.5%

*Note: Does not include special campuses (ALC, Rosedale, Huston-Tillotson GED, Texas School for Deaf, Phoenix Academy). In 1999-2000 and 2000-2001, only one Title I school – Reagan. Data for 2001-02 not yet available.

Source: AISD Records, 1999-2000, 2000-2001

District dropout data (Table 7) show that the AISD dropout rate has lowered from 1998-99 to 2000-01. Comparing the dropout rates for Title I schools to non-Title I schools during this time, Title I campuses had higher rates than non-Title I campuses in 1998-99 and 1999-2000 but lower rates in 2000-01. In fact, the rates for Title I schools have been reduced over the three-year period in spite of the increase in the number of Title I schools in AISD.

Table 7: Percentages of AISD Student Dropouts, 1998-99 Through 2000-01

	1998-99	1999-2000	2000-01
District	3.7%	2.4%	1.5%
Title I Schools	5.2%	2.9%	1.2%
Non-Title I Schools	3.4%	2.2%	1.4%

Note: Data for 2001-02 not yet available.

Source: AISD and TEA Records, 1998-99 to 2000-01

ACCOUNTABILITY RATINGS

The state accountability system criteria are used to assess student performance. TEA determines four levels of performance: Exemplary, Recognized, Acceptable, and Low Performing. The base indicator standards for each performance level or rating are based on TAAS performance and on dropout rate as shown in Table 8. Passing TAAS is defined by TEA as approximately 70% of test items correct. The criteria apply to the district and to each campus, as well as to all students and to specific student subgroups (African American, Hispanic, White, economically disadvantaged) in grades 3-8 and 10 (exit-level). In 2001-02, performance on grade 8 TAAS social studies was added to the accountability system and only results for all students were used in accountability.

Table 8: TEA Accountability Rating Standards for 2002

	Exemplary	Recognized	Acceptable	Low Performing
Spring 2002 TAAS (Reading, Writing, Mathematics, Social Studies)*	At least 90% passing each subject test	At least 80% passing each subject test	At least 55% passing Reading, Writing, and Mathematics tests; at least 50% passing Social Studies test	Less than 55% passing Reading, Writing, and Mathematics tests; less than 50% passing Social Studies test
2000-2001 Dropout Rate (Secondary Campuses Only)*	1% or less	2.5% or less	5% or less	Above 5%


*Applies to all students and student subgroups, with the exception of Social Studies where the results for student subgroups are not examined.

Source: Texas Education Agency, 2002

The Austin school district's 2002 accountability rating was Acceptable. Therefore, according to state criteria, at least 55% of all district students (and student subgroups) passed TAAS reading, mathematics, and writing, and at least 50% passed TAAS social studies. Figures 14 and 15 show changes in the accountability ratings for all AISD campuses and Title I campuses. A complete list of accountability ratings for Title I campuses can be found in Appendix D. Overall, between 2001 and 2002 there were increases in the numbers of AISD campuses with Exemplary and Recognized ratings, and decreases in the numbers of campuses with Acceptable and Low Performing ratings (see Figure 14). In 2002, AISD had 17 Exemplary campuses, 31 Recognized campuses, 51 Acceptable campuses, and three Low Performing campuses. When examining only Title I campuses (see Figure 15), in 2002, two Title I campuses were Exemplary; 19 Title I campuses were Recognized; 36 were Acceptable; and three campuses were Low Performing.


Between 2001 and 2002, ratings at 41 Title I campuses remained the same: 10 Recognized, 30 Acceptable, and one Low Performing. During that same time, 14 Title I campuses showed increases in their ratings: three from Low Performing to Acceptable; eight from Acceptable to Recognized; two from Recognized to Exemplary; and, one from Low Performing to Recognized. Four Title I campuses showed a decrease in their ratings between 2001 and 2002: two from Recognized to Acceptable, and two from Acceptable to Low Performing. A new campus, Pickle, received its first accountability rating of Acceptable in 2002.

Figure 14: Accountability Ratings, All AISD Campuses, 2000 to 2002



Source: TEA AEIS Information, 2000 to 2002

Figure 15: Accountability Ratings, AISD Title I Campuses, 2000 to 2002



Source: TEA AEIS Information, 2000 to 2002

AISD has had several Title I campuses identified for school improvement in the past few years since these campuses had received low performing ratings for two or more years (due to either poor TAAS passing rates or high dropout numbers). TEA allocates Title I funds to those campuses in 18-month increments. Therefore, for 2000-2002, the following AISD Title I campuses received Title I School Improvement program (SIP) funds: Reagan, Dobie, Mendez, Pearce, Blackshear, Govalle, Palm, Pecan Springs, Wooldridge. For 2001-2003, the following schools received SIP funds: Johnston, Reagan, Dobie, Pearce, Blackshear, Langford, Oak Springs. Of these schools, only Pearce and Oak Springs remained low performing in 2002. Since some of the schools just came off the low performing list, the district will be applying for competitive funds in January 2003 for Reagan, Dobie, Pearce, and Oak Springs. The school improvement campuses receive additional Title I funding in order to assist with efforts to bring the campuses out of their low performing status. Those schools on the school improvement list must implement an approved plan for improving student achievement as well as improving campus staff skills, and the district must provide technical assistance to those campuses. These

campuses will be monitored by TEA. Under the new federal education law, those Title I schools that have been identified as in need of school improvement for three years due to their low performing rating must offer effective supplemental academic services to low-income students from those schools. Plans are underway for this to occur in AISD during 2002-03.

SUMMARY

Over the past ten years, AISD students have improved their academic performance according to the state-mandated achievement tests given to Texas public school students. In fact, an examination of TAAS passing rates over time shows that the largest percentage point gains in students passing TAAS have been in mathematics and reading at Title I campuses. However, there are some concerns to be addressed by AISD especially regarding students who are at risk in terms of academic needs, namely Title I students:

- AISD's overall TAAS passing rates are lower than those of students statewide, and AISD's Title I campus students' TAAS passing rates are lower than for students districtwide and statewide.
- The new more rigorous state testing program (TAKS) will begin in 2002-03. With the state's student success initiative, the new state requirement is that third graders must pass TAKS reading in order to be promoted to fourth grade. In 2001-02, the passing rates for TAAS reading at third grade were 93.6% for non-Title I campus students and 75.2% for Title I campus students. Thus, if 2002-03 passing rates for third graders are even similar to those in 2001-02, the district will have a substantial number of students (approximately 645 third graders districtwide failed TAAS reading in 2001-02) who need additional academic assistance in reading in order to be able to pass TAKS reading before the end of the school year.
- Most but not all of the Title I campuses are expending all of their allocations by the end of the year, and there has not been a completely clear method for ensuring that campuses use funds in ways that are aligned with district goals for academic excellence. These conditions may be a hindrance to students achieving academic progress. The district Board of Trustees has recently adopted a policy outlining goals for student achievement that include learning daily, academic proficiency in all core academic areas, college and career opportunities, and other skills (see Appendix E). In order to meet these goals, all campuses, including Title I campuses, will need to improve the alignment of plans for instruction, staffing, and programming.
- Currently, there is an imbalance in the percentage of certified, highly qualified teachers providing instruction at the Title I and non-Title I campuses in AISD.

RECOMMENDATIONS

The goal of the federal Title I grant, the state of Texas, and all of AISD schools is the same – to assist all students in reaching the state's high academic achievement standards. Therefore, based on the findings of this report, and the impending high stakes testing requirements facing Texas public school students, several recommendations are offered to address Austin ISD's Title I grant program:

- Identify early those students and campuses where students are in most academic need (e.g., low performing schools, students who have failed one or more TAAS tests, students who are in at-risk groups such as limited English proficient, economically disadvantaged, retained).

- Offer a variety of intensive supplemental instructional assistance to those students in the identified curricular areas of need. Provide this assistance early in the school year rather than waiting until the next administration of the state tests (TAKS) or until students are at risk of failing the grade level and must attend summer school. AISD is taking steps to plan and offer intensive extra instruction to those students with problems in reading beginning in 2002-03 through specialized reading interventions, after-school tutoring, and teacher training.
- Ensure campuses and the district are spending all of their Title I funds and other funds appropriately to ensure students in academic need are being assisted. Better campus planning along with improved district monitoring of expenditures can improve this process. Only allow campuses to expend funds for programs, curricula, and activities that are aligned with district goals and curriculum standards.
- Improve overall quality of AISD instruction by increasing teachers' opportunities for professional development, thereby enabling 100% of AISD teachers to be certified in their area of instruction. Also, assure that all teachers assigned to Title I campuses are certified and experienced in order to bring high quality instruction to those campuses.

APPENDICES

APPENDIX A: 8 COMPONENTS OF A TITLE I, PART A SCHOOLWIDE PROGRAM

1. A comprehensive needs assessment of the entire school that is based on information of children in relation to the state content and student performance standards.
2. Schoolwide reform strategies that –
 - a. Provide opportunities for all children to meet the state’s proficient and advanced levels of student performance.
 - b. Are based on effective means of improving children’s achievement.
 - c. Use effective instructional strategies that –
 - i. Increase the amount and quality of learning time, such as extended year, before- and after-school, and summer school programs.
 - ii. Help provide an enriched and accelerated curriculum.
 - iii. Meet the educational needs of historically underserved populations.
 - d. Address the needs of all children in the school, but particularly the needs of children of target populations of any program that is included in the schoolwide program, and address how the school will determine if these needs are met. These programs may include counseling and mentoring services, college and career preparation, such as college and career guidance, services to prepare students for school-to-work transition, and the incorporation of gender equitable methods and practices.
 - e. Are consistent with, and are designed to implement, the state and local improvement plans, if any, approved under Title III of Goals 2000.
3. Instruction by highly qualified professional staff.
4. Professional development for teachers and aides, and where appropriate, pupil services personnel, parents, principals, and other staff to enable all children in the schoolwide program to meet the state’s student performance standards [in accordance with P.L. 103-382, sections 1114(a)(5) and 1119].
5. Strategies that increase parental involvement, such as family literacy services.
6. Strategies for assisting preschool children in the transition from early childhood programs, such as Head Start and Even Start, to local elementary school programs.
7. Steps to include teachers in the decisions regarding the use of assessments.
8. Activities to ensure that students who experience difficulty mastering any of the state’s standards during the school year will be provided with effective, timely additional assistance. The assistance must include:
 - a. Measures to ensure that students’ difficulties are identified on a timely basis and to provide sufficient information on which to base effective assistance.
 - b. To the extent the school determines it to be feasible using Part A funds, periodic training for teachers in how to identify difficulties and to provide assistance to individual students.

Source: Texas Education Agency, 2001

APPENDIX B: TITLE I A PRIVATE SCHOOLS STUDENT DATA, 2001-02

Title I Private Schools Total Allocations, Expenditures, and Per Pupil Expenditures, 2001-02

Private School	Title I Allocation	Title I Expenditure	Per Pupil Expenditure
Abundant Life Learning Center	\$4,036	\$3,763	\$102
Ebenezer Child Development Center	\$14,203	\$8,925	\$229
Greater Calvary Academy	\$6,566	\$6,827	\$285
Griffin School	\$1,492	\$216	\$5
Mt. Sinai Christian Academy	\$5,706	\$5,728	\$43
Peace School	\$1,732	\$2,243	*
Sacred Heart School	\$7,578	\$7,512	*
St. James Episcopal School	\$7,187	\$6,968	\$536
St. Mary's Cathedral School	\$4,244	\$3,747	\$99

* Student data not available from these schools.

Source: AISD Records, 2001-02

Numbers of Title I Private School Students by School, Gender, and Ethnicity, 2001-02

School	Gender		Ethnicity		
	Females	Males	African American	Hispanic	White
Abundant Life Learning Center	23	14	36	0	1
Ebenezer Child Development Center	15	24	27	11	1
Greater Calvary Academy	15	9	24	0	0
Griffin School	22	22	2	6	36
Mt. Sinai Christian Academy	65	68	125	5	3
Peace School	*	*	*	*	*
Sacred Heart School	*	*	*	*	*
St. James Episcopal School	9	4	10	1	2
St. Mary's Cathedral School	18	20	1	31	6

* Data not available from these schools.

Source: AISD Records, 2001-02

Numbers of Title I Private School Students by School and Grade Level, 2001-02

Grade Level	Abundant Life Lng. Ctr.	Ebenezer Child Dvlpt. Ctr.	Greater Calvary Academy	Griffin School	Mt. Sinai Christian Academy	Peace School *	Sacred Heart School *	St. James Episcopal School	St. Mary's Cathedral School
EC (age 0-3)		39			90				
PK (age 4-5)	31				24				3
K	6		11		12				2
1			5		7				4
2			1						4
3			6						4
4			1						4
5									6
6									4
7									4
8									3
9				4					
10				11					
11				13					
12				16					
UG								13	

* Data not available from these schools. Source: AISD Records, 2001-02


Numbers of Title I Private School Students by School and Instructional/Support Services Provided, 2001-02

Private School	Reading or Language Arts	Math	Science	Social Studies	Guidance or Counseling	Health or Dental
Abundant Life Learning Center	37	37	37	37	0	37
Ebenezer Child Development Center	39	39	0	0	2	23
Greater Calvary Academy	24	24	24	24	0	0
Griffin School	44	44	32	44	0	0
Mt. Sinai Christian Academy	133	44	44	44	0	0
Peace School	*	*	*	*	*	*
Sacred Heart School	*	*	*	*	*	*
St. James Episcopal School	13	13	13	0	0	0
St. Mary's Cathedral School	38	34	4	8	0	0


*Data not available from these schools. Source: AISD Records, 2001-02

APPENDIX C: TAAS ACHIEVEMENT


Percentages of AISD Students at Title I and Non-Title I Schools Passing TAAS Mathematics by Grade, 2002



Percentages of AISD Students at Title I and Non-Title I Schools Passing TAAS Reading by Grade, 2002



Percentages of AISD Students at Title I and Non-Title I Schools Passing TAAS Writing by Grade, 2002




Source: TEA AEIS TAAS Information and AISD Records, 2002

TAAS Percentage Point Gains, AISD District, Title I Campuses, and Non-Title I Campuses, 1999-2002

	1999 % Passing	2002 % Passing	% Point Gain
TAAS Mathematics			
District	75.6	87.7	12.1
Title I Campuses	66.0	82.6	16.6
Non-Title I Campuses	81.9	92.4	10.5
TAAS Reading			
District	79.3	86.7	7.4
Title I Campuses	68.0	79.1	11.1
Non-Title I Campuses	86.1	93.6	7.5
TAAS Writing			
District	81.8	84.2	2.4
Title I Campuses	71.0	76.2	5.2
Non-Title I Campuses	86.3	90.1	3.8


Source: TEA TAAS Records and AISD Student Records, 1999-2002

TAAS Mathematics Percentages Passing by Disaggregated Groups at Title I Campuses, 2000-2002




Source: TEA TAAS Records and AISD Student Records, 2000, 2001, 2002

TAAS Reading Percentages Passing by Disaggregated Groups at Title I Campuses, 2000-2002



Source: TEA TAAS Records and AISD Student Records, 2000, 2001, 2002

TAAS Writing Percentages Passing by Disaggregated Groups at Title I Campuses, 2000-2002



Source: TEA TAAS Records and AISD Student Records, 2000, 2001, 2002

**APPENDIX D: TEA ACCOUNTABILITY RATINGS FOR AUSTIN ISD TITLE I CAMPUSES,
1999 THROUGH 2002**

Campus	1999 Rating	2000 Rating	2001 Rating	2002 Rating
Elementary Campuses				
Allan	AC	AC	AC	AC
Allison	AC	AC	AC	RE
Andrews	AC	AC	AC	AC
Barrington	AC	AC	RE	RE
Becker	AC	AC	RE	AC
Blackshear	LP	AC	LP	RE
Blanton	AC	AC	AC	AC
Brooke	AC	AC	RE	RE
Brown	AC	AC	AC	RE
Campbell	AC	AC	AC	AC
Cook	AC	AC	AC	AC
Dawson	AC	RE	RE	RE
Galindo	AC	AC	AC	AC
Govalle	LP	AC	RE	AC
Graham	AC	AC	AC	AC
Harris	AC	AC	AC	AC
Hart	AC	AC	RE	EX
Houston	AC	AC	AC	AC
Jordan	AC	AC	AC	AC
Joslin	AC	AC	RE	RE
Langford	AC	LP	AC	AC
Linder	AC	AC	AC	AC
Maplewood	AC	RE	RE	RE
Mathews*	AC	AC	RE	RE
McBee	--	--	AC	AC
Metz	AC	AC	AC	RE
Norman	AC	AC	AC	AC
Oak Springs	AC	AC	LP	LP
Odom	AC	AC	RE	RE
Ortega	AC	AC	RE	RE
Palm	LP	AC	AC	AC
Pecan Springs	LP	AC	AC	AC
Pickle**	--	--	--	AC
Pleasant Hill	AC	AC	AC	AC
Reilly	AC	AC	RE	RE
Ridgetop	AC	RE	AC	RE
Rodriguez	--	AC	AC	RE
Sanchez	AC	AC	RE	EX
Sims	AC	AC	AC	LP
St. Elmo	AC	AC	AC	RE
Sunset Valley**	AC	AC	AC	AC
Travis Heights	AC	AC	AC	AC
Walnut Creek	AC	AC	AC	RE

Legend: LP=Low Performing, AC=Acceptable, RE=Recognized; EX=Exemplary; "--" school not yet open; "*" school became Title I campus in 2001; "**" school became Title I campus in 2002.

Source: Texas Education Agency, 1999 - 2002

Appendix D (continued)

Campus	1999 Rating	2000 Rating	2001 Rating	2002 Rating
Elementary Campuses continued				
Widen	AC	AC	AC	AC
Winn	AC	AC	AC	AC
Wooldridge	LP	AC	AC	RE
Wooten	AC	AC	AC	AC
Zavala	AC	AC	RE	RE
Secondary Campuses				
Burnet	AC	AC	AC	AC
Dobie	LP	LP	LP	AC
Fulmore	AC	AC	AC	AC
Kealing	AC	AC	AC	AC
Martin	AC	AC	AC	AC
Mendez	LP	AC	AC	AC
Pearce	LP	LP	AC	LP
Porter	AC	AC	AC	AC
Webb	AC	AC	AC	AC
Johnston**	LP	LP	LP	AC
Reagan	LP	LP	LP	AC
Travis**	LP	LP	AC	AC

Legend: LP=Low Performing, AC=Acceptable, RE=Recognized; EX=Exemplary; “-” school not yet open; “*” school became Title I campus in 2001; “**” school became Title I campus in 2002.

Source: Texas Education Agency, 1999 - 2002

APPENDIX E: AISD BOARD RESULTS POLICY

See next page for AISD Board Results Policy Adopted August 26, 2002

R-1: Mission	R-2: Academic Achievement	R-3: College and Career	R-4: Arts	R-5: Citizenship	R-6: Essential Life Skills	R-7: Health and Safety
<p>All students will learn something new every day, successfully advancing each year and graduating prepared to contribute to the economic, intellectual, creative and technological growth of the Austin community.</p>	<p>All students will achieve at high academic levels that meet or exceed state and national performance standards, including the Texas Assessment of Knowledge and Skills (TAKS), effectively eliminating any achievement gap.</p> <p>2.1 Students will be proficient in language arts: 2.1.1 reading 2.1.2 writing 2.1.3 oral communications: 2.1.3.1 speaking 2.1.3.2 listening</p> <p>2.2 Students will be proficient in mathematics.</p> <p>2.3 Students will be proficient in sciences.</p> <p>2.4 Students will be proficient in social studies.</p> <p>2.5 Students will be proficient in technology.</p> <p>2.6 Students will be proficient in a second language.</p>	<p>All students will demonstrate and understand the skills, knowledge, work habits, attitude, leadership and teamwork required by employers for success in the global 21st century workplace:</p> <p>3.1 Explore and experience a wide range of career options in relation to their interests and aptitudes.</p> <p>3.2 Graduate with a jumpstart on college and career, including consideration of: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • postsecondary credit • industry certification • scholarship opportunities </p> <p>3.3 Demonstrate and understand the skills and knowledge to successfully enroll in postsecondary education.</p> <p>3.4 Demonstrate and understand the skills and knowledge required to transition into the workforce and to be successful in a variety of jobs and careers.</p>	<p>All students will participate in and appreciate the arts.</p> <p>4.1 Students will use the visual, performing or musical arts: 4.1.1 Exploration 4.1.2 Communication 4.1.3 Self expression</p>	<p>All students will be productive and contributing members of the community.</p> <p>Students will:</p> <p>5.1 Know the values of democracy.</p> <p>5.2 Demonstrate civic responsibility: 5.2.1 vote and participate in the political process 5.2.2 contribute positively to the community 5.2.3 volunteer time and talents 5.2.4 be good stewards of the environment</p>	<p>All students will demonstrate the aptitude, attitude and skills to lead responsibly fulfilling, mutually respectful and contributing lives.</p> <p>6.1 Possess high self-esteem.</p> <p>6.2 Access and manage resources to solve problems.</p> <p>6.3 Possess sound character.</p> <p>6.4 Identify and accomplish personal goals.</p> <p>6.5 Understand and respect the broad range of cultures, languages and belief structures in our community.</p>	<p>All students will learn and understand the components of good health and personal safety and regularly engage in physical activity to develop a healthy lifestyle.</p>

REFERENCES

- Curry, J. (2002). *S.O.A.R. Evaluation, 2001-02*. Austin, TX: Austin Independent School District, Office of Program Evaluation.
- Curry, J., Doolittle, M., Huskey, B., Koehler, H., & Washington, W. (2002). *Title I Evaluation Report 2000-2001*. (Publication No. 00.11). Austin, TX: Austin Independent School District, Office of Program Evaluation.
- Curry, J., Washington, W., & Zyskowski, G. (2000). *Title I Evaluation Report, 1999-2000*. (Publication No. 99.03). Austin, TX: Austin Independent School District, Office of Program Evaluation.
- Improving America's Schools Act of 1994, P.L. 103-382, U. S. 103rd Congress* (1994). Available from <http://www.ed.gov/legislation/ESEA/toc.html>.
- Leave No Child Behind Act of 2001, P.L. 107-110, U. S. 107th Congress* (2001). Available from <http://www.ed.gov/legislation/ESEA02/107-110.pdf>.
- McKinney-Vento Homeless Assistance Act, P.L. 107-110, U. S. 107th Congress* (2001). Available from <http://www.ed.gov/legislation/ESEA02/pg116.html>.
- Texas Education Agency (TEA) (2002). *TAKS Information Booklet*. Available from <http://www.tea.state.tx.us/student.assessment/taks/booklets/index.html>.
- Washington, W. (2002). *Optional Extended Year Evaluation Report, 2002*. Austin, TX: Austin Independent School District, Office of Program Evaluation.
- Washington, W. (2002). *Parent and Community Involvement Evaluation Report, 2001-02*. Austin, TX: Austin Independent School District, Office of Program Evaluation.
- Washington, W. (2002). *Title I Facilities for Neglected or Delinquent Youth Evaluation Report, 2001-02*. Austin, TX: Austin Independent School District, Office of Program Evaluation.

Austin Independent School District

Division of Accountability and Information Systems

Joy McLarty, Ph.D.

Office of Program Evaluation

Holly Williams, Ph.D.

Author

Martha Doolittle, Ph.D.

Programmer

Veda Raju



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

Superintendent of Schools

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