

Archived Information

TITLE I GRANTS FOR SCHOOLS SERVING AT-RISK CHILDREN

Goal: At-risk students improve their achievement to meet challenging standards.

Relationship of Program to Volume 1, Department-wide Objectives: Title I supports Objectives 2.1 (ready-to-learn), 2.2 (reads by third grade), 2.3 (masters mathematics by eighth grade), and 2.4 (service to special populations) of the Department’s strategic plan by funding services to enable at-risk students in low-income communities to meet challenging academic standards. It also helps build the capacity of schools in low-income communities to improve their performance through supporting standards and assessment development (Objective 1.1), staff professional development (Objective 1.4), family involvement (Objective 1.5), and technology (Objective 1.7).

FY 2000—\$7,996,020,000

FY 2001—\$8,357,500,000 (Requested budget)

OBJECTIVE 1: PERFORMANCE OF THE LOWEST-ACHIEVING STUDENTS AND STUDENTS IN HIGH-POVERTY PUBLIC SCHOOLS WILL INCREASE SUBSTANTIALLY IN READING AND MATHEMATICS.

Indicator 1.1 Student performance on national assessments: Performance of the lowest-achieving public school students and students in high-poverty public schools will increase substantially on the National Assessment of Educational Progress (NAEP) in reading and mathematics.						
Targets and Performance Data				Assessment of Progress		Sources and Data Quality
<i>NAEP reading scale scores for public school students at the bottom 25th percentile</i>						
Year	4th Grade		8th Grade		12th Grade	
	Actual Performance	Performance Targets	Actual Performance	Performance Targets	Actual Performance	Performance Targets
1994:	187		234		263	
1998:	192		239		266	
1999:	No data available	Continuous improvement	No data available	Continuous improvement	No data available	Continuous improvement
2002:		202		249		276
<i>NAEP Mathematics Scale Scores for Public School Students at the Bottom 25th Percentile</i>						
Year	4th Grade		8th Grade		12th Grade	
	Actual Performance	Performance Targets	Actual Performance	Performance Targets	Actual Performance	Performance Targets
1992:	197		242		274	
1996:	201		247		281	
1999:	No data available	Continuous improvement	No data available	Continuous improvement	No data available	Continuous improvement
2000:		211		257		291

Status: Positive movement toward the target for students at the bottom 25th percentile.

Explanation: Data are based on NAEP, which is collected every 4 years. The most recent NAEP show that students at the bottom 25th percentile had increasing scores in both reading and math at all three grade levels over the 4-year period (from 1994 to 1998 for reading and from 1992 to 1996 for math). Average scale scores rose by between 3 and 7 points, depending on the subject and grade level, with an average increase of about 5 points. However, the rate of growth will need to accelerate in order to meet the targets for 2000 and 2002, which will require a 10-point increase in average scale scores for each subject at each grade level. A 10-point increase is roughly equivalent to one grade level.

Source: National Assessment of Educational Progress (NAEP), reading.
Frequency: Every 4 years.
Next Update: 2002.

Source: National Assessment of Educational Progress (NAEP), mathematics.
Frequency: Every 4 years.
Next Update: 2000.

Validation Procedure: Data validated by NCES review procedures and NCES Statistical Standards.

Limitations of Data and Planned Improvements: NAEP assessments are not aligned with state content and performance standards. Caution is suggested in interpreting 12th grade achievement data because Title I serves a small number of high school students.

Targets and Performance Data					Assessment of Progress	Sources and Data Quality
<i>Percentage of fourth-grade students in high-poverty schools at or above basic level in reading</i>					<p>Status: Positive movement for students in high-poverty schools.</p> <p>Explanation: Fourth-grade students in high-poverty schools were more likely to score at or above the basic level in both reading and math. For schools above 50 percent poverty, the percentage of students at or above the basic level in reading rose from 36 percent in 1994 to 43 percent in 1998; in math the percentage rose from 31 percent in 1992 to 49 percent in 1996. For the highest-poverty schools (those above 75 percent poverty), the percentage of students at or above the basic level in reading rose from 26 percent in 1994 to 32 percent in 1998, and in math rose from 26 percent in 1992 to 42 percent in 1996.</p>	<p>Source: National Assessment of Educational Progress (NAEP), reading. <i>Frequency:</i> Every 4 years. <i>Next Update:</i> 2002.</p> <p>Source: National Assessment of Educational Progress (NAEP), mathematics. <i>Frequency:</i> Every 4 years. <i>Next Update:</i> 2000.</p> <p>Validation Procedure: Data validated by NCES review procedures and NCES statistical standards.</p> <p>Limitations of Data and Planned Improvements: NAEP assessments are not aligned with state content and performance standards.</p>
Year	50-100% Poverty		75-100% Poverty			
	Actual Performance	Performance Targets	Actual Performance	Performance Targets		
1994:	36%		26%			
1998:	43%		32%			
1999:	No data available	Continuous Improvement	No data available	Continuous Improvement		
2002:		60%		50%		
<i>Percentage of fourth grade students in high-poverty schools at or above basic level in mathematics</i>						
Year	50-100% Poverty		75-100% Poverty			
	Actual Performance	Performance Targets	Actual Performance	Performance Targets		
1992:	31%		26%			
1996:	49%		42%			
1999:	No data available	Continuous improvement	No data available	Continuous improvement		
2000:		60%		50%		

Indicator 1.2 Meeting or exceeding state performance standards: Among states with 2 years of assessment data and aligned content and performance standards, an increasing number will report an increase in the percentage of students in schools with at least 50 percent poverty who meet proficient and advanced performance levels in reading and math on their state assessment systems.

Targets and Performance Data				Assessment of Progress		Sources and Data Quality				
<i>Number of states with performance standards aligned to content standards and two years of data disaggregated by school poverty level</i>				<p>Status: No 1999 data but progress toward the target is likely. Data for the 1998-99 school year will become available in fall 2000.</p> <p>Explanation: Although the number of states with aligned performance standards and 2 years of data disaggregated by school poverty level rose only slightly between 1997 and 1998, the rate of increase is expected to accelerate as the 2001 deadline approaches for state reporting of disaggregated results.</p> <p>While all states are required to have disaggregated data, not all states are likely to have 2 years of achievement data from their final aligned assessment system for reporting in the 2001-02 school year.</p> <p>The number of states that reported an increase in the percentage of students in schools with at least 50 percent poverty who met proficient and advanced levels of performance in both reading and mathematics rose from 7 states in 1997 to 10 states in 1998. All but one of the states with the necessary assessment data reported increased achievement in their high-poverty schools.</p>		<p>Source: Title I state performance reports. <i>Frequency:</i> Annually. <i>Next Update:</i> 1999.</p> <p>Validation Procedure: Verified by Department attestation process and <u>Standards for Evaluating Program Performance Data</u>.</p> <p>Limitations of Data and Planned Improvements: There is substantial variation across states in their definitions of proficient student performance as well as alignment of content and performance standards. All states are in the transitional period for final assessments and accountability systems. The first peer review of state final assessment systems will take place in January 2000. All states will be required to submit evidence of their final aligned assessments by October 2000.</p>				
Year	Actual Performance		Performance Targets							
1997:	10									
1998:	11									
1999:	No data available		15							
2000:			20							
2001:			24							
2002:			26							
<i>Number of states reporting an increase in the percentage of students in schools with at least 50 percent poverty who meet proficient and advanced levels of performance</i>										
Year	Reading		Mathematics					Both		
	Actual	Targets	Actual					Targets	Actual	Targets
1997:	7		7						7	
1998:	10		10						10	
1999:	No data	13	No data					13	No data	13
2000:		18						18		18
2001:		20		20		20				
2002:		24		24		24				

Indicator 1.3 Improving schools: An increasing percentage of Title I schools will report that they have met or exceeded state or district standards for progress.				
Targets and Performance Data			Assessment of Progress	Sources and Data Quality
Year	Actual Performance	Performance Targets	Status: Unable to judge. Data for the 1998-99 school year will become available (fall 2000). Explanation: Unable to assess progress until the 1999 data become available (fall 2000).	Source: Follow-Up Public School Survey on Education Reform, SY 1997-98. <i>Frequency:</i> One time. <i>Next Update:</i> None. Source: Annual Title I State Performance Reports, SY 1998-99 and beyond. <i>Frequency:</i> Annually. <i>Next Update:</i> Fall 2000. Validation Procedure: Data collected before Department <u>Standards for Evaluating Program Performance Data</u> were developed. Limitations of Data and Planned Improvements: There is substantial variation across states in their definitions of adequate yearly progress and proficient student performance.
1998:	57%			
1999:	No data available	75%		
2000:		85%		
2001:		90%		
Indicator 1.4 School readiness of Title I participants: An increasing percentage of children in Title I preschool programs will achieve a basic level of readiness on measures of language development, reading readiness, and mathematics concepts.				
Targets and Performance Data			Assessment of Progress	Sources and Data Quality
Year	Actual Performance	Performance Targets	Status: Unable to judge. Explanation: New indicator.	Source: Planned Title I Preschool Evaluation. <i>Frequency:</i> Biannually. <i>Next Update:</i> 2001. Validation Procedure: Data are not yet available. Limitations of Data and Planned Improvements: Limitations unknown—study is in the design phase.
1999:	No data available	To be established after baseline data are obtained		
2000:				
2001:				

OBJECTIVE 2: INCREASE THE NUMBER OF TITLE I SCHOOLS USING STANDARDS-BASED REFORM AND EFFECTIVE STRATEGIES TO ENABLE ALL STUDENTS TO REACH STATE AND LOCAL PERFORMANCE STANDARDS.

Indicator 2.1 Use of challenging standards: All Title I schools will report the use of content standards to guide curriculum and instruction in reading and mathematics.

Targets and Performance Data				Assessment of Progress	Sources and Data Quality	
<i>Percentage of schools reporting use of content standards to guide curriculum and instruction in reading and math "to a great extent"</i>				<p>Status: Positive movement toward the target in both reading and math.</p> <p>Explanation: The percentage of schools reporting use of content standards to guide curriculum and instruction in reading "to a great extent" rose from 74 percent in 1997-98 (based on principals' responses) to 81 percent in 1998-99 (based on teachers' responses) but did not reach the target of 85 percent. For math, the percentage of schools reporting use of standards to guide curriculum and instruction "to a great extent" rose from 73 percent in 1997-98 to 78 percent in 1998-99 but did not reach the target of 85 percent.</p>	<p>Source: Follow-up Public School Survey on Education Reform, SY 1997-98. <i>Frequency:</i> One time. <i>Next Update:</i> None.</p> <p>Source: National Longitudinal Survey of Schools, SY 1998-99 through SY 2000-01. <i>Frequency:</i> Annually. <i>Next Update:</i> 2000.</p> <p>Validation Procedure: Verified by Department attestation process and <u>Standards for Evaluating Program Performance Data</u>.</p> <p>Limitations of Data and Planned Improvements: Data for 1998 were based on a survey of principals, while data for 1999 were based on a teacher survey. Teachers are a more valid source of information on classroom practices.</p>	
Year	Reading		Mathematics			
	Actual Performance	Performance Targets	Actual Performance			Performance Targets
1998:	74%		73%			
1999:	81%	85%	78%			85%
2000:		100%				100%
2001:		100%		100%		

Indicator 2.2 Extended learning time: An increasing number of Title I schools will operate before- and after-school, summer, or other programs to extend and reinforce student learning.

Targets and Performance Data			Assessment of Progress	Sources and Data Quality
<i>Percentage of Title I schools operating extended learning time programs either during the school year or during the summer</i>			<p>Status: Target exceeded.</p> <p>Explanation: The percentage of Title I schools reporting that they offered extended time programs rose from 65 percent in 1997-98 to 83 percent in 1998-99. However, much of this increase is probably due to a change in the wording of the questionnaire, which included only instructional programs in 1997-98 but included all extended time programs in 1998-99, including non-instructional programs such as after-school daycare.</p>	<p>Source: Follow-up Public School Survey on Education Reform, SY 1997-98. <i>Frequency:</i> One time. <i>Next Update:</i> None.</p> <p>Source: National Longitudinal Survey of Schools, SY 1998-99 through 2000-01. <i>Frequency:</i> Annually. <i>Next Update:</i> 2000.</p> <p>Validation Procedure: Verified by Department attestation process and <u>Standards for Evaluating Program Performance Data</u>.</p> <p>Limitations of Data and Planned Improvements: The 1997-98 survey asked about instructional extended time programs, while the 1998-99 survey asked about extended time programs generally and included daycare and other non-instructional programs. The survey will be revised for the 2000-01 school year to focus again on instructional programs only.</p>
Year	Actual Performance	Performance Targets		
1998:	65%			
1999:	83%	70%		
2000:		75%		
2001:		80%		

Indicator 2.3 Parental involvement for improved student performance: An increasing percentage of Title I schools will report that their parental involvement programs and activities are effective in improving student performance.

Targets and Performance Data						Assessment of Progress	Sources and Data Quality	
<i>Percentage of teachers in Title I schools reporting that their school's parent involvement efforts have resulted in a "great extent" of change in their classroom</i>						<p>Status: Unable to judge.</p> <p>Explanation: Baseline data for the 1998-99 school year show that two-thirds of the teachers in Title I schools report that their school's parent involvement efforts resulted in a "great extent" of change in students attending school regularly (70 percent) and students arriving at school on time (67 percent). A smaller percentage of these teachers reported that parent involvement efforts had greatly improved homework completion (43 percent).</p>	<p>Source: National Longitudinal Survey of Schools, SY 1998-99 and 2000-01. <i>Frequency:</i> Biennially. <i>Next Update:</i> 2001.</p> <p>Validation Procedure: Data collected before Department <u>Standards for Evaluating Program Performance Data</u> were developed.</p> <p>Limitations of Data and Planned Improvements: No known limitations.</p>	
Year	Students Attending School Regularly	Students Arriving at School on Time	Homework Completion					
1999:	70%	Baseline	67%	Baseline	43%			Baseline
2000:		90%		90%				90%
2001:		90%		90%				90%

Indicator 2.4 Qualified staff: Title I schools will report an increase in the proportion of Title I staff who are teachers and in district support for the educational improvement of paraprofessionals.

Targets and Performance Data			Assessment of Progress	Sources and Data Quality
<i>Percentage of Title I staff who are teachers</i>			<p>Status: No change.</p> <p>Explanation: The percentage of Title I-funded staff who are teachers was unchanged from SY 1997-98 to SY 1998-99. Currently, the program supports as many teacher aides as teachers, and there is concern that many of these aides are performing instructional responsibilities for which they are not qualified. An increase in the proportion of Title I staff who are teachers would reflect a shift in using Title I funds for staff who are more qualified to help students improve their achievement levels.</p>	<p>Source: Study of Education Resources and Federal Funding, SY 1997-98. <i>Frequency:</i> One time. <i>Next Update:</i> None.</p> <p>Source: National Longitudinal Survey of Schools, SY 1998-99 through 2000-01. <i>Frequency:</i> Annually. <i>Next Update:</i> 2000.</p> <p>Validation Procedure: Data collected before the Department's <u>Standards for Evaluating Program Performance Data</u> were developed.</p> <p>Limitations of Data and Planned Improvements: Additional information is needed on the qualifications of teachers and the extent to which Title I teacher aides are providing instruction to students, a responsibility that is inappropriate for the education and training of most paraprofessionals. Future surveys will obtain information on these issues.</p>
Year	Actual Performance	Performance Targets		
1998	45%			
1999:	45%	No target set		
2000:		47%		
2001:		49%		
<i>Percentage of Title I schools in districts offering career ladders for paraprofessionals</i>			<p>Status: Target met.</p> <p>Explanation: The percentage of Title I schools whose districts offer career ladders rose from 24 percent in 1997-98 to 30 percent in 1998-99.</p>	<p>Source: Follow-up Public School Survey on Education Reform, SY 1997-98. <i>Frequency:</i> One time. <i>Next Update:</i> None.</p> <p>Source: National Longitudinal Survey of Schools, SY 1998-99 through 2000-01. <i>Frequency:</i> Annually. <i>Next Update:</i> 2000.</p> <p>Validation Procedure: Data collected before Department <u>Standards for Evaluating Program Performance Data</u> were developed, but not reported until 2000.</p> <p>Limitations of Data and Planned Improvements: No known limitations.</p>
Year	Actual Performance	Performance Targets		
1998:	24%			
1999:	30%	30%		
2000:		35%		
2001:		35%		

OBJECTIVE 3: STATES AND DISTRICTS WILL IMPLEMENT STANDARDS-BASED ACCOUNTABILITY SYSTEMS AND PROVIDE EFFECTIVE SUPPORT FOR SCHOOL IMPROVEMENT EFFORTS.

Targets and Performance Data			Assessment of Progress	Sources and Data Quality
Year	Actual Performance	Performance Targets	<p>Status: No 1999 data, but progress toward target is likely.</p> <p>Explanation: All states have adopted transitional measures of adequate yearly progress and will be adopting final measures of adequate yearly progress linked to state performance as they put their final assessments in place (see Indicator 3.2). All states are in the transitional period for final assessments and accountability systems. The first peer review of state final assessment systems will take place beginning in January 2000. All states will be required to submit evidence of their final aligned assessments by October 2000.</p>	<p>Source: Title I peer review records. <i>Frequency:</i> Annually. <i>Next Update:</i> 2000.</p> <p>Validation Procedure: Data supplied by independent contractors who reviewed state plans.</p> <p>Limitations of Data and Planned Improvements: No known limitations.</p>
1999:	No data available	N/A		
2000:		40 states		
2001:		All states		

Indicator 3.2 Aligned assessments: All states will have assessments aligned with content and performance standards for mathematics, and reading or language arts.

Targets and Performance Data			Assessment of Progress	Sources and Data Quality
Year	Actual Performance	Performance Targets	<p>Status: No 1999 data, but progress toward target is likely.</p> <p>Explanation: Although no states have yet submitted evidence to the Department that they have final assessments in place, an independent evaluation found that 14 states had assessments aligned to state standards in 1997. All states are in the transitional period for final assessments and accountability systems. The first peer review of state final assessment systems will take place beginning in January 2000. All states will be required to submit evidence of their final aligned assessments by October 2000.</p> <p>The Department distributed peer review guidance for aligned assessments in fall 1999 and conducted technical workshops for states. The Department has recently identified 15 states as having a high-priority need for assistance and intervention if they are to have a final aligned assessment system in place within the statutory timeline.</p>	<p>Source: Title I peer review records. <i>Frequency:</i> Annually. <i>Next Update:</i> 2000.</p> <p>Validation Procedure: Verified by Department attestation process and <u>Standards for Evaluating Program Performance Data</u>.</p> <p>Limitations of Data and Planned Improvements: No known limitations. By design and by the legislation, Title I peer review records are the authoritative data source for this indicator.</p>
1999:	N/A	N/A		
2000:		40 states		
2001:		All states		

Indicator 3.3 Effective assistance and public school enrollment options: Schools identified as needing improvement will report receiving effective assistance from their districts and states, including expanded opportunities for children to transfer to high-performing public schools.				
Targets and Performance Data			Assessment of Progress	Sources and Data Quality
<i>Percentage of schools identified for improvement that report receiving assistance as a result of being identified</i>			<p>Status: Unable to judge.</p> <p>Explanation: Prior evaluations indicate that states and districts may lack the capacity to provide effective support for school improvement. In 1998, the Follow-up Public School Survey on Education Reform indicated that only eight states reported that school support teams were able to serve the majority of schools identified as in need of improvement. In 24 states, Title I directors reported more schools in need of assistance than Title I could support. Among schools that reported in 1997-98 that they had been identified for improvement, only 47 percent reported that they had received additional professional development or assistance from school support teams. Future evaluations will track progress in providing more effective assistance from the perspective of the schools in need of this assistance.</p>	<p>Source: National Longitudinal Survey of Schools, SY 1998-99 through 2000-01. <i>Frequency:</i> Annually. <i>Next Update:</i> 2000.</p> <p>Validation Procedure: Data collected before Department <u>Standards for Evaluating Program Performance Data</u>.</p> <p>Limitations of Data and Planned Improvements: Schools were asked about whether they received assistance but not about the quality of that assistance. Future surveys will ask schools about the effectiveness of the assistance they received.</p>
Year	Actual Performance	Performance Targets		
1999:	47%	Baseline		
2000:		60%		
2001:		80%		
<i>Percentage of schools reporting expanded opportunities for children to transfer to public schools not identified for improvement</i>			<p>Status: Unable to judge.</p> <p>Explanation: Indicator has been expanded to include performance data concerning public school choice opportunities for children attending Title I schools identified as in need of improvement, consistent with the FY 2000 appropriations language concerning Title I school improvement funds.</p>	<p>Source: National Longitudinal Survey of Schools, SY 1999-00 and 2000-01. <i>Frequency:</i> Annually. <i>Next Update:</i> 2000.</p> <p>Validation Procedure: Data collected before Department <u>Standards for Evaluating Program Performance Data</u>.</p> <p>Limitations of Data and Planned Improvements: The number of sample schools responding to this survey item is very small because the question was asked only of schools that had been identified as in need of improvement for more than 1 year.</p>
Year	Actual Performance	Performance Targets		
1999:	No data available	No target set		
2000:		Targets will be set after baseline data are obtained for school year 1999-00		
2001:		To be established after the baseline data are obtained		

Indicator 3.4 Schools identified for improvement: An increasing percentage of schools identified for improvement will make sufficient progress to move out of school improvement status.

Targets and Performance Data			Assessment of Progress	Sources and Data Quality
Year	Actual Performance	Performance Targets	<p>Status: Unable to judge.</p> <p>Explanation: This is a new indicator, needed to assess whether Title I schools identified as in need of improvement actually do improve. States report annually on the number of schools identified for improvement but do not report the number of schools that move out of school improvement status each year. The Department will amend the annual Consolidated State Performance Report to obtain this information, beginning with the 2001-01 school year. For the 1999-00 school year, data will be obtained from the National Longitudinal Survey of Schools.</p>	<p>Source: National Longitudinal Survey of Schools, SY 1999-00. <i>Frequency:</i> Annually. <i>Next Update:</i> 2000.</p> <p>Source: Consolidated State Performance Report, SY 2000-01 and beyond. <i>Frequency:</i> Annually. <i>Next Update:</i> 2000.</p> <p>Validation Procedure: N/A.</p> <p>Limitations of Data and Planned Improvements: No known limitations.</p>
1999:	No data available	Targets will be set after baseline data are obtained		
2000:				
2001:				

KEY STRATEGIES

Strategies Continued from 1999

- ❖ Continue collaborating with professional organizations, providing technical assistance, and disseminating descriptions of successful extended-time and research-based practice and programs to promote school-level improvement.
- ❖ Continue to assist states as they develop and implement challenging, aligned systems of standards, assessments, and accountability.
- ❖ Continue the support for increased parent and family involvement.

New or Strengthened Strategies

- ❖ Disseminate the findings from the National Research Council's reports, "Preventing Reading Difficulties," and "Starting Out Right" to all Title I Coordinators and to all Title I teachers. Use integrated review teams' follow-up stage to determine whether Title I teachers are using the research-based reading practices described in the reports in their classrooms.
- ❖ Disseminate new "Compact for Reading" guide to help parents and other caregivers reinforce reading instruction.
- ❖ Assist states and high-poverty school districts in the development, implementation, and refinement of aligned systems of standards, assessments, and accountability.
- ❖ Provide expert peer consultants and target technical assistance and dissemination efforts about standards, assessments, and accountability to those states and school systems that have the greatest need for assistance.
- ❖ Sponsor national, regional, and statewide forums that focus on moving content standards into the classroom, particularly in high-poverty schools.
- ❖ Work with Comprehensive Centers and Regional Labs to develop, disseminate, and demonstrate various approaches to transform state content standards into everyday teaching practice in Title I high-poverty schools across the nation.
- ❖ Disseminate research-based and promising practices of effective implementation of Title I provisions in order to accelerate the progress of districts and schools toward better student achievement, particularly in high-poverty and low-performing states, districts, and schools.
- ❖ Disseminate to all state and local education agencies guidance about how to use Title I and other Federal program funds to support extended learning time programs.
- ❖ Initiate a study of the programs, policies, and practices in districts that provide good career development opportunities for teacher aides.
- ❖ Initiate studies that focus on implementation challenges and successes associated with aligned standards, assessment, and accountability systems.
- ❖ Invite nationally recognized experts to work with Title I and Comprehensive Center staff to design a Resource Guide for aligning curricula to standards.

HOW THIS PROGRAM COORDINATES WITH OTHER FEDERAL ACTIVITIES

- ❖ To assist state educational agencies in meeting timelines for final aligned assessment and accountability systems, the Compensatory Education Program office is leading the effort to provide ED and peer expert assistance, in collaboration with the Goals 2000 Program office and the OESE Standards, Assessment, and Accountability team. The Department has produced guidance for peer reviewers of states' evidence of such systems, has conducted orientation sessions for state agency teams, and continues to make available expert Peer Consultants to all states, paying particular attention to those states that may not meet the timelines as required by the Title I statute.
- ❖ To assess the impact of Title I preschool literacy programs in preparing at-risk children for success in kindergarten, a study is being designed for such purpose in collaboration with the Department's office of Planning and Evaluation Services, and the Even Start and Head Start programs, which are administered by the Department of Health and Human Services.

CHALLENGES TO ACHIEVING PROGRAM GOAL

- ❖ While states, districts, and schools encounter many challenges in having at-risk students meet challenging standards, the following challenges comprise the "short" list outlined in the final report of the National assessment of Title I, Promising Results, Continuing Challenges. These challenges are also addressed in the Administration's proposal for the reauthorization of Title I of the ESEA as well as in the program's new or strengthened strategies listed above.
- ❖ The challenges include
 - closing the achievement gap,
 - strengthening instruction,
 - focusing on assistance and accountability, and
 - strengthening parental involvement.
- ❖ Other challenges include
 - high turnover of state and local Title I Directors,
 - ED concern for 15 states that may not have final aligned state assessment systems within established timelines, and
 - professional development programs for teachers in Title I schools that are of sufficient breadth and depth to improve teaching and learning.
- ❖ Although the NAEP data indicate that students at the bottom 25th percentile showed increasing scores in both reading and math at all three grade levels, the rate of growth will need to accelerate in order to meet the targets for 2000 and 2002. Strategies to close the achievement gap and to accelerate the rate of improved performance include:
 - moving research-based teaching strategies and best/promising practice into more high-poverty schools;
 - assisting states and school districts in the development, implementation and refinement of aligned systems of standards, assessments, and accountability;
 - disseminating abstracts of successful extended-time programs—supported by Title I as well as other Federal, state, and local funds—to schools with poverty rates of at least 50 percent;
 - increasing the number of qualified staff providing instruction in Title I schools, while decreasing the number of Title I paraprofessionals who provide direct instruction to students through the "bully pulpit" at national, regional, and state meetings;
 - continuing to request Federal funding for the necessary support systems administered by the state education agencies for the benefit of low-performing schools and high-poverty schools; and
 - strengthening parental involvement in the early grades to support reading and family literacy, and in the middle- and high-school levels to encourage students to take challenging courses.

INDICATOR CHANGES

From FY 1999 Annual Plan (two years old)

Adjusted

- ❖ FY 1999 Indicator 1.1 (state and local assessments) was modified for FY 2000. The FY 2000 indicator remains unchanged in FY 2001, except for its indicator number, which is described above.
- ❖ FY 1999 Indicator 1.2 (NAEP reading and math) was modified for FY 2000 to target performance of the lowest achieving students and students in the highest-poverty public schools as well as being renumbered as Indicator 1.1 (a shared indicator with Goals 2000). The FY 2001 indicator remains the same as FY 2000.
- ❖ FY 1999 Indicator 1.3 (other national tests) was dropped in FY 2000.
- ❖ FY 1999 Indicator 2.1 (recognition for quality) was dropped in FY 2000.
- ❖ FY 1999 Indicator 2.2 (standards and assessments) was modified by dropping the assessment indicator and including the standards section in FY 2000 Indicator 2.1 (use of challenging standards).
- ❖ FY 2001 Indicator 3.2 (aligned assessments) brings back the FY 1999 assessment piece that had been dropped in FY 2000.
- ❖ FY 1999 Indicator 2.3 (research-based curriculum and instruction) was modified as FY 2000 Indicator 2.4.
- ❖ FY 1999 Indicator 2.4 (extended learning time) was slightly modified in FY 2000 and renumbered as Indicator 2.3.
- ❖ FY 1999 Indicator 2.5 (services to private school students) was modified as FY 2000 Indicator 2.7 to delete "more effective communication, consultation, and services" and substitute "effective implementation of on-site services to students." For FY 2001, the indicator has been dropped as described above.

INDICATOR CHANGES (CONTINUED)

Adjusted

- ❖ FY 1999 Indicator 3.1 (teacher training linked to standards) was dropped in FY 2000.
- ❖ FY 1999 Indicator 3.2 (qualified teacher aides) was modified in FY 2000 Indicator 2.6 to shift the focus from credentials to district support for the educational improvement through career ladders for paraprofessionals and aides. FY 2001 Indicator 2.5 retains the FY 2000 indicator and expands to include qualified staff in Title I schools.
- ❖ FY 1999 Indicator 4.1 (implementing high standards) was slightly modified as FY 2000 Indicator 3.1 (establishing annual progress measures) and dropped in FY 2001.
- ❖ FY 1999 Indicator 4.2 (linked assessments) was modified slightly in FY 2000 Indicator 3.2 (aligned assessments) and substantially maintained as FY 2001 Indicator 3.2 (aligned assessments).
- ❖ FY 1999 Indicator 4.3 (accountability: monitoring, intervention, and assistance) was significantly changed in FY 2000 Indicator to assess only the provision of “effective assistance to schools not making progress through school support teams and other sources.” The FY 2001 Indicator 3.3 remains the same as FY 2000 but has been expanded to include public school enrollment options as described above.
- ❖ FY 1999 Indicator 5.1 (school-parent compacts) was modified in FY 2000 Indicator 2.5 to delete “school staff and parents will report” and replace it with “Title I participating schools will report.” The FY 2001 Indicator 2.3 has been changed to reflect a broader assessment of the effectiveness of parental involvement programs.
- ❖ FY 1999 Indicator 5.2 (improved attendance and homework completion) was not included in FY 2000 Indicator 2.5 but was used instead as performance data.
- ❖ FY 1999 Indicators 6.1 (responsive and useful guidance), 6.2 (impact on local understanding), and 6.3 (impact on local performance measurement) were indicators linked to Federal leadership, assistance and guidance objectives. All these indicators were dropped for FY 2000.

Dropped—None.

From FY 2000 Annual Plan (last year’s)

Adjusted

- ❖ Indicator 2.2 (improving schools) is now Indicator 1.3 under Objective 1 (Student Performance) because it is more closely related to that than to reform strategies (Objective 2). It has been modified to delete the words “for two consecutive years.”
- ❖ Indicator 2.3 (extended learning time) is now Indicator 2.2, which has been changed to include extended time offered either during the school year or during the summer and to extended any daycare and other non-instructional programs for the 2000-01 school year survey.
- ❖ Indicator 2.4 (research-based curriculum and instruction) has been dropped because of lack of quality data.
- ❖ Indicator 2.5 (school-parent compacts) is now Indicator 2.3, expanded to include broader parental involvement approaches to improve student performance.
- ❖ Indicator 2.6 (qualified teacher aides) is now Indicator 2.4 (qualified staff), which has been expanded to include the proportion of Title I staff who are teachers.
- ❖ Indicator 2.7 (services to private school students) has been dropped because the planned study was not conducted.
- ❖ Indicator 3.1 (establishing annual progress measures) has been revised to delete the wording “that are more rigorous than those used under the antecedent Chapter I program.”
- ❖ Indicator 3.2 (aligned assessments) has been changed to delete “core subjects” and to replace these words with “mathematics and reading or language arts.”
- ❖ Indicator 3.3 (aligned curricula and materials) has been dropped because of lack of data from surveys and studies.
- ❖ Indicator 3.4 (effective assistance) is now Indicator 3.3 and expanded to include public school enrollment options for students attending Title I schools that are chronically-low performing.

Dropped—None.

New

- ❖ Added new FY 2001 Indicator 1.4 (school readiness) to Objective 1.
- ❖ Added new FY 2001 Indicator 3.4 (schools identified for improvement).