Indiana
DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION

Dr. Jennifer McCormick
Superintendent of Public Instruction
Working Together for Student Success

Title I Program Evaluation Toolkit

Indiana Department of Education
Title Grants & Support

Disclaimer: IDOE staff have not yet been able to pilot this document as intended. As such, it is a living document that will be continuously improved.

LIFECYLE OF PROGRAM EVALUATION

For a comprehensive evaluation, IDOE recommends programs be evaluated district-wide to emphasize a systems-approach to implementing Title I, enabling analysis of student achievement and progress from preschool access to graduation and beyond.

Comprehensive Needs Assessment Template

Phases

I. Establish a Comprehensive Needs Assessment planning team
II. Develop a vision of excellence
III. Create a school profile
IV. Identify focus areas
V. Collect additional data on focus areas
VI. Analyze data to determine key findings and root causes

STAGE 1: COMPREHENSIVE NEEDS ASSESSMENT

The purpose of a Comprehensive Needs Assessment (CNA) is to identify effective school features to learn from, replicate, and scale as well as to identify areas for growth.

STAGE 2: SCHOOL IMPROVEMENT PLAN

The School Improvement Plan (SIP), including school-wide plans, should serve as a road map that sets out the changes a school needs to make to improve the level of student achievement, illustrating how and when these changes will be made.

School Improvement Plan Template

Phases

I. From a School Improvement Plan development team
II. Develop a vision of excellence
III. Identify focus areas, root causes, and root causes
IV. Develop the school's core components to identify opportunities to address focus areas
V. Create evidence-based interventions that addresses the school's focus areas
VI. Develop a professional development plan
VII. Develop a roadmap to guide implementation of the school improvement plan

Indiana
DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION

IDOE Programmatic Self-Audit Assessment

Disclaimer:

Risk Assessment

Disclaimer:

STAGE 3: PROGRAMMATIC SELF-AUDIT ASSESSMENT

The self-audit assessment is a proactive tool to be used to predict audit probability and monitor the overall compliance of LEA Federally-funded program practices.

STAGE 4: TITLE I PROGRAM EVALUATION

The Title I Program Evaluation Toolkit is designed to support LEAs as they evaluate the effectiveness of their Title I programs. It may also be used to evaluate other Federal Grants.

Title I School-Wide Programs: Why Evaluate?

Close your eyes for a moment and imagine the following. You are visiting a Kindergarten classroom. As you walk into the room, you see what might be termed "managed chaos." Students are working on iPads on beanbags around the room, a group of four students are working with the classroom teacher, another group of four is working with a paraprofessional, the remainder of the students are spread around the room working on different tasks.

You continue into the room to see what everyone is actually doing. First you kneel down to talk to a student on the iPad. She is working with an online software focused upon building reading skills, such as Lexia. When asked what she is learning, the student is able to explain what she is doing and why.

Next you stop at a table of students who are also on iPads. This group is working both with a partner or individually using Osmo Letters. The partners are playing a sight word game to see who can spell the words first. Students working individually are trying to match the first letter of the word they have heard as they practice beginning sounds.

The paraprofessional table is working on making sense of words placed in sentence order. Each student has a set of words to unscramble to make meaning as well as adding correct punctuation at the end. The sentences have come from a book they have been reading.

At the teacher table, he is working with students on a close read of a book they will be reading tomorrow. These students need extra help in accessing the text either due to a learning deficit or language acquisition. The teacher wants them to be able to fully participate in the discussion tomorrow with peers.

Other students are working at a listening center, writing a different ending to a story they just heard, finding math words in the story and illustrating what the word means, or asking and recording questions being posed to a partner questions about a current event the class has covered.

Question: How does this relate to Title I and evaluating the program? In the classroom above, Title I funds are funding Lexia, the paraprofessional, Osmo kits, several of the iPads, and books for the classroom library. How do you decide if these funds are being used effectively to increase student achievement in not only this classroom, but all classrooms, and by extension, all schools, using Title I funds?

With the *Title I Program Evaluation Toolkit*, the Indiana Department of Education (IDOE) seeks to support you as you conduct comprehensive, collaborative evaluations of your Title I programs to identify areas of strength and of needed improvement and effectively implement revisions to strengthen student outcomes.

Using the Title I Program Evaluation Toolkit

The *Title I Program Evaluation Toolkit* is designed to support LEAs as they evaluate the effectiveness of their Title I programs. For a more comprehensive evaluation, IDOE recommends programs be evaluated district-wide to emphasize a systems-approach to implementing Title I, enabling analysis of student achievement and progress from preschool access to graduation and beyond. The toolkit is also appropriate for school-based program evaluations, as we recognize that schools have diverse needs and contexts, so they need evaluations best suited to them.

Before beginning the process, LEA's should develop a few general questions they want to answer in this program evaluation. These questions can, and probably will, change throughout the process. However, establishing these questions at the very beginning can help inform and frame each of the evaluation steps, so all of the necessary team members are selected and relevant data is collected. Complete the table below and add questions as necessary. Examples of how questions can be worded include: to what extent does this program impact a specific student outcome; how much planning and instructional time is needed for this program to be successfully implemented in the classroom, and how invested are teachers in implementation of the program.

Title I Program Evaluated:	
Evaluation Question 1:	
Evaluation Question 2:	
Evaluation Question 3:	

LEAs are encouraged to appoint one member of the evaluation team as the evaluation coordinator. The evaluation coordinator may delegate certain tasks, but will be responsible for scheduling and facilitating meetings, data collection, and oversight of the evaluation timeline. The evaluation coordinator is encouraged to review all provided training materials provided by IDOE and connect evaluation team members with resources according to their roles and needs.

The evaluation process will vary in length and scope according to local context, but IDOE recommends that LEAs plan to complete the first six steps of the evaluation over a period of at least eight weeks to allow adequate time to collect data, solicit stakeholder input, research evidence-based strategies, and develop a comprehensive plan of action. The final two steps of the evaluation will be conducted over the course of the school year on an ongoing basis. IDOE recommends that LEAs conduct a comprehensive program evaluation once every three years, with annual interim evaluations of success. A suggested timeline for program evaluation is provided below:

Evaluation Task	Estimated Time Needed
Step 1: Assembling the Evaluation Team	2 Weeks
Step 2: Gathering Data	3-4 Weeks
Step 3: Defining the Current State	Half- or Full-Day In-Person Meeting*
Step 4: Identifying Needs	Half- or Full-Day In-Person Meeting*
Step 5: Setting Goals	Half- or Full-Day In-Person Meeting*
Step 6: Developing a Plan of Action	Half- or Full-Day In-Person Meeting*
Step 7: Implementing the Plan of Action	Determined by Evaluation Team
Step 8: Evaluating Success	6-9 Months After Implementation; Annually Thereafter

*LEAs should allow for sufficient time for reflection, additional stakeholder review, and supplemental data analysis and research between Steps 3-6. For example, teams may conduct Steps 3 and 4 in a single, full-day meeting, then conduct Steps 5 and 6 in a second follow-up meeting a few weeks later.

Step 1: Assembling the Evaluation Team

To effectively evaluate the Title I program, key stakeholders must lead and actively contribute. While each local context may vary, the following guidance addresses ideal team composition for district-wide and/or school-wide program evaluation.

District-Wide Evaluation Teams	School-Wide Evaluation Teams
Team Members: These staff members should commit to fully engaging in the evaluation process as a collaborative and results-focused committee. ● District Title I Director ● Title I Teachers/Coaches ● Building-Level Principals (at least one elementary and one secondary) ● Elementary and Secondary Instructional Coaches ● Content Area Teachers (for elementary, at least one primary and one upper elementary, for secondary, at least two teachers from different content areas) ● Curriculum Director ● Title I Director and Key Title I Staff ● District Family Engagement Director (if applicable) ● District Psychologist	**Team Members:** These staff members should commit to fully engaging in the evaluation process as a collaborative and results-focused committee. ● District Title I Director ● Building Administrators ● Instructional Coach ● All Title I Teachers ● Content Area Teachers (for elementary, at least one primary and one upper elementary, for secondary, at least two teachers from different content areas) ● PBIS Coordinator ● Family Engagement Staff (if applicable) ● Title I Support Staff ● School Counselor and Social Worker ● Parents (that are not staff members)
Contributing Staff: These staff members will contribute feedback and data for the evaluation process, and, depending on local context, may or may not be members of the evaluation team. ● Superintendent/Assistant Superintendent ● Special Education Director ● Assessment/Data Director ● Finance Staff ● Other Federal Program Directors (if applicable; ELs, High Ability, McKinney-Vento liaison, Foster etc.) ● School Board Member ● Nutrition and Health Staff ● School Safety Personnel ● Transportation Staff ● Technology Staff ● After School Activity Staff	**Contributing Staff:** These staff members will need to contribute input and data for the evaluation process, and depending on local context, may or may not be members of the evaluation team. ● Assessment/Data Coordinator ● Special Education Teacher ● English Learner Teacher ● High Ability Teacher ● Other Mental Health Staff ● School Safety Personnel ● Nurses ● Transportation Staff ● Technology Staff ● Finance Staff ● After School Activity Staff

Step 2: Gathering Data

Step 3: Defining the Current State

After gathering quantitative and qualitative data for each evaluation area, the entire program evaluation team will conduct an in-depth analysis of the school and district-level data to identify current gaps and clearly define the current state of the program in each area. Depending on the size of the evaluation team and the amount of time available for this step of the evaluation, the team may either analyze each program area jointly or divide the different areas for analysis by smaller groups of evaluation team members. In either case, the entire team should have the opportunity to review and consent to the defined current states drafted in this phase of the evaluation.

The definition of the current state for each program area should be 3-5 sentences long and should cite specific data to define any observed achievement or opportunity gaps, as well as identified areas of strength.

Evaluation Area	Current State
Equitable Representation	
Academic Achievement	
Elementary/Secondary Programming	
Professional Learning and Teacher Capacity	
Family Engagement	
Safe and Healthy Schools	
Resource Allocation	

Step 4: Identifying Needs

After the evaluation team has analyzed data to define the current state for each of the evaluation areas, the team will identify the specific program needs in each area. As in Step 3, the team may either develop need statements for each area jointly or assign the different areas to smaller groups of evaluation team members. In either case, the entire team should have the opportunity to review and consent to the need statements drafted in this step of the evaluation process.

Need statements should be rooted in data and clearly aligned to the gaps identified during Step 3 of the program evaluation. Need statements should typically be 1-2 sentences in length, although teams may identify 2-3 need statements for each evaluation area.

Evaluation Area	Need Statement
Equitable Representation	
Academic Achievement	
Elementary/Secondary Programming	
Professional Learning and Teacher Capacity	
Family Engagement	
Safe and Healthy Schools	
Resource Allocation	

After developing need statements for each evaluation area, the evaluation team is encouraged to share the drafted need statements with a broader group of stakeholders (district leadership, classroom teachers, Title I program support staff, Title I families, etc.) for review and revision before continuing to Step 5 of the program evaluation. The team should also identify any additional data needed after this step of the evaluation process.

Step 5: Setting Goals

After defining the needs of the Title I program in each of the evaluation areas, the evaluation team will convene to set goals for program improvement. Although needs were identified in all program evaluation areas in Step 4, evaluation teams are encouraged to select only 1-3 program evaluation areas for goal setting.

The evaluation team will revisit data and evaluation team input from Steps 2-4 to determine which evaluation areas will be prioritized for program improvement. The team will then develop Specific, Measurable, Attainable, Relevant, and Time Bound (SMART) goals to address the priority evaluation areas. At least one SMART goal should be developed for each priority evaluation area for a total of 3-5 SMART goals. The team should also define attainment of each SMART goal, including what data will be collected to measure progress toward attainment.

Priority Evaluation Area 1:
SMART Goal 1: **How will we know we have attained SMART Goal 1?**
SMART Goal 2 (Optional): **How will we know we have attained SMART Goal 2?**
SMART Goal 3 (Optional): **How will we know we have attained SMART Goal 3?**

Priority Evaluation Area 2:
SMART Goal 1: **How will we know we have attained SMART Goal 1?**
SMART Goal 2 (Optional): **How will we know we have attained SMART Goal 2?**
SMART Goal 3 (Optional): **How will we know we have attained SMART Goal 3?**

Priority Evaluation Area 3 (Optional):
SMART Goal 1: **How will we know we have attained SMART Goal 1?**
SMART Goal 2 (Optional): **How will we know we have attained SMART Goal 2?**
SMART Goal 3 (Optional): **How will we know we have attained SMART Goal 3?**

Step 6: Developing a Plan of Action

After developing SMART Goals to address identified high priority areas of need, the evaluation team will select 2-4 evidence-based strategies to address each SMART goal. Strategies may include professional learning initiatives, language-based instructional programs, instructional strategies, or other program-wide practices to be implemented.

When developing the plan of action, the evaluation team should provide a brief rationale for each selected strategy outlining the evidence base for the selected practice. The evaluation team should also consider all needed resources, including funding, staff time, and supplemental external materials. The evaluation team should also determine who will be the lead responsible for carrying out or overseeing each strategy and when implementation of the strategy is projected to begin.

SMART Goal 1:			**Priority Evaluation Area:**	
Strategy	**Rationale**	**Resources Needed**	**Staff Responsible**	**Projected Start Date**
Strategy 1:				
Strategy 2:				
Strategy 3 (Optional):				
Strategy 4 (Optional):				

SMART Goal 2:			**Priority Evaluation Area:**	
Strategy	**Rationale**	**Resources Needed**	**Staff Responsible**	**Projected Start Date**
Strategy 1:				
Strategy 2:				
Strategy 3 (Optional):				
Strategy 4 (Optional):				

SMART Goal 3:			Priority Evaluation Area:	
Strategy	**Rationale**	**Resources Needed**	**Staff Responsible**	**Projected Start Date**
Strategy 1:				
Strategy 2:				
Strategy 3 (Optional):				
Strategy 4 (Optional):				

SMART Goal 4 (Optional):			Priority Evaluation Area:	
Strategy	**Rationale**	**Resources Needed**	**Staff Responsible**	**Projected Start Date**
Strategy 1:				
Strategy 2:				
Strategy 3 (Optional):				
Strategy 4 (Optional):				

SMART Goal 5 (Optional):			Priority Evaluation Area:	
Strategy	**Rationale**	**Resources Needed**	**Staff Responsible**	**Projected Start Date**
Strategy 1:				
Strategy 2:				
Strategy 3 (Optional):				
Strategy 4 (Optional):				

Step 7: Implementing the Plan of Action

After developing the plan of action, the evaluation team and evaluation coordinator are responsible for implementing the plan, along with any other designated staff members who will enact evidence-based strategies selected in Step 6. The following questions should be used to guide initial implementation and revisited at each implementation meeting thereafter.

How will the evaluation results and plan of action be communicated with administrators, teachers, families, and other key stakeholder groups? When will this information be shared?
What additional steps must be taken in order to enact selected strategies (e.g. secure approval from school board, request amendment for budgeted grant funds, procure curricular materials)?
What additional training is needed in order to enact selected evidence-based strategies effectively? Who will provide this training? When will the training be provided?

What additional data need to be collected to track progress toward SMART goals and effectiveness of selected strategies? How will data be collected? Who will be responsible for tracking data?
When will the evaluation team meet next? Who will lead the next check-in meeting? Who will be expected to attend? ***Note:*** *IDOE recommends the evaluation team meets after the first six weeks of implementation to address any concerns or barriers to full implementation and at least once every three months for the duration of the first school year of implementation.*

Step 8: Evaluating Success

Evaluation is an ongoing process and is most impactful when it occurs regularly and proactively. The IDOE recommends local educational agencies conduct a comprehensive evaluation of their Title I programs once every three years. Step 7 concludes the comprehensive program evaluation process, but Step 8 maximizes impact by continually assessing progress and adapting the plan of action to program needs. The evaluation team should meet once after the first six weeks of implementation to address any barriers to full implementation and at least once every three months during the first school year of implementation.

After the initial implementation period, the evaluation team should meet at least once annually to formally analyze data and assess progress toward SMART goals as an interim program evaluation. The interim evaluation template provided below is intended to guide evaluation teams as they seek to continuously improve their Title I programs. When revising the plan of action, evaluation teams are encouraged to preserve the fidelity of the comprehensive evaluation findings and ensure that any changes align to the priority focus areas and work toward the SMART goals defined during the comprehensive program evaluation.

Interim Evaluation Date:	
Evaluation Team Members Present:	

SMART Goal 1:

What progress has been made toward attainment of SMART Goal 1? Cite specific quantitative and qualitative data demonstrating progress.

Review evidence-based strategies selected to address SMART Goal 1 in Step 6 of the comprehensive evaluation. Are all strategies being implemented with fidelity? Do any strategies need to be revised? Do additional strategies need to be implemented to meet SMART Goal 1?

SMART Goal 2:

What progress has been made toward attainment of SMART Goal 2? Cite specific quantitative and qualitative data demonstrating progress.

Review evidence-based strategies selected to address SMART Goal 2 in Step 6 of the comprehensive evaluation. Are all strategies being implemented with fidelity? Do any strategies need to be revised? Do additional strategies need to be implemented to meet SMART Goal 2?

SMART Goal 3:

What progress has been made toward attainment of SMART Goal 3? Cite specific quantitative and qualitative data demonstrating progress.

Review evidence-based strategies selected to address SMART Goal 3 in Step 6 of the comprehensive evaluation. Are all strategies being implemented with fidelity? Do any strategies need to be revised? Do additional strategies need to be implemented to meet SMART Goal 3?

SMART Goal 4 (Optional):

What progress has been made toward attainment of SMART Goal 4? Cite specific quantitative and qualitative data demonstrating progress.

Review evidence-based strategies selected to address SMART Goal 4 in Step 6 of the comprehensive evaluation. Are all strategies being implemented with fidelity? Do any strategies need to be revised? Do additional strategies need to be implemented to meet SMART Goal 4?

SMART Goal 5 (Optional):

What progress has been made toward attainment of SMART Goal 5? Cite specific quantitative and qualitative data demonstrating progress.

Review evidence-based strategies selected to address SMART Goal 5 in Step 6 of the comprehensive evaluation. Are all strategies being implemented with fidelity? Do any strategies need to be revised? Do additional strategies need to be implemented to meet SMART Goal 5?

What additional resources are needed in order to enact all selected strategies with fidelity and ensure all SMART Goals are met?

What additional data need to be collected to track progress more effectively?

When will the evaluation team meet next? Who will lead the next check-in meeting? Who will be expected to attend?