

1995

Guidelines for implementing an effective part-time Title I reading program

Claudia Beecher
University of Northern Iowa

Let us know how access to this document benefits you

Copyright ©1995 Claudia Beecher

Follow this and additional works at: <https://scholarworks.uni.edu/grp>



Part of the [Education Commons](#)

Recommended Citation

Beecher, Claudia, "Guidelines for implementing an effective part-time Title I reading program" (1995).
Graduate Research Papers. 2029.
<https://scholarworks.uni.edu/grp/2029>

This Open Access Graduate Research Paper is brought to you for free and open access by the Student Work at UNI ScholarWorks. It has been accepted for inclusion in Graduate Research Papers by an authorized administrator of UNI ScholarWorks. For more information, please contact scholarworks@uni.edu.

Guidelines for implementing an effective part-time Title I reading program

Abstract

Since 1965, when Title I of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act (ESEA) was enacted, federal aid has been provided to enable extra instruction in reading, writing, and mathematics to disadvantaged children. Throughout the past three decades, the laws governing Title I/Chapter 1 programs have been amended several times to improve the quality of this service.

GUIDELINES FOR IMPLEMENTING AN EFFECTIVE PART-TIME
TITLE I READING PROGRAM

A Graduate Project
Submitted to the
Department of Curriculum and Instruction
In Partial Fulfillment
of the Requirements for the Degree
Master of Arts in Education
UNIVERSITY OF NORTHERN IOWA

by
Claudia Beecher
December 1995

This project by Claudia Beecher

Entitled: Guidelines for Implementing an Effective Part
Time Title 1 Reading Program

has been approved as meeting a project requirement for
the Degree of Master of Arts in Education.

12/6/95
Date Approved

Deborah L. Tidwell
Director of Research Paper

12/6/95
Date Approved

Deborah L. Tidwell
Graduate Faculty Advisor

12/14/95
Date Approved

Rick C. Traw
Graduate Faculty Reader

12/15/95
Date Approved

Peggy Ishler
Head, Department of
Curriculum and
Instruction

Rationale of the Project

Since 1965, when Title I of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act (ESEA) was enacted, federal aid has been provided to enable extra instruction in reading, writing, and mathematics to disadvantaged children. Throughout the past three decades, the laws governing Title I/Chapter 1 programs have been amended several times to improve the quality of this service.

In 1981, the Education Consolidation and Improvement Act changed Title I to Chapter 1. The Augustus F. Hawkins-Robert T. Stafford Elementary and Secondary School Improvement Amendments of 1988 expanded the program by increasing funds and its purpose was to improve the educational opportunities of educationally deprived children by helping such children succeed in the regular program of the local educational agency, attain grade-level proficiency, and improve achievement in basic and more advanced skills. These purposes were accomplished through such means as supplemental education programs, schoolwide programs, and the increase in involvement of parents in their children's education.

On October 20, 1994, President Clinton signed into law the Improving America's Schools Act. This law brings about significant changes to Chapter 1 (Kapaska, Cahill, & McCune, 1995). First of all, Chapter 1 has

returned to its original name, Title I--Helping Disadvantaged Children Meet High Standards. Local Education Agencies (LEAs) are to establish high content and performance standards in mathematics and reading of language arts for all students, have professional development, coordinate services among Title I students, and have a written parent compact. This bill authorizes \$7.4 billion for the Title I compensatory education program (Appendix A).

Due to the Improving America's Schools Act, the formula for calculating funds for Title I has been changed. This change may have quite an impact on Iowa's Title I programs. The new funding formula brings more money to high population areas and the majority of Iowa's school districts do not fit into that category. Many school districts are or will be forced to cut their Title I compensatory programs to part-time or to eliminate the programs entirely (for more information see Appendix B). This will have quite an effect on the make-up of individual programs within each of these schools. Title I teachers will have to make some decisions on how to reorganize their programs to fit the new requirements and the reduced time allotted for Title I assistance.

Organizing time to fit other schedules is not a new task for veteran Title I teachers. Title I is designed

to be flexible and to fit in during the noninstructional reading time of the regular classroom. Reducing the time the Title I teacher is available by cutting to part-time reading assignments will reduce the flexibility of scheduling.

Less time means fewer students will be able to be served. The decision has to be made as to the Title I teacher's caseload of students, which students, and the grade levels which will most benefit from Title I assistance.

After finding times and identifying the students to be served, other decisions need to be made. The type of instruction and type of program (in-class or pull-out) need to be determined. This instruction will need to fit into the the time frames established when the reduction occurred and fit the guidelines of Title I, which state that instruction is to supplement, not supplant, the reading curriculum. This instruction also needs to be a type that will be the most beneficial to the students.

Purpose of the Project

The purpose of this project was to study and design guidelines that can be used to develop and implement an effective part-time Title I reading program. Specifically, these guidelines will address three critical issues: time, students, and instruction.

Time will be dealt with in terms of frequency, minutes per session, and time of day. The issue of students will be discussed in terms of total caseload, number of students per session, and grade levels served. The third issue, instruction, will deal with location and type of instruction. The guidelines generated using these key issues will be used to implement a part-time Title I program in the writer's school district.

After many years of teaching full-time Chapter 1 Reading, the writer's teaching position has been reduced to part-time Title I because of the changes in the funding of Title I services. In this new situation, the writer finds that it is even more important to be aware of how Title I Reading time is spent.

Many other school districts may find themselves having to reduce their Title I Reading positions due to the new laws. The Title I Reading teachers in these districts may find it useful to have guidelines for a part-time Title I reading program accessible to them. They may use these guidelines, in part or in whole, to build an effective Title I Reading program in their school.

Pertinent Terms

Title I Reading

A federally funded compensatory program to provide supplemental assistance in reading to low-achieving students.

Pull-out Program

A program where eligible children leave their regular classroom to participate in Title I reading at a second location.

In-class Program

A program in which eligible students receive Title I reading instruction in their regular classroom environment.

Reading Strategies

The systematic problem-solving techniques used by a reader to understand and decode text.

Reading Skills

The tools used in reading, such as phonics skills, word recognition skills, and comprehensions skills, to become an independent reader.

Individualized Program

A program designed so a teacher works one-on-one with an eligible student to improve that student's reading by focusing on his/her particular needs.

Reading Recovery

A first-grade individualized reading program developed in New Zealand by Marie Clay (Clay, 1993).

Questionnaire of Title I Teachers

A questionnaire (Appendix C) was developed to glean input from other experienced Title I Reading teachers. The writer used questions that dealt with the three main issues which are affected by reducing Title I teaching positions. These issues are time, students, and instruction.

In the first section of the questionnaire, questions about current Title I practices of the teacher were asked. These questions about current caseload, time allotments, and instructional practices of each Title I Reading teacher were needed to help the writer understand the participants' situations and points of view.

In Section 2 of the questionnaire, questions were to be answered assuming federal funding for Title I was reduced in the participants' school districts and their Title I Reading programs were reduced to half-time. These questions also dealt with the three key issues of time, students, and instruction.

The questionnaire was presented to two Title I Reading teachers in the writer's school district to check for pertinence of questions. After screening by

the two teachers, the Title I Reading Teacher's Questionnaire was then sent to all Title I Reading teachers in Iowa's Area Education Agency 1 (AEA 1). The AEA 1 teachers were asked in the cover letter (Appendix D) to answer all the questions and to return the questionnaire to the writer within 2 weeks, using the AEA 1 van mail. They were also informed that all information would be confidential and that they could remain anonymous if they chose.

The Title I Teacher's Questionnaire (Appendix C), which was developed by the writer, was sent to 104 Title I teachers; 58 Title I reading teachers responded. The respondents varied by grade levels in which they taught Title I reading: 36% taught kindergarten through third grade, 50% taught first through sixth grade, 12% taught first through eighth grade, and 2% taught 7th through 12th grade. Twenty-four percent of these respondents were part-time Title I reading teachers, while 76% were full-time.

Results from Section 2 of the Title I Teacher's Questionnaire, which refer to the time elements of an effective part-time Title I reading program, are presented in tabular form. The participants expressed their opinions on the amount of time that should be allotted per session (see Table 1). Forty-eight percent of the participants felt that 30 minutes should be the

Table 1

Suggested Minimum Amount of Time Allotments Per Title I Reading Session

Time allotments in Minutes	Number of Respondents	Percentage of Respondents
Over 40	3	5%
30	28	48%
25	9	16%
20	12	21%
15	2	3%
No Comment	4	7%

Note: $n = 58$; percentages have been rounded off.

amount of time allotted. Sixteen percent of the participants agreed on 25 minutes per session and 21% responded with 20-minute sessions. Lesser time allotments were chosen by fewer respondents.

Table 2 shows the results of the question, What time of the day would be the most productive for the Title I students to be served? Morning was the preferred time of day for instruction with 81% of the participants agreeing. Nine percent of the participants suggested morning and early early afternoon with no

Table 2

Suggested Times of the Day Which Would be Most Productive to Teach Title I Reading

Times of Day	Number of Respondents	Percentage of Respondents
A.M.	47	81%
P.M.	2	3%
All Day	2	3%
A.M. & Early P.M.	5	9%
No Comment	2	3%

Note: $n = 58$; percentages are rounded off.

clear parameters for early afternoon.

The questionnaire participants suggestions to frequency of Title I sessions are listed in Table 3. 53% of the participants agreed that Title I instruction should occur daily. Other suggestions were: Monday through Thursday 10%, Tuesday through Thursday 14%, and Tuesday through Friday 2%.

The question, What grade levels do you feel would benefit most from Title I service? was answered by numbering the grade levels K-12, using a rank ordering of 1-13, with 1 being the level that would benefit most.

Table 3

Suggested Frequency of Title I Reading Instruction

Days	Number of Respondents	Percentage of Respondents
Mon. - Fri.	31	53%
Mon. - Thurs.	6	10%
Tues. - Thurs.	8	14%
Tues. - Fri.	1	2%
No Comment	12	21%

Note: $n = 58$; percentages are rounded off.

Tabulating all number 1 rankings (Table 4), 62% of participants felt first grade should be served and 21% of the participants felt kindergarten would benefit most from Title I service.

All of the second choices for the grade level that would benefit the most from Title I service were also tabulated (see Table 5). Fifty percent of the participants ranked second grade as their second choice to most benefit from Title I services, with 28% agreeing that first grade should be considered as a second choice.

Table 4

Suggested First Choice for Grade Levels to be Served by
Title I

Grade	Number of Respondents	Percentage of Respondents
Kindergarten	12	21%
First	36	62%
Second	5	9%
Third	1	2%
Seventh	1	2%
No Comment	3	5%

Note: $n = 58$; percentages are rounded off.

Table 6 addresses the maximum caseload of students that a half-time Title I teacher should serve. The majority (64%) of the participants felt that somewhere between 11 and 20 students should be served. Nine percent of the participants felt that below 11 students was an appropriate amount. Another 9% felt 21-25 students should be the maximum amount served.

The issue of the type of reading instruction was ranked 1-5 (1 being most effective) by participants for grouping of grade levels by K-3, 4-6, 7-12 (see

Table 5

Suggested Second Choices for Grade Levels Served by
Title I

Grade	Number of Respondents	Percentage of Respondents
Kindergarten	6	10%
First	16	28%
Second	29	50%
Third	1	2%
Seventh	1	2%
No Comment	3	5%

Note: $n = 58$; percentages are rounded off.

Table 7). The choices were: teaching of reading strategies, teaching of reading skills, reteaching skills taught in the classroom, individual instruction, and any other suggestions.

Teaching reading strategies was suggested by the majority of participants at all levels: 33% for grades K-3, 52% for grade levels 4-6 and 24% of the teachers for levels 7-12. Individual reading instruction, such as Reading Recovery, had 27% of the Title I teachers agreeing that it would be most beneficial for students

Table 6

Suggested Maximum Number of Students that Should be Served by a Part-time Title I Reading Teacher

Number of Students	Number of Respondents	Percentage of Respondents
1 - 10	5	9%
11 - 20	37	64%
21 - 25	5	9%
26 - 30	6	10%
Over 30	1	2%
No Comment	4	7%

Note: $n = 58$; percentages are rounded off.

in grade levels K-3.

In general, the teachers that gave feedback suggested that using a pull-out program for Title I service was preferred over an in-class program. Some participants that work with kindergarten students encouraged having an extended day program.

The results of the Title I Teacher's Questionnaire suggest that the majority of experienced Title I teachers believe that an effective part-time reading program should have daily instruction presented in the

Table 7

Type of Reading Instruction Ranked as First Choice Per
Grade Levels for Part-time Title I Reading

Type of Instruction	Number/Percentage of Respondents		
	Grade Levels		
	<u>K-3</u>	<u>4-6</u>	<u>7-12</u>
Teaching Reading Strategies	19/33%	30/52%	14/24%
Teaching Reading Skills	12/21%	6/10%	1/2%
Reteach Skills Taught in Classroom	9/16%	6/10%	3/5%
Individual Instruction	16/28%	4/7%	2/3%
Other	2/3%	3/5%	3/5%
No Comment	0/0%	9/16%	35/60%

Note: $n = 58$; percentages are rounded off.

mornings with a minimum of 30 minutes per session. The student caseload should be between 11 and 20, including students in kindergarten through second grade. The focus of instruction should include the teaching of reading strategies and individual instruction.

Review of Key Literature

In this section, the literature that pertains to the three key aspects of an effective part-time Title I reading program will be reviewed. The three issues are time, students, and type of instruction.

Time allotments and frequency for Title I sessions in reading programs such as Reading Recovery and Literacy program use 30 minutes daily and 45 minutes daily respectively (Salinas, 1993). Eighty-five percent of the Title I programs instruct students between 2 1/2 and 3 hours per week (Allington & Johnson, 1986). These numbers agree with another report that current Title I programs instruct students 30 to 35 minutes each day (Birman, Orland, Jung, Anson, & Garcia, 1987). The 30 minutes to 45 minutes daily reading instruction is not a clear answer to effective time lines for Title I instruction, much depends on the content of instruction. The contact time must be enough to allow for effective instructional delivery (Allington, 1984).

The students served by Title I in terms of caseload depend on several variables. In a study at McCallen Independent School District, the set caseload was 22 students per teacher for both their Reading Recovery program and their Literacy program (Salinas, 1993). This caseload is low for a full-time program, due to the very specific group sizes allowed in the two programs

being studied. Group size, scheduling, and length of sessions play a major role in the Title I caseload of students.

There are many questions about optimal group size for Title I instruction. In a review of the literature, the largest group size for remedial instruction was found in a study by Bean, Cooley, Eichelberger, Lazar, and Zigmond (1991), where they used a maximum of 10 students per group. Others suggest that low student ratios of 1:1 to 1:4 are most beneficial in Title I instruction and that teachers find it difficult to attend to the individual needs of students when instructing in groups (Allington, 1984). While Reading Recovery has shown success in a one-to-one ratio caseload, a study by Hiebert, Colt, Catto, and Gury (1992), suggested that students who are low achievers are able to benefit from focused small-group instruction, but do not necessarily need to have one-to-one tutoring.

Grade levels to incorporate into a Title I programs should start at the earliest grades. Students in early grades show more gains from instruction than students in later years (Kennedy, Birman, & Demaline, 1986). If students fail in earlier grades they will likely become unmotivated and be harder to remediate later (Slavin, 1991).

Two models of Title I instruction delivery are pull-out and in-class. The delivery of Title I instruction has primarily been through the use of pull-out programs (Ascher, 1988). However, recently the in-class model is becoming more popular. Its benefits are improved student-teacher ratio in the classroom and a better coordination of instruction with the regular classroom teacher, but such a model has shown little evidence of success. Pull-out program's advantages are that they produce more hours of instruction, meet Title I guidelines, and show sizable standard gains (King & Sommers, 1990). In a survey study of students preferences of delivery systems, the students preferred pull-out to in-class remedial instruction. They felt more embarrassed being helped by the Title I teacher in the regular classroom (Jenkins & Heinen, 1989).

Individualized reading programs such as Reading Recovery have been studied and proven to be effective in accelerating the progress of children who are having difficulty in learning to read (Allington, 1992). Reading Recovery involves a year-long training program in which the teacher learns a specific regimen of instructional practices. This program is a first-grade intervention where the teacher works 30 minutes daily with low-achieving students one-to-one to develop self-monitoring strategies (Allington, 1992). Studies in the

United States found that 90% of the Reading Recovery students met or exceeded average students after a year (Pinnell, 1990).

Drawbacks to the implementation of a Reading Recovery program are the time it takes to implement (Pinnell, 1990) and the cost. However, Dyer's analysis (as cited by Allington, 1992) suggested that, due to reported reduction in retention and referrals to special education, the Reading Recovery program may be more cost effective in the long run than some other programs.

Another type of reading instruction for Title I program is the teaching of reading strategies. In this approach, teaching is a constructive and strategic activity where deliberate teaching of strategies promotes successful readers (Osborn, 1986). In fact, many believe the teaching of reading strategies should be thought of as an integral part of any curriculum (Palincsar & Ranson, 1988).

A third type of reading instruction is the teaching of reading skills. The teaching of skills in reading has been a familiar and traditional practice. Some research shows that reading programs that include the teaching of phonics skills as part of the curriculum provide students with text knowledge which enhances their learning to read (Idol & Rutledge, 1993). Other research states that low-achieving students would be

instructed best using whole text and should not be taught isolated skills, such as phonics (Sabin, 1989). Reading instruction models that have the highest gains in reading performance are models that have a combination of p and holistic teaching (New York City, 1987).

The fourth type of instruction is the reinforcing of reading skills taught in the classroom. Working in coordination with the regular classroom teacher has always been a goal of Title I teachers. Through this model, Title I teachers plan their instruction in coordination with classroom instruction. This requires good communication and constant contact (Louisiana State Department, 1987). This model is effective because low-achieving reading students often need more time than average students to practice the skills taught in the current curriculum (Louisiana State Department, 1987). These students also need practice in prerequisite skills that are unknown or difficult for them to become better readers.

The literature reveals that the most often used and suggested time frames for Title I instruction are 30 minute to 45 minute sessions 5 days a week (Salinas, 1993). The caseload of students varies in accordance with the group size and the number of sessions per day (Salinas, 1993). The group size of one to four students

is suggested as optimal, since the smaller the group the more individualized the instruction (Allington, 1984). The grade levels served should be in the lower elementary grades to prevent students from becoming unmotivated by experiencing failure (Slavin, 1991).

The instructional delivery models for Title I reading of pull-out and in-class both have strengths and weaknesses. The pull-out program does, however, have more evidence of success. All of the types of instruction have some valuable attributes to be used with low-achieving students in a Title I program (King & Sommers, 1990). Individualized instruction has very good evidence of success, but it services very few students (Pinnell, 1990). Teaching reading strategies and reading skills in combination appears to be most beneficial to remedial students (New York City, 1987).

Project

The following guidelines for an effective part-time Title I program were developed using both the survey results as well as the information derived from the literature review. These proposed guidelines are designed to be utilized in the writer's school district.

The Title I program will be conducted during the first 4 hours of the school day. The 4 hours will be divided into 30-minute sessions. There will be a maximum of six group sessions, with the remaining time used for

preparation. This preparation would involve weekly meetings with each regular classroom teacher to plan effective instruction and discuss individual student's needs.

The number of student per group session may range from 1 to 4 students, with the maximum total caseload of students to be 20. The grade levels served will be first grade, second grade, and third grade. Kindergarten will not be served because they are not available on a daily basis.

The type of delivery model will be pull-out. The pull-out model will be used because of the time constraints on a part-time program.

The reading instruction will consist of reinforcing reading skills taught in the regular classroom and the teaching of reading strategies. Both reading skills and reading strategies will be taught, using actual text from the regular classroom or materials that are similar.

Conclusion

Due to the changes in the funding of Title I, many full-time Title I programs may be cut to part-time. The proposed model for an effective part-time Title I program includes the key variables of time, students, and type of instruction. Time involves six 30-minute morning sessions offered daily. Students are in small

groups of 1 to 4 (with a maximum of 20), representing the first, second, and third grades. Type of instruction includes reading skills and strategies which reinforce classroom instruction, in a pull-out setting. The guidelines proposed in this project are a framework for implementing an effective part-time Title I reading program. While this project was designed with a specific school district in mind, the proposed guidelines may be incorporated by other school districts who are experiencing the same reduction in force issues, adapting these guidelines to meet their own specific needs.

References

- Allington, R. L. (1984, May). Policy constraints and effective compensatory reading instruction: A review. Paper presented at the annual meeting of the International Reading Association, Atlanta, GA. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 248 456)
- Allington, R. L. (1992, Nov.). How to get information on several proven programs for accelerating the progress of low-achieving children. Reading Teacher, 46, 246-248.
- Allington, R. L., & Johnson, P. (1986). The coordination among regular classroom reading programs and targeted support programs. Albany: State University of New York.
- Ascher, C. (1988). Improving chapter 1 delivery. ERIC/Cue Digest Number 39. New York: ERIC Clearinghouse on Urban Education. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 292 940)
- Bean, R. M., Cooley, W. W., Eichelberger, M. K., & Zigmond, N. (1991). Inclass or pullout: Effects of setting on the remedial reading program. Journal of Reading Behavior, 23, 445-463.
- Birman, B. F., Orland, M. E., Jung, R. K., Anson, R. J., & Garcia, G. N. (1987). The current operation of the chapter 1 program. Washington, DC: Office of Educational Research and Improvement.
- Clay, M. M. (1993). Reading recovery: A guidebook for teachers in training. Auckland, New Zealand: Heinemann.
- Hiebert, E. H., Colt, J. M., Catto, S. L., & Gury, E. C. (1992). Reading and writing of first-grade students in a restructured chapter 1 program. American Educational Research Journal, 29, 545-572.
- Idol, L., & Rutledge, M. (1993). Teaching phonics to poor readers: Direct instruction using sound sheets. Teaching Exceptional Children, 25, 58-61.

- Jenkins, J. R., & Heinen, A. (1989, April). Students' preferences for service delivery: Pull-out, in-class, or integrated models. Exceptional Children, 55, 516-523
- Kapaska, M., Cahill, P., & McCune, T. (1995). Title I planning packet. Des Moines: Iowa State Department of Education.
- Kennedy, M., Birman, B. F., & Demaline, R. F. (1986). The effectiveness of Chapter 1 services. Second Interim Report for the National Assessment of the Chapter 1 Office of Educational Research and Improvement, Washington, DC: United States Department of Education.
- King, F., & Sommer, A. (1990). Chapter 1: Does the model matter? Portland, OR: Northwest Regional Educational Laboratory. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 330 448)
- Louisiana State Department of Education. (1987). Strategies & ideas for young readers in Chapter 1 instructional activities. (Bulletin No. 1826). Baton Rouge, LA: Author. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 294 145)
- New York City Board of Education. (1987, Oct). Chapter 1 corrective reading program 1985-1986 OEA evaluation report. Brooklyn: Office of Educational Assessment. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 291 056)
- Osborn, J. (1986, May-June). Reading comprehension. Curriculum Review, 25, 9-10, 12, 14, 16-26.
- Palincsar, A. S., & Ransom, K. (1988, April). From the mystery spot to the thoughtful spot: The instruction of metacognitive strategies. Reading Teacher, 41, 784-789.
- Pinnell, G. S. (1990). Success for low achievers through reading recovery. Educational Leadership, 48, 17-21.

- Sabin, B. J. (1989). The conflict between instruction that characterizes chapter 1 programs & instruction that results from the whole language philosophy. Master's paper. Cedar Falls: University of Northern Iowa. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 334 548)
- Salinas, A. (1993). Reading recovery program evaluation. (Report 1992-93). (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 366 938)
- Slavin, R. E., (1991, April). Chapter 1: A vision for the next quarter century. Phi Delta Kappan, 586-592.

Appendix A

PART A--IMPROVING BASIC PROGRAMS OPERATED BY LOCAL EDUCATIONAL AGENCIES

Subpart 1--Basic Program Requirements

SEC. 1111. State PLANS.

(a) PLANS REQUIRED

(1) IN GENERAL--Any State desiring to receive a grant under this part shall submit to the Secretary a plan, developed in consultation with local educational agencies, teachers, pupil services personnel, administrators, other staff, and parents, that satisfies the requirements of this section and that is coordinated with other programs under this Act, the Goals 2000: Educate America Act, and other Acts, as appropriate, consistent with section 14306.

(2) CONSOLIDATION PLAN.--A State plan submitted under paragraph (1) may be submitted as part of a consolidation plan under section 14302.

(b) STANDARDS AND ASSESSMENTS.--

(1) CHALLENGING STANDARDS.--(A) Each State plan shall demonstrate that the State has developed or adopted challenging content standards and challenging student performance standards that will be used by the State, its local educational agencies, and its schools to carry out this part, except that a State shall not be required to submit such standards to the Secretary.

(B) If a State has State content standards or State student performance standards developed under title III of the Goals 2000: Educate America Act and an aligned set of assessments for all students developed under such title, or if not developed under such title, adopted under another process, the State shall use such standards, as modified, if necessary, to conform with the requirements of subparagraphs (A) and (D) of this paragraph, and paragraphs (2) and (3).

(C) If a State has not adopted State content standards and State student performance standards for all students, the State plan shall include a strategy and schedule for developing State

content standards and State student performance standards for elementary and secondary school children served under this part in subjects as determined by the State, but including at least mathematics and reading or language arts by the end of the one-year period described in paragraph (6), which standards shall include the same knowledge, skills, and levels of performance expected of all children.

(D) Standards under this paragraph shall include--

(i) challenging content standards in academic subjects that--

(I) specify what children are expected to know and be able to do

(II) contain coherent and rigorous content;

and

(III) encourage the teaching of advanced skills;

(ii) challenging student performance standards that--

(I) are aligned with the State's content standards;

(II) describe two levels of high performance, proficient and advanced, that determine how well children are mastering the material in the State content standards;

and

(III) describe a third level of performance, partially proficient, to provide complete information about the progress of the lower performing children toward achieving to the proficient and advanced levels of performance.

(E) For the subjects in which students will be served under this part, but for which a State is not required by subparagraphs (A), (B), and (C) to develop, and has not otherwise developed such standards, the State plan shall describe a strategy for ensuring that such students are taught the same knowledge and skills and held to the same expectations as are all children.

(2) YEARLY PROGRESS--

(A) Each State plan shall demonstrate, based on assessments described under paragraph (3), what constitutes adequate yearly progress of--

(i) any school served under this part toward enabling children to meet the State's student performance standards; and

(ii) any local educational agency that received funds under this part toward enabling children in schools receiving assistance under this part to meet the State's student performance standards.

(B) Adequate yearly progress shall be defined in a manner-

(i) that is consistent with guidelines established by the Secretary that shall result in continuous and substantial yearly improvement of each local educational agency and school sufficient to achieve the goal of all children served under this part meeting the State's proficient and advanced levels of performance, particularly economically disadvantaged and limited English proficient children; and

(ii) that links progress primarily to performance on the assessments carried out under this section while permitting progress to be established in part through the use of other measures.

(3) **ASSESSMENTS.**--Each State plan shall demonstrate that the State has developed or adopted a set of high-quality, yearly student assessments, including assessments in at least mathematics and reading or language arts, that will be used as the primary means of determining the yearly performance of each local educational agency and school served under this part in enabling all children served under this part to meet the State's student performance standards. Such assessments shall--

(A) be the same assessments used to measure the performance of all children, if the State measures the performance of all children;

(B) be aligned with the State's challenging content and student performance standards and provide coherent information about student attainment of such standards;

(C) be used for purposes for which assessments are valid and reliable, and be consistent with relevant, nationally recognized professional and technical standards for such assessments;

(D) measure the proficiency of students in the academic subjects in which a State has adopted challenging content and student performance standards and be administered at some time during---

- (i) grades 3 through 5;
- (ii) grades 6 through 9; and
- (iii) grades 10 through 12;

(E) involve multiple up-to-date measures of student performance, including measures that assess higher order thinking skills and understanding;

(F) provide for--

(i) the participation in such assessments of all students;

(ii) the reasonable adaptations and accommodations for students with diverse learning needs, necessary to measure the achievement of such students relative to State content standards; and

(iii) the inclusion of limited English students who shall be assessed, to the extent practicable, in the language and form most likely to yield accurate and reliable information on what such students know and can do, to determine such students' mastery of skills in subjects other than English;

(G) include students who have attended schools in a local education agency for a full academic year but who have not attended a single school for a full academic year, however the performance of students who have attended more than one school in the local educational agency in any academic year shall be used only in determining the progress of the local educational agency;

(H) provide individual student interpretive and descriptive reports, which shall include scores, or other information on the attainment of student performance standards, and

(I) enable results to be disaggregated within each State, local educational agency, and school by gender, by each major racial and ethnic group, by English proficiency status, by migrant status, by students with disabilities as compared to students who are not economically disadvantaged.

(4) **SPECIAL RULE.**--Assessment measures that do not meet the requirements of paragraph (3)(C) may be included as one of the multiple measures, if a State includes in the State plan information regarding the State plan information regarding the State's efforts to validate such measures.

(5) **LANGUAGE ASSESSMENTS.**--Each State plan shall identify the languages other than English that are present in the participating student population and indicate the languages for which yearly student assessments are not available and are needed. The State shall make every effort to develop such assessments and may request assistance from the Secretary if linguistically accessible assessment measures are needed. Upon request, the Secretary shall assist with the identification of appropriate assessment measures in the needed languages through the Office of Bilingual Education and Minority Languages Affairs.

(6) **STANDARD AND ASSESSMENT DEVELOPMENT.**--

(A) A State that does not have challenging State content standards and challenging State student performance standards, in at least mathematics and reading or language arts, shall develop such standards within one year of receiving funds under this part after the first fiscal year for which such State receives such funds after the date of enactment of the Improving America's Schools Act of 1994.

(B) A State that does not have assessments that meet the requirements of paragraph (3) in at least mathematics and reading or language arts shall develop and test such assessments within four years (one year of which shall be used for field testing such assessment), of receiving funds under this part after the first fiscal year for which such State receives such funds after the date of enactment of the Improving America's Schools Act of 1994 and shall develop benchmarks of progress toward the development of such assessments that meet the requirements of paragraph (3), including periodic updates.

(C) The Secretary may extend for one additional year the time for testing new assessments under subparagraph (B) upon the request of the State and the submission of a strategy to correct problems identified in the field testing of such new assessments.

(D) If, after the one-year period described in subparagraph (A), a State does not have challenging State content and challenging student performance standards in at least mathematics and reading or language arts, a State shall adopt a set of standards in these subjects such as the standards and assessments contained in other State plans the Secretary has approved.

(E) If, after the four-year period described in subparagraph (B), a State does not have assessments in at least mathematics and reading or language arts, that meet the requirement of paragraph (3), and is denied an extension under subparagraph (C), a State shall adopt an assessment that meets the requirement of paragraph (3) in these subjects such as one contained in other State plans the Secretary has approved.

(7) TRANSITIONAL ASSESSMENTS.--(A) If a State does not have assessments that meet the requirements of paragraph (3) and proposes to develop such assessments under paragraph (6)(B), the State may propose to use a transitional set of yearly Statewide assessments that will assess the performance of complex skills and challenging subject matter.

(B) For any year in which a State uses transitional assessments, the State shall devise a procedure for identifying local educational agencies under paragraphs (3) and (7) of section 1116(d), and schools under paragraphs (1) and (7) of section 1116(c), that rely on accurate information about the academic progress of each local educational agency and school.

(8) REQUIREMENT.--Each State plan shall describe--

(A) how the State educational agency will help each local educational agency affected by the State plan develop the capacity to comply with each of the requirements of sections 1112(c)(1)(D), 1114(b), and 1115(c) that is applicable to such agency or school, and

(B) such other factors the State deems appropriate (which may include opportunity-to-learn standards or strategies developed under the Goals 2000: Educate America Act) to provide students an opportunity to achieve the knowledge and skills described in the challenging content standards adopted by the State.

(c) OTHER PROVISIONS TO SUPPORT TEACHING AND LEARNING--Each State plan shall contain assurances that--

(1)(A) the State educational agency will implement a system of school support teams under section 1117(c), including provision of necessary professional development for those teams;

(B) the State educational agency will work with other agencies, including educational service agencies or other local consortia, and institutions will provide technical assistance to local educational agencies and schools to carry out the State educational agency's responsibilities under this part, including technical assistance in providing professional development under section 1119 and technical assistance under section 1117; and

(C)(i) where educational services do not exist, the State educational agency will consider providing professional development and technical assistance through such agencies, and

(ii) where educational service agencies do not exist, the State educational agency will consider providing professional development and technical assistance through other cooperative agreements such as through a consortium of local educational agencies;

(2) the State educational agency will notify local educational agencies and the public of the standards and assessments developed under this section, and of the authority to operate schoolwide programs, and will fulfill the State educational agency's responsibilities regarding local educational agency improvement and school improvement under section 1116, including such corrective actions as are necessary

(3) the State educational agency will provide the least restrictive and burdensome regulations for local educational agencies and individual schools participating in a program assisted under this part

(4) the State educational agency will encourage the use of funds from other Federal, State, and local sources for schoolwide reform in schoolwide programs under section 1114:

(5) the Committee of Practitioners established under 1603(b) will be substantially involved in the development of the plan and will continue to be involved in monitoring the plan's implementation by the State; and

(6) the State will coordinate activities funded under this part with school-to-work, vocational education, cooperative education and mentoring programs, and apprenticeship programs involving business, labor, and industry, as appropriate.

(d) PEER REVIEW AND SECRETARIAL APPROVAL.--**(1) IN GENERAL.--The Secretary shall--**

(A) establish a peer review process to assist in the review and recommendations for revision of State plans;

(B) appoint individuals to the peer review process who are representative of State educational agencies, local educational agencies, teachers, and parents;

(C) following an initial peer review, approve a State plan the Secretary determines meets the requirements of subsections (a), (b), or (c), immediately notify the State of such determination and the reasons for such determination;

(E) not decline to approve a State's plan before--

(i) offering the State an opportunity to revise its plan;

(ii) providing technical assistance in order to assist the State to meet the requirements under subsections (a), (b), and (c); and

(iii) providing a hearing, and

(F) have the authority to disapprove a State plan for not meeting the meeting the requirements of this part, but shall not have the authority to require a State, as a condition of approval of the State plan, to include in, or delete from, such plan one or more specific elements of the State's content standards or to sue specific assessment instruments or items.

(2) WITHHOLDING.--The Secretary may withhold funds for State administration and activities under section 1117 until the Secretary determines that the State plan meets the requirements of this section.

(e) DURATION OF THE PLAN.--**(1) IN GENERAL.--Each State plan shall--**

(A) remain in effect for the duration of the State's participation under this part; and

(B) be periodically reviewed and revised by the State, as necessary, to reflect changes in the State's strategies and programs under this part.

(2) ADDITIONAL INFORMATION.--If the State makes significant changes in its plan, such as the adoption of new State content standards and State student performance standards, new

assessments, or a new definition of adequate progress, the State shall submit such information to the Secretary.

(f) **LIMITATIONS ON CONDITIONS.**--Nothing in this part shall be construed to authorize an officer or employee of the Federal Government to mandate, direct, or control a State, local educational agency, or school's specific instructional content or student performance standards and assessments, opportunity-to-learn standards or strategies, curriculum, or program of instruction, as a condition of eligibility to receive funds under this part.

(g) **PROHIBITION.**--Nothing in this act shall be construed to require any State educational agency, local educational agency, or school, to implement opportunity-to-learn standards or strategies developed by such State under the Goals 2000: Educate America Act.

(h) **SPECIAL RULE.**--If the aggregate State expenditure by a State educational agency for the operation of elementary and secondary education programs in the State is less than such agency's aggregate Federal expenditure for the State operation of all Federal elementary and secondary education programs, then the State shall include assurance and specific provisions that such State will provide State expenditures for the operation of elementary and secondary education programs equal to or exceeding the level of federal expenditures for such operation by October 1, 1998.

SEC. 1112. LOCAL EDUCATIONAL AGENCY PLANS.

(a) **PLANS REQUIRED.**--

(1) **SUBGRANTS.**--A local educational agency may receive a subgrant under this part for any fiscal year only if such agency has on file with the State educational agency a plan, approved by the State educational agency, that is coordinated with other programs under this Act, the Goals 2000: Educate America Act, and other Acts, as appropriate, as specified in section 14306.

(2) **CONSOLIDATED APPLICATION.**--The plan may be submitted as part of a consolidated application under section 14304.

(b) **PLAN PROVISIONS.**--Each local educational agency plan shall include--

(1) a description of additional high-quality student assessments, if any, other than the assessments described in the

State plan under section 1111, that the local educational agency and schools served under this part to--

(A) determine the success of children served under this part in meeting the State's student performance standards and provide information to teacher, parents, and students on the progress being made toward meeting the State student performance standards described in section 1111(b)(1)(D)(ii);

(B) assist in diagnosis, teaching, and learning in the classroom in ways that best enable children served under this part to meet State standards and do well in the local curriculum; and

(C) determine what revisions are needed to projects under this part so that such children will meet the State's student performance standards;

(2) at the local educational agency's discretion, a description of any other indicators that will be used in addition to the assessments described in paragraph (1) for the uses described in such paragraph;

(3) a description of the strategy the local educational agency will use to provide professional development for teachers, and where appropriate, pupil services personnel, administrators, parents and other staff, including local educational agency level staffing accordance with section 1119;

(4) a description of how the local educational agency will coordinate and integrate services provided under this part with other educational services at the local educational agency or individual school level, such as--

(A) Even Start, Head Start, and other preschool programs, including plans for the transition of participants in such programs to local elementary school programs, vocational education programs, and school-to-work transition programs; and

(B) services for children with limited proficiency or with disabilities, migratory children served under part C or who were formerly eligible for services under part C in the two-year period preceding the enactment of the Improving America's Schools Act of 1994, neglected or delinquent youth and youth at risk of dropping out served under part D, homeless children, and immigrant children in order to

increase program effectiveness, eliminate duplication, and reduce fragmentation of the instructional program

(5) a description of the poverty criteria that will be used to select school attendance areas under section 1113

(6) a description of how teachers, in consultation with parents, administrators, and pupil services personnel, in targeted assistance schools under section 1115, will identify the eligible children most in need of services under this part

(7) a general description of the nature of the programs to be conducted by such agency's schools under sections 1114 and 1115 and, where appropriate, educational services outside such schools for children living in local institutions for neglected or delinquent children, for neglected and delinquent children in community day school programs, and for eligible homeless children

(8) a description of how the local educational agency will use funds under this part to support preschool programs for children, particularly children participating in a Head Start of Even Start program, which services may be provided directly by the local educational agency or through a subcontract with the local Head Start agency designated by the Secretary of Health and Human Services under section 641 of the Head Start Act, agencies operating Even Start programs, or other comparable public early childhood development program.

(c) ASSURANCES.--

(1) **IN GENERAL.--**Each local educational agency plan shall provide assurances that the local educational agency will--

(A) inform eligible schools and parents of schoolwide project authority;

(B) provide technical assistance and support to schoolwide programs

(C) work in consultation with schools as the schools develop the schools' plans pursuant to section 1114 and assist schools as the schools implement such plans or undertake activities pursuant to section 1115 so that each school can make adequate yearly progress toward meeting the State content standards and State student performance standards;

(D) fulfill such agency's school improvement responsibilities section 1116, including taking corrective actions under section 1116(c)(4)

(E) coordinate and collaborate to the extent feasible and necessary as determined by the local educational agency, with other agencies providing services to youth, and families, including health and social services

(F) provide services to eligible children attending private elementary and secondary schools in accordance with section 1120, and timely and meaningful consultation with private school officials regarding such services;

(G) take into account the experience of model programs for the educationally disadvantaged, and the findings of relevant research indicating that services may be most effective if focused on students in the earliest grades at schools that receive funds under this part, and

(H) beginning in fiscal year 1997 and in the case that a local educational agency chooses to use funds under this part to provide early childhood development services to low-income children below the age of compulsory school attendance, ensure that such services comply with the performance standards established under section 641A(a) of the Head Start Act or under section 651 of such Act, as such section 661 was in effect on the day preceding the date of enactment of the Human Services Amendments of 1994.

(2) SPECIAL RULE.--In carrying out subparagraph (H) of paragraph (1) the Secretary--

(A) in fiscal year 1995, shall consult with the Secretary of Health and Human Services on the implementation of such subparagraph and shall establish procedures (taking into consideration existing State and local laws and local teacher contracts) to assist local educational agencies to comply with such subparagraph, and

(B) in fiscal year 1996, shall disseminate to local educational agencies the Head Start Performance Standards revised pursuant to section 641A(a) of the Head Start Act and such agencies effected by such subparagraph shall plan for the implementation of such subparagraph (taking into consideration existing State and local laws and local teacher contracts) , including pursuing the availability

of other Federal, State, and local funding sources to assist in compliance with such subparagraph.

(3) **INAPPLICABILITY.**--The provisions of this subsection shall not apply to preschool programs using the Even Start model or to Even Start programs which are expanded through the use of funds under this part.

(d) **PLAN DEVELOPMENT AND DURATION.**--Each local educational agency plan shall--

(1) be developed in consultation with teachers, including vocational teachers, and pupil services personnel, where appropriate, and parents of children in schools served under this part; and

(2)(A) remain in effect for the duration of the local educational agency's participation under this part, and

(B) periodically be reviewed and revised, as necessary, to reflect changes in the local educational agency's strategies and programs.

(e) **State APPROVAL.**--

(1) **IN GENERAL.**--Each local educational plan shall be filed according to a schedule established by the State educational agency, except that a local educational agency shall have not more than one year after the date of enactment of the Improving America's Schools Act of 1994 to have such plan provisionally approved by the State education agency and not more than two years after the date of enactment of such Act to have such plan finally approved by the State educational agency.

(2) **APPROVAL.**--The State educational agency shall approve a local educational agency's plan only if the State educational agency determines that the local educational agency's plan will enable schools served under this part to substantially help all children served under this part meet the standards expected of all children described in section 1111(b)(1)l.

(3) **REVIEW.**--The State educational agency shall review the local educational agency's plan to determine if such agency's professional development activities are in accordance with section 1119.

(f) **PROGRAM RESPONSIBILITY.**--The local educational agency plan shall reflect the shared responsibility of schools, teachers, and the

local educational agency in making decisions regarding activities under sections 1114 and 1115.

Appendix B

The Title I Formula: A Summary*

Currently, Title I funds are allocated to LEAs in two "pots": basic grants (roughly 90 percent of annual funding), which are calculated according to the normal Title I eligibility criteria, and concentration grants (the other 10 percent of annual funds), which only go to higher-poverty LEAs. However, once the funds arrive at the LEA, they may be commingled and used for the identical purposes.

At present, the U.S. Education Department (ED) calculates allocations down to the county level, using several "data elements." One key element is the state per-pupil expenditure (PPE), which is calculated for each state. PPE is multiplied by 40 percent to produce and "adjusted state PPE." Similarly, the national average PPE is multiplied by 40 percent to produce an "adjusted national PPE." The adjusted state PPE is then compared to the adjusted national PPE. If a given state's adjusted PPE would fall below 80 percent of the adjusted national PPE, it is raised to 80 percent of the national figure, and if it would be above 120 percent of the adjusted national PPE, it is reduced to 120 percent of the national figure.

Other key data elements are a county-by-county count of low-income children (aged 5-7) identified in the decennial census, children receiving AFDC payments who have family incomes above the poverty line (termed "excess AFDC" children), children in locally operated institutions for the neglected and delinquent, and children in foster homes. Of these so-called "formula children," the vast majority--95.5 percent of the total formula count for the 1995-96 school year--are those identified as low-income in the census.

For each county that meets the minimum eligibility criteria (currently, at least 10 formula-eligible children), ED multiplies the number of formula children by the relevant state's "adjusted PPE," as determined under the procedure described previously. Each county amount is ratably reduced nationwide to reflect the actual appropriation, which is always too small to provide the full county amount. The resulting figures constitute the basic grant for the county. In addition, counties that meet a higher threshold (having more than 6,500 formula children, of formula children constitute more than 15 percent of the total child population, get an extra "concentration" grant that is based on their relative share of all formula children located in counties eligible for concentration grants. The

concentration grant is added to their basic grant allotment.

Currently, states are responsible for suballocate county amounts to LEAs in each county, using poverty data of their choice. States typically use census data, AFDC data, and counts of children eligible under the free and reduced price lunch program. LEAs suballocate funds to schools with poverty above the LEA average, using similar counts of low-income students.

The procedures just described represent a simplified version of the allocation process. There are special procedures governing a variety of special circumstances. Moreover, additional complications will arise in future years as a result of the 1994 Title I amendments. Notably, a third type of grant, the "targeted" grant, will be introduced in FY 97. Under this new provision, LEAs having 5 percent of more poverty children will receive funds according to a "weighted child formula" that provide a higher per-pupil amount, the greater the number of percentage of poverty children in the LEA. Also in FY 97, ED will start using biennially updated census data. In FY 99, ED will start calculating grants down the LEA level (thereby removing this function from the state).

More immediately, a change in the definition of eligible LEA will knock a number of small rural LEAs out

of the program in FY 95. Historically, as long as an LEA was located in an eligible county (minimum of 10 formula children), the state had the option of allocating funds to the LEA, even if it had fewer than 10 formula children. In FY 95, however, the law specifies that an LEA must have a minimum of 10 formula children to be eligible. The hurdle gets even higher in FY 96; that year, in order for an LEA to receive funds, it must have at least 10 formula children and the number of formula children must constitute a minimum of 2 percent of the LEA's total school-aged population. This hits some rural states pretty hard; for example, Vermont may ultimately lose 31 out of 192 participating LEAs.

By creating targeted grants, establishing a tougher eligibility requirement for LEAs, and requiring ED to calculate grants down to the LEA level, Congress sought to direct more money to the areas with the highest concentrations of poverty children. The shift to biennially updated census data is intended to allow more frequent adjustment for population shifts than is currently possible with regular census data, which is generated only once every 10 years.

*Edwards, C. J. (Ed.). (1994). Title I handbook (p. C5). Arlington, VA: Education Funding Research Council.

Appendix C

Title 1 Teachers Questionnaire

Section 1

The first set of questions concerns information about your chapter 1 program during the 1994-1995 school year.

1. Name (optional) _____
2. School district _____
3. Is your Chapter 1 position full-time or part-time?
(circle one) If you circled part-time, how
many hours a week do you teach Chapter 1? _____
4. Grade levels which you serve _____
5. Total number of students which you serve _____
6. Number of groups served per day _____

7. Average number of minutes per session per grade level

K___ 1___ 2___ 3___
 4___ 5___ 6___ 7___
 8___ 9___ 10___ 11___ 12___

8. Average number of students per group per grade level

K___ 1___ 2___ 3___
 4___ 5___ 6___ 7___
 8___ 9___ 10___ 11___ 12___

9. Is your Chapter 1 program a total pull-out program? Yes ___ No ___

(If the answer to number 9 was No, answer the following)

Which grade levels are not pull-out? _____

How much time do you spend in the regular classroom per session on the average? _____

How much time is available for planning with the regular classroom teacher? _____

Section II

Complete the following

In this section give your opinion on what you feel would be the most effective way to implement a Title 1 program, assuming federal funding for Title 1 were reduced and your school district cut the Title 1 teaching positions or position to half-time

1. What grade levels do you feel would benefit most from Title 1 service? (Prioritize numbering 1-13)

K___ 1___ 2___ 3___
 4___ 5___ 6___ 7___
 8___ 9___ 10___ 11___ 12___

2. What should be the maximum number of students served by a half-time Title 1 teacher? _____
3. What do you feel would be the minimum amount of time that should be allotted per session? _____

4. What time of the day would be the most productive for the Title 1 student to be served? _____
 Also comment on which days of the week and/or parts of days you feel the teacher should be scheduled to benefit the students most _____

5. Which type of reading instruction do you feel would be most effective considering the reduced Title 1 assistance? (Prioritize, numbering 1-5, one being highest, for each set of grade levels in which you have experience.)

<u>Grade level</u>	<u>K-3</u>	<u>4-6</u>	<u>7-12</u>
Teaching of reading strategies	___	___	___
Teaching of reading skills	___	___	___
Reteaching skills taught in classroom	___	___	___
Individual instruction(ex.Reading Recovery)	___	___	___
Other _____	___	___	___

If you have any further thoughts on the effective implementation of a part-time Title 1 program please comment. _____

Thank you for your cooperation and expertise in answering the questionnaire.

Appendix D

Edgewood-Colesburg School
Box 125
Colesburg, Iowa 52032
Route 9 Drop 10

Dear Chapter 1 Teacher:

As a University of Northern Iowa graduate student, I am compiling information to complete my research project dealing with the most effective implementation of a part-time Title 1 program. I would appreciate your cooperation in completing the questions.

Please answer all the questions. If you choose, you may remain anonymous and all information will be confidential. Return your questionnaire to me by May 25, 1995. You may use the envelope provided and send through the AEA van mail.

Thank you for your time and cooperation in filling out the questionnaire.

Sincerely,

Claudia Beecher