

DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 252 585

TM 850 062

TITLE Chapter 1 and Chapter 1 Migrant. Evaluation Findings, 1983-84.

INSTITUTION Austin Independent School District, Tex. Office of Research and Evaluation.

REPORT NO AISD-ORE-83.53

PUB DATE 84

NOTE 29p.

AVAILABLE FROM Office of Research and Evaluation, AISD, 6100 Guadalupe, Box 79, Austin, TX 78752 (\$1.25, plus \$1.00 postage).

PUB TYPE Reports - Evaluative/Feasibility (142)

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC02 Plus Postage.

DESCRIPTORS *Achievement Gains; Communication Skills; *Compensatory Education; Elementary Secondary Education; Low Income Groups; *Migrant Education; Preschool Education; *Program Evaluation; Reading Instruction; *Remedial Programs; Teacher Attitudes

IDENTIFIERS *Austin Independent School District TX; *Education Consolidation Improvement Act Chapter 1

ABSTRACT

Using a question/answer format, this report provides program descriptions and evaluation findings for the 1983-84 Chapter 1 and Chapter 1 Migrant programs in the Austin Independent School District. Topics covered include student eligibility, numbers of students served, teacher characteristics, teacher satisfaction, special programs, achievement gains, parental involvement, migrant health services, and the Migrant Student Record Transfer System. Major positive findings are: (1) impressive achievement gains for Chapter 1 and Migrant Early Childhood Programs; (2) Chapter 1 and Migrant Program elementary teacher satisfaction; (3) mixed but positive four-year effects of the Schoolwide Projects; and (4) beneficial effects from the Schoolwide Projects in kindergarten. Major findings requiring action are: (1) program improvements requested by secondary migrant teachers; (2) less Chapter 1 success in meeting achievement test objectives; (3) apparent lack of effect of Chapter 1 services on kindergarten achievement scores; and (4) pupil/teacher ratio reductions in Schoolwide Projects that are generally not cost effective above first grade. (BS)

 * Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
 * from the original document. *

ED252585

**U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION
CENTER (ERIC)**

This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it

Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality

• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official NIE position or policy

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY
F. Holling

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

TM 85-062

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

A copy of this report may be obtained for
\$1.25 plus \$1.00 for postage and handling
from the address below. Pub. No. 83.53
OFFICE OF RESEARCH AND EVALUATION, AISD,
6100 GUADALUPE, BOX 79, AUSTIN, TX 78752

DEFINITIONS

Chapter 1 Regular - AISD's Chapter 1 Regular Program provides supplementary reading instruction to low-achieving students (those who score at or below the 30th percentile) in twenty-three schools with high concentrations of students from low-income families.

Chapter 1 Schoolwide Projects - Chapter 1 and supplemental local funds are used in reducing the overall pupil/teacher ratio within a school if the concentration of low-income students at that school equals or exceeds 75 percent. In a Schoolwide Project, teachers paid from Chapter 1 funds function as regular classroom teachers with students of mixed achievement levels and a lower pupil/teacher ratio. In a Schoolwide Project, all students are considered served by Chapter 1.

Current Migrant - A current migratory child is one (a) whose parent or guardian is a migratory agricultural worker or fisher, and (b) who has moved within the past twelve months from one school district to another to enable the child, the child's guardian, or a member of the child's immediate family to obtain temporary or seasonal employment in an agricultural or fishing activity.

Former Migrant - Students who remain in the District following their year of current eligibility are considered formerly migratory students (with the concurrence of their parents) for a period of five additional years. Current and former migratory students are eligible for the same program services.

Low-Income Student - Any student receiving free or reduced-priced meals or a sibling of such a student.

MSRTS - The Migrant Student Record Transfer System (MSRTS) is a national level recordkeeping system designed to maintain files of eligibility forms, health data, instructional data, and achievement data on migrant students.

Needs Assessment - A document produced by ORE which describes the procedures used to calculate the percent of low-income students by school attendance area for District schools. The results are used to determine which schools should receive a Chapter 1 Program.

Special Testing - The testing of students who do not have valid spring semester test scores on file with the District and who would not be tested until the districtwide test administration period. Special testing is conducted (only at Chapter 1 Regular schools) to determine Chapter 1 service eligibility.

Types of Service - 1) Lab or Pullout - Student is served outside regular classroom. 2) Classroom Service - Student is served in his/her regular classroom. 3) Special Class - Student is registered for a special program class, e.g., Early Childhood Classes. 4) Other - Any other ways a student might be served, e.g., tutoring.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Definitions.....1

Major Findings.....3

Early Childhood.....4

Chapter 1 Program Information.....6

Migrant Program Information.....12

Achievement Gains

 Chapter 1.....15

 Migrant.....20

Parental Involvement.....22

Migrant Health Services.....23

Migrant Student Record Transfer System.....23

Bibliography.....24

Listing of AISD Schools Participating in Chapter 1 and
Chapter 1 Migrant Programs in 1983-84.....25

All programs reported herein are funded by the Educational Consolidation and Improvement Act. The Chapter 1 programs, formerly called Title I programs, were created to serve educationally disadvantaged students.

FINAL REPORT

Project Title: Chapter 1 and Chapter 1 Migrant

Contact Persons: Walter E. Jordan-Davis and Catherine A. Christner

MAJOR POSITIVE FINDINGS:

1. Students in Chapter 1 and Migrant Early Childhood Programs made impressive achievement gains. There were more consistent gains made across the classes within each program and across programs than made in previous years.
2. The large majority of Chapter 1 and Migrant Programs teachers in grades K-6 reported satisfaction with the elementary program in that:
 - there was good coordination, cooperation, and planning with the regular school program, and
 - their compensatory instructional coordinators were helpful.
3. The four-year effects of Schoolwide Projects are mixed. Schoolwide Project students who were in kindergarten in 1980-81 and were in grade 3 in 1983-84 are about two months ahead of their regular Chapter 1 peers. Sixth-grade Schoolwide Projects students who are relatively high achieving also showed bigger gains after four years.
4. When one-year gains are considered, Schoolwide Projects appear beneficial at kindergarten and for all but the very low achievers at grade 1.

MAJOR FINDINGS REQUIRING ACTION:

1. The secondary migrant teachers requested a number of program improvements:
 - an instructional coordinator assigned to them,
 - more regular and frequent meetings of secondary Migrant Program teachers,
 - more program definition which should include training and orientation about the expected role of the Migrant teacher, and
 - more contact with the program staff.
2. Chapter 1 was less successful this year than last year in terms of meeting achievement test objectives.
3. Providing Chapter 1 service to kindergarten students does not appear to affect their achievement test scores.
4. Reducing the pupil/teacher ratio in Schoolwide Projects does not appear to be cost effective above grade 1 (except for students of limited English proficiency).

EARLY CHILDHOOD (CHAPTER 1 AND MIGRANT)

HOW MANY EARLY CHILDHOOD (EC) STUDENTS WERE SERVED BY MIGRANT, CHAPTER 1, AND LOCALLY FUNDED CLASSES?

Six Migrant Program classes served 98 migrant EC students. Seven Chapter 1 and four locally funded classes operating like Chapter 1 served 191 EC students. Students for these eleven classes were selected via a screening test and the lowest scoring 16 students from each school attendance area were selected to participate in the program.

DID EARLY CHILDHOOD STUDENTS MAKE ACHIEVEMENT GAINS?

Yes. Both Chapter 1 and Migrant Program students made impressive gains on the Peabody Picture Vocabulary Test--Revised (PPVT-R). The Chapter 1 students and students in locally funded classes like Chapter 1 showed an average gain of 14.7 scale score points from the pretest to the posttest. Migrant Program students gained an average of 14.2 points. Over a period of time, scale scores are expected to remain constant, so these gains indicate real growth rates well above the national average. See Figure 1.

This year the gains across the two programs were more consistent. In the past Chapter 1 produced greater gains than did Migrant. Also in both programs there was less by-class variation indicating more consistency across teachers. Students who made lower scores on the pretest made greater gains on the posttest than did students with higher scores on the pretest.




Figure 1. PPVT-R PRETEST AND POSTTEST SCORES FOR CHAPTER 1/LOCAL AND MIGRANT EARLY CHILDHOOD CLASSES, 1983-84.

WHAT HAPPENS TO THE ACHIEVEMENT OF FORMER EARLY CHILDHOOD (EC) STUDENTS WHEN THEY REACH HIGHER GRADE LEVELS?

Beginning with the 1978-79 EC programs, a longitudinal data file was created to track the achievement of EC students as they progress through AISD. Figure 2 illustrates how former Migrant and Chapter 1 Early Childhood students have fared through this year. AISD medians are used for comparison purposes. The gap between AISD students and former EC students in 1980 appears to have narrowed or at least remained stable by 1984. These data should be interpreted cautiously because the number of former EC students from 1978-79 with 1984 test scores is small.




Figure 2. MEDIAN PERCENTILES FOR 1978-79 EARLY CHILDHOOD STUDENTS AND AISD STUDENTS IN 1980 (GRADE K) AND IN 1984 (GRADE 4).

WHAT DOES NATIONAL RESEARCH INDICATE ABOUT THE EFFECTIVENESS OF EARLY CHILDHOOD PROGRAMS IN PRODUCING LONG-TERM BENEFITS?

A national review of the literature on the long-term effects of early childhood programs (ORE Publication Number 83.30) indicated that attending a good program can:

- reduce special education placement,
- reduce retention rates,
- provide long-term achievement benefits,
- decrease the number of dropouts,
- provide increased motivation, and
- more than pay for itself later.

THE CHAPTER 1 PROGRAM IN AISD

WHAT IS THE CHAPTER 1 PROGRAM?

In AISD, the Chapter 1 Program consists of the following components:

- A reading/language arts program serving K-6 students in 23 regular Chapter 1 schools,
- Two Schoolwide Projects,
- A reading and mathematics program at three nonpublic schools,
- Supplementary assistance to four institutions for neglected/delinquent (N&D) children, and
- Seven early childhood (EC) classes.

HOW ARE SCHOOLS AND INDIVIDUAL STUDENTS SELECTED FOR THE CHAPTER 1 PROGRAM?

By law, AISD Chapter 1 schools must be chosen by first ranking all of the District's schools on the basis of the percentage of low-income students who reside in each school's attendance area. The major effort conducted to obtain this information is documented in the Needs Assessment for the Preparation of the 1984-85 Chapter 1 Application (Publication Number 83.16).

Individual students within Chapter 1 schools are ranked on the basis of greatest educational need. Chapter 1 eligible students are those with reading achievement test scores at or below the 30th percentile (or the 30th percentile in language for kindergarten students). Students with the lowest test scores are served first, with as many students served as resources allow.

HOW MANY STUDENTS WERE SERVED IN THE 1983-84 CHAPTER 1 PROGRAM?

The Chapter 1 Program provided service to 4,372 students in 1983-84. This figure is slightly lower than the 4,557 students served in 1982-83. Part of the decrease in the 1983-84 Chapter 1 enrollment figures can be attributed to a 15% reduction in funding. This reduction resulted in the hiring of fewer Chapter 1 Program teachers for the 1983-84 school year than would have been possible otherwise.

Both figures include students served in all the Chapter 1 Program components:

- The 23 AISD elementary schools,
- Schoolwide Projects,
- Early childhood classes,
- Nonpublic schools, and
- Institutions for the neglected and delinquent.

Figure 3 illustrates the proportion of students served by each component during the 1983-84 school year.




Figure 3. PROPORTION OF CHAPTER 1 STUDENTS SERVED BY EACH COMPONENT IN 1983-84 (N=4372).

WHAT PERCENTAGE OF ELIGIBLE STUDENTS WERE SERVED?

There was a sharp increase in the percentage of eligible students in Chapter 1 schools who were served by Chapter 1. For 1983-84, 84% of Chapter 1-eligible students were served compared with 67% in the 1982-83 school year. For 1983-84, 59% of the eligible students who were not served by Chapter 1 were served by other programs, such as special education, Local/State Bilingual, or Chapter 1 Migrant. Figure 4 presents the proportion of Chapter 1-eligible students served only by other programs during the 1983-84 school year.




Figure 4. PROPORTION OF CHAPTER 1 ELIGIBLE STUDENTS SERVED ONLY BY OTHER PROGRAMS.

HOW MANY STUDENTS WERE SERVED IN SCHOOLWIDE PROJECTS?

The Schoolwide Project schools, Allison and Becker, are distinguished from regular Chapter 1 schools by their reduced pupil/teacher ratio. Supplemental local funds are used to hire additional classroom teachers.

A total of 1058 students were served by Chapter 1 at the two SWP schools. This total represents 24 percent of the total number of students served by the AISD Chapter 1 Program. Allison served 371, 35% of the SWP total; and Becker 687, 65% of this total.

HOW WERE STUDENTS SERVED IN THE 23 CHAPTER 1 REGULAR SCHOOLS?

Information concerning the location of Chapter 1 service (lab, classroom, or both) in the 1983-84 school year was collected through teacher interviews. In previous years, this information was obtained from the Chapter 1 service reports, but school staff had difficulty making a distinction between certain lab/class locations.

The findings from the interviews show that:

- 56% of the Chapter 1 schools in 1983-84 provided Chapter 1 services in both locations, as compared to 76% in 1982-83.
- 28% of the regular Chapter 1 schools provided Chapter 1 services in a lab setting, as compared to 24% of the Chapter 1 schools in the 1982-83 school year, and
- 16% of the Chapter 1 schools provided Chapter 1 services only in a class setting during the 1983-84 school year; whereas, none of the regular Chapter 1 schools provided Chapter 1 services exclusively in a class setting in 1982-83.

HOW SIMILAR ARE THE 73 CHAPTER 1 TEACHERS TO LOCALLY FUNDED AISD ELEMENTARY TEACHERS?

The above question was addressed for the following reasons:

- To collect information for the National Institute of Education's nationwide study on the characteristics of compensatory teachers. and
- To provide the Texas Education Agency with information on the characteristics of Chapter 1 teachers.

The results of the study showed that:

- 3% of the Chapter 1 teachers were male, whereas 8% of the District's locally funded elementary teachers are male,
- 48% of the Chapter 1 teachers were members of ethnic minority groups, as compared to 37% of the District's locally funded elementary teachers,
- The Chapter 1 teachers and the District's locally funded elementary teachers both had an average of ten years total teaching experience, and
- 38% of the Chapter 1 teachers have graduate degrees; as compared to 35% of the District's locally funded elementary teachers.

AISD appears to have assigned to the Chapter 1 Program teachers with comparable experience and degrees to regular AISD elementary teachers.

WHAT DID THE COMPENSATORY INSTRUCTIONAL COORDINATORS REPORT ABOUT THEIR PROGRAMS?

The three compensatory instructional coordinators were interviewed to find out how they functioned with regard to the Chapter 1 Regular, Migrant, and State Compensatory Education Programs. Two findings are:

- The coordinators' activities differed somewhat among the three programs: activities with the Chapter 1 and Migrant Programs were more compliance related, while SCE activities were more related to instruction, and
- The coordinators stated that there were no curriculum or planning adjustments made in the classrooms to accommodate former early childhood students.

ARE CHAPTER 1 TEACHERS SATISFIED WITH HOW THE CHAPTER 1 PROGRAM OPERATES?

Interviews were conducted with all grades K-6 Chapter 1 teachers in the spring. Some of the major findings were:

- 93% of the Chapter 1 teachers were satisfied with the coordination between the Chapter 1 Program and the foundation program at their school,
- 78% of the Chapter 1 teachers perceived their instructional coordinator as being extremely helpful,
- 74% of the Chapter 1 teachers found ORE to be very helpful and prompt in providing tests, computer printouts, and answers to questions, and
- 70% of the Chapter 1 teachers were satisfied with the coordination within the Chapter 1 Program.

WHAT INFORMATION WAS GATHERED FROM THE CHAPTER 1 SPECIAL TESTING PROCESS?

Special testing enables students without an achievement test score from the spring semester to be tested for Chapter 1 eligibility. In addition, schools may retest students whose scores are higher or lower than classroom performance would predict. An evaluation of the special testing results indicated:

- Students were most often tested because they had no previous score on file, and these students were most likely to score above the 30th percentile;
- All retested students with an Iowa Tests of Basic Skills (ITBS) percentile rank score above the 30th percentile scored at or below the 30th percentile when special tested;
- 55% of the retested students with an ITBS score at or below the 30th percentile scored above the 30th percentile when special tested; and
- 47% of all students who were special tested were identified as eligible for Chapter 1 service.

WHAT DID THE EVALUATION OF THE CHAPTER 1-RELATED GOALS OF THE FOUR NEGLECTED AND DELINQUENT (N&D) INSTITUTIONS ACCOMPLISH?

The evaluation process for N & D institutions focused on the goals each institution established in conjunction with the provision of services to Chapter 1 students. The evaluation process assisted the institutions' administrative and instructional staff in the following ways:

- Indicated programmatic strengths and weaknesses,
- Identified areas where service delivery could be improved, and
- Improved in-house evaluation of individual program components.

In addition, the evaluation process improved:

- Documentation of each institution's Chapter 1 Program and services,
- Administrative understanding of the Chapter 1 tutor's role, and
- Institution's staff understanding of the AISD Chapter 1 Program.

WHAT TYPES OF SERVICES ARE PROVIDED BY THE CHAPTER 1 PROGRAM AT THE THREE NONPUBLIC SCHOOLS?

Supplemental instruction was provided in both reading and math to students who scored at or below the 30th percentile. A total of 88 students were served, some in both subject areas.

Some of the major findings were:

- 80% of the Chapter 1 students at the three nonpublic schools receiving Chapter 1 funds were provided supplemental instruction in reading;
- 77% of the Chapter 1 students at the three nonpublic schools receiving Chapter 1 funds were provided supplemental instruction in both reading and math;
- 76% of the Chapter 1 students at the three nonpublic schools receiving Chapter 1 funds were provided supplemental instruction in math; and
- 66% of the Chapter 1 students at the three nonpublic schools receiving Chapter 1 services were Hispanic, 23% were Anglo, and 11% were Black.

THE CHAPTER 1 MIGRANT PROGRAM IN AISD

WHAT IS THE GRADES K-12 MIGRANT INSTRUCTIONAL PROGRAM?

The instructional component focuses on teaching communication skills (primarily reading) through supplementary instructional services to migrant students. At the elementary level, eleven campuses were served with seven parttime and three fulltime teachers. At the secondary level, eight campuses were served by four fulltime and two parttime teachers. A special pilot project was conducted at Johnston High School during the second semester to serve migrant students.

WHO WAS SERVED BY MIGRANT TEACHERS?

Figure 5 below shows the numbers of students seen by Migrant teachers. Sixty-four percent were seen 91 or more days out of the 165 day school year.

<u>1-15 Days</u>	<u>16-30 Days</u>	<u>31-90 Days</u>	<u>91 + Days</u>	<u>Total</u>
37	33	102	314	486
(7.6%)	(6.8%)	(21%)	(64.6%)	(100%)

Figure 5. NUMBER AND PERCENT OF MIGRANT STUDENTS SERVED DURING 1983-84 BY A GRADES K-12 MIGRANT TEACHER.

The percent of eligible students being served varied (across the six six-weeks periods) from 63% to 69%. These are down slightly from the 1982-83 levels of 70% to 73%. This is considerably less than the 84% of eligible students being served by Chapter 1. Generally more of the eligible students are being seen at the elementary level than at the secondary level. Also more of the lower achieving students are being served at the elementary level than at the secondary level.

HOW WERE GRADES K-12 MIGRANT STUDENTS SERVED?

At the elementary level 91% of instruction was delivered in a lab or pullout setting. This is an increase in the use of pullout from 1982-83 (71%). The most used method of instruction at the junior high level was special migrant classes (53%). At the senior high level the majority of students were served in their regular classrooms via team teaching (55%).

HOW SIMILAR ARE MIGRANT AND OTHER AISD TEACHERS?

In looking at various demographic characteristics of Migrant teachers and AISD teachers, the following comparisons can be noted:

- 73% of the Migrant teachers are Hispanic, and 17% of all AISD teachers are Hispanic;
- 28% of AISD teachers have zero to two years of AISD experience, and 73% of Migrant teachers have between zero to two years of AISD experience;
- 68% of AISD teachers and 68% of Migrant teachers have between four and 20 years of total teaching experience; and
- 13% of the Migrant teachers have a Master's degree, and 38% of AISD teachers have a Master's degree.

Migrant Program teachers in AISD are generally Hispanic, newer to the District, and have fewer advanced degrees than other AISD teachers.

ARE THE MIGRANT TEACHERS SATISFIED WITH THE K-12 INSTRUCTIONAL PROGRAM?

Yes and No. During the spring, all migrant teachers were interviewed about how the program functions at their schools. At the elementary level all teachers reported:

- regularly scheduled meetings,
- frequent informal meetings with classroom teachers,
- cooperative classroom teachers,
- good coordination between the regular and Migrant programs, and
- helpful interactions with their compensatory instructional coordinator.

All but two teachers reported meeting with their principal at some point during the year to discuss the program.

At the secondary level, only one teacher knew who the instructional coordinator was. The teachers requested a number of program improvements:

- an instructional coordinator assigned to them,
- more program definition, including training and orientation about the expected role of the Migrant teacher,
- more regular and frequent meetings of the secondary Migrant teachers, and
- more contact with program staff.

HOW SUCCESSFUL WAS THE SPECIAL INSTRUCTIONAL PROGRAM FOR MIGRANT STUDENTS AT JOHNSTON HIGH SCHOOL?

This special project consisted of training students in Learning-to-Learn techniques, using a computer-assisted instruction approach called PLATO, and personal counseling. This project was available to Migrant Program students during the second semester.

The Project Specialist and the Secondary Migrant Coordinator both felt the program had great potential to benefit migrant students if it could be implemented more effectively. The problems reported in the first year of implementation included:

- not beginning until the second semester,
- not getting enough CRTs to operate the program effectively until late in the second semester,
- not enough coordination with classroom teachers so they could reinforce the Learning-to-Learn concepts,
- students seeing this as isolated not related to other schoolwork, and
- difficulties in getting students scheduled.

CHAPTER 1 ACHIEVEMENT GAINS

WERE THE OBJECTIVES FOR THE REGULAR CHAPTER 1 READING COMPONENT MET?

WERE THE OBJECTIVES FOR SCHOOLWIDE PROJECTS MET?

In general, the objectives were not met. As Figure 6 shows, the Regular Chapter 1 Program met its objectives only at grade 3, and partially met them at grade 6. Of the 11 objectives at Allison and Becker (Allison serves grades K-3 only), four were met and another four were partially met.

Grade	Regular Ch. 1 Schools	Schoolwide Project-School	
		Allison	Becker
K	no	yes	yes
1	no	yes	?
2	no	no	?
3	yes	no	?
4	no	--	no
5	no	--	?
6	?	--	yes

?=Unable to determine whether the objective was met

Figure 6. SUMMARY OF OBJECTIVES MET/NOT MET BY TYPE OF PROGRAM

Chapter 1 objectives are stated in terms of the percentage of students making given percentile gains at grades K and 2-6. At first grade, where there is no pretest, objectives are stated in terms of percentages of students achieving certain spring scores. In the figure, question marks indicate a mixed pattern. For example, at grades 1 and 2 at Becker, fewer students than expected were in the highest gain category, more than expected either made no gain or lost ground, but more than expected made small gains.

Because objectives are set based on the previous year's performance, it does seem clear that this year's gains were smaller than last year's.

WHAT HAS HAPPENED TO THE ACHIEVEMENT OF STUDENTS WHO ARE NO LONGER ATTENDING A CHAPTER 1 SCHOOL BECAUSE OF DESEGREGATION?

Students who were served by Title I in 1979-80, the last year before desegregation, were divided into two groups: those who remained in Title I/Chapter 1 schools for each of the following four years, and those not in a Title I/Chapter 1 school for any of the following four years. ITBS Reading scores for these students were examined.

Of the three grades measured (4, 5, and 6 - younger students were not yet in school in 1979-80), statistically reliable differences were found at grades 5 and 6. The differences favored the group who moved to non-Title I/Chapter 1 schools by about 4 1/2 months at grade 5 and 5 months at grade 6.

These findings should be interpreted very cautiously. Because of attrition over the years, there are only 30-35 students at each grade among the group of students who left Title I/Chapter 1 schools after 1979-80. These students may not be representative of the original group of formerly Title I students who left Title I schools because of desegregation. It should be remembered that under AISD's paired school plan, anyone who was reassigned in 1980-81 should be back in his/her neighborhood schools in 1983-84. This means that if these students are still in non-Chapter 1 schools, either their neighborhood schools are no longer served by Chapter 1 or they now reside in different attendance areas. Either may indicate a higher average socioeconomic status among this group of students, which may account for the higher scores. This possibility was checked and found to be true--the percentage of low income students was lower among the students who left Title I after desegregation and have remained out.

DID SERVING KINDERGARTEN STUDENTS MAKE A DIFFERENCE?

Six schools chose not to provide Chapter 1 service at kindergarten. Low-achieving students attending these schools were compared to low-achieving kindergarten students at Chapter 1 schools which did serve kindergarten. No differences in ITBS Language scores were found, indicating that Chapter 1 service did not affect achievement at kindergarten. This repeats the "no-difference" finding from last year.

DID STUDENTS IN SCHOOLWIDE PROJECTS FOR FOUR YEARS DIFFER IN ACHIEVEMENT GAINS FROM STUDENTS IN REGULAR TITLE I/CHAPTER 1 SCHOOLS?

ITBS Reading Total scores from spring, 1984 were compared for the two groups. Comparisons were done separately for students in grades K, 1, 2, and 3 in 1980-81 (students in higher grades are no longer in elementary school).

Results differed by grade. Among students who went from kindergarten to grade 3, the Schoolwide Project students had a statistically reliable advantage, although it is small--about two months, after four years. No differences were found at grades 1 and 2 (this year's 4th and 5th graders). At grade 3 (grade 6 in 1983-84), there was no difference between groups among students who were below the 15th percentile on the pretest, and an increasing difference in favor of the Schoolwide Projects as pretest achievement level increased. For students at the 30th percentile on the pretest, the advantage for Schoolwide Project students after four years is about three months.

The effect for students who were in kindergarten in 1980-81 is illustrated in Figure 7.




Figure 7. ILLUSTRATION OF FOUR-YEAR EFFECT OF SCHOOLWIDE PROJECTS ON STUDENTS WHO WERE IN KINDERGARTEN IN 1980-81.

WAS THERE A DIFFERENCE IN ONE-YEAR GAINS BETWEEN THIS YEAR'S SCHOOLWIDE PROJECT STUDENTS AND A COMPARISON GROUP OF REGULAR CHAPTER 1 STUDENTS?

This analysis was done in two ways. First, all students at Schoolwide Project campuses were compared to all students in Regular Chapter 1 schools who also lived in traditional Title I/Chapter 1 attendance areas. Among these students, the Schoolwide Projects had a statistically reliable advantage at kindergarten and grade 1 (a little less than two months at each grade); the Schoolwide Project students gained less than Regular Chapter 1 students at grades 2 and 4; and there were no differences at grades 3, 5, or 6.

The second analysis focused only upon students who scored below the 30th percentile on the pretest. Among this group, the Schoolwide Projects still showed a two-month advantage at kindergarten and about a two-month disadvantage at grade 2; there were no differences at grades 3-6.

The relationship between the groups among the low achievers at grade 1 was complex. Among the very low scorers on the pretest, the Regular Chapter 1 students gained more. Among relatively higher achievers (from the 20th-30th percentile), the Schoolwide Project students gained more.

In sum, Schoolwide Projects appear to be beneficial at kindergarten, and, for all but the lowest achievers, at grade 1 as well. They seem to have no positive effect at grades 2-6.

DO THE GAINS OF LIMITED ENGLISH PROFICIENT STUDENTS ATTENDING SCHOOLWIDE PROJECT SCHOOLS DIFFER FROM THOSE WHO DO NOT?

Comparisons of limited English proficient (LEP) students attending the two schoolwide project (SWP) schools, Allison and Becker, with other District LEP students indicate the following:

- o SWP LEP students are doing better than their Chapter 1 counterparts in language arts at grades 2, 3, and 6, and in math at grades 2 and 3;
- o SWP LEP students outperformed their non-Chapter 1 LEP peers in reading at grades 3 and 6 and in math at grades 2 and 3; and
- o At no grade or in no achievement area did non-SWP LEP students surpass SWP LEP students in their achievement.

HOW DID ACHIEVEMENT GAINS COMPARE ACROSS AISD COMPENSATORY PROGRAMS?

Statistical comparisons were made of the achievement gains made by students served by Chapter 1 Regular, State Compensatory Education (SCE), and Migrant students in grades 2-6. These analyses revealed no significant differences in gains made across the three programs. In graphing the mean grade equivalent gains of these programs and those gains made by the low-achieving students in the Schoolwide Project schools, one can note that all programs produced very similar gains at nearly all grade levels. The majority of the gains produced by the AISD programs were generally higher than the .8 grade equivalent gain that is the average expected gain for low-achieving students. Figure 8 depicts these results graphically.




Figure 8. GRADE EQUIVALENT GAINS COMPARISONS OF ITBS READING TOTAL FOR STUDENTS SERVED BY CHAPTER 1 REGULAR, STATE COMPENSATORY EDUCATION (SCE), AND THE MIGRANT PROGRAM, AND THE LOW ACHIEVING STUDENTS IN THE SCHOOLWIDE PROJECT SCHOOLS.

CHAPTER 1 MIGRANT ACHIEVEMENT GAINS

WHAT ACHIEVEMENT GAINS WERE MADE BY MIGRANT STUDENTS WHO WERE SERVED BY A GRADES K-12 MIGRANT TEACHER?
Grades K-8

The 45 kindergarten students served by a Migrant teacher and who had pre- and posttest scores made an average 0.8 grade equivalent gain on the Iowa Tests of Basic Skills (ITBS) Language Total from the fall of 1983 to the spring of 1984. This gain is smaller than that made by all AISD kindergarteners pre- and posttested (0.98) and better than the 0.7 point gain made by AISD Hispanic kindergarteners. This gain by Migrant students is better than the served kindergarten students made in 1982-83.

The 75 first-grade students served by a Migrant teacher had an average ITBS Reading Total grade equivalent score of 1.4 in spring, 1984. This is four months less than the national average for first graders of 1.8. These students' scores this year are two months lower than the served first graders' average score of 1.6 from 1982-83.

In Figure 9 are presented the average grade equivalent gains for the grades 2-8 migrant students served by a Migrant teacher. Also included are the gains made by students in 1982-83 for comparison purposes. This year's gains are very similar to last year's, and with the exception of grades 2 and 7, the gains are consistent across grades.

<u>GRADE</u>	<u>1982-83</u>	<u>1983-84</u>
2	0.8 (n=35)	0.6 (n=58)
3	1.0 (n=26)	0.9 (n=37)
4	0.9 (n=31)	0.9 (n=25)
5	0.9 (n=33)	0.9 (n=23)
6	1.1 (n=22)	0.9 (n=30)
7	0.9 (n=32)	0.7 (n=35)
8	0.9 (n=34)	1.0 (n=26)

Figure 9. AVERAGE GRADE EQUIVALENT GAINS ON THE ITBS READING TOTAL FOR STUDENTS SERVED BY A MIGRANT TEACHER IN 1982-83 AND 1983-84 AND WHO HAD PRE- AND POSTTEST SCORES.

Grades 9-12

The 21 ninth-grade migrant students (with pre- and posttest scores) served by a Migrant teacher averaged better than a one-year grade equivalent gain--1.3 from their 1983 reading scores.

The gains made by the served students in grades 10-12 are hard to assess because the pretest was the Sequential Tests of Educational Progress (STEP) and the posttest was the Tests of Achievement and Proficiency (TAP). These tests were not equated so comparisons of gains between the two tests are difficult to make. However in Figure 10 are listed the pre- and posttest scores for students served with two comparison groups. The AISD students' scores and the AISD Hispanic students' scores are based on all students in each group who took the test. As can be noted from the figure, with one exception (the pretest average for 11th graders), the served students' median scores are well below both comparison groups.

Grade	1983		1984	
	1983-84	STEP (1978 norms)	TAP (1982 norms)	
10	AISD	54 (n=4115)	AISD	51 (n=3085)
	AISD Hisp.	44 (n=1027)	AISD Hisp.	33 (n=690)
	MIG (served)	33 (n=10)	MIG (served)	16 (n=10)
11	AISD	51 (n=3308)	AISD	55 (n=2715)
	AISD Hisp.	41 (n=687)	AISD Hisp.	31 (n=490)
	MIG (served)	40 (n=9)	MIG (served)	19 (n=9)
12	AISD	52 (n=2864)	AISD	45 (n=2522)
	AISD Hisp.	40 (n=575)	AISD Hisp.	27 (n=507)
	MIG (served)	20 (n=6)	MIG (served)	8 (n=6)

Figure 10. MEDIAN PERCENTILE READING SCORES FOR 1983-84 GRADES 10-12 MIGRANT STUDENTS SERVED BY A MIGRANT TEACHER (AND WHO HAVE BOTH A PRE- AND POSTTEST) AND TWO COMPARISON GROUPS. AISD students and AISD Hispanic students includes all students in those groups who took the test that year.

OVER TIME, DOES IT HELP STUDENTS' ACHIEVEMENT TO BE SERVED BY THE MIGRANT PROGRAM?

In comparing one-year achievement gains of migrant students not served with those served one, two, three, or four years by a Migrant teacher, there were no clear-cut advantages or disadvantages found regardless of length of time served. This analysis was done in 1981-82 and in 1982-83, and the results were the same.

PARENTAL INVOLVEMENT - CHAPTER 1 AND MIGRANT

WHAT HAPPENED WITH THE PARENTAL ADVISORY COUNCILS (PACS) IN 1983-84?

The only specific requirement for Chapter 1 and Migrant regarding parents was a directive to inform parents about the programs and to get their input on any proposed changes in the programs. As they had last year, the parent members of the Elementary Chapter 1/Migrant Districtwide PAC and the Secondary Districtwide PAC voted to continue the PAC meetings as their preferred way of being involved in the two programs.

In examining the documentation of the PAC meetings, the following was noted:

- Eight elementary and five secondary meetings were held.
- The minutes/agendas of these meetings reflect compliance with the funding directive--both groups discussed the current programs, possible funding cuts/increases, regulation changes, and the programs for the upcoming year.
- A total of 153 Chapter 1 parents and 31 Migrant Program parents attended the elementary meetings. A total of 30 Migrant Program parents attended the secondary PAC meetings.
- The attendance of Chapter 1 parents has continued to increase from previous years.
- Slightly fewer Migrant Program parents attended PAC meetings this year than attended last year.

The declining number of participating migrant parents is a concern to program staff. This reflects that the number of migrants is decreasing and that several of the parents who have participated most actively are no longer eligible as migrants.

MIGRANT HEALTH SERVICES

WHAT SERVICES WERE PROVIDED BY THE MIGRANT NURSE?

The Migrant Nurse:

- saw 284 different migrant students during the school year,
- visited 43 different AISD campuses,
- made 399 contacts with parents,
- used over \$12,000 to provide medical/dental services to 177 migrant students, and
- conducted a wide variety of services for migrant students (see Figure 11).

<u>ACTIVITY</u>	<u>NUMBER OF TIMES ACTIVITY WAS REPORTED</u>
Regularly Scheduled Exam	266
Nonscheduled Exam	130
Phone Contact	280
Referral to Medical Doctor	137
Referral to Dentist	84
Home Visit	34
Counseling/Teaching	379
Referral to Other Professionals	38

Figure 11. TALLY OF VARIOUS NURSING ACTIVITIES FOR AUGUST, 1983 THROUGH MAY, 1984.

MIGRANT STUDENT RECORD TRANSFER SYSTEM (MSRTS)

WERE MSRTS GUIDELINES FOLLOWED BY AISD?

The MSRTS Clerk kept the eligibility forms, educational records, log book, and other required educational records in an auditable file. In interviewing the Clerk, it was determined that most of the MSRTS deadlines were met during this school year. This is an improvement over 1982-83 when a number of deadlines were not met. Possible reasons for this improvement were:

- the Clerk and her supervisor both have had experience with the system,
- the community representatives were all officed together and there was better coordination among them and the MSRTS Clerk, and
- monthly printouts of migrant students soon to be no longer eligible or changing status were helpful in focusing the staff in this area, thus facilitating the meeting of the MSRTS deadlines.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Chapter 1

Jordan-Davis, W.E. ECIA Chapter 1: testing students for Chapter 1 eligibility. Austin, Texas: Office of Research and Evaluation (Publication Number 83.03), Austin Independent School District, August, 1983.

Jordan-Davis, W.E. Chapter 1: 1983-84 evaluation design. Austin, Texas: Office of Research and Evaluation (Publication Number 83.10), Austin Independent School District, September, 1983.

Jordan-Davis, W.E. ECIA Chapter 1: 1983-84 final technical report. Austin, Texas: Office of Research and Evaluation (Publication Number 83.50), Austin Independent School District, June, 1984.

Jordan-Davis, W.E. Needs assessment for the preparation of the 1983-84 Chapter 1 application. Austin, Texas: Office of Research and Evaluation (Publication Number 83.16), Austin Independent School District, February, 1984.

Chapter 1 Migrant

Christner, C.A. ECIA Chapter 1 Migrant Program: 1983-84 Evaluation Design Austin, Texas: Office of Research and Evaluation (Publication Number 83.11), Austin Independent School District, 1983.

Christner, C.A. ECIA Chapter 1 Migrant Program: 1982-83 Final Technical Report. Austin, Texas: Office of Research and Evaluation (Publication Number 82.12), Austin Independent School District, 1983.

Early Childhood Education - The Best Thing Going in Education? Austin, Texas: Office of Research and Evaluation (Publication Number 83.30), Austin Independent School District, January, 1984.

What We Know About Compensatory Education: A Compendium. Austin, Texas: Office of Research and Evaluation (Publication Number 83.29), Austin Independent School District, January, 1984.

Christner, C.A., Jordan-Davis, W.E., Mangino, E., and Curtis, J. Overlap Study: 1983-84. Austin, Texas: Office of Research and Evaluation (Publication Number 83.E), Austin Independent School District, 1984.

LISTING OF AISD SCHOOLS PARTICIPATING IN CHAPTER 1 AND
CHAPTER 1 MIGRANT PROGRAMS IN 1983-84

<u>School</u>	<u>Programs</u>
Allan	Chapter 1 Regular, Migrant
Allison	Migrant Early Childhood, Chapter 1 Schoolwide Project
Becker	Chapter 1 Schoolwide Project, Migrant
Blackshear	Chapter 1 Early Childhood, Chapter 1 Regular
Brooke	Migrant Early Childhood, Migrant, Chapter 1 Regular
Brown	Chapter 1 Early Childhood, Chapter 1 Regular
Campbell	Chapter Early Childhood, Chapter 1 Regular
Casis	Chapter 1 Regular, Migrant
Cook	Migrant
Dawson	Migrant Early Childhood, Chapter 1 Regular
Govalle	Chapter 1 Regular, Migrant
Harris	Chapter 1 Regular
Highland Park	Migrant
Maplewood	Chapter 1 Early Childhood, Chapter 1 Regular
Metz	Migrant Early Childhood, Chapter 1 Regular
Norman	Chapter 1 Early Childhood, Chapter 1 Regular
Oak Springs	Chapter 1 Regular
Ortega	Local Early Childhood, Chapter 1 Regular
Pecan Springs	Local Early Childhood
Ridgetop	Chapter 1 Regular
Rosedale	Chapter 1 Regular
Rosewood	Chapter 1 Early Childhood, Chapter 1 Regular
Sanchez	Chapter 1 Regular, Migrant
Sims	Chapter 1 Early Childhood, Local Early Childhood, Chapter 1 Regular
Sunset Valley	Migrant Early Childhood
Walnut Creek	Chapter 1 Regular
Webb	Migrant
Winn	Local Early Childhood, Chapter 1 Regular
Woodridge	Chapter 1 Regular
Zavala	Migrant Early Childhood, Chapter 1 Regular, Migrant
Fulmore	Migrant
Martin	Migrant
Murchison	Migrant
O. Henry	Migrant
Porter	Migrant
Anderson	Migrant
Crockett	Migrant
Johnston	Migrant-Special Program
Travis	Migrant

AUSTIN INDEPENDENT SCHOOL DISTRICT
OFFICE OF RESEARCH AND EVALUATION

Dr. Glynn Ligon, Director

Chapter 1

Walter E. Jordan-Davis, Evaluator
Lauren H. Moede, Evaluation Assistant
Natalie Rodgers, Evaluation Assistant
Perry J. Sailor, Evaluation Assistant
John Fry, Data Analyst
Cynthia Amezquita, Secretary

Chapter 1 Migrant

Dr. Catherine A. Christner, Evaluator
John Fry, Data Analyst
Kathi Beene, Secretary



BOARD OF TRUSTEES

Larry G. Waterhouse, President
Abel R. Ruiz, Vice President
Bernice Hart, Secretary

Lidia M. Pérez
Ed Small

Peter W. Werner, M.D.
Nan Clayton

SUPERINTENDENT OF SCHOOLS

Dr. John Ellis

Cover Drawing by Michele Riojas, Anderson High

Publication Number 83.53