Author: Wanda Washington,
Evaluation Specialist

th

5th grades) and summer (4th-8th grades) of 2003 at 76 schools and served 2,312 students who would have been retained without the benefit of supplemental instructional.

e guidelines for promotion, and provides OEY program policy on class size (no more than 16 students to a class and no fewer than 8), attendance, staff development and parental involvement. This report provides a summary of operational and participant outcome (attendance, promotion, parent involvement, and staff development) data, as well as recommendations to assist district program planners, administrators (principals), grants staff, teachers, and school support services staff in the planning and delivery of services to students at risk of not being promoted to the next grade.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

ctivities andexpenditures, per state law.

2. To summarize the participation of parents in AISD's OEYP activities.

3. To gather information from OEYP staff (teachers, their mentors, and principals) on the program's implementation, curriculum, and expectations for program participants.

EXPENDITURES

AISD received OEY program funds in January 2003. The Final Expenditure report submitted in September 2003 by AISD as part of the TEA OEYP Evaluation Report for 2002-03 did not include additional expenses posted after the 9/30/03 submission date. Therefore, the amounts shown in this report reflect expenditures as of 9/30/03 only. These expenditures show a project cost of $831,137. Payroll costs for school staff and other program support staff made up the largest share of the project budget at $606,529 (73%). Instructional and office supplies, textbooks, testing materials, and janitorial supplies cost $141,962 (17%). Other operating costs such as refreshments, transportation, awards and incentives cost $65,483 (8%). Contracted services (e.g., child care for parental involvement activities or nursing services) cost $17,164 (2%).

STAFFING

In 2002-03, AISD used OEYP funds to support salaries of 318 staff members. Of these, 269 were teachers and 49 were other staff (e.g., principals, teacher aides, mentors, cler050pISm(e)Tj12 0 0 12

summer school principals (SUCCESS–3, SMART-5, and Bridges-1).   OEYP Accelerated

! TAKS Testing and TEKS Standards (176).

PROGRAM INFORMATION, CURRICULA, AND PROCEDURES

Only principals of summer school (n=10) were asked whether they received adequate information about the program grant, whether their expectations for student success were high, whether the OEYP curriculum used at their school was adequate, and whether the program's student data would be useful to them in planning future activities for their students. Nine of the summer school principals returned the survey. All nine of the summer principals' responses were positive on each of these topics. On the statement concerning curriculum packets, one principal suggested that Read Naturally, a program used by 3rd grade teachers that seemed to help students with reading fluency, be used in future programs.

Several principals offered suggestions for improving program procedures such as hiring more counselors; providing a parent support specialist at each summer site; providing "review" sessions of staff development for teachers on student behavior management, attendance requirements, and payroll issues; and providing more training for campus staff on the student data system in areas such as grades and attendance. Principals also suggested that the OEYP school and class rosters include all data for a student on one spreadsheet and that the spreadsheets be distributed and returned electronically for verification.

PROGRAM COMPLETION, STUDENT PROMOTION AND RETENTION

Teachers in the OEY summer programs made recommendations for student promotion or retention based on their students' pre- and posttest scores (where available), academic work, and attendance. However, student promotion or retention is not necessarily predicated upon these types of data because state law (Senate Bill 1) allows students who attend the program's activities to be promoted to the next grade in one of four situations: 1) meeting program attendance requirements and district academic requirements; 2) meeting academic requirements only; 3) meeting attendance requirements only; or 4) meeting neither attendance nor academic requirement (*subjective student placement*). The final decision to promote or retain a student is made by the home school principal or the parent of the student.

At the end of the program, OEY program rosters with student data, including pre- and posttest scores, attendance information, and reco

provide principals with promotion or retention data on their students.   These student data summaries became a part of each student's cumulative record.

Table 2 shows that 2,312 students attended at least one day of an OEY program in 2002-03.   Of that num

Table 4: Course Pass/Fail Data for Students in Grades 6-8
Taking Failed Regular-Term Courses During OEYP Summer 2003

Grade	One Course Failed Regular Term and Retaken During Summer		Two or More Courses Failed Regular Term and Retaken During Summer	
	Number & Percent Passed	Number & Percent Failed	Number & Percent Passed	Number & Percent Failed
6			229 (99%)	2 (1%)
7			408 (99%)	5 (1%)
8	4 (100%)	0	64 (98%)	1 (2%)
Total	4 (100%)	0	701 (99%)	8 (1%)

Source: AISD's OEYP Performance Report to TEA, September 2003
NOTE: Promotion totals and percentages contain some placements.

OEYP TEACHER SURVEY RESULTS

Only teachers who taught in the spring Accelerated Reading Instruction program and the summer programs, SUCCESS and SMART, were surveyed. Teachers who taught 8th grade in the OEYP-funded Bridges to 9th grade were excluded from the survey's administration because there were other high school sites not funded by OEYP who held the Bridges program. See Table 5 for a summary of teachers' responses to the survey. Although most staff perceived the OEY program positively, there were several areas of concern among staff. For instance, survey responses for summer school teachers showed that a majority of them either did not believe parent involvement at their school was good, or they were unsure. These results seem counter-intuitive, in light of the data from principals showing large numbers of parents participating in OEY program activities during 2002-03. Principals provided documentation (sign-in sheets) that supported their participant counts.

Other survey results suggest that some staff need more information on OEYP, and that some would like improvements made in staff development and curricula selected. When asked which staff development, curriculum and other OEYP-related activities they would like to see continued, the majority of teachers recommended continuation of the staff development (including more Saturday sessions) and use of the current OEYP curricula. However, they expressed frustration with the MOY benchmark eligibility score that was used as a pretest score and having to find a comparable posttest. A number of teachers wanted to minimize the paperwork required by program managers and evaluation staff.

Table 5: AISD OEYP Teacher Survey Results, 2003

Survey Item	% Agree	% Disagree	% Undecided	% No Response

OEYP MENTOR TEACHER SURVEY RESULTS

Review of the mentor teachers' survey data showed mixed responses for all but one statement on the survey (See Table 6). The majority of mentor teachers felt they had received adequate support from the school staff where they worked. However, some staff were not satisfied with staff development, grant information provided to them, the availability of assessment (pre and-posttest) information, or tools for Accelerated Reading Instruction staff. At the middle school level, there were concerns about the pace/rigor of the program, and many did not seem to have high expectations for student success.

Table 6: AISD OEYP Mentor Teacher Survey, 2003

Survey Item	% Agree	% Disagree	% Undecided	% No Response
Staff development on operations "specific" to the OEYP (e.g., class rosters, electronic attendance, attendance summaries, and payroll) was adequate.				
Accelerated Reading Inst. Mentors (n=53)	81	13		

mentor teachers suggested revising the flow of paperwork received from program managers and evaluation staff.

SUMMARY

Review of the data shows very positive outcomes of AISD's 2002-03 OEY program, such as a 99% promotion rate for the 4th and 5th grade students who participated in the spring Accelerated Reading Instruction program. This outcome resulted in a reduction of summer costs (such as transportation, staff, and utilities) since these students did not need additional instruction. Also, 94% of the summer school participants in grades 4-8 were promoted to the next grade. Parent involvement (3,917) was relatively high, and classes were smaller in summer because there were fewer students.

RECOMMENDATIONS

Because the majority of 4th and 5th grade students who participated in the spring Accelerated Reading Instruction program were promoted at the end of the school year, fewer elementary summer resources were needed for the 136 students who attended summer school. Thus, early intervention seems to work well. However, strict promotion standards are in effect under the state's Student Success Initiative. Thus, the first recommendation is to continue the OEY spring and summer programs with more operational uniformity. For instance, stricter program guidelines should be given to campuses regarding required attendance and number of program days, to lessen confusion about reporting data. Secondly, consideration should be given to expanding grade levels served and courses offered because of the success of the early intervention program.

Since students' MOY test scores (<60%) in reading were used to determine their eligibility for the spring Accelerated Reading Instruction program (written as a percentage of items correctly answered and recorded as the pretest), a number of principals and mentors felt that the April 2003 TAKS test results were the only results comparable to use. This caused many mentor teachers in the Accelerated Reading Instruction program to say that they did not receive adequate information on pre- and posttest assessments. This may have generated a delay in posting and returning information to AISD departments or offices at the end of the school year. Therefore, a third recommendation is for program managers to provide a pre- and posttest assessment instrument for the spring program (as was done in the summer) or an approved list of standardized pre- and posttests that all campuses can use along with the MOY benchmark test eligibility measure. Several mentors suggested measures to use such as the TAKS Practice test

(available from Region XIII), the STEMS, a test whose questions are closely aligned to the TAKS information, and teacher-made end-of-unit tests.

Survey results showed that many teachers in both programs felt that parent involvement was less than satisfactory in their schools. Thus, a fourth recommendation is for program managers and campus administrators to offer teachers staff development about ways to involve parents in activities that are tailored to the OEY program that their school is implementing.

Although secondary school mentors/teachers were among the prwsi112 25 d