

Evaluation of Accelerated Reading Instruction (ARI) and Accelerated Math Instruction (AMI) Program

2004-2005 School Year



Project Staff:

Li-Chin Wu
Andrea Winkler
Sonia Castañeda
Amie Green

**Office for Planning, Grants, and Evaluation
Texas Education Agency
May 2006**

- ARI/AMI program funding was used to serve, at least in part, more than 80% of the K-5 students identified as being at risk in either reading or math. Services provided to the student population not served through the ARI/AMI program were funded exclusively through other sources.

Program Funding

ARI/AMI funding consists of non-competitive grants awarded on a formula basis. Funding in 2004-2005 for ARI was based on the number of students who did not pass the first administration of the 2004 Grade 3 TAKS reading assessment, with LEAs receiving \$905.84 for each student who failed to pass. Funding for 2004-2005 AMI was based on the number of students who did not pass the first administration of the 2004 Grade 5 TAKS math section, with LEAs receiving \$905.84 for each child who did not pass. Historical funding levels for the program for the past five years are as follows:

- 2000-2001: \$65.2 million;
- 2001-2002: \$57.5 million;
- 2002-2003: \$106.4 million;
- 2003-2004: \$75.1 million; and
- 2004-2005: \$80.9 million.

Use of Funds and Instructional Strategies

Analysis of how LEAs used their ARI/AMI funds revealed that:

- Over 90% of all 2004-2005 ARI/AMI funds were concentrated in two broad budget categories – payroll costs and supplies/materials; and
- LEAs spent the bulk of their funding on four specific budget items: Teacher Pay (25%), Supplemental Curriculum (24%), Tutor Pay (18%), and Other Supplies and Materials (15%).

The predominant instructional grouping strategies and time of instruction strategies used by the districts indicate that they are in line with recommended “best practices” deemed to be most effective. Key findings related to these strategies are as follows:

Instructional Grouping Strategies

- More than 80% of the LEAs indicated that they used ARI Teacher and Tutor Pay predominantly for Small Group instruction – this finding also held for AMI;
- More than 60% of the LEAs indicated that funds spent on Supplemental Curriculum and Other Supplies and Materials to support the ARI and AMI programs were used primarily for Small Group instruction and approximately 22% noted that funds were concentrated on Whole Group instruction.

Instructional Timing Strategies

- There was substantial variation in how LEAs spent ARI and AMI funds on the various instructional timing strategies (i.e., Before School, During School, After School, Summer School).
- In terms of Teacher Pay, about 40% of the LEAs used ARI/AMI funds for Summer School instruction, and more than 30% for instruction during regular school hours. Approximately 40% of the LEAs used ARI and AMI funds on Tutor Pay almost equally for During School and After School activities. However, Tutor Pay was more likely than Teacher Pay to be used primarily for After School instruction, and less likely to be used for Summer School instruction.
- For Supplemental Curriculum materials, the vast majority of LEAs spent their ARI/AMI funds primarily to support regular school day instruction.

