

MEMORANDUM

Feb 24, 2016

TO: Staff, Community, Board Members

FROM: Oscar Garcia, Ed.D. SFDR-CISD, Director of Federal Programs

SUBJECT: **STATE COMPENSATORY EDUCATION REPORT**

CONTACT: Oscar Garcia, Ed.D.,
830-778-4152

Attached is the State Compensatory Education report for the 2014–2015 school year. The State Compensatory Education (SCE) program is designed to reduce dropout rates and increase academic performance of students identified as being at-risk of dropping out of school. SCE operates as a funding source to supplement instructional services and offer academic support to students who meet the SCE at-risk criteria established by the state. Funds allocated under SCE law are to be channeled toward programs and services that eliminate disparities in performance on assessment instruments administered under Subchapter B, Chapter 39.

Some of the SCE highlights are as follows:

- Of the 10,643 students attending SFDR-CISD, 51% were identified as being at-risk according to SCE criteria.
- District wide, on the 2014 STAAR results the following achievement rates were noted: Grade 3:-Reading- 58%, Grade 4 Reading- 60%, -Writing 59%, Grade 5- Reading 71%, Science-56%, Grade 6 Reading -69%, Grade 7-Reading-60%- Writing 56%, 8th Grade-Reading- 71%-Science-51% Social Studies-41%. Data indicates the achievement gap did not decrease using State and district standards for all STAAR assessments. **(2014 and 2015 STAAR Results - Table A)**
- District wide, on the 2014 STAAR EOC, the gaps in the percent of at-risk students who met the satisfactory standard were for English 1- 55%, English 2- 62%, U.S. History 91%, Algebra 1 - 77%, Biology – 81% **(2014 and 2015 EOC Results - Table B)**
- For the class of 2014, 89.8% students graduated from SFDR-CISD. Due to fluctuating class sizes, gaps between the two groups widened from 2013 to 2014 for graduation rates.
- In general, the 2014 English STAAR and STAAR EOC results indicate that passing rates of students who received and/or participated in various SCE programs and services did not exceed the passing rates of all at-risk students across the district.

Should you have any questions, please contact my office:

Oscar Garcia, Ed.D, Federal and State Programs Department
830-778-4152.

Attachment cc:
Superintendent
Curriculum
School Staff
Principals
DPDM



**SAN FELIPE-DEL RIO C.I.S.D.
STATE COMPENSATORY
EDUCATION REPORT
2015-2016**

2015 Board of Education

Cecilia Martinez-Lozano
President

Joshua Overfelt
Vice President

Amy Haynes
Secretary

Roberto Chavira
Board Member

Charles Garabedian
Board Member

Raymond P. Meza
Board Member

Carlos Rios, Ed.D.
Superintendent of Schools

It is the policy of the San Felipe Del Rio School District not to discriminate on the basis of age, color, handicap or disability, ancestry, national origin, marital status, race, religion, sex, veteran status, political affiliation, sexual orientation, gender identity and/or gender expression in its educational or employment programs and activities.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Summary

Introduction

Methods

Discussion

Tables

AN EVALUATION OF STATE COMPENSATORY EDUCATION, 2015-2016

Summary

Program Description

The State Compensatory Education (SCE) program is designed to reduce dropout rates and increase academic performance of students identified as being at-risk of dropping out of school. SCE operates as a funding source to supplement instructional services and offer academic support to students who meet the SCE at-risk criteria established by the state. Funds allocated under SCE law are to be channeled toward programs and services that eliminate disparities in performance on assessment instruments administered under Subchapter B, Chapter 39. Further, programs designated for SCE funding should reduce disparities in the rates of high school completion between students who are at-risk of dropping out of school and all other students. Terra Nova, LAS –LINKS, and Woodcock- Munoz were used as the assessment tools for Bilingual students. The assessments measured grades 1 and 2. The State of Texas Assessments of Academic Readiness (STAAR) served as the state assessment measures for grades 3 through 8. STAAR End-of-Course (EOC) served as the state assessment measurement for grades 9 through 11 for the 2014–2015 school year. In order for SCE funds to be allocated to a campus, the campus must not only meet the state criteria for percent of students at-risk of dropping out of school, but the services provided to students must also be described in the district and/or campus improvement plan.

As defined by law, SCE programs and/or services are designed to supplement the regular education program that districts offer to students and these funds must provide additional support for at-risk students. Supplemental costs include costs for program and student evaluation, instructional materials and equipment, and other supplies required for quality instruction, supplemental staff expenses, salary for teachers of at-risk students, smaller class sizes, and individualized instruction (TEC §42.152(c)).

Program Cost and Funding Source

The annual budget for SCE programs in SFDR-CISD for the 2014–2015 academic year was \$3,144,162.50. These amounts are budgeted amounts and not final expenditures for 2015–2016.

Recommendations

1. From 2014-2015, performance gaps between at-risk and non-at-risk students widened. This indicates that schools should focus on emphasizing the same level of growth for at-risk students at all grade levels.
2. All Elementary and Secondary campuses need to focus on ensuring that at-risk students are advancing at the same rate as not at-risk students, if not at a higher rate. Campuses need to utilize academic interventions/support services, QTEL, summer school, tutoring and credit recovery. STAAR results must be used to determine effective strategies.
3. Increase support for our student success through enhanced literacy initiatives to reduce dropouts and increase completion rates.

Administrative Response

The State Compensatory Education Department has reviewed the 2014–2015 State Compensatory Education evaluation report that assessed the implementation of the State Compensatory Education programs in SFDR-CISD. The evaluation met the department's expectations in terms of providing budgetary data for all schools and (3) centralized programs. These programs include (1) the district Disciplinary Alternative Education Programs (SGLC); (2) Val Verde Juvenile Center; and, (3) Blended Academy- School Wide (2016).

Introduction

Program Description

The State Compensatory Education (SCE) program is designed to reduce dropout rates and increase academic performance of students identified as being at-risk of dropping out of school. SCE operates as a funding source to supplement instructional services and offer academic support to students who meet the SCE at-risk criteria established by the state. Funds allocated under SCE law are to be channeled toward programs and services that eliminate disparities in performance on assessment instruments administered under Subchapter B, Chapter 39. Further, programs designated for SCE funding should reduce disparities in the rates of high school completion between students who are at-risk of dropping out of school and all other students. The State of Texas Assessments of Academic Readiness (STAAR) served as the state assessment measures for grades 3 through 8; and STAAR End-of-Course (EOC) served as the state assessment measures for grades 9 through 11 for the 2014–2015 school year. In order for SCE funds to be allocated to a campus, the campus must not only meet the state criteria for percent of students at-risk of dropping out of school, but the services provided to students must also be described in the district and/or campus improvement plan.

As defined by law, SCE programs and/or services are designed to supplement the regular education program that districts offer to students and funds must provide additional support for at-risk students. Supplemental costs include costs for program and student evaluation, instructional materials and equipment and other supplies required for quality instruction, supplemental staff expenses, salary for teachers of at-risk students, smaller class sizes, and individualized instruction (TEC §42.152(c)).

Program History

Since the early 1960s, federal, state, and local governmental agencies have demonstrated concern regarding the provision of equitable and appropriate learning opportunities for economically disadvantaged youth served in public educational institutions. The growing number of disadvantaged students, particularly in large, urban school districts, helped fuel the compensatory education movement. The underlying assumption was that many students were at an educational disadvantage because of circumstances associated with their minority and/or socioeconomic status, which ultimately contributed to their lowered academic achievement. Supporters of the movement maintained that these students should be provided extra assistance to “compensate” for those disadvantages (Rossi and Montgomery, 1994).

In 1975, Texas joined the compensatory education movement by enacting the first of a series of legal and administrative guidelines, which, in amended form, shaped compensatory education programs in Texas. Then, in 1997, Senate Bill 1873 amended Section 42.152 of the Texas Education Code and placed new restrictions on compensatory education. The bill required that school districts develop reporting and auditing systems to monitor the use of compensatory education funds.

The next major change came in 2001 when Senate Bill 702 (TEC §29.081), amended the sections of the Texas Education Code that governed the SCE Program. First, the statute required school districts to use student performance on basic skills assessment and achievement tests administered under Subchapter B, Chapter 39, to design and implement appropriate compensatory, intensive or accelerated instructional services for students at-risk of dropping out of school, to enable these students to perform at grade level at the conclusion of the subsequent regular school term. SCE legislation later expanded funding to cover mentoring services to at-risk students (Senate Bill 16 of the 78th Legislature), those services being accelerated reading programs and programs helping students who have dyslexia or a related disorder (House Bill 1691 of the 78th Legislature).

In 2003, House Bill 3459 amended the sections of the Texas Education Code that govern the SCE Program to allow use of the compensatory education allotment to fund costs that are attributed to programs that are specifically designed to serve students at-risk of dropping out of school, as defined by Texas Education Code Section 29.081. The bill also lowered the required threshold percentage for low income students on a campus to 40 percent (or greater), which was expected to permit expanded use of the SCE allotment to supplement school-wide components of federal *No Child Left Behind* projects.

Senate Bill 16 in 2003 amended Subchapter C, Chapter 29 of the Texas Education Code so programs that provide mentoring services to students at risk of dropping out of school are eligible to be charged to the state compensatory education allotment.

In 2009, House Bill 2703 added a provision to §29.081 that changed the compensatory education definition of “student at risk of dropping out of school” by excluding a student who did not advance from prekindergarten or kindergarten to the next grade level only as the result of the request of the student’s parents. Previously, any student who was not advanced from one grade level to the next was defined by §29.081(d) (1) as a “student at risk of dropping out of school.”

Under House Bill 5, the age of students considered “at-risk” for dropping out of school increased from 21 to 26 years of age for state compensatory education eligibility purposes. House Bill 5 also amended TEC §29.081 to require school districts to offer, without cost to a student, additional accelerated instruction in any subject if the student failed to perform satisfactorily on an EOC assessment test that measures the knowledge and skills in that course and is required for graduation. The LEA is required to separately budget and prioritize state compensatory education funding and any other funding necessary for additional accelerated instruction for students who fail to perform satisfactorily on an EOC assessment instrument.

The LEA should also determine whether the student meets any of the other criteria under TEC §29.081(d). An LEA should also review local eligibility criteria adopted by the board of trustees in accordance with TEC §29.081(g) to determine whether the student is eligible for services/supports.

Purpose of the Evaluation Report

The purpose of this report is to describe and evaluate the SCE funded programs in SFDR-CISD as required by law. The district must evaluate and document the effectiveness of instructional programs in reducing any disparities in performance on the STAAR, and STAAR EOC and disparities in the rates of high school completion between students at-risk of dropping out of school and all other district students. This evaluation compares at-risk students’ STAAR, and STAAR EOC with the performance of their not at-risk counterparts. As required by the TEA (2004),

Differences in passing rates between at-risk and not at-risk students are reported for the past three years when data is available so that movement in reducing the disparity in passing rates can be ascertained.

In compliance with guidelines specified by the TEA (2004), high school completion rates are reported for at-risk and not at-risk students attending SFDR-CISD. As will be discussed in more detail in the Methods section of this report, the reported completion rate includes students who graduated, received a GED, or continued to be enrolled.

Additionally, the district must evaluate and document the effectiveness of instructional programs in reducing any disparities in performance on the STAAR, and STAAR EOC and disparities in the rates of high school completion between students at-risk of dropping out of school and all other district students. These evaluations are required annually. SCE resources must be redirected when evaluations indicate that programs and/or services are unsuccessful in producing desired results for students at-risk of dropping out of school (TEA, 2004).

Finally, this evaluation provides a profile of the SCE programs and services offered to at-risk students in SFDR-CISD during the 2014–2015 school year. Examples of some programs and services are: credit by exam, BOY, EOY, MOY, summer school, credit recovery, exposure to university settings, achievement awards and recognitions. The evaluation of individual programs and services is summarized in the Budget Worksheet.

Methods

Data Collection

Student data were obtained using a variety of sources. In SFDR-CISD, the Public Education Information Management System (PEIMS) database served as the foundation from which students were matched and information was combined with other sources of data for analysis. PEIMS is a statewide data collection and reporting system operated by the state, which includes extensive information on students, staffing, and school budget/finances and serves as the fundamental database for many statewide reports on public education, such as the new Texas Academic Performance Report (TAPR). PEIMS contains information from the “fall snapshot” of students taken on the last Friday of October each academic year. Most student demographic information and at-risk status are taken from the PEIMS October, 2014 snapshot. Completion status and attendance data were also obtained from PEIMS.

Student performance on the STAAR and STAAR EOC were extracted from their respective databases. Information for multiple years was extracted with the number of years dependent on state reporting requirements.

Data Analysis

At-Risk Status

Students were identified as being at-risk if they were labeled as such in the PEIMS database. If a student was identified as at-risk in the PEIMS database, then that information was attached to the student's scores in the STAAR, STAAR EOC databases.

Attendance Rate

Attendance rate outcomes were calculated by dividing the total number of students' days present at the educational program or service by the students' total number of days eligible to participate in the program or service for the 2013–2014 and the 2014–2015 school years. Attendance rates for specific programs were analyzed by matching the electronic file submitted by program personnel to the summer resubmission of the Average Daily Attendance (ADA) database. Students in all grades were included in the calculations with the exception of students with multiple impairments.

Completion Rate Indicator

The annual TAPR report provides a completion rate indicator for individual campuses and districts in the state of Texas. The formula used by the TEA was adopted for this report. The completion rate is calculated based on a cohort of students identified at ninth grade for the first time and tracked longitudinally for four years. Students are excluded from this cohort as specified in TEC §39.053. To become a member of the cohort, a student must have attained one of the following final statuses: (i) graduated, (ii) received a GED, (iii) continued in a Texas public high school in the fall following the completion year of interest, or (iv) dropped out. All four of these calculations use the number of first-time ninth graders in the longitudinal cohort, plus transfers in, minus transfers out, which is the denominator of the rate calculations. The results presented are with exclusions applied.

For the numerator of the rate calculation, the first three of the above outcomes (high school diplomas, GEDs, and continuing students) are summed. These three indicators are then divided by the number of students in the 9th grade cohort of interest (the sum of all four outcome indicators). This is referred to as the completion indicator. Completion rates are calculated separately for at-risk and not at-risk students.

Completion rate is a lagging indicator, meaning that information is only available to report one year after the completion of the previous academic year. Thus, completion information is available only for the class of 2015 and previous academic years.

STAAR Performance

The report provides information pertaining to the proportion of at-risk and not at-risk students on the English and Spanish STAAR assessments for grades 3–8 for 2014 who met the satisfactory standard at the current phase-in 1 standard. Differences in percentages of students meeting the satisfactory standard between at-risk and not at-risk students are also reported. Student performance was reported for the overall district and at the school level. The only students whose scores were included in the analysis of school and district-level performance were those students who were present during the “fall snapshot.” That is, students who transferred into the district after that point in October were not included in these analyses.

STAAR EOC Performance

The report provides information pertaining to the proportion of at-risk and not at-risk students who met the satisfactory phase-in 1 standard on the STAAR EOC tests for Algebra, Biology, English I, English II, and US History for 2015, expressed as a percent. Differences in percentages of students meeting the satisfactory standard between at-risk and not at-risk students are also reported. Student performance was reported for the overall district and the school level. The only students whose scores were included in the analysis of school and district-level performance were those students who were present during the “fall snapshot.” That is, students who transferred into the district after that point in October were not included in these analyses.

Discussion

Overall, the findings from the State Compensatory Education Report indicated that at-risk students underperform their not at-risk counterparts in every measure. Continued support for students at risk of dropping out of school is necessary in order to improve their performance and close the achievement gap. At-risk students represent 51% of the students in SFDR-CISD.

SFDR-CISD must continue to implement programs to address student achievement and graduation rates. The district is focusing on the recruitment of highly qualified teachers and supporting them with on-going professional development. Additional emphasis in high school such as tutoring, increased academic support, professional development and credit recovery is provided to help students complete credits for graduation. At the elementary and middle school levels, the achievement gaps between at-risk and not at-risk students have not been satisfactorily reduced. Further efforts are needed to improve the achievement of at-risk students in the K–8 grade levels.

At the high school level, the gaps between at-risk and not at-risk students also widened, but not to the same magnitude as the elementary and middle school levels. The performance gap from English I and English II drives the result of the performance gap increasing from the 2013–2014 to the 2014–2015 school year. Previous measures of performance on English EOC exams had similarly sized gaps, therefore if a directly comparable measure of English I or English II existed, then the growth between the gaps seen in the report could disappear.

Texas Education Agency (2004). Compensatory education guidelines. *Financial Accountability System Resource Guide*. Austin, TX: Texas Education Agency.

Texas Education Agency (2005, indexed). High school completion rates: Investigating a longitudinal performance measure for Texas schools. *Policy Research Report prr8*, pm6.5. [On-line]. Available: <http://www.tea.state.tx.us/research/pdfs/prr8.pdf>

U. S. Department of Education, Office of Elementary and Secondary Education. (1997, November). Prevention and intervention programs for children and youth who are neglected, delinquent, or at-risk of dropping out: Guidance, State agency programs (Part D, Subpart 1), Local agency programs (Part D, Subpart 2) *Part D, Subparts 1 and 2 of Title I, Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965 as amended by the Improving America's School Act of 1994* (Public Law 103-382) [On-line]. <http://www.ed.gov/offices/OESE/CEP/nord3.html>.

Del Rio HS #001	Teachers : 11 Instr. Aide: 5 Secretaries: 1 Professionals: 1 Instr Supplmnts: 10 Total Staff: 28 Total Campus Payroll: <u>\$914,175.00</u>	Internet & Sprint Cards: \$2778.71 Misc. Contracted Services: 11,535.00 General Supplies: 2,000.00 General Supplies: 1,093.26 Total: <u>\$17,406.97</u>
Del Rio Freshman #002	Teachers: 4 Instr. Aide: 3 Instr Supplmnts: 3 Professionals: 1 Total Staff: 11 Total Campus Payroll: <u>\$381,764.83</u>	Computer Software & Lic: \$8,282.94 General Supplies: 1,000.00 Total: <u>\$9,282.94</u>
Blended Academy #004	Teachers: 6 Secretaries: 1 Counselor : 1 Principal: 1 Instr Supplmnts: 0 Total Staff: 9 Total Campus Payroll: <u>\$465,153.70</u>	<u>NONE</u>
Del Rio Middle School #043	Teachers: 2 Instr. Aide: 4 Professional: 1 Instr Supplmnts: 1 Total Staff: 8 Total Campus Payroll: <u>\$262,710.20</u>	General Supplies: \$2,000.00 Travel- Employee 894.48 Only: Total: <u>\$2,894.48</u>
San Felipe Memorial Middle School #104	Teachers: 2 Instr. Aide: 4 Professional: 1 Instr Supplmnts: 1 Total Staff: 8 Total Campus Payroll: <u>\$313,660.90</u>	Computer Software & Lic: \$5000.50 Travel/Employee Only: 500.00 Total: <u>\$5,500.00</u>
Garfield Elementary #102	Teachers: 1 Instr. Aide: 2 Professional: 1 Coor/Prof: 0.125 Instr Supplmnts:1 Total Staff: 5.125 Total Campus Payroll: <u>\$175,911.04</u>	General Supplies: \$1,000.00 General Supplies: 1,500.00 Travel/Emp Only 588.76 Total: <u>\$3,088.76</u>
North Heights Elementary #103	Teachers: 1 Instr. Aide: 1 Professional: 1 Instr Supplmnts:1 Coor/Prof: 0.125 Total Staff: 4.125 Total Campus Payroll: <u>\$172,304.73</u>	Reading Materials: \$2,000.00 Placement Testing: 3,500.00 General Supplies: 1,000.00 General Supplies: 2,308.22 Travel/Emp Only: 2,047.24 Total: <u>\$10,855.46</u>

Lamar #106	Teachers : 1 Instr. Aide: 1 Professionals: 1 Instr Supplmnts: 1 Coor/Prof: 0.125 Total Staff: 4.125 Total Campus Payroll: <u>\$176,208.15</u>	General Supplies: \$ 1,000.00 General Supplies: 1,500.00 Total: <u>\$2500.00</u>
Irene Cardwell Head Start #108	Teachers: 5 @ %s Instr. Aide: 39 @ %s Coor/Prof: 0.125 Instr Supplmnts: 0 Total Staff: 14.095 Total Campus Payroll: <u>\$375,479.39</u>	Computer Software & Lic: \$3,353.92 Total: <u>\$3,353.92</u>
Buena Vista Elementary #110	Instr Aide: 1 Coor/Prof: 0.125 Professionals: 1 Instr Supplmnts:1 Total: 3.125 Total Campus Payroll: <u>\$109,120.85</u>	General Supplies: \$1,000.00 General Supplies: 1,500.00 Travel/Emp Only: 854.99 Travel/Emp Only: 500.00 Travel/Emp Only: 650.00 Total: <u>\$4,504.99</u>
Ruben Chavira Elementary #111	Instr Aide: 2 Coor/Prof: 0.125 Teachers : 1 Instr Supplmnts: 0 Total: 3.125 Total Campus Payroll: <u>\$145,362.73</u>	General Supplies: \$1,000.00 General Supplies: 1,500.00 Travel/Emp Only: 1,436.00 Travel/Emp Only: 650.00 Total: <u>\$4,586.00</u>
Dr. Fermin Calderon Elementary #112	Instr Aide: 1 Coor/Prof: 0.125 Teachers : 1 Professionals: 1 Instr Supplmnts:1 Total: 4.125 Total Campus Payroll: <u>\$181,339.06</u>	General Supplies: \$1,000.00 General Supplies: 2,500.00 Total: <u>\$3,500.00</u>
Dr. Lonnie Green Elementary #113	Instr Aide: 2 Coor/Prof: 0.125 Teachers : 1 Professionals: 1 Instr Supplmnts: 1 Total: 5.125 Total Campus Payroll: <u>\$203,696.86</u>	General Supplies: \$1,000.00 General Supplies: 1,335.01 Travel/Emp Only: 1,323.47 Travel/Emp Only: 650.00 Total: <u>\$4,308.48</u>
Student Guidance/ Learning Center	Teachers: 5 Counselors: 1 Instr Aide: 1 Instr Supplmnts:1 Total: 8 Total Campus Payroll: <u>\$432,538.73</u>	<u>NO SUPPLIES</u>

Federal Programs	Para/Other: 0.5 Secretaries: 0.5 Directors/Prof: 0.5 Total: 1.5 <u>Total Payroll: \$100,950.83</u>	<u>NO SUPPLIES</u>
Pupil and Family Services	All Clerks : 3 Total: 3 <u>Total Payroll: \$132,710.82</u>	<u>NO SUPPLIES</u>
Special Education	NONE	General Supplies: \$11,000 Travel/Misc: \$10,300.00 Total: \$21,300.00
Instruction	Substitutes and Extra Duty: <u>Total Payroll: \$166,998.26</u>	General Supplies: \$36,076.98 Transportation/Yellow Buses: \$6,206.06 Total: \$42,283.04
Summer School	<u>Extra Duty:</u> <u>\$38,041.00</u>	General Supplies/Custodial: \$1,300.00 Total: \$1,300.00
	<u>Total Campus Salaries:</u> <u>\$4,748,127.08</u>	<u>Total Supplies/Travel</u> <u>\$136,665.04</u>

2014 and 2015 STAAR TESTING RESULTS

TABLE A	<u>2014 STAAR</u>	<u>2015 STAAR</u>
Grade 3 Reading	58%	68%
Grade 4 Reading	60%	58%
Grade 4 Writing	62%	59%
Grade 5 Reading	71%	74%
Grade 5 Science	56%	58%
Grade 6 Reading	69%	62%
Grade 7 Reading	60%	58%
Grade 7 Writing	56%	55%
Grade 8 Reading	71%	69%
Grade 8 Science	51%	53%
Grade 8 Social Studies	41%	48%

2014 and 2015 End of Course (EOC) Exam Results

TABLE B	<u>2014 EOC EXAM</u>	<u>2015 EOC EXAM</u>
ENGLISH 1	55%	54%
ENGLISH 2	62%	60%
US HISTORY	91%	85%
ALGEBRA I	77%	72%
BIOLOGY	81%	78%