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

Prepared by Gail S. Ogawa, Ph.D. September 2016

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 <u>FSA Reading and Math</u> 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 <u>professional development</u> trainings implemented as planned?
- 6. Did the <u>private school component</u> 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	31	RD	4	тн	5	тн	61	ГН	2	016 mi	inus 20)15
Reading	2015	2016	2015	2016	2015	2016	2015	2016	3 rd	4 th	5 th	6 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

iviatr	M	la	t	ł
--------	---	----	---	---

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	71	ГН	8	тн	9	тн	10) TH	20	016 mi	nus 20)15
Reading	2015	2016	2015	2016	2015	2016	2015	2016	7 th	8 th	9 th	10 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 8th 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

			Met 70%
Awareness of Standards and Testing	2014-2015	2015-2016	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	Impleme	entation
#	Activity	High	Fair	Low	Not
					Implemented
1	Supplemental classroom and school supplies	Yes			
2	Authentic literature	Yes			
3	ACALETICS	Yes			
4	Renaissance 360	Yes			
5	Rosetta Stone		Yes		
6	Accelerated Reader	Yes			
7	Accelerated Math	Yes			
8	STAR Reading	Yes			
9	STAR Math	Yes			
10	Supplies to support instruction (e.g., backpacks, pencils, paper, USB ports)	Yes			

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 <u>Comprehensive English</u>

<u>Language Learning Assessment (CELLA) program</u>, 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/accessfor-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	i							
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 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 director and other Title grant coordinators to determine funding, services and 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 student progress and implementation of grant requirements.	Yes

RECOMMENDATIONS

FINDINGS	RECOMMENDATIONS
Elementary In reading, 2 of 12 cells increased in percent scoring 3 and above. In math, 7 of 12 cells increased in percent scoring 3 and above. High School In reading the percent scoring 3 and above increased at the 8th grade level. 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. Make instructional adjustments as needed to meet students' needs. As needed, provide training in data analysis so staff can identify weaknesses and strengths of individual students.

PARENT INVOLVEMENT	
 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. 	 Continue to offer parents training on how they can help their child with school-related activities. Provide training to school staff about the value and importance of parent involvement and student achievement.
SCHOOLWIDE ACTIVITIES	
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	
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	
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	
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.