

PPSS

POLICY AND PROGRAM STUDIES SERVICE

STATE EDUCATION INDICATORS WITH A FOCUS ON TITLE I

2000–01

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION OFFICE OF THE UNDER SECRETARY
Doc # 2004-17



STATE EDUCATION INDICATORS WITH A FOCUS ON TITLE I 2000–01

Prepared for:

**U.S. Department of Education
Office of the Under Secretary**

By:

Andra Williams

Rolf K. Blank

Abigail Potts

Carla Toyé

of the

Council of Chief State School Officers

Washington, D.C.

2 0 0 4

This report was prepared for the U.S. Department of Education under Contract No. ED-01-CO-0040-0001. The project monitors were Daphne Kaplan, Collette Roney, and Kirsten Duncan in the Policy and Program Studies Service. The views expressed herein are those of the contractor. No official endorsement by the U.S. Department of Education is intended or should be inferred.

U.S. Department of Education

Rod Paige
Secretary

June 2004

This report is in the public domain. Authorization to reproduce it in whole or in part is granted. While permission to reprint this publication is not necessary, the citation should be: U.S. Department of Education, Policy and Program Studies Service, *State Education Indicators with a Focus on Title I, 2000–01*, Washington, D.C.: 2004.

Copies of this report may be ordered the following ways:

- Mail. Write to ED Pubs, Education Publications Center, U.S. Department of Education, P.O. Box 1398, Jessup, MD 20794-1398.
- Fax. Dial 301.470.1244
- Telephone (toll-free). Dial 877.433.7827 (877.4ED.PUBS). If 877 service is not yet available in your area, call 800.872.5327 (800.USA.LEARN). Those who use a telecommunications device for the deaf (TDD) or a teletypewriter (TTY) should call 800.437.0833.
- Electronic mail. Send your request to: edpubs@inet.ed.gov
- Online. Order a copy of the report at: www.edpubs.org. This report may also be downloaded from the Department's Web site at: <http://www.ed.gov/about/offices/list/ous/ppss/index.html>.
- Alternate formats. Upon request, this report is available in alternate formats such as Braille, large print, audiotope, or computer diskette. For more information, please contact the Department's Alternate Format Center at 202.260.9895 or 202.205.8113.

Contents

Introduction: State Education Indicators

Report Objectives and Design	v
Guide to State Indicator Profiles	v
Progress of State Standards and Assessments	viii
Sample State Trends Analysis	ix
Uses of State Indicators	x
Acknowledgments	xii

National Summary

Table 1: State Progress toward Development of Accountability System

Table 2: Availability of Student Achievement Results by Disaggregated Category, 2000–01

Table 3: Summary by State of Students at Proficient Level or Higher, by State Definition

Table 4: Sample Student Achievement Trends, 1996–2001

State Profiles

Alabama	Louisiana	Oklahoma
Alaska	Maine	Oregon
Arizona	Maryland	Pennsylvania
Arkansas	Massachusetts	Puerto Rico
California	Michigan	Rhode Island
Colorado	Minnesota	South Carolina
Connecticut	Mississippi	South Dakota
Delaware	Missouri	Tennessee
District of Columbia	Montana	Texas
Florida	Nebraska	Utah
Georgia	Nevada	Vermont
Hawaii	New Hampshire	Virginia
Idaho	New Jersey	Washington
Illinois	New Mexico	West Virginia
Indiana	New York	Wisconsin
Iowa	North Carolina	Wyoming
Kansas	North Dakota	
Kentucky	Ohio	

Sources

Appendixes

Appendix A: Further State Proficiency Level Definitions

Appendix B: Sources of Funding 1999–2000

Appendix C: National Assessment for Educational Progress—Definitions and Further Information

Introduction

Report Objectives and Design

State Education Indicators with a Focus on Title I 2000–01 is the sixth in a series designed to provide: 1) consistent, reliable indicators to allow analysis of trends for each state over time, 2) high data quality for comparability from state to state, and 3) accessible indicator formats for increased uses by a variety of audiences. The report is based on two-page profiles that report the same indicators for each state.

Guide to State Indicator Profiles

The state profiles contain key measures of the quality of K–12 public education in each state. The profiles in this report focus on the status of each indicator as of the 2000–01 school year, and many indicators also include data for a baseline year to provide analysis of trends over time. The sources section provides more detailed information and explanations for the indicators. It is important to note that the indicators that comprise this report are based on data collected *before* the No Child Left Behind Act of 2001 (NCLB) was enacted. As a result, the state indicators and data reflect Title I requirements under the 1994 Elementary and Secondary Education Act (ESEA) legislation.

The indicators in each state profile are organized in six categories:

School and Teacher Demographics

The indicators in this category provide a statewide picture of characteristics of the public K–12 school system, including schools, teachers and finances. The number of public schools, FTE (full-time equivalent) teachers, and percentage of grade 7–12 teachers with a major in the main subject taught are presented with 1993–94 as a baseline year, permitting comparisons across time. These data are from the Common Core of Data, collected from state departments of education by the National Center for Education Statistics (NCES), and the Schools and Staffing Survey, a sample-based survey of teachers and schools, also conducted by NCES.

Student Demographics

An important aspect of the assessment and evaluation for Title I is the disaggregation of student achievement results by student characteristics. This section of the profile provides a picture of the student enrollment across grades, as well as trends in the student populations in each state, particularly characteristics of students by race or ethnicity, poverty, disability status, English proficiency, and migrant status. The bar graph showing counts of public schools by percent of students eligible for the free or reduced-price lunch program (i.e., students from families below the poverty level) is

useful for reviewing the disaggregated student achievement results reported on the second page of each profile.

Statewide Accountability Information

The information on state accountability systems was compiled from several sources: annual updates collected by the Council of Chief State School Officers (CCSSO) with each state education agency, review of state Internet Web sites, and print reports. The information, collected Winter 2002, reflects the status of the state's system for the 2001–02 school year. The information provides comparable information on the status of state policies defining accountability systems and their relationship to Title I accountability (in cases in which states had not yet developed a unitary accountability system, a requirement in the No Child Left Behind Act of 2001). Definitions of the five indicators on state accountability are:

- **Statewide Goal for Schools on Student Assessment:** As of 2002, 35 states had established a goal, such as percentage of students in a school that will attain the state-defined proficient level on state student assessments in specific subjects.
- **Expected School Improvement on Assessment:** In 2002, 30 states had set a target for the amount of the improvement in student achievement scores for the school by a certain time period (e.g., annually).
- **Title I AYP Target for Schools:** In 2002, 50 states and the District of Columbia had measures of Adequate Yearly Progress (AYP), as required under Title I. Schools that do not meet their AYP targets for two years are identified for improvement actions by the state. In 2002, 18 states had an AYP target for school improvement based on the statewide accountability system, and the report lists “same” for this indicator. If the targets for Title I and non-Title I schools differ, the Title I target is described. (AYP measures for Title I schools were required under the 1994 Elementary and Secondary Education Act reauthorization.)

Title I Schools

To offer a focus on Title I, the report includes several specific indicators for Title I programs. These include the number of Title I schools, either “targeted assistance” programs for low-income children, or “schoolwide programs” for schools with high rates of low-income children (50 percent or higher based on the 1994 ESEA legislation) that use Title I funds to support the learning of all students in the school. Also reported are the percent of each type of Title I schools meeting AYP goals, and the percent of each type of Title I schools identified for school improvement. States report the data on Title I programs in the State Consolidated Performance Report submitted on an annual basis to the U.S. Department of Education. In addition, the report includes the Title I funding allocation per state.

National Assessment of Educational Progress

State-level results on the National Assessment of Educational Progress (NAEP), which are comparable state by state, are reported in the lower right corner of the left page of each state's profile. NAEP proficiency definitions are available in Appendix C.

Student Achievement

The name of the state assessment and state definitions of proficient are included at the top of the right page of each state profile. State assessment aggregate scores were obtained from the State Consolidated Performance Report (Section B) submitted by states annually to the U.S. Department of Education.

Each state determines its state test, how proficiency levels are set and defined, and the grades at which students are tested. Thus, *student achievement scores are not directly comparable state to state*. Within a state, student results, e.g., percent meeting the state's "proficient" level, can be reasonably compared with the same state's performance in the prior year as long as the same test, standards, and definitions of proficiency are in place.

States reported student achievement results for the 2000–01 school year for mathematics and reading or language arts at three grade levels, as specified by Title I requirements prior to the program's reauthorization in the No Child Left Behind Act: elementary school—grade 3, 4 or 5; middle school—grade 6, 7, 8 or 9; and high school—grade 10, 11, or 12. *State Education Indicators* provides disaggregated assessment results for states reporting by schools with Title I programs, schools with 75 percent or more students from low-income families, limited English proficient students, students with disabilities, and migratory students. The availability of results by other student characteristics is listed in the Availability of Student Achievement Results by Disaggregated Category table on pages 4-5.

The "student achievement trend" at the bottom of the second page of each profile shows a histogram with the percent of students that meet or exceed the state definition of "proficient." Histograms are displayed for eight states with 1996–97 as their baseline year for analysis, and 11 states with 1997–98 as their baseline year. In order for a trend to be reported for multiple years, the state must use the same assessment tool and keep the same definition of proficient over time. Changes in these characteristics disqualify a state from having a trend analysis. Table 3 on page 6 provides a summary of student performance for all states for 2000–01, and Table 4 on pages 8-9 summarizes student achievement trends for elementary reading or language arts and middle grades mathematics from 1995–96 through 2000–01.

In the bottom right corner of the right page are reported two measures of student outcomes from secondary schools—the high school dropout rate (based on annual percent of grade 9–12 students leaving school or "event" rate) and the postsecondary enrollment rate (percent of high school graduates enrolled in any postsecondary education institution in the fall of the following school year).

Progress of State Standards and Assessments

This report tracks the progress of state Title I programs, and particularly the development and use of state standards and assessments in state accountability. A goal of the annual report is to chart the progress of states in developing state accountability systems based on state content standards and aligned state assessment programs.

Title I is the largest single grant program of the U.S. Department of Education. For over 30 years, it has earmarked funds for states to provide additional educational support for the neediest children in all 50 states and the outlying territories. Prior to the 2001 reauthorization, schools with greater than 50 percent poverty rates were eligible to operate “schoolwide” programs, which allow funds to be distributed throughout the entire school. Effective in 2002–2003, schools with greater than 40 percent poverty may operate schoolwide programs. Targeted programs channel funds directly to the neediest students.

The 1994 reauthorization of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act (ESEA) required states to monitor the progress of schools in improving the achievement of low-income students, and also required alignment of student achievement tests with state standards for learning that apply to all students. The No Child Left Behind Act, which reauthorized ESEA in 2001, strengthens these requirements and adds a requirement for testing of all students in grades 3–8 and one grade in the 10–12 grade span, by 2005–06. The individual state profiles and trends in assessment results in the *State Education Indicators* report are useful for initial determinations of educational improvements that may be related to Title I programs. The 50-state matrix in Table 1 on pages 2-3 displays key indicators of state progress in developing accountability systems for Title I.

1. Content Standards

As of spring 2002, 49 states plus the District of Columbia and Puerto Rico had completed and implemented content standards meeting Title I requirements for K–12 education in the core academic subjects of English or language arts and mathematics, and 46 states and the District of Columbia had completed and implemented standards for science and social studies or history. The No Child Left Behind Act requires that all states have content standards in mathematics and English or language arts. States are also required to develop science content standards by the 2005–06 school year.

2. State Assessment Results reported by Proficiency Levels

For the 2000–01 school year, 48 states plus the District of Columbia and Puerto Rico reported state assessment results using three or more proficiency levels that were defined by the state. The matrix in Table 1 on pages 2-3 identifies the name of each assessment instrument and the number of proficiency levels reported.

3. State Achievement Results Disaggregated

A key feature of the 1994 reauthorization was a provision that assessment results be disaggregated by characteristics of students. This requirement is retained in the No Child Left Behind Act of 2001. The purpose of disaggregated results and reporting is to increase the possibility that educators and policymakers will analyze and improve the progress of learning through focusing on the students that are most in need of assistance. Under NCLB requirements, states are required by 2002–03 to disaggregate and report state assessment results by school and by students with families in poverty, student race or ethnicity, gender, and student status as disabled, limited-English proficient, and migratory. Table 2 on pages 4-5 summarizes the availability of disaggregated student assessment data. For the 2000–01 school year, 47 states plus the District of Columbia and Puerto Rico reported assessment results using one or more disaggregated categories.

4. Assessment Trends Analysis

As of 2000–01, 27 states had reported at least two years of assessment results using consistent assessments, levels, and grades, and 20 states reported three or more years of results that could be analyzed as trends.

Sample State Trends Analysis

The following is an example of trend analysis in student achievement using data from the Texas assessment program. This sample examines the extent of gains in language arts or reading and mathematics from 1996 to 2001 using consistent data from five years of assessment results, based on the same test with results reported by proficiency levels and disaggregated by school poverty level. Table 4 on pages 8-9 provides additional sample student achievement trends for elementary school reading or language arts and middle school mathematics.

Reading Proficient and higher

	1996	2001	Gain
All Students	78%	91%	13%
High Poverty Schools	67%	85%	18%

Math Proficient and higher

	1996	2001	Gain
All Students	78%	91%	13%
High Poverty Schools	67%	85%	18%

Test—Texas Assessment of Academic Skills (TAAS)—CRT

Texas Definition of Proficient or Above: Score of 70 or above on the Texas Learning Index

For Texas students, a score of 70 or above on the Texas Learning Index (TLI), equaling a proficient or higher rating, indicates that the student has achieved grade level expectations on the TAAS test. The index allows comparisons of student performance from year to year—a consistent score on the TLI indicates a full year of learning; an increase from one year to the next indicates more than a year of learning during the school year, while a decreasing score indicates that less than a year of achievement took place.

In both reading and mathematics, a disparity in achievement is evident between schools with few low-income students and schools with many low-income students. For example, the average school has 91 percent of students proficient or above in reading, while high-poverty schools have 85 percent above this level. Results for both reading and mathematics have improved since 1996 in high-poverty schools, increasing at a rate higher than the rate of improvement for all students.

Across all Texas elementary schools, more than nine out of ten students are at or above the expected levels of performance in mathematics and reading. In schools with high concentrations of low-income children, more than eight out of ten students are proficient in math and reading.

The progress of Texas students in mathematics as measured on the National Assessment of Educational Progress (NAEP) is consistent with the progress of students on the state assessment during the period 1996 to 2000. For example, the percentage of all fourth-grade students at or above the basic mathematics level on NAEP improved 8 percentage points over four years from 1996 to 2000, and 21 percentage points from 1992 to 2000 (from *The Nation's Report Card: State Mathematics 2000, Report for Texas*, U.S. Department of Education, Office of Educational Research and Improvement, 2001). A similar increase in scores can be found in fourth-grade reading, with an increase of 5 percentage points for all students at the basic level or above between 1994 and 1998, and a total increase of 6 percentage points for students between 1992 and 1998.

Beginning with the 2002–03 school year, Texas students are taking a new assessment, the Texas Assessment of Knowledge and Skills (TAKS). The new assessment measures student performance against more challenging standards than the TAAS, and was developed to better measure student performance against the statewide curriculum. The TAKS assesses students on the statewide curriculum in reading, writing, English language arts, mathematics, and social studies at specific points, grades 3–11. Satisfactory performance on the TAKS in grade 11 is necessary in order to receive a high school diploma.

Uses of State Indicators

This report comes at an important time for states, schools, and students. Standards and assessments are at the center of education reform in the states and are a central focus of the No Child Left Behind Act (NCLB). Schools are using Title I funds to develop new approaches to education for low-income and at-risk students. An important goal of these

efforts is to close the gap in educational opportunity and student learning between poor and wealthier students. For anyone tracking information about student achievement in the states, *State Education Indicators with a Focus on Title I* can be a useful tool on several fronts:

Policy Information

This is the only published report that summarizes state assessment results by state using a common format and a consistent method of reporting scores over time. As states have met the federal Title I requirements for reporting on student achievement, and prepare to meet the NCLB requirements, this report provides a central resource for examining trends in improvement of scores and reviewing differences in progress by student characteristics, such as school poverty level. The report also allows state policymakers to see the status of key indicators for states comparable in size, budget, and region. National policymakers have a convenient source for state-by-state statistics, outcomes, programs, and demographics, as well as national totals for comparison.

Data

The *State Education Indicators 2000–01* report provides the sixth year of consistent, reliable data on a range of indicators at the state level. The report is a convenient and comprehensive data source for research and analysis of achievement and other outcomes not only in relation to state program characteristics, such as per pupil expenditures, but also to state demographic context characteristics, such as poverty information.

Monitoring Accountability Systems

As states have developed statewide accountability systems that have gone beyond the requirements for Title I under the 1994 ESEA law, *State Education Indicators* has tracked key information on the differences in definitions of accountability, types of indicators reported, and school and district objectives for improvement. Now, NCLB requires that all states have accountability reporting for each school and district. In this and subsequent editions, *State Education Indicators* will continue to provide a snapshot of the state's development of accountability systems, focusing on key system characteristics such as adequate yearly progress (AYP) starting points, performance levels, annual measurable objectives for improvement, additional indicators, and the percentage of students assessed.

State Education Indicators with a Focus on Title I provides convenient snapshots for policymakers, educators, business leaders, parents, and anyone else in a state working toward increasing the achievement of all students. In addition, when considered in context with other factors, it can be a barometer of the success of efforts to meet the goal of federal and state legislation and policies, which together have the aim of ensuring that all children receive a high quality education, with no child being left behind.

Acknowledgments

The Council of Chief State School Officers received valuable contributions from many organizations and individuals in preparing the *2001 State Education Indicators* report. We consider the report a collaborative effort.

We received strong support from chief state school officers, state assessment directors, and state Title I directors for the idea of a 50-state report profiling key statewide education indicators and indicators of progress of Title I programs. States provided excellent cooperation in reporting not only the state assessment data required under Title I but also further details about state assessment programs and student demographics that provide the context for analyzing assessment results. State education staff carefully reviewed the data in the state profiles and provided important suggestions for improving the report, and we thank them for their continued assistance which makes the profiles possible.

Funding support for the *State Education Indicators* report was provided under a task order from the U.S. Department of Education, Policy and Program Studies Service. We very much appreciate the guidance and assistance provided by staff in the Policy and Program Studies Service, including Daphne Kaplan, Collette Roney, and Kirsten Duncan as well as staff from the Office of Elementary and Secondary Education, including Mary Moran and Chuck Laster. The National Center for Education Statistics provided access to data files from the Common Core of Data, NAEP, and Schools and Staffing Survey, and we particularly thank John Sietsema and Beth Young for their assistance. The database for the state profiles was developed in collaboration with Westat, Inc., and we appreciate the efforts of Beth Sinclair, Nina Blecher, and Babette Gutmann in data collection and project support.

The data were proofed by Abigail Potts, Carla Toyne, and Elizabeth Laird. The state assessment directors, Title I coordinators, and CCD coordinators reviewed the profiles and proofed the state assessment data. The EIAC subcommittee on assessment, co-chaired by Sally Tiel (Idaho) and Louis Fabrizio (North Carolina), reviewed the design and offered suggestions.