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## Evaluation of the Title I Program: 2015-2016 Hamilton County Schools

This document presents the findings of the Title I Evaluation for the 2015-2016 school year. It should be noted that the 2015-2016 grant did not list SMART objectives, therefore, the evaluation questions in this report were developed around these major topics: Student Performance, Schoolwide Activities, Parent Involvement, Professional Development Training, ELL, and the Private School Component.

## EVALUTION QUESTIONS

The evaluation questions for this study are:

1. Did the percent scoring 3 and above on the FSA Reading and Math increase from 2015 to 2016?
2. What percent of parent involvement activities were met in 2015-2016 as compared to the 2014-2015 school year?
3. To what extent were schoolwide activities implemented in 2015-2016?
4. What is the status of students taking the ACCESS for ELLs 2.0 assessments in 2015-2016?
5. Were professional development trainings implemented as planned?
6. Did the private school component include timely, meaningful consultation and equitable services to all eligible students?

## DATA COLLECTION

An objective-based approach was used to answer the evaluation questions. A combination of test data, survey data, district records, and survey/interview information from the Title I Director were used as measures in the evaluation. The data sources included the following:

- State assessment file for FSA and SPARS (2015) indicators available at http://www.fldoe.org/schoolgrades.asp
- Parent survey data were collected in April 2016 using the Hamilton County Parent Survey.
- Document reviews and interview with Director were initiated in fall 2016.


## FINDINGS

EVALUATION QUESTION 1: Did the percent scoring 3 and above on the FSA
Reading and Math increase from 2015 to 2016?
Table 1 below details the information used to answer question 1.
Table 1. 2015 and 2016 FSA \% 3 and above

| ELEM | 3 RD |  | $4^{\text {TH }}$ |  | $5^{\text {TH }}$ |  |  | 6 TH |  |  | 2016 minus 2015 |  |  |  |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Reading | 2015 | 2016 | 2015 | 2016 | 2015 | 2016 | 2015 | 2016 | $3^{\text {rd }}$ | $4^{\text {th }}$ | $5^{\text {th }}$ | $6^{\text {th }}$ |  |  |
| CHE | 24 | 36 | 25 | 13 | 25 | 22 | 21 | 13 | 11 | -12 | -3 | -8 |  |  |
| NHE | 30 | 30 | 27 | 34 | 31 | 17 | 44 | 33 | 0 | 7 | -14 | -11 |  |  |
| SHE | 56 | 29 | 56 | 52 | 33 | 26 | 21 | 38 | -27 | -4 | -7 | 17 |  |  |

Math

| CHE | 74 | 67 | 54 | 54 | 42 | 39 | 33 | 33 | -7 | 0 | -3 | 0 |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| NHE | 63 | 71 | 53 | 56 | 49 | 19 | 43 | 51 | 8 | 3 | -30 | 8 |
| SHE | 70 | 79 | 38 | 44 | 19 | 32 | 35 | 38 | 9 | 6 | 13 | 3 |


| HIGH | 7TH |  | $8^{\text {TH }}$ |  | $9^{\text {TH }}$ |  | $10^{\text {TH }}$ |  | 2016 minus 2015 |  |  |  |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Reading | 2015 | 2016 | 2015 | 2016 | 2015 | 2016 | 2015 | 2016 | $7^{\text {th }}$ | $8^{\text {th }}$ | $9^{\text {th }}$ | $10^{\text {th }}$ |
| HHS | 27 | 21 | 20 | 27 | 22 | 20 | 26 | 23 | -6 | 7 | -2 | -3 |

Math

| HHS | 34 | 34 | 15 | 12 |  |  |  |  | 0 | -3 |  |  |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |

## Elementary

- In reading, 2 of 12 cells increased in percent scoring 3 and above.
- In math, 7 of 12 cells increase in percent scoring 3 and above.


## High School

- In reading the percent scoring 3 and above increased at the $8^{\text {th }}$ grade level.
- In math, none of the grade levels increased in scoring 3 and above.

EVALUATION QUESTION 2: What percent of parent involvement activities were met in 2015-2016 as compared to the 2014-2015 school year?

Table 2 shows the comparison of the 2015 and 2016 results as measured by the Title I Parent Survey.

Table 2. Results of the 2015 and 2016 Title I Parent Survey

| Awareness of Standards and Testing | 2014-2015 | 2015-2016 | Met 70 \% Standard? |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| What school teaches child | 85 | 86 | + |
| Sunshine State Standards (Common Core)* | 94 | 86 | + |
| State tests (FCAT, FAIR, other) | 95 | 86 | + |
| How child scored on state tests | 91 | 80 | + |
| What scores mean | 91 | 81 | + |
| Information about promo/retention | 94 | 80 | + |
| How to work with teachers to help child succeed | 95 | 88 | + |
| Information on monitoring progress | 89 | 86 | + |
| Information on working with teachers | 94 | 84 | + |
| Attend open house about goals | 82 | 67 | - |
| Helping your Child with School |  |  |  |
| Received materials to work with child | 82 | 76 | + |
| Shown how to use materials | 65 | 58 | - |
| Attended meetings/training | 57 | 51 | - |
| Helped with homework at least 1/week | 92 | 94 | + |
| Parents as Partners |  |  |  |
| Staff willing to communicate with you | 95 | 91 | + |
| School values your suggestions | 95 | 92 | + |
| Asks your advice how to best teach child | 81 | 67 | - |
| Review policies | 90 | 80 | + |
| Communication |  |  |  |
| Know how to contact child's teacher | 99 | 95 | + |
| Info from school easy to understand | 97 | 96 | + |
| Info from school in understandable language | 96 | 98 | + |

17 of 21 items met the $70 \%$ standard for $81 \%$ in 2015-2016. In contrast, 19 of 21
items met the $70 \%$ standard for $80 \%$ in 2014-2015.

EVALUATION QUESTION 3: To what extent were schoolwide activities
implemented in 2015-2016?
Table 3 shows that all except for one activity (Rosetta Stone) was implemented to a "High" degree, according to the Title I Director.

Table 3. Implementation of schoolwide activities

|  |  |  | Degree of Implementation |  |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| $\#$ | Activity | High | Fair | Low | \(\left.\begin{array}{c}Not <br>

Implemented\end{array}\right)\)

EVALUATION QUESTION 4: What is the status of students taking the ACCESS for
ELLs 2.0 assessments in 2015-2016?
The ACCESS for ELLs 2.0 assessments have replaced the Comprehensive English Language Learning Assessment (CELLA) program, which was administered through spring 2015. ACCESS for ELLs 2.0 is a large-scale test of English language proficiency based on the WIDA English Language Development (ELD) Standards that form the core of WIDA's approach to instructing and assessing ELLs in Grades K-12.
http://www.fldoe.org/accountability/assessments/k-12-student-assessment/access-

## for-ells.stml

Tables 4 and 5present the results by category and grade level. The results form the baseline for the 2016-2017 evaluation.

Table 4. Levels 1, 2, and 3

| LEVELS 1, 2 AND 3 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Grade | N | Listening | Spkg | Reading | Writing | Oral | Literacy | Compre | Overall |
| 2 | 24 | 12 | 7 | 15 | 24 | 15 | 23 | 16 | 22 |
| 3 | 26 | 7 | 7 | 16 | 25 | 10 | 24 | 18 | 24 |
| 4 | 10 | 6 | 2 | 3 | 9 | 2 | 7 | 6 | 6 |
| 5 | 14 | 3 | 2 | 6 | 14 | 2 | 11 | 4 | 9 |
|  | 74 | 28 | 18 | 40 | 72 | 29 | 65 | 44 | 61 |
|  |  | 37.84\% | 24.32\% | 54.05\% | 97.30\% | 39.19\% | 87.84\% | 59.46\% | 82.43\% |
| 6 | 7 | 3 | 1 | 4 | 7 | 1 | 6 | 4 | 6 |
| 8 | 9 | 1 | 1 | 7 | 9 | 2 | 9 | 4 | 9 |
| 9 | 2 | 2 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 |
| 10 | 4 | 2 | 1 | 2 | 3 | 1 | 3 | 2 | 2 |
| 11 | 2 | 1 | 0 | 2 | 2 | 0 | 2 | 2 | 2 |
| 12 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 1 | 2 | 1 | 2 | 2 | 2 |
|  | 26 | 11 | 6 | 17 | 23 | 6 | 23 | 15 | 22 |
|  |  | 42.31\% | 23.08\% | 65.38\% | 88.46\% | 23.08\% | 88.46\% | 57.69\% | 84.62\% |
|  | 100 | 39 | 24 | 57 | 95 | 35 | 88 | 59 | 83 |
| ALL |  | 39.00\% | 24.00\% | 57.00\% | 95.00\% | 35.00\% | 88.00\% | 59.00\% | 83.00\% |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |

Table 5. Levels 5 and 6

| LEVELS 5 AND 6 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Grade | N | Listening | Spkg | Reading | Writing | Oral | Literacy | Compre | Overall |
| 2 | 24 | 12 | 17 | 9 | 0 | 9 | 1 | 8 | 2 |
| 3 | 26 | 19 | 19 | 10 | 1 | 16 | 2 | 8 | 2 |
| 4 | 10 | 4 | 8 | 7 | 1 | 8 | 3 | 4 | 4 |
| 5 | 14 | 11 | 12 | 8 | 0 | 12 | 3 | 10 | 5 |
|  | 74 | 46 | 56 | 34 | 2 | 45 | 9 | 30 | 13 |
|  |  | 62.16\% | 75.68\% | 45.95\% | 2.70\% | 60.81\% | 12.16\% | 40.54\% | 17.57\% |
| 6 | 7 | 4 | 6 | 3 | 0 | 6 | 1 | 3 | 1 |
| 8 | 9 | 8 | 8 | 2 | 0 | 7 | 0 | 5 | 0 |
| 9 | 2 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 2 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 |
| 10 | 4 | 2 | 3 | 2 | 1 | 3 | 1 | 2 | 2 |
| 11 | 2 | 1 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 12 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
|  | 26 | 15 | 20 | 9 | 3 | 20 | 3 | 11 | 4 |
|  |  | 57.69\% | 76.92\% | 34.62\% | 11.54\% | 76.92\% | 11.54\% | 42.31\% | 15.38\% |
|  | 100 | 61 | 76 | 43 | 5 | 65 | 12 | 41 | 17 |
| ALL |  | 61.00\% | 76.00\% | 43.00\% | 5.00\% | 65.00\% | 12.00\% | 41.00\% | 17.00\% |

EVALUATION QUESTION 5. Were professional development trainings provided to staff to support instruction in core subject areas and in the use of technology in the classroom?

In the 2015-2016 grant, professional development was explained in this manner:
Focused, job-embedded, high-quality professional development will be provided to teachers to support classroom instruction and to support continuous growth for teachers. Professional development will be planned in collaboration with Title II
and the Teacher Incentive Fund. Activities will support instruction in core subjects and the use of technology in the classroom.

On a three-point scale (Fully implemented, Partial Implementation, and Low Implementation), the Title I Director rated the activities as "Partial Implementation."

EVALUATION QUESTION 6. Did the private school component include timely,
meaningful consultation and equitable services to all eligible students?
All objectives were met for this component, as summarized in Table 6.

Table 6. Results for Private School Component

|  | PRIVATE SCHOOL COMPONENT | SCORE |
| :--- | :--- | :---: |
| 1 | Title I office will contact all private schools in late November or early December <br> 2015 to determine school's intent to participate. | Yes |
| 2 | Follow-up phone calls emails will be sent to ensure letters are received. | Yes |
| 3 | In January 2016 there will be a meeting of the principal and the Title I program <br> director and other Title grant coordinators to determine funding, services and <br> methods of delivery. See applications for details of meeting agenda. | Yes |
| 4 | Participating schools and the district will hold at least quarterly meetings to monitor <br> student progress and implementation of grant requirements. | Yes |

## RECOMMENDATIONS

| FINDINGS | RECOMMENDATIONS |
| :---: | :---: |
| STUDENT PERFORMANCE <br> Elementary <br> - In reading, 2 of 12 cells increased in percent scoring 3 and above. <br> - In math, 7 of 12 cells increased in percent scoring 3 and above. <br> High School <br> - In reading the percent scoring 3 and above increased at the $8^{\text {th }}$ grade level. <br> - In math, none of the grade levels increased in scoring 3 and above. | - Continue to monitor the progress of students not making adequate academic progress. <br> - Make instructional adjustments as needed to meet students' needs. <br> - As needed, provide training in data analysis so staff can identify weaknesses and strengths of individual students. |


| PARENT INVOLVEMENT <br> - 17 of 21 items met the $70 \%$ standard for 81\% in 2015-2016. In contrast, <br> - 19 of 21 items met the $70 \%$ standard for 80\% in 2014-2015. | - Continue to offer parents training on how they can help their child with schoolrelated activities. <br> - Provide training to school staff about the value and importance of parent involvement and student achievement. |
| :---: | :---: |
| SCHOOLWIDE ACTIVITIES <br> Almost all activities were implemented to a "High" degree. | - For the 2016-2017 school year, ask teachers to rate the degree to which Title I activities support student achievement. |
| ELL <br> In grades 2-5, only 17.57\% achieved Level 5 and 6. In grades 6-12, only $17 \%$ achieved Level 5 and 6. | - The 2015-2016 data are the baseline data. |
| PROFESSIONAL DEVELOPMENT <br> Overall, professional development activities were partially implemented during the 2015-2016 school year. | - Conduct a follow-up study of the level of use in the classroom of the information/strategies covered in professional development training. |
| PRIVATE SCHOOL <br> All objectives were met for the private school component. | - Continue to provide timely, meaningful consultations and provide equitable services to private schools that participate in the Title I program. |

For more information, contact Phyllis Porter at 386-792-7807.

