Guidance for Title 1 Part D, S1 **Program Evaluation\***

*(\* Modified for state-operated correctional institutions providing educational programs for Title 1 eligible children and youth, based on K-12* [*guidance*](https://www.doe.mass.edu/federalgrants/resources/monitoring/)*.)*

The Title I Part D Subpart 1 program evaluation must be conducted *every three years* to measure the efficacy and outcomes of the Title I funded program. An evaluation committee is formed to carry out, or oversee, an analysis of outcome d*ata that will be documented in a formal evaluation report.* At a *minimum, the report would answer the following questions:*

* ***What measures were used to track academic outcomes for Title 1 students?*** *(Note: Analysis of program outcomes requires that at least one measure be one used for evaluating outcomes for all children/youth served by the grantee, not just Title 1. This allows for comparison which is essential in evaluating program outcomes.)*
* ***Has the program led to*** ***measurable improvements in academic outcomes for Title 1 students?***
* ***What does the data tell us has worked well in the Title I program?***
* ***What does the data tell us has not worked well?***
* ***Does the data indicate that the Title I program should be continued or refined? If so, how? If not, why not, based on the data?***

*The “Title 1 program” is the sum of the grant funded services and resources provided annually so that Title 1 eligible youth: (1) have the opportunity to meet the same challenging State academic standards that all children in Massachusetts are expected to meet; (2) benefit from improvements in educational services; and, (3) receive the support services needed to make a successful transition from the institution to school and/or employment and continue their education upon release. Therefore,* all aspects of the Title I program (i.e., grant funded staff, supplies, equipment, professional development) are included in the evaluation of program’s impact.

The evaluation will focus on direct services for Title 1 students but would also include funded activities intended to influence student achievement (e.g., staff supervision, family engagement activities).

To determine the Title 1 program’s influence on student achievement, data analyses will drive the program evaluation. Analyses would include a review of **quantitative data**, such as formative and summative student assessment results, and the rate of course completions or credential attainment. It would also include **qualitative data** such as teacher/counselor notes on student academic performance or student survey data. Whatever data are analyzed, the final evaluation report (which is required every three years) should prominently feature an analysis of the **Title 1 program outcome measures** reported annually in the [Neglected or Delinquent (N or D) Evaluation](https://www.doe.mass.edu/infoservices/data/nord/) .

At a minimum, the final evaluation report would include:

* **a list of the measures analyzed to evaluate the Title I program**
* **a summary of the methods used to analyze the data (e.g., descriptive analysis, t-tests, statistical significance)**
* **a summary of the outcomes of the completed analyses (e.g., descriptive analysis, statistical significance)**
* **a comparison of Title I students’ achievement with those of similar students not served by Title I (e.g., graduation or GED/HiSET attainment rates of Title 1 vs non-Title 1 students).**
* **a description of program elements that the evaluation reveals as the following: 1) supporting or facilitating improvements student outcomes, 2) having no bearing on improving student outcomes, and/or 3) hindering improvements in or positive student achievement outcomes**
* **recommended changes to the program or, alternatively, justification for maintaining existing services/activities, informed by the findings of the evaluation and supported with data from the analysis**

The following is offered as an example of a Title I program’s annual evaluation process illustrating how a Title I Part D program might be evaluated. This is only an example.

Example of an Evaluation of a Title I Part D S 1 Program

In late September, the XYZ Correctional Institution established an evaluation committee comprised of:

* the education director
* re-entry director
* superintendent of programing
* an independent evaluator (N*ote: an independent evaluator must be an unbiased individual or organization with no vested interest in the outcome of the evaluation*)

In December, the committee met to plan the evaluation of its Title I program, which consisted of a math boot-camp with a peer tutoring component. The committee’s initial goal was to identify a method for determining the influence of these services on student achievement outcomes in the years ahead. To that end, they planned to review and use one or more review protocols highlighted in the [studies](https://ies.ed.gov/ncee/wwc/Intervention/380) that the teacher used in developing the boot-camp program. This would include a review of the peer tutoring component. Since there were no relevant review protocols for the peer tutoring component, they planned to develop one, by the end of March, with guidance from DESE. The committee also established a plan for collecting the following quantitative and qualitive data:

* A comparison of formative and summative math performance data for boot camp participants and similar students not participating in the non-boot camp
* Comparison of attendance and participation data for Title I students receiving math support in the boot camp and the other students not receiving math support in the boot camp.
* Observation notes of student participation and student demonstration of academic skills from classroom teachers, counselors, parents/family members, if available[[1]](#footnote-1)
* Boot camp students’ survey results including one or more questions about the extent to which students believe that the peer tutoring had a positive impact on their math skills and/or achievement.

The evaluation committee’s goal was to begin their evaluation of the program in mid-July guided by the following high-level questions:

(1) **Has the program** **led to** **measurable improvements in math achievement for boot-camp students compared to similar students who did not attend the boot camp?**

(2) **Does the data analyzed indicate that** **improvements in student math achievement, or lack thereof, are tied to one or more program component (e.g., peer support, boot camp curriculum, boot camp schedule)**?

No later than August 1, the committee would share their results with the Title I coordinator and staff to determine if there is a need for changes to the program or the evaluation plan for next year.

1. It is important that everyone included is a “reliable reporter”. People asked to evaluate themselves (e.g., teachers evaluating the quality of instruction), are not unbiased, nor should qualitative data be provided by those with a vested interest in the results (e.g., grant funded counselor asked to report on students’ effort or persistence). [↑](#footnote-ref-1)