OPTIONAL EXTENDED YEAR PROGRAM SUMMARY REPORT: 2004-2005

The Optional Extended Year Program (OEYP) was initiated in 1995 as a result of Senate Bill 1 to provide extended learning opportunities for students in kindergarten through grade 8 who are at risk of academic failure. The primary focus of an OEY program is to immediately reduce and ultimately to eliminate the need for student retention by providing additional instructional time for students to master the State's academic performance standards (Texas Education Code Sections 42.152 & 29.082). OEY programs are designed to accommodate four school-day options: 1) extended day, 2) extended week, 3) intersession for year-round schools and 4) summer school. A school district may provide instructional services during any of these programs for a period of time not to exceed 30 days. Participating students must receive a minimum of 240 minutes of instruction to meet the Texas Education Agency (TEA) reporting requirements. Since 1993, the Austin Independent School District (AISD) has used the OEY program to reduce the number of AISD students at risk of academic failure. AISD used OEY program funds throughout school year 2004-2005 at 73 elementary, 5 middle, and 3 high schools to provide additional instructional time for 4,006 students who were likely to be retained.

TEA sets the guidelines for grade promotion through OEYP, and provides OEY program policies regarding class size (no more than 16 students to a class and no fewer than 8), attendance (a minimum of 240 minutes), staff development training, and parental involvement. This report provides a summary of program operation (configuration and cost, staff development strategies, reporting requirements, and parent involvement) and participation (attendance and promotion) data, as well as recommendations to assist district program planners, principals, grants staff, teachers, and school support services staff in the planning and delivery of services to students at risk of not being promoted to the next grade.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

EVALUATION OBJECTIVES

1. To document and report AISD's OEY program activities and expenditures, per state law.
2. To summarize the participation of parents in AISD's OEYP activities.
3. To gather information from OEYP staff (teachers and principals) regarding program implementation, including curriculum and expectations for program participants.

4. To provide AISD decision makers with recommendations to enhance the operation of AISD's OEY program and its ability to foster academic success.

AISD'S OPTIONAL EXTENDED YEAR PROGRAM CONFIGURATION AND COST

During 2004-2005, OEYP funds supported programs at 81 AISD campuses. These programs provided accelerated, supplemental services that included literacy and mathematics instruction to students in grades K-5 whose eligibility scores were 50% or less on the Beginning of the Year (BOY) benchmark test for reading and/or math. In addition, reading and mathematics intervention or remediation instruction was provided to eligible middle school students in grades 6-8. Also, the funds supported credit recovery courses in several subjects for high school students. In school year 2004-2005, the following class sizes were designated for participating grade levels: 5-8 students at elementary, 16 students at middle school, and 12 students or fewer at high school. Students could participate in one of the three OEY program types: extended day, extended week/Saturday, or a combination of the two. All OEY programs included parental involvement, staff development sessions for teachers, and student performance evaluations (attendance, pre- and post-test information, classroom performance, and promotion/retention information).

AISD received its OEYP formula-based allocation of $392,713 in fall 2004 plus an additional OEYP entitlement of $25,169 in April 2005 for a total of $417,882. Along with the entitlement, TEA required that AISD serve a minimum of 3,923 AISD students. Payroll costs for school staff and other program support staff comprised the largest share of the project budget at $284,109 (67%) of the allocation. Instructional and office supplies, textbooks, and testing materials for the program totaled $107,575 (25%), and operational costs, such as refreshments, contracted services (e.g., child care for parental involvement activities), and middle school incentives meals, totaled $31,198 (8%).

TEA's Optional Extended Year Program Final Expenditure Report, submitted in September 2005 by AISD Finance staff, showed that all allocated funds were expended, and an additional $109,134 in other local or state funds were used to support the program.

PROGRAM STRATEGIES

AISD curriculum staff developed a curriculum for structured classes that incorporated an interdisciplinary program. The curriculum also required staff to deliver the materials at a more rigorous, accelerated pace to provide additional instructional time for students to master the State's academic performance standards. The collective strategies used most often by schools participating in the OEY programs included state-designated curriculum or campus-determined areas of focus, and were reported to TEA as part of the compliance report.

Following are the curriculum areas of focus for which the collective strategies were reported most often:

- Reading or Language Arts,
- Mathematics and/or Science,
- Integration of Technology,
- Problem Solving,
- ESL (English as a Second Language),
- Mentoring,
- Parent Partnerships,
- Accelerated Reading Instruction (ARI),
- Accelerated Math Instruction (AMI), and
- Readiness for Next Grade (an assessment tool used to determine readiness for promotion).

In the elementary reading program, campuses used Science Research Associates/McGraw-Hill's Corrective Reading (English) or Trofeos (Spanish) curriculum for third grade students with insufficient decoding skills. See AISD Publication 04.07, AISD K-5 Accelerated Reading and Mathematics Instruction Evaluation, 2004-2005, for more information about grades K-3. For upper elementary grades 4 and 5, elementary campuses used Corrective Reading (Levels B1 and B2) curriculum intervention for students with insufficient decoding skills, and the Orchestrated Reading Success (ORS) curriculum intervention for those students with minimal comprehension skills. Teachers provided assistance to struggling readers via direct instruction, demonstrations, discussions, guided reading, expository text, Texas Assessment of Knowledge and Skills (TAKS) passages from ORS materials, and other approaches. Students were assessed regularly with AISD's Graphic Organizer rubric to determine areas in which they needed additional academic support.

The middle and high school curricula, developed by district staff in alignment with the Texas Essential Knowledge and Skills (TEKS), covered course materials needed for grade or credit recovery at a rigorous pace in core courses (e.g., Language Arts, Mathematics, or Science). All eligible secondary students took a maximum of two courses from those offered.

REPORTING REQUIREMENTS

During September, TEA requires each district that receives OEYP funds to submit OEYP information as part of the district's electronic Public Education Information Management System (PEIMS) report, as well as a separate OEY Program Evaluation Report. The OEYP PEIMS data contain basic demographic information about the students who participated in OEY program activities, plus data requiring students' OEY program type, attendance, and promotion or retention.

To substantiate the PEIMS count of program participants and to gather the data for the final evaluation report, teachers provided information about their students to the staff of the Department of Program Evaluation. Data requested were: student name, ID number, current grade, daily attendance, academic classes attended, pre- and post-test scores, and student promotion or retention recommendations. Program Evaluation staff also gathered data from accelerated instruction surveys sent to principals and teachers at participating campuses.

To ensure consistent records, AISD's PEIMS and evaluation staff maintained only one attendance file with students' daily attendance. Prior to the electronic transmission of the PEIMS report and the program evaluation report to TEA, class rosters were reconciled with the district's student database for OEYP participation by examining student attendance, promotion, and/or retention data from principals. This process ensured reporting accuracy.

An accelerated instruction principal survey was sent to principals at 81 participating campuses to secure additional documentation regarding staff development training, parental involvement, adequacy of information provided by program managers, and expectations for program success. Seventy-two percent (n = 58) of surveys were returned. Of the surveys returned, 52 were from elementary principals and 6 were from secondary principals (4 middle and 2 high schools).

STAFF DEVELOPMENT SESSIONS

The principal survey results showed that 67% (n = 35) of the responding elementary principals reported providing at least one staff development session prior to implementation of the OEY program for their teachers, 27% (n = 14) had not done so, and 6% (n = 3) did not respond to that question. All six of the secondary principals who returned surveys reported providing staff development sessions for their teachers prior to implementation of the grant on their campuses. Staff development topics mentioned most often by elementary principals were:

- Determining eligibility;
- Complying with OEY program guidelines, procedures, and policy;
- Reading and math intervention strategies;
- Record keeping and attendance; and
- Expectations, assessment, and monitoring.

Principals at secondary schools said they provided staff development sessions on OEY program guidelines, identification of students for participation, attendance and class size, promotion or retention, compacting the curriculum, lesson plans, use of materials, and grade reporting. Staff development sessions also were provided to both elementary and secondary staff in areas such as behavioral management, attendance, program schedules, pay, staff assignments, student registration, staff planning and preparation, and evaluation/data requirements.

PARENT INVOLVEMENT

The Texas Education Agency requires that the OEY program at each participating school district include a parent/family awareness component. Thus, when principals were asked how they informed parents that the OEY program was available to their child/children, most said they used letters/flyers, phone calls, parent/teacher conferences, counselors' notices, marquee messages, PTA/PTO meetings, and family literacy nights.

Seventy-six percent (n = 44) of the responding principals reported that their schools sponsored OEYP parent involvement activities during 2004-2005, while 24% (n = 14) reported that they had not done so. Survey records completed by principals showed that 5,820 elementary and secondary parents participated in OEY program activities during school year 2004-2005. Please note that parents may have attended more than one event, so the participation counts include duplicates. The following list includes the parent involvement activities reported by OEYP principals and the attendance totals for the categories in parentheses:

- Back-to-School or Orientation assemblies (3,391),
- Family Literacy Night (986),
- Events such as PTA, monthly meetings, ethnic celebrations, and open houses (500),
- Conferences (468),
- TAKS workshops or seminars (257),
- Principal Coffees (139), and
- Grade level meetings (79).

PROGRAM INFORMATION, CURRICULA, AND EXPECTATION FOR SUCCESS

As shown in Table 1, a majority of the principals who returned surveys agreed that they had received adequate information about the OEYP grant (72%), and its payroll and accounting procedures (53%). Most of the principals (74%) said that the rigor/pace of the curriculum's delivery was comfortable. Also, most principals wanted frequent e-mail updates with the number of students they were serving (78%) and their account balances from the Grants Office (84%). Fifty-five percent of responding principals agreed that expectations for student success were met, and 47% of principals indicated that parent involvement at their schools was good. However, these percentages are causes for concern because both items are key components to program success and because these percentages were smaller than those reported on last year's program survey. At the same time, the percentages of principals disagreeing with these items have increased. See Optional Extended Year Summary Report: 2003-2004, Publication 03.08, for more information.

Table 1: Percentages of Principal Responses to Questions on the
OEYP Accelerated Instruction Principal Survey, 2004-2005

Survey Items	% Agree	% Disagree	% Undecided	% Did Not Respond
I would like e-mail updates _at least_ two times per program period on account balances and directions for use from the Grants Office or the Department of Program Evaluation.	84	10	3	3
I would like e-mail updates _at least_ two times per program period on the number of students I am serving from the Grants Office or the Department of Program Evaluation.	78	9	6.5	6.5
The rigor/pace of the curriculum's delivery was comfortable.	74	9	14	3
I received adequate information about the grant (Optional Extended Year Program) that funded the Optional Extended Year Program at my school.	72	17	9	2
My expectations for student success were met.	55	22	12	10
I would like more information about payroll procedures and accounting practices associated with the OEY Program.	53	34	10	3
Parent involvement at my school for students participating in the OEYP classes was good.	47	33	10	11

Source: AISD Accelerated Instruction Principal Survey, 2004-2005.

ACCELERATED INSTRUCTION STAFF SURVEY RESULTS

Elementary teachers who participated in the accelerated instruction program were asked to complete the Reading and Mathematics Intervention Teacher Survey developed through the coordinated efforts of the Department of Program Evaluation staff. Secondary teachers were not asked to complete the survey because their classes were credit recovery classes for promotion that may not have been specific to Reading and Mathematics intervention.

Three hundred thirty-one elementary teachers responded to statements about AISD's reading and mathematics interventions program. Table 2 shows that the majority of teachers agreed that the campus contact person worked cooperatively with teachers to make interventions beneficial for students (95%), and that the curriculum used in their program was effective (81%). Smaller percentages of teachers agreed with statements regarding the usefulness of the training provided them in their program (22%), the accuracy of the academic monitoring assessments tools used (21%), and the availability of adequate planning time (19%). Table 3 shows that most teachers agreed that the information provided to them regarding key areas of their campus' accelerated instructional program was adequate. However, 22% of the respondents indicated that information provided to them about their program's assessment options was adequate.

Table 2: Numbers and Percentages of Teachers Who Agreed with the AISD Accelerated Instruction Teacher Survey Items About Program Information and Curricula, 2004-2005

Survey Items	Number of Teachers Responding	% of Teachers Agreeing
The contact person at my campus worked cooperatively with teachers to make this intervention beneficial for students.	315	95%
The curriculum used in my program was effective in accelerating student progress.	324	81%
Professional development provided useful information about the curriculum to be used in accelerated learning for struggling students.	296	22%
The monitoring assessments used in my program gave accurate information about student progress.	328	21%
Adequate planning time was available for effective implementation of the accelerated instruction program at my campus.	329	19%

Source: AISD Accelerated Instruction Teacher Survey, 2004-2005.

Table 3: Numbers and Percentages of Teachers Who Agreed with AISD Accelerated Instruction
Teacher Survey Items About Adequacy of Program Information Provided in Key Areas, 2004-2005

I was provided adequate information about the accelerated instruction program in the following areas:	Number of Teachers Responding	% of Teachers Agreeing
Eligibility criteria	322	95%
Curriculum and instruction	328	91%
Data collection and reporting	321	91%
Grant requirements	324	88%
Payroll procedures	313	87%
Assessment options	325	22%

Source: AISD Accelerated Instruction Teacher Survey, 2004-2005.

Although teachers responded favorably to the majority of the survey items, there is still a need to address the items to which they responded less favorably. These items concern training sessions, information about assessment options, accurate monitoring tools, and adequate planning time, which are essential for teachers to enhance the educational opportunities for every student participating in their school's program.

PROGRAM COMPLETION, STUDENT PROMOTION, AND RETENTION

Teachers in the OEY program made recommendations for student promotion or retention based on their students' pre- and post-test scores (where available), academic work, and attendance. However, student promotion or retention is not necessarily predicated upon these types of data because state law (Senate Bill 1) allows students who attend OEY program activities to be promoted to the next grade in one of four situations: 1) meeting program attendance requirements and district academic requirements; 2) meeting academic requirements only; 3) meeting attendance requirements only; or 4) meeting neither attendance nor academic requirement (*subjective student placement*). The final decision to promote or to retain a student is made by the home school principal, or, when necessary, by the principal and parent of the student after consultation.

At the end of the program, OEY program summary rosters with student data (including pre- and post-test scores, attendance information, and recommendations for promotion or retention) were provided to the home school principals, who verified student promotion or retention. Table 4 shows that 4,006 students attended at least one day of an OEY program in 2004-2005. Of that number, 3,783 (94%) were promoted and 223 (6%) were retained.

Table 4: Promotion/Retention Data by Grade Level for Students Who Participated in
AISD's Optional Extended Year Program, 2004-2005

Grade Level	# Enrolled	# Promoted	# Retained
Kindergarten	28	*	*
01	226	201	25
02	235	220	15
03	942	893	49
04	469	451	18
05	1,371	1,328	43
06	226	*	*
07	169	169	0
08	115	*	*
09	16	10	6
10	31	*	*
11	84	68	16
12	94	52	42
TOTAL	**4,006**	**3,783**	**223**

Source: AISD's Program Evaluation Records, September 2005.
*Numbers are less than 5.

As shown in Table 5, OEYP attendance records indicated that a majority of students attended Extended Day OEYP classes. The review also showed that most students in grades 9 and 10 attended Extended Week/Saturday classes. Only students in grade 5 attended a program with a combination of weekday and weekend classes.

Table 5: Optional Extended Year Program Student Enrollment and
Promotion Percentages by Program Types, 2004-2005

Grade Level	Extended Day # Enrolled	Extended Day % Promoted	Extended Week # Enrolled	Extended Week % Promoted	Extended Day & Week # Enrolled	Extended Day & Week % Promoted
Kindergarten	28	89				
01	226	89				
02	235	94				
03	914	95	28	89		
04	422	97	47	87		
05	1,333	97	31	87	7	100
06	116	99	110	100		
07	76	100	93	100		
08	79	100	36	97		
09	2	100	14	57		
10	6	100	25	84		
11	55	84	29	76		
12	54	50	40	63		
TOTAL	**3,546**	**92%**	**453**	**84%**	**7**	**100%**

Source: AISD's Program Evaluation Records, September 2005.

SUMMARY AND RECOMMENDATIONS

Because the majority of students who participated in the accelerated instruction programs were promoted at the end of the school year, fewer summer school resources were needed for students at risk of being retained. However, many students who still needed additional academic services attended the district's summer school programs. Their promotion or retention data were included in this report if they were participants in the accelerated instructional programs during the regular school year. Since 2000-2001, the District has used OEYP to serve 16,010 students who would have been retained without the benefit of supplemental instruction. Ninety-four percent of these students (n = 15,118) were promoted. Table 6 shows longitudinal data for students served districtwide from 2000-2001 to 2004-2005. As shown in Table 7, the program actively involved 19,071 parents in a variety of OEYP activities during this five-year period. Please note that parents may have attended more than one event; therefore, the total participation count for this period includes duplicates.

Table 6: Number of AISD Students Served and Percent Promoted in Optional Extended Year Program Grade Level Ranges from 2000-2001 to 2004-2005

School Year	Grade Level Ranges Served	School Semester	# Served	% Promoted
2000-2001	K-8	Intersession & Summer	3,518	96%
2001-2002	3-8	Summer	2,609	86%
2002-2003	4-8	Spring & Summer	2,312	97%
2003-2004	3-8	Spring & Summer	3,565	97%
2004-2005	K-12	Fall & Spring	4,006	94%

Source: Optional Extended Year Program Summary Reports: 2000-2001 through 2004-2005.

Table 7: Number of Parents Involved in Activities in AISD's Optional Extended Year Program from 2000-2001 to 2004-2005

School Year	# Parents Involved
2000-2001	2,909
2001-2002	2,420
2002-2003	3,917
2003-2004	4,005
2004-2005	5,820
TOTAL	**19,071**

Source: Optional Extended Year Program Summary Reports: 2000-2001 through 2004-2005.

These early intervention programs have provided students with the accelerated instruction that they needed in order to be promoted. Yet, there are some concerns about the program's planning and operation within AISD. For instance, some campuses provided instructional services to eligible students in more than one academic area with the same funding source. However, the

OEYP grant requires that AISD serve an assigned unduplicated number of students with the limited funds allocated. Thus, the first recommendation is for program managers to insist that each campus administrator spread intervention services across as many eligible students as possible because a student can be counted only once for OEYP purposes. Other evaluation results showed that the majority of principals would like regular updates regarding the number of students they serve, their account balances, and directions for use of funds. In response to their requests, the second recommendation is that the department(s) responsible for the attendance file and the OEYP budget provide campus administrators or designated staff (e.g., mentors, payroll clerks, assistant principals, others) the requested information at least twice per program period to help them keep current on student counts and program expenditures. Principals' responses to the OEYP Accelerated Instruction Survey regarding their expectations for student success and their feelings about parent involvement should be addressed because these are crucial components for a successful program. Thus, a final recommendation is that program staff include appropriate training to address these concerns in their meetings with principals prior to the start of accelerated programs in the future.

REFERENCES

Curry, J., Doolittle, M., & Williams, H. (2004). AISD K-5 Accelerated Reading and Mathematics Instruction Evaluation, 2004-2005 (DPE Publication 04.07). Austin, TX: Austin Independent School District.

Washington. W., Doolittle, M., & Williams, H. (2003). Optional Extended Year Program Summary, 2003-2004 (DPE Publication 03.08). Austin, TX: Austin Independent School District.

Washington. W., Doolittle, M., & Williams, H. (2002). Optional Extended Year Program Summary, 2002-2003 (DPE Publication 02.12). Austin, TX: Austin Independent School District.

Washington. W., Doolittle, M., & Williams, H. (2001). Optional Extended Year Program Summary, 2001-2002 (OPE Publication 01.10). Austin, TX: Austin Independent School District.

Washington. W., Doolittle, M., & Williams, H. (2000). Optional Extended Year Program Summary, 2000-2001 (OPE Publication 00.07). Austin, TX: Austin Independent School District.

AUSTIN INDEPENDENT SCHOOL DISTRICT

Office of Accountability
Maria Whitsett, Ph.D.

Department of Program Evaluation
Holly Williams, Ph.D.
Martha Doolittle, Ph.D.

Author
Wanda Washington

Support Staff
Joyce Partee
Becky Sanchez