TITLE I GRANTS FOR SCHOOLS SERVING AT-RISK CHILDREN

Goal: At-risk students improve their achievement to meet challenging standards.	**Funding History** ($ in millions)			
	Fiscal Year	**Appropriation**	**Fiscal Year**	**Appropriation**
Legislation: Title I, Part A of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act (ESEA) of 1965, as amended by the Improving America's Schools Act of 1994 (20 U.S.C. 6301 et. seq.).	1985	$3,200	2000	$7,941
	1990	4,768	2001	$8,601
	1995	$6,698	2002 (Requested)	$9,060

Program Description

Title I Grants to Local Educational Agencies (LEAs) provide supplemental education funding to LEAs and schools, especially in high-poverty areas, to improve education for children at risk of failing to achieve high standards. The primary purpose of Title I is to ensure equal educational opportunity for all children regardless of socioeconomic background and to close the achievement gap between poor and affluent children, by providing additional resources for schools serving disadvantaged students.

The 1994 reauthorization of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act (ESEA) required states to develop challenging content and performance standards for all students that are be linked to an aligned assessment and accountability system. Students in Title I schools are to be held to the same standards as students in other schools, and districts and schools are held accountable for the achievement of all children, including those who are low-achieving, have limited English proficiency or disabilities, or are migratory. These policies were intended to align federally-supported Title I resources and policies with state and local reforms.

Title I funds are allocated to districts and schools in accordance with their number of low-income children. Title I funds go to nearly all districts (93 percent) and 58 percent of all schools. Ninety-five percent of the nation's highest-poverty schools (those with 75 percent or more students eligible for free- or reduced price lunch) participate in Title I. While the highest-poverty schools comprise 16 percent of all schools, they account for 46 percent of Title I spending.

Schools may use Title I funds for one of two approaches: 1) targeted assistance programs, in which schools use Title I funds to provide targeted services for low-achieving students, and 2) schoolwide programs, in which schools use Title I funds to improve curriculum and instruction throughout the entire school. The schoolwide approach may be used only in high-poverty schools (those with 50 percent or more students from low-income families) or in schools which have received waivers of this eligibility minimum. Use of the schoolwide approach increased dramatically after the eligibility requirements were relaxed in the 1994 reauthorization, and schoolwide programs now account for 45 percent of Title I schools (up from 10 percent in 1994-95) and 60 percent of Title I funds.

Title I reaches more than 12.5 million students enrolled in both public and private schools. Two-thirds (67 percent) of Title I participants are in grades 1-6, while 12 percent are in kindergarten or preschool, 15 percent are in grades 7-9, and 5 percent are in grades 10-12 (VI-6). Elementary schools receive 89 percent of Title I funds, which go to two-thirds of all elementary schools (67 percent) and less than one-third of secondary schools (29 percent).

Program Performance

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
Reading scale scores on the Main NAEP for public school students at the bottom 25th percentile							**Status:** Positive movement toward the targets for students at the bottom 25th percentile. **Explanation:** Data are based on the Main NAEP, which is currently collected every 4 years. For low-achieving students (those at the 25th percentile), NAEP scores rose over the most recent 4-year period in both reading and mathematics at all three grade levels. Over a slightly longer 6-year period, however, trends in NAEP scores appear flat in reading but show gains in mathematics. In reading, scores for 4th-graders were the same in 1998 as in 1992, while 8th-graders show a gain of 4points and 12th-graders show a decline of 2 points. In mathematics, scores rose at all three grade levels tested, by an average of 10 to 12 points.	**Sources:** National Assessment of Educational Progress (NAEP), reading. *Frequency:* Every 4 years. *Next collection update:* 2000 (4th grade only). *Date to be reported:* 2001. National Assessment of Educational Progress (NAEP), mathematics *Frequency:* Every 4 years. *Next collection update:* 2000 (4th and 8th grades). *Date to be reported:* 2001. **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.
Year	**Actual Performance**	**Performance Targets**	**Actual Performance**	**Performance Targets**	**Actual Performance**	**Performance Targets**		
	4th Grade		8th Grade		12th Grade			
1992:	192		235		268			
1994:	187		234		263			
1998:	192		239		266			
2000:	**193**	**202**	**No data**	**249**	**No data**	**276**		
2002:								
Mathematics scale scores on the Main NAEP for public school students at the bottom 25th percentile								
1990:	192		237		269			
1992:	197		242		274			
1996:	201		247		281			
2000:	**No data**	**211**	**No data**	**257**	**No data**	**291**		
2002:								
2004:								

Targets and Performance Data							Assessment of Progress	Sources and Data Quality
Reading scale scores on the Trend NAEP for public school students in the highest-poverty schools (75-100% poverty)							**Status:** Trend toward target likely. **Explanation:** Data are based on the Trend NAEP, which is currently collected every 4 years. In the highest-poverty schools (those with poverty rates between 75-100%), trends in NAEP scores from 1990 to 1999 show a mixed pattern. For 9-year-olds the trend is fairly flat in both reading and math. For 13-year-olds, reading scores show a marked drop in 1992 followed by a steady increase but remaining below the 1990 level, while math scores are about the same in 1999 as in 1990. For 17-year olds, data are not available before 1994; the trends from 1994 to 1999 show an increase of 10 points in reading and a decline of 7 points in math.	**Sources:** National Assessment of Educational Progress (NAEP), reading. *Frequency:* Every 4 years. *Next collection update:* 2003. *Date to be reported:* 2004. National Assessment of Educational Progress (NAEP), mathematics *Frequency:* Every 4 years. *Next collection update:* 2003. *Date to be reported:* 2004. **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 achievement data for 17-year-olds because Title I serves a small number of high school students.
Year	**Actual Performance**	**Performance Targets**	**Actual Performance**	**Performance Targets**	**Actual Performance**	**Performance Targets**		
	9-year-olds		13-year-olds		17-year-olds			
1990:	189		246		NA			
1992:	180		223		NA			
1994:	184		229		256			
1996:	188		233		262			
1999:	186		234		266			
2000:	**No data**	**191**	**No data**	**239**	**No data**	**271**		
2002:								
2003:								
NAEP mathematics scale scores on the Trend NAEP for public school students in the highest-poverty schools (75-100% poverty)								
1990:	213		251		NA			
1992:	208		248		NA			
1994:	215		256		290			
1996:	217		252		284			
1999:	212		254		283			
2000:	**No data**	**217**	**No data**	**259**	**No data**	**288**		
2002:								
2003:								

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
Number of states with performance standards aligned to content standards and two years of data disaggregated by school poverty level			**Status:** Unable to judge. **Explanation:** There were a limited number of States with two years of data disaggregated by poverty that also had aligned content standards in the1998-99 school year and two years of comparable data. Five States were available for review. Two of the five States showed progress in both reading and mathematics. Two of the five States showed progress in reading, and four States showed progress in mathematics. Two of the States not showing progress in reading had minimal declines. Looking ahead to next year, preliminary analysis indicates that the number of States with two years of assessment data and aligned standards is likely to rise to 17 States, which is much closer to the target.	**Source:** Title I state performance reports *Frequency:* Annually. *Next collection update:* 2000. *Date to be reported:* March 2002. **Validation Procedure:** Verified by Department attestation process and Standards for Evaluating Program Performance Data.
Year	**Actual Performance**	**Performance Targets**		
1997:	10			
1998:	11			
1999:	5	15		
2000:	**No data**	**20**		
2001:		24		
2002:		26		

Targets and Performance Data							Assessment of Progress	Sources and Data Quality
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								**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. States are required to have their final assessment systems in place by Spring 2001. All States have submitted evidence and it is currently being reviewed. Many States are transitioning from NRTs to assessments aligned to standards. Many States therefore, will not have two years of data.
Year	**Actual**	**Targets**	**Actual**	**Targets**	**Actual**	**Targets**		
	Reading		Mathematics		Both			
1997:	7		7		7			
1998:	10		10		10			
1999:	2	13	4	13	2	13		
2000:	**No data**	**18**	**No data**	**18**	**No data**	**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. **Explanation:** The Title I State Performance Report for 1998-99 will not be available until May 2001.	**Sources:** Annual Title I State Performance Reports, SY 1998-99 and beyond. *Frequency:* Annually. *Next collection update:* 1999. *Date to be reported:* March 2001. **Validation Procedure:** Data collected before Department Standards for Evaluating Program Performance Data 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:	**No data available**	**85%**		
2001:		90%		
2002:				

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:** A study of Title I-supported preschool programs is currently in the design phase. According to the NCES Early Childhood Longitudinal Study, 59 percent of students entering kindergarten in Title I schools had mastered letter recognition readiness skills, compared with 76 percent in non-Title I schools. Among poor students entering kindergarten, those who had been enrolled in preschool programs were more likely to achieve proficiency on this measure of school readiness (46 percent) than poor students who did not participate in preschool programs.	**Source:** Planned Title I Preschool Evaluation *Frequency:* Biennually. *Next collection update:* 2002. *Date to be reported:* 2003. **Validation Procedure:** Data are not yet available. **Limitations of Data and Planned Improvements:** Limitations unknown—study is in the design phase.
1999:				
2000:	**No data available**	**To be established after baseline data are obtained**		
2001:				
2002:				

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

Percentage of schools reporting use of content standards to guide curriculum and instruction in reading and math "to a great extent"

Year	Actual Performance	Performance Targets	Actual Performance	Performance Targets
	Reading		Mathematics	
1998:	74%		73%	
1999:	81%	85%	78%	85%
2000:	**83%**	**100%**	**80%**	**100%**
2001:		100%		100%
2002:				

Assessment of Progress

Status: Unable to judge.

Explanation: The percentage of schools reporting use of content standards to guide curriculum and instruction in reading "to a great extent" rose from 81 percent in 1998-99 to 83 percent in 1999-2000 (both based on teacher's responses) but did not reach the target of 100 percent. For math, the percentage of schools reporting use of standards to guide curriculum and instruction "to a great extent" rose from 78 percent in 1998-99 to 80 percent in 1999-2000 but did not reach the target of 100 percent.

Sources and Data Quality

Sources: Follow-up Public School Survey on Education Reform, SY 1997-98.
Frequency: One time.
Next collection update: None.
Date to be reported: N/A.

National Longitudinal Survey of Schools, SY 1998-99 through SY 2000-01.
Frequency: Annually.
Next collection update: 2001.
Date to be reported: 2002.

Validation Procedure: Verified by Department attestation process and Standards for Evaluating Program Performance Data.

Limitations of Data and Planned Improvements: Teacher survey responses are subject to self-report bias.

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

Percentage of Title I schools operating extended learning time programs either during the school year or during the summer

Year	Actual Performance	Performance Targets
1998:	65%	
1999:	83%	70%
2000:	**84%**	**75%**
2001:		80%
2002:		

Assessment of Progress

Status: Target exceeded.

Explanation: The percentage of Title I schools operating extended time programs rose from 83 percent in 1998-99 to 84 percent in 1999-2000.

Sources and Data Quality

Sources: National Longitudinal Survey of Schools, SY 1998-99 through 2000-01.
Frequency: Annually.
Next collection update: 2001.
Date to be reported: 2002.

Validation Procedure: Verified by Department attestation process and Standards for Evaluating Program Performance Data.

Limitations of Data and Planned Improvements: Much of the increase from 1998 to 2000 is probably due to a change in the wording of the questionnaire. The l997-98 survey asked about instructional extended time programs, while the l998-99 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.

Indicator 2.3 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
Percentage of Title I staff who are teachers			**Status:** Exceeded target. **Explanation:** The percentage of Title I staff who are teachers rose from 45 percent in 1998-99 to 49 percent in 1999-2000. Historically, the program has supported 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.	**Sources:** National Longitudinal Survey of Schools, SY 1998-99 through 2000-01. *Frequency:* Annually. *Next collection update:* 2000. *Date to be reported:* May 2001. **Validation Procedure:** Data collected before the Department's Standards for Evaluating Program Performance Data were developed. **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.
Year	**Actual Performance**	**Performance Targets**		
1998	45%			
1999:	45%	No target set		
2000:	**49%**	**47%**		
2001:		49%		
2002:				
Percentage of Title I schools in districts offering career ladders for paraprofessionals			**Status:** Target not met. **Explanation:** The percentage of Title I schools that reported that their districts offered career ladders rose from 1998 to 1999 but was unchanged from 1999 to 2000.	**Sources:** Follow-up Public School Survey on Education Reform, SY 1997-98. *Frequency:* One time. *Next collection update:* None. *Date to be reported:* May 2001. National Longitudinal Survey of Schools, SY 1998-99 through 2000-01. *Frequency:* Annually. *Next collection update:* 2000. *Date to be reported:* May 2001. **Validation Procedure:** Data collected before Department Standards for Evaluating Program Performance Data were developed, but not reported until 2000. **Limitations of Data and Planned Improvements:** No known limitations.
Year	**Actual Performance**	**Performance Targets**		
1998:	24%			
1999:	30%	30%		
2000:	**30%**	**35%**		
2001:		35%		
2002:				

Indicator 3.1 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
Year	**Actual Performance**	**Performance Targets**	**Status:** Unable to judge. **Explanation:** No data is currently available. States must implement their final assessment systems by Spring 2001. States will submit definition of AYP for peer review in March 2000.	**Source:** Title I peer review records *Frequency:* Annually. *Next collection update:* 2000. *Date to be reported:* 2001. **Validation Procedure:** Data supplied by independent contractors who reviewed state plans. **Limitations of Data and Planned Improvements:** No known limitations.
1999:		N/A		
2000:	**No data available**	**40 states**		
2001:		All states		
2002:				

Indicator 3.2 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
Year	**Actual Performance**	**Performance Targets**	**Status:** Did not meet performance target. **Explanation:** As of January 2001, the Department had reviewed assessment systems for all States and had made decisions for 34 States. Of the 34 States with decisions, 11 States received full approval, 6 States received conditional approval, 14 States received a timeline waiver, and 3 States entered into a compliance agreement.	**Source:** Title I peer review records *Frequency:* Annually. *Next collection update:* 2001. *Date to be reported:* April 2002. **Validation Procedure:** Verified by Department attestation process and Standards for Evaluating Program Performance Data. **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.
1999:	N/A	N/A		
2000:	**34**	**40 states**		
2001:		All states		
2002:				

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
Percentage of schools identified for improvement that report receiving assistance as a result of being identified			**Status:** Did not meet performance target. **Explanation:** Among schools that indicated that they had been identified as in need of improvement in 1999-2000, only 40 percent reported that they had received additional professional development of other assistance as a result of being identified—a decline from 47 percent in 1998-99 and well below the target of 60 percent. This decline may be related to the large increases in the numbers of schools identified for improvement and the actual provision of support to help schools improve. However, even among schools that had been identified for three years or more, only 50 percent reported receiving additional assistance.	**Source:** National Longitudinal Survey of Schools, SY 1998-99 through 2000-01. *Frequency:* Annually. *Next collection update:* 2000. *Date to be reported:* 2001. **Validation Procedure:** Data collected before Department Standards for Evaluating Program Performance Data. **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.
Year	**Actual Performance**	**Performance Targets**		
1999:	47%	Baseline		
2000:	**40%**	**60%**		
2001:		80%		
2002:				
Percentage of schools reporting expanded opportunities for children to transfer to public schools not identified for improvement			**Status:** Unable to judge. **Explanation:** Only 5 percent of schools that had been identified as in need of improvement reported that their district had authorized students to transfer to other public schools, with transportation provided, as a result of the school being identified for improvement. However, the Title I requirement to institute corrective actions, such as allowing students to transfer to other schools, does not take effect until the third year after a school has been identified for improvement, and few if any schools have yet been identified for this length of time.	**Source:** National Longitudinal Survey of Schools, SY 1999-00 and 2000-01. *Frequency:* Annually. *Next collection update:* 2000. *Date to be reported:* 2001. **Validation Procedure:** Data collected before Department Standards for Evaluating Program Performance Data. **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.
Year	**Actual Performance**	**Performance Targets**		
1999:	No data available	No target set		
2000:	**5%**	**Baseline**		
2001:				
2002:				

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**	**Status:** Unable to judge. **Explanation:** The data provided for 2000 is based on schools identified as in need of improvement in the first year by the district, but were not in need in the second year.	**Sources:** National Longitudinal Survey of Schools, SY 1999-00 and SY 2000-01. *Frequency:* Annually. *Next collection update:* 2000. *Date to be reported:* 2001. **Validation Procedure:** N/A. **Limitations of Data and Planned Improvements:** State assessment and accountability systems are currently in transition, and state policies for identifying schools vary widely across states. For these reasons, data for this indicator is not a reliable indicator of schools' actual progress in raising student achievement levels. Moreover, schools and districts often disagree as to whether a particular school has been identified as in need of improvement. Data for this indicator were based on principal reports on whether their school was identified for improvement.
1999:				
2000:	**44%**	**Baseline**		
2001:				
2002:				

INDICATOR CHANGES
From Annual Plan (FY 2001)
Adjusted—None.
Dropped
❖ Indicator 2.3 was dropped at the request of Office of Management and Budget.
New—None.