

Archived Information

Title I Grants for Schools--ESEA - 2002

CFDA Number: 84.010 - Title I Grants to Local Educational Agencies

Goal 8: At-risk students improve their achievement to meet challenging standards.

Objective 8.1 of 2: Performance of the lowest-achieving students and students in high-poverty public schools will increase substantially in reading and mathematics

Indicator 8.1.1 of 3: 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>Reading scale scores on the Main NAEP for public school students at the bottom 25th percentile</i>				<p>Status: Unable to judge</p> <p>Progress: Positive movement toward target. Data for FY 2002 are not available until Spring 2003. Progress in meeting 2002 targets cannot be measured until those data are available from NCES.</p> <p>Explanation: Data are based on the Trend NAEP, which is currently collected every 4 years. Over an 8 year period, trends in NAEP scores appear flat in reading but show gains in mathematics in 4th and 8th grades. In reading, scores for 4th-graders were the same in 1998 as in 1992, while 8th-graders show a gain of 4 points and 12th-graders show a decline of 2 points for that same period. In mathematics, scores rose at two grade levels tested (4th and 8th) and declined in 12th grade.</p>			<p>Additional Source Information: National Assessment of Educational Progress (NAEP) Reading, Mathematics.</p> <p>Frequency: Biennially. Collection Period: 2001 - 2002 Data Available: April 2003 Validated By: NCES.</p> <p>Limitations: 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.</p>					
Year	Actual Performance									Performance Targets		
	4th grade	8th grade	12th grade							4th grade	8th grade	12th grade
1992	192	235	268									
1994	187	234	263									
1998	192	239	266									
2000										202	249	276
2001				27	249	276						
<i>Mathematics scale scores on the Main NAEP for public school students at the bottom 25th percentile</i>												
Year	Actual Performance									Performance Targets		
	4th grade	8th grade	12th grade							4th grade	8th grade	12th grade
1992	197	242	274									
1996	201	247	281									
2000	206	250	276	211	257	291						
<i>Reading scale scores on the Trend NAEP for public school students in the highest-poverty schools (75-100% poverty)</i>												
Year	Actual Performance									Performance Targets		
	9-year olds	13-year olds	17-year olds							9-year olds	13-year olds	17-year olds
1992	180	223										
1994	184	229	256									
1996	188	233	262									
1999	186	234	266							191	239	271
2000				191	239	271						
<i>NAEP mathematics scale scores on the Trend NAEP for public school students in the highest-poverty schools (75-100% poverty)</i>												
Year	Actual Performance									Performance		

	Targets					
	9-year-olds	13-year-olds	17-year-olds	9-year-olds	13-year-olds	17-year-olds
1992	208	248				
1994	215	256	290			
1996	217	252	284			
1999	212	254	283			
2000				217	259	288

Indicator 8.1.2 of 3: 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: Unable to judge</p> <p>Progress: Data to measure progress on this indicator are not available until Spring 2003.</p> <p>Explanation: There were a limited number of states with two years of data disaggregated by poverty that also had aligned content standards in the 1998-99 school year and two years of comparable data. Seven states were available for review. Five of the seven states showed progress in both reading and mathematics. Five states showed progress in reading, and seven states showed progress in mathematics. The states not showing progress in reading had minimal declines.</p>	<p>Additional Source Information: Consolidated State Performance Report which includes the Title I State Performance Reports</p> <p>Frequency: Annually. Collection Period: 2001 - 2002 Data Available: April 2003 Validated By: No Formal Verification. Verified by ED attestation process and Standards for Evaluating Program Performance Data.</p> <p>Limitations: There is substantial variation across states in their definitions of proficient student performance as well as alignment of content and performance standards. All states have submitted evidence and have been reviewed. Many states are transitioning from NRTs to assessments aligned to standards. Many states therefore, will not have two years of data. Also, many states do not disaggregate by poverty, so would not have two years of data.</p>				
Year	Actual Performance		Performance Targets						
1997	10								
1998	11								
1999	5		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% poverty who meet proficient and advanced levels of performance</i>									
Year	Actual Performance							Performance Targets	
	Reading	Mathematics	Both	Reading	Mathematics	Both			
1997	7	7	7						
1998	10	10	10						
1999	2	4	2	13	13	13			
2000				18	18	18			
2001	5	7	5	20	20	20			
2002				24	24	24			

Indicator 8.1.3 of 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		

Percentage of Title I schools			Status: Unable to judge	Additional Source Information: The Consolidated State Performance Report which includes the annual Title I State Performance Reports.
Year	Actual Performance	Performance Targets		
	Percentage of Title I schools	Percentage of Title I schools	Progress: Data for this indicator are not available until Spring 2003; therefore, we are unable to measure progress for FY 2002.	Frequency: Annually. Collection Period: 2001 - 2002 Data Available: April 2003 Validated By: No Formal Verification.
1998	57			
1999	80	75		
2000	81	85		
2001		90		
			Explanation: The Title I State Performance Report for 1999-2000 indicates that 19% of all schools are designated as Title I Schools in Improvement. The converse of this fact indicates that 81% are not in school improvement.	Limitations: There is substantial variation across states in their definitions of adequate yearly progress and proficient student performance.

Objective 8.2 of 2: States and districts will implement standards-based accountability systems and provide effective support for school improvement efforts.

Indicator 8.2.1 of 3: Establishing annual progress measures: All states will adopt or develop measures of adequate yearly progress linked to state performance standards.

Targets and Performance Data			Assessment of Progress	Sources and Data Quality
<i>Number of States</i>			Explanation: The only data available is for states applying for Ed-Flex authority. Currently 10 states have received approval (as of 10/02). All states are required to establish Adequate Yearly Progress (AYP) consistent with No Child Left Behind by January 2003 which is a pre-requisite of Ed-Flex.	Additional Source Information: Title I performance reports that respond to the requirements of the Consolidated State Application for No Child Left Behind. Reports on adequate yearly progress measures (due Jan. 2003) are reviewed by Department staff. Frequency: Other. Data Available: January 2003 Validated By: No Formal Verification. Verification of data will be done through an on-site peer review process which will be completed by April 30, 2003.
Year	Actual Performance	Performance Targets		
	Number of States	Number of States		
2000		40		
2001	9	50		
Indicator 8.2.2 of 3: Aligned assessments: All states will have final assessment systems or negotiated agreements that will enable them to meet the criteria in the Title I law—including alignment, inclusion of limited English proficient and special education students, disaggregated reporting, and technical quality—for two or more core subjects.				
Targets and Performance Data			Assessment of Progress	Sources and Data Quality

Number of States with final assessment systems or negotiated agreements			Status: Unable to judge Explanation: As of January 2003, the Department had reviewed assessment systems for all states, approved 21 states, systems, and negotiated timeline waivers for 26 additional states. The 5 remaining states have entered a compliance agreement.	Additional Source Information: Records of the Student Achievement and School Accountability Programs Standards Team in the Title I program office. Frequency: Other. Data Available: May 2003 Validated By: On-Site Monitoring By ED. Limitations: No known limitations. By design and by the legislation, Title I peer review records are the authoritative data source for this indicator.
Year	Actual Performance	Performance Targets		
	Number of States	Number of States		
2000	34	40		
2001	46	50		
2002	50	50		

Indicator 8.2.3 of 3: Schools identified for improvement: An increasing percentage of schools identified for improvement will make sufficient progress to move out of school improvement status.			Assessment of Progress	Sources and Data Quality
Targets and Performance Data				
.			Status: Unable to judge Progress: Progress on this indicator cannot be judged because the Longitudinal Survey of Schools ended its collection of data on this indicator with the 2000-2001 school year. Future data for this indicator will be obtained through the Consolidated State Performance Report. The baseline for the indicator will be established after 2 years of data from the new data source. The first year for reporting on these new data will be Spring of 2003. Explanation: Because the existing state Performance Report was based on the requirements of the Improving America's Schools Act, the Department did not require states to submit data on schools identified for improvement for 2001-02; therefore, no data are available for this year. The Performance Report will be revised to reflect the requirements of the No Child Left Behind Act.	Additional Source Information: Longitudinal Survey of Schools Frequency: Other. Data Available: January Validated By: No Formal Verification. Limitations: State assessments and accountability systems are currently in transition, and state policies for identifying schools vary widely across states. Department performance reporting requirements are also in transition because of new requirements in No Child Left Behind.
Year	Actual Performance	Performance Targets		
2000	44			
2001	47			