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What is Title I ESEA

- $14 billion of federal aid to school districts based on child poverty, for compensatory education
What’s the problem?

- How states and districts think they can or can’t use Title I and other federal funds
- How the money is distributed
The tension over district flexibility

- ESEA 1965: no safeguards led to misuse of funds
Supplement not supplant

Supplement not supplant before and after ESSA

- **Before:** test for supplemental spending
  - Schoolwide programs could test for supplemental funds, but rarely did
  - Misunderstanding of law at SEA and LEA levels

- **After:** test for supplemental funds
What to do now?

- Provide clear regulations and guidance (ED and SEAs)
- Reach beyond the Title I community
- Help SEAs and LEAs revamp policies and practices around federal grants with pilot grants for technical assistance
- Revisit single-audit quality
How current Title I formulas distribute Title I funds per eligible, by share of students eligible

Share of Children Eligible for Title I vs. Title I Grant per Eligible Child, State Level, 2015 projected

Proposed formula changes

- Keep basic grant
- Eliminate concentration grants and EFIG
- Expand targeted grants
  - Eliminate “number weighting”
- For basic & targeted grants
  - Eliminate small state minimum
  - No longer adjust allocations based on state PPE
  - Phase out hold harmless over 4-year period
  - Keep maintenance of effort
How proposed formulas would distribute 2015 Title I grant per eligible, by share of students eligible

Share of Children Eligible for Title I vs. Proposed Title I Funding per Eligible Child

Source: Department of Education (2015); author’s calculations.
Surmounting political challenges

- Independent commission to recommend formula changes
- Congress votes recommendation up or down without amendment
Why now? ESSA

- Regulation, implementation
- IES must study formulas
- Prepare for next reauthorization
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Not too late:
Overcoming the adverse effects of poverty on schooling during adolescence
For all $a$ and $b$, 

$6a^2b^3 - 3a^2b$ is equivalent to which of the expressions?

If $3x - 10 = 24$, then $x = ?$
\[
8 + 14 - 7 \\
7 \times 4 \\
\frac{1}{2} + \frac{3}{4}
\]
Implication for new intervention

- If mismatch is the problem, an intervention needs to be individualized and intensive

- Goal: bring students back up to grade level so they can re-engage with regular classroom instruction
Individualized Math Tutorials

- Designed by Match Education, now delivered by SAGA innovations
- 2 on 1
- Frequent assessment
- In school, 55 min per day, every day
Gain in math scores by 30% of B-W gap (equal to 1 to 2 years of extra math learning, in 1 year)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Math scores</th>
<th>Black-white gap in math scores, US 13 year olds</th>
<th>Effects of Match on math test scores</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0.8</td>
<td>0.23</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Closed 30% of the b-w test score gap
Math Course Failures, AY 2013-14

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Total Math Courses Failed</th>
<th>Control</th>
<th>Match</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Math failures</td>
<td>0.39</td>
<td>0.195</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

50% reduction from control
Non-Math Course Failures, AY 2013-14

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Total Non-Math Courses Failed</th>
<th>Control</th>
<th>Match</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Non-math failures</td>
<td>2.457</td>
<td>1.77</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

28% decrease from control
The Proposal

- Schools receiving Title I funding
- Every 3rd – 10th grade student at least two grade levels behind in math
- Two-to-one ratio math tutorial
- In school, every day
The Proposal

- Could be funded using Title I funds
- Goal: Get kids back to grade level
- Complementary to classroom teacher and classroom instruction
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My local school...and yours too.
But which digital learning activities actually work?
We have little idea, creating large barriers to unlocking the potential of educational technology.

If we do not know what really works and for whom:

- Students and teachers are being poorly served
- There is less incentive for entrepreneurs to create new products
- Ed tech is unlikely to raise outcomes significantly

But rigorous evaluation is traditionally time-consuming and expensive!

**The opportunity:**

- Create a low-cost platform for rigorous and rapid evaluation of educational technologies
- Use the evidence to put the right content in front of the right student at the right time
EDUSTAR aims to address this opportunity.

EDUSTAR is a platform for evaluating digital learning activities.

The platform performs rapid, randomized-control trials (RCTs).

EDUSTAR is built on PowerMyLearning Connect, an online library of digital learning activities for K-12 students.
PowerMyLearning Connect works with 40 partner schools and has 8 million page views per month.
We apply the same method that companies like Google and Amazon use every day—rapid RCTs.
Example 1: Two activities that teach the same skill

Skill: Dividing Fractions (Common Core Standard 6.NS.A.1)

“Dividing Fractions”

“Basketball Dividing Fractions”
Example 2: Two versions of the same digital learning activity

Baseline video

Have you ever wondered what would happen if you divided a whole number by a fraction, instead of dividing by another whole number?

I wonder... $2 + \frac{1}{2}$?

Baseline video + section on “common mistakes”

A Common Mistake

A common mistake is to confuse division by $\frac{1}{2}$ with division by 2.

\[
1 + \frac{1}{2} = 2
\]

\[
1 + 2 = \frac{1}{2} \quad \frac{1}{2} \quad \frac{1}{2}
\]
FIGURE 1.
EDUSTAR Results for Two Pilot Examples

Dividing fractions vs. basketball dividing fractions: 4.8*
Video tutorials vs. control: 3.2**
Video tutorials vs. video tutorials with common mistakes unit: 2.0+
What did we learn?

Teachers in PowerMyLearning partner schools provided essential feedback

- Improved alignment of EDUSTAR goals with classroom needs

Platform can be useful to multiple groups

- Students, teachers, parents, school administrators
- Content creators
- Education researchers

Guiding Principles

- Evaluation must be rigorous, continuous, conducted by a trusted party, and preferably built on an existing large platform
What’s next?

At scale, EDUSTAR can provide systematic information about digital learning activities

Provide teachers and their students the very best educational technology available

- Target the right content to the right student at the right time
- Personalize learning for all kinds of learners
- Enhance access to high quality content for students who lack financial resources and supporting infrastructure

The smart application of educational technology is a promising opportunity to improve our K-12 education system
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