

Evaluation Brief of the Title I Program: 2016-2017

Hamilton County Schools

Prepared by
Gail S. Ogawa, Ph.D.
June 2017

Evaluation of the Title I Program: 2016-2017 Hamilton County Schools

This document presents the findings of the Title I Evaluation for the 2016-2017 school year. Generally, the evaluation uses an objectives-based approach referencing the nine (9) objectives listed in the Title I, Part A, grant for 2016-2017. Additionally, the evaluation will address questions related to the implementation of activities used to support student achievement and ELL student performance. Table I lists the objectives.

Table 1. Grant Objectives

#	Objectives
1	By the end of the 2016-2017 school year, all students at each grade level will increase proficiency by at least 5% on the 2017 FSA.
2	By the end of the 2016-2017 school year, the district will achieve or maintain 100% HQ and increase the percentage of highly effective and effective teachers in Title I schools.
3	By the end of the 2016-2017 school year, the district will maintain its high level (within 5 percentage points) the percent of parents who indicate on the Hamilton County Title I Parent Involvement Survey that they attended meetings/training (e.g. SAC, Family Literacy Workshops, Parent Involvement to learn about State Standards, other activities) at their child's school or other location.
4	By the end of 2016-2017 school year, 100% of the students eligible for homeless services in Hamilton County will be identified and served as their needs dictate.
5	By the end of the 2016-2017 school year, all identified neglected or delinquent children will be assessed and provided the necessary services to assist them to stay in school and have academic success.
6	By the end of the 2016-2017 school year, 7-10th graders will increase proficiency by 3% on Florida Standards Assessment in reading and math.
7	By the end of the 2016-2017 school year, there will be a decrease in number of students NOT meeting proficiency in each Title I school. All schools (2016-2017) will attain a grade status of "C" or above.
8	By the end of the 2016-2017 school year, 100% of K-2 teachers and students and 100% of 3-12 teachers in title I schools will have access to technology at a level that will enable them to effectively integrate technology into the classroom curriculum.
9	To ensure timely and meaningful consultation, the local education agency shall consult with appropriate private school officials for the design and development of equitable services for 2016-2017.

EVALUATION QUESTIONS

The **evaluation questions** are aligned with the objectives of the grant.

1. Did the percent scoring 3 and above on the FSA Reading and Math increase by at least 5% percentage points from 2016 to 2017?
2. Did the district increase or maintain (if 100%) the percentage of highly-qualified teacher in Title I schools?
3. Did the district maintain (within 5 points) its high level of percentage of parents who indicate that they attended meetings/trainings?

4. Were 100% of the students eligible for homeless services identified and served as their needs dictated?
5. Were all identified neglected or delinquent students assessed and provided the necessary service to be successful in school?
6. Did the 7-12 graders increase proficiency by 3% points on FSA in reading and math?
7. Did all schools attain a grade of "C" or above?
8. Did 100% of teachers and students have access to technology to enable them to effectively integrate technology into the classroom curriculum?
9. Did the LEA consult with appropriate private school officials for the design and development of equitable services for 2016-2017?

DATA COLLECTION

Based on the objectives of the grant, 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 (2017) indicators available at
 - <http://www.fldoe.org/accountability/assessments/k-12-student-assessment/results/2017.shtml>
 - <http://schoolgrades.fldoe.org/>
- Parent survey data were collected in April 2016 using the *Hamilton County Parent Survey*.
- *Test of Silent Word Reading Fluency* was collected in April 2017.
- Document reviews and interview with Director were initiated in summer 2017

FINDINGS

EVALUATION QUESTION 1: Did the percent scoring 3 and above on the FSA Reading and Math increase by at least 5% percentage points from 2016 to 2017?

Table 2 below details the information used to answer question 1.

Table 2. 2016 and 2017 FSA % 3 and above

ELEM	3RD		4 TH		5 TH		6 TH		2017 minus 2016			
Reading	2016	2017	2016	2017	2016	2017	2016	2017	3 rd	4 th	5 th	6 th
CHE	36	32	13	15	22	12	13	23	-4	2	-10	10
NHE	30	35	34	29	17	33	33	25	5	-5	16	-8
SHE	29	24	52	21	26	40	38	26	-5	-31	14	-12

Math

CHE	67	65	54	24	39	29	33	65	-2	-30	-10	32
NHE	71	62	56	36	19	39	51	39	-9	-20	20	-12
SHE	79	24	44	36	32	31	38	47	-55	-8	-4	9

HIGH	7 TH		8 TH		9 TH		10 TH		2016 minus 2015			
Reading	2016	2017	2016	2017	2016	2017	2016	2017	7 th	8 th	9 th	10 th
HHS	21	24	27	11	20	32	23	18	3	-16	12	-5

Math

HHS	34	32	12	26					-2	14		
-----	----	----	----	----	--	--	--	--	----	----	--	--

Elementary

- In reading, 4 of 12 cells increased at least 5% points in scoring 3 and above.
- In math, 3 of 12 cells increased at least 5% points in scoring 3 and above.

High School

- In reading, 1 out of 4 cells increased at least 5% points in scoring 3 and above.
- In math, 1 of 2 cells increased at least 5% points in scoring 3 and above.

EVALUATION QUESTION 2: Did the district increase or maintain (if 100%) the percentage of highly-qualified teachers in Title I schools?

According to district records, all teachers in Title I schools are highly-qualified.

EVALUATION QUESTION 3: Did the district maintain (within 5 points) its high percentage of parents who indicate that they attended meetings/trainings?

Table 3 shows the comparison of the 2016 and 2017 results as measured by the *Title I Parent Survey*. The highlighted item shows that the percentage who attended meetings/trainings was maintained within 5 points (51% and 46%).

Table 3. Parent Involvement Components

Awareness of Standards and Testing	2015-2016	2016-2017	Met 70% Standard?
What school teaches child	86	86	+
State tests (FCAT, FAIR, other)	86	83	+
How child scored on state tests	80	83	+
What scores mean	81	84	+
Information about promo/retention	80	82	+
How to work with teachers to help child succeed	88	88	+
Information on monitoring progress	86	87	+
Information on working with teachers	84	81	+
Attend open house about goals	67	60	-
Helping your Child with School			
Received materials to work with child	76	70	+
Shown how to use materials	58	50	-
Attended meetings/training	51	46	-
Helped with homework at least 1/week	94	93	+
Parents as Partners			
Staff willing to communicate with you	91	92	+
School values your suggestions	92	89	+
Asks your advice how to best teach child	67	68	-
Review policies	80	75	+
Communication			
Know how to contact child's teacher	95	96	+
Info from school easy to understand	96	93	+
Info from school in understandable language	98	95	+

EVALUATION QUESTION 4: Were 100% of the students eligible for homeless services identified and served as their needs dictated?

According to district records, 100% identified homeless students were provided services according to their needs. For example, school supplies, resources and guidance services were made available to all homeless students.

EVALUATION QUESTION 5: Were all neglected or delinquent students assessed and provided the necessary services to be successful in school?

According to the Title I Director and district records, all neglected and delinquent students were assessed and provide with recourse so they could be successful in school.

EVALUATION QUESTION 6: Did the 7-12 graders increase proficiency by 3% points on FSA in reading and math?

Referencing Table 1, students in grades 7-10 did not increase in proficiency by 3% point on FSA reading in 2017. In math, there was a 14% increase in students scoring at level 3 and above.

EVALUATION QUESTION 7: Did all schools attain a grade “C” or above?

None of the schools attained a “C” rating. Table 4 shows the grades for each school for the last two years.

Table 4. School Grades

School	2016	2017
Central Hamilton Elementary School	F	F
North Hamilton Elementary School	D	D
South Hamilton Elementary School	C	D
Hamilton County High School	D	I

EVALUATION QUESTION 8: Did 100% of the teachers have access to technology to enable them to effectively integrate technology into the classroom curriculum?

According to the Title I Director and district records, professional development to enable staff to use technology effectively in the classroom was “partially implemented.”

EVALUATION QUESTION 9: Did the LEA consult appropriate private school officials for the design and development of equitable services for 2016-2017?

All objectives were met for this component, as summarized in Table 5.

Table 5. 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

TOSWRF RESULTS

The results of the spring 2017 testing at Achievers' Christian Academy are detailed in Table 6. Three (3) students received "Very Poor" ratings and three (3) received ratings in the average range.

Table 6. TOSWRF – April 2017 Results

Student	Grade	Sex	Race	Age at time of test			Raw Score	Percentile	Index Score	Index Score Descriptive Rating
				Yrs	Mos	Days				
A	2	F	H	9	5	7	10	<1	52	Very Poor
B	3	F	H	12	3	14	6	<1	45	Very Poor
C	3	F	B	8	7	7	76	47	99	Average
D	4	M	B	10	1	10	114	65	106	Average
E	8	F	H	16	2	11	81	2	69	Very Poor
F	11	F	B	19	2	3	137	19	87	Below Average

Note: Student names are deleted for security purposes.

ADDITIONAL ITEMS

This section presents the results of two additional items. One relates to the implementation of schoolwide activities and the other addresses ELL ACCESS 2.0 results.

SCHOOLWIDE ACTIVITIES: To what extent were schoolwide activities implemented in 2016-2017?

Table 7 shows that all except for one activity (Rosetta Stone) was implemented to a “High” degree, according to the Title I Director.

Table 7. Implementation of schoolwide activities

#	Activity	Degree of Implementation			
		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			

ELL ACCESS 2.0: What is the status of students taking the ACCESS for ELLs 2.0 in 2016-2017?

The 2015-2016 ACCESS 2.0 results had been proposed as the baseline year to measure student growth (see Evaluation Brief 2015-2016); however, the ACCESS 2.0 2016 Standard Study changed the expectations for ACCESS 2.0 proficiency targets and 2016 and 2017 scores are not comparable. They recommend that the 2017 results be used “...as a new baseline for growth.”

https://www.wida.us/Assessment/ACCESS%202.0/documents/ACCESS_2017ScoreChanges_SEAchecklist.pdf

Table 8 presents the ACCESS 2.0 results for grades K-12 for Level 6. The Level 6 rubric states: Knows and uses social and academic language at the highest level measured by this test.” The results will form the baseline for the 2017-2018 evaluation.

Table 8. ACCESS 2.0 2017 Results: Level 6

Gr	n17	List17	Spkg17	Rdg17	Wrtg17	Oral17	Lit17	Compre17
KG	28	3	1	0	0	0	0	0
1	24	1	0	2	0	0	0	2
2	20	7	0	2	0	2	0	2
3	37	10	1	2	0	1	0	3
4	15	5	0	1	0	0	0	1
5	12	3	0	2	0	0	0	1
Total	136	29	2	9	0	3	0	9
		21.32%	1.47%	6.62%	0.00%	2.21%	0.00%	6.62%
6	13	6	0	1	0	0	0	1
7	5	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
8	0							
9	7	0	1	0	0	4	0	0
10	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
11	6	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
12	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Total	35	6	1	1	0	4	0	1
		17.14%	2.86%	2.86%	0.00%	11.43%	0.00%	2.86%

- Challenges remain across all grade levels.
- The largest percentage reaching Level 6 is with the Listening domain for both the K-5 and 6-12 clusters.

SUMMARY

The table below summarizes whether or not each objective was met.

#	Objectives	Met Objective?	
		Yes	No
1	By the end of the 2016-2017 school year, all students at each grade level will increase proficiency by at least 5% on the 2017 FSA.		√
2	By the end of the 2016-2017 school year, the district will achieve or maintain 100% HQ and increase the percentage of highly effective and effective teachers in Title I schools.	√	
3	By the end of the 2016-2017 school year, the district will maintain its high level (within 5 percentage points) the percent of parents who indicate on the Hamilton County Title I Parent Involvement Survey that they attended meetings/training (e.g. SAC, Family Literacy Workshops, Parent Involvement to learn about State Standards, other activities) at their child's school or other location.	√	
4	By the end of 2016-2017 school year, 100% of the students eligible for homeless services in Hamilton County will be identified and served as their needs dictate.	√	
5	By the end of the 2016-2017 school year, all identified neglected or delinquent children will be assessed and provided the necessary services to assist them to stay in school and have academic success.	√	
6	By the end of the 2016-2017 school year, 7-10 the graders will increase proficiency by 3% on Florida Standards Assessment in reading and math.	Math √	Rdg √
7	By the end of the 2016-2017 school year, there will be a decrease in number of students NOT meeting proficiency in each Title I school. All schools (2016-2017) will attain a grade status of "C" or above.		√
8	By the end of the 2016-2017 school year, 100% of K-2 teachers and students and 100% of 3-12 teachers in Title I schools will have access to technology at a level that will enable them to effectively integrate technology into the classroom curriculum.		√
9	To ensure timely and meaningful consultation, the local education agency shall consult with appropriate private school officials for the design and development of equitable services for 2017-2018.	√	

RECOMMENDATIONS

FINDINGS	RECOMMENDATIONS
<p>STUDENT PERFORMANCE</p> <p><u>Elementary</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • In reading, 4 of 12 cells increased 5% percent scoring 3 and above. • In math, 2 of 12 cells increased 5% percent scoring 3 and above. <p><u>High School</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • In reading, 1 in 4 cells increased 5% percent scoring 3 and above. • In math, 1 of 2 cells increased 5% percent 3 and above. <p>PARENT INVOLVEMENT</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 80% of the items on the <i>Title I Parent Survey</i> met the 70% success criterion. • Attendance at meetings/trainings continues to be a challenge: 51% (2016) and 46% (2017). <p>PRIVATE SCHOOL</p> <p>All objectives were met for the private school component.</p> <p>SCHOOLWIDE ACTIVITIES</p> <p>Almost all activities were implemented to a "High" degree.</p> <p>TECHNOLOGY</p> <p>Professional development in technology use was "partially implemented."</p> <p>ELL</p> <p>Across all grade levels, less than 50% of the students reached the highest level (Level 6)</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 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. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Continue to offer parents training on how they can help their child with school-related activities. • Survey/interview parents about their preferred topics for training events. • Seek solutions for meeting schedules that conflict with parents' work schedules. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Continue to provide timely, meaningful consultations and provide equitable services to private schools that participate in the Title I program. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • For the 2017-2018 school year, ask teachers to rate the degree to which Title I activities support student achievement. • Ask teachers to rate activities on their impact of student achievement. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Provide training to enable teachers to effectively integrate technology in the classroom curriculum. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The 2016-2017 data are the baseline data.

For more information, contact Phyllis Porter, Director of Federal Programs, 386-792-7807.