

*A Report to the  
North Carolina Department of Public Instruction*



**TITLE VI:  
ANNUAL EVALUATION REPORT  
2001-2002**

Authors:

Carol Speas, Ph.D., Evaluation Specialist  
Amy Overbay, Evaluation Assistant

Contributing Staff:

Nancy Baenen, Senior Director of Program Accountability

Report No. 02.43  
Department of Evaluation and Research  
[www.wcpss.net/evaluation-research](http://www.wcpss.net/evaluation-research)  
February 2003

**WAKE COUNTY PUBLIC SCHOOL SYSTEM**

## Table of Contents

Summary .....	i
Potential Improvements .....	ii
Background .....	1
Evaluation Plan .....	1
Evaluation Questions .....	1
Data Collection .....	1
Implementation .....	2
Assistance To District Magnet Schools .....	2
Services Provided .....	2
Assistance To Private Non-Profit Schools .....	3
Assistance To Project Achieve .....	3
Effects Of The Program .....	4
Project Achieve .....	4
Private Non-Profit Schools .....	4
Private School Surveys .....	5
Evaluation Specialist .....	5
Magnet Arts Teachers' Perceptions .....	6
Parent Perceptions And Student Achievement .....	7
Parent Survey Results .....	8
State ABCs Results .....	10
Conclusions .....	16
ATTACHMENT 1 .....	A-1
ATTACHMENT 2 .....	A-3

## **Title VI: Annual Evaluation Report, 2001-02**

### ***Summary***

The Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965 (ESEA) was reauthorized in 1994 by the *Improving America's Schools Act*. The reauthorization strengthened the focus on changing the way we deliver education, encouraging comprehensive school reform, upgrading instructional and professional development, strengthening accountability, and promoting the coordination of resources. Title VI of the act created eight innovative assistance program areas within which school districts could develop specific projects. In addition, Title VI required school districts to provide funding to interested private non-profit schools in operation within the district.

In the 2001-02 school year, Wake County Public School System (WCPSS) again implemented a project within an innovative assistance program area - the provision of performing arts teachers within magnet elementary schools to provide arts education - under the "promising educational reform projects" category. Twelve arts teachers, representing between 0.3 and 1.0 FTE each, served in six elementary magnet schools: Fuller, Powell, Washington, Wendell, Conn, and Wiley.

Also, in spring 2001, funding was allocated for planning and training activities for a new school improvement/reorganization effort at eight schools. WCPSS Instructional Services Division identified a set of six schools showing historical patterns of below-expectation growth, and two schools volunteered to participate in "Project Achieve." Training and development for the eight schools did occur as planned in July – October, 2001. The project was piloted in the 2001-02 school year and was evaluated (E&R Report #02.35).

Funding provided to private non-profit schools within the district was used primarily for curricular materials under the "programs to acquire and use" category.

### **Impact on Student Achievement and Parent Perceptions at Title VI Schools**

To evaluate the potential impact of Title VI-funded arts instruction on student achievement, six magnet schools receiving Title VI funding for arts instruction were matched to six other WCPSS elementary schools (excluding other magnet schools and Project Achieve schools) on the basis of their spring 2001 ABCs Performance Composites (percent of 3<sup>rd</sup>-5<sup>th</sup>-grade students at or above grade level on end-of-grade tests) and on the percent of students receiving free or reduced-price lunches.

ABCs data from the 2001-02 school year suggest that students at Title VI schools performed better on some indicators of academic achievement than students at six comparison schools. The arts focus of these schools *may* have contributed to these positive results:

- More Title VI schools than comparison schools met the *Expected* and *High Growth* standards and attained Performance Composites in reading and mathematics equal to or greater than the district.
- A gap in the percentage of students at/above grade level persisted between White students and Black students at both Title VI and comparison schools, but a higher percentage of Black students scored at or above grade level at Title VI schools than at comparison schools. Additionally, the gap decreased from the previous year at all six Title VI schools, but at only two comparison schools.

As in the previous year, WCPSS Parent Survey results do provide evidence that parents' opinions about the visual and performing arts programs at Title VI schools are more positive than those of parents at comparison schools, and more positive than the views of WCPSS parents in general. Additionally, parents at two Title VI schools rated math and reading instruction more highly than the WCPSS average.

These results indicate that arts instruction at Title VI schools was positively perceived by WCPSS parents, and that achievement at Title VI schools was higher than in the comparison (matched) schools.

### **Feedback from Magnet Arts Teachers**

Although the response rate was low, the spring 2002 magnet school arts teacher survey responses suggest that efforts to integrate instruction in the arts and in "core" subjects should continue. Participation in teams, especially grade-level team meetings, was less than ideal, according to survey respondents, and formal staff development led by the arts teachers remained uneven across schools. However, all did report collaborating with individual teachers. In concert with district-wide emphasis, a change in focus within the Title VI program occurred in the current school year (2002-03), with the goals now emphasizing collaboration of arts teachers with teachers of core subjects. This shift in focus moves beyond formal training provided by arts teachers to integration of the arts program and the core curriculum.

### ***Potential Improvements***

Some potential areas of improvement were suggested at the beginning of the current (2002-03) school year:

- A continuing theme from the surveys of arts teachers is the need for improvement of coordination between regular classroom teachers and arts teachers. Therefore, emphasis

by the Senior Administrator for Arts Administration on how to best improve communication with other teachers, initiate more team contact, and share integration strategies began in 2002-03.

- A change in objectives for Title VI arts teachers occurred in fall 2002, with emphasis on collaboration and integration with core area teachers.
- Emphasis has been placed on improving the response rate for the teacher and private school surveys in spring 2003.

The development of a more rigorous method for evaluating the effectiveness of the Title VI arts education project remains a challenge, chiefly because of the difficulty in finding an adequate comparison group and the indirect impact of arts on academic achievement. In addition, the arts have benefits beyond academic achievement that are somewhat difficult to measure. The option selected for the current evaluation (matching similar district schools with no visual and performing arts enrichment program for comparison with Title VI schools) was the preferred approach with available data.

**TITLE VI:  
ANNUAL EVALUATION REPORT  
2001-02**

***Background***

The Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965 (ESEA) was reauthorized in 1994 by the *Improving America's Schools Act*. The reauthorization strengthened the focus on changing the way we deliver education, encouraging comprehensive school reform, upgrading instructional and professional development, strengthening accountability, and promoting the coordination of resources. Title VI of the act created eight innovative assistance program areas within which school districts could develop specific projects. In addition, Title VI required school districts to provide funding to interested private non-profit schools in operation within the district.

The Wake County Public School System (WCPSS) developed a project within an innovative assistance program area - the provision of performing arts teachers within magnet elementary schools to provide arts education - under the "promising educational reform projects" category. Funding provided to private non-profit schools within the district was used primarily for curricular materials under the "programs to acquire and use" category.

***Evaluation Plan***

**EVALUATION QUESTIONS**

The general evaluation questions used in both FY 2000 and 2001 were:

1. What services were provided?
2. Was the program implemented as planned and, if not, why?
3. To what extent did the program effectively realize its objectives?
4. How could the program be improved?

**DATA COLLECTION**

Data collection for all program components included analysis of the budget and other relevant program documentation. Several other sources of data were used:

- A survey of the Title VI arts teachers.
- A survey of the contact persons at participating private non-public schools.
- A comparison of state *ABCs* results and local *Parent Survey* information in the six magnet schools that received Title VI positions with six other district elementary

- schools similar to the Title VI schools in terms of demographics and previous student performance – but different from them in relation to their arts programs.
- Participation records, documentation of completed activities, and school-based plans for reform of the eight Project Achieve schools.
  - Products and activities of the evaluation specialist (1.0 FTE).

### *Implementation*

#### **ASSISTANCE TO DISTRICT MAGNET SCHOOLS**

The primary purpose of the WCPSS Title VI program is to provide arts teachers at gifted and talented magnet elementary schools in order to improve the quality of their programs. Three objectives were specified for the arts teachers:

- Provide visual and performing arts elective course offerings that are responsive to the interests, talents, and needs of the students (and their parents) attending the gifted and talented magnet elementary schools.
- Participate in team meetings with other teachers to (a) coordinate elective offerings, promote arts and curricular integration activities and (b) provide examples of arts curricular integration that support student achievement in the core curricular areas of language arts, social studies, mathematics, and science.
- Provide staff development for regular classroom teachers on methods of integrating the visual and performing arts and the core curricular areas, enhancing differentiated instruction.

#### **Services Provided**

The provision of arts education elective courses in magnet elementary schools represents the primary project conducted under the Title VI innovative program areas. In the 2001-02 school year, six Wake County Public School system (WCPSS) elementary schools received Title VI funding for arts instruction. As magnet schools, these six sites recruit students via their unique instructional programs. Four schools (Fuller Elementary, Powell Elementary, Washington Elementary and Wendell Elementary) offer Gifted and Talented (GT) programs. Conn Elementary offers a Global Communications program, and Wiley Elementary emphasizes International Studies.

Each of these schools offers students enhanced access to arts instruction. Conn Elementary and the four Title VI schools with Gifted and Talented programs provide students with regularly-scheduled arts rotations, plus the opportunity to choose a series of arts-based electives every nine weeks. At Wiley Elementary, some students attend arts rotations, and a smaller number participate in an in-depth orchestral program.

Twelve arts teachers, representing between 0.3 and 1.0 FTE each, served in these six schools. Together, they represent 9.9 FTE. The majority of the funding in this project was used for the

salaries of these teachers. A small amount was used for educational materials. Table 1 provides information about the number of instructional positions funded by Title VI, and the number of students served at each school.

**Table 1**  
**Title VI Implementation, 2001-02**

<b>School</b>	<b>Magnet Program</b>	<b>No. of Title VI Teachers</b>	<b>No. of Students Served</b>	<b>Focus of Instruction</b>
Conn	Global Communications	2	506	Visual and Performing Arts
Fuller	Gifted and Talented	2	435	Performing Arts
Powell	Gifted and Talented	1	492	Visual Arts
Washington	Gifted and Talented	3	579	Performing Arts
Wendell	Gifted and Talented	3	547	Visual Arts
Wiley	International Studies	1	381	Performing Arts

### **ASSISTANCE TO PRIVATE NON-PROFIT SCHOOLS**

The relationship between WCPSS and private non-profit schools is specified in Title VI. Assistance provided to interested private non-profit schools is equal (consistent with the number of children served) to Title VI services provided to public school students. Assistance is based on the number of students receiving free or reduced-price lunches as well as those receiving full-cost lunches. Activities funded in this manner are not limited to the innovative assistance areas targeted by the district, and may include any activity allowable under Title VI.

Each spring, WCPSS sends a certified letter to all private, non-profit schools in Wake County inviting them to participate in the Title VI program. In Funding Year 2001, 11 of 51 private schools chose to participate in the program.

### **ASSISTANCE TO PROJECT ACHIEVE**

In spring 2001, funding was allocated for planning and training activities for a new school improvement/reorganization effort at eight schools under the “3a. Promising Educational Reform Programs: Effective Schools” category, most closely aligned with goals 7, 3, and 4 among the National Education Goals. WCPSS Instructional Services staff identified a set of six schools showing historical patterns of below-expectation growth in accordance with standards set in the NC ABCs Accountability System, and two schools volunteered to participate in “Project Achieve.”



In this project, local, state and federal resources were redirected to assist in the development of school reform plans at these schools. Activities included visitations to school sites currently implementing successful reform projects and work sessions for school staff to design models and practices for incorporation in local school-based reform projects. An evaluation specialist monitored the ongoing reform activities.

### *Effects of the Program*

#### **PROJECT ACHIEVE**

In 2001-02, the planned training activities did occur for school teams from the eight schools participating in Project Achieve. Attendance logs, documentation of completed activities, and the individual school-based plans for reform are on file in the Evaluation and Research Department (E&R). Six elementary schools (Cary, Creech Road, Hodge Road, Rand Road, Smith, and Vance) and two middle schools (East Garner and East Wake) participated in the project. Table 2 lists the Project Achieve planning and professional development activities funded by Title VI in 2001-02.

**Table 2  
Project Achieve Planning and Training Activities, 2001-02**

Date	Activities
July 17-19, 2001	Joint planning session with leadership teams.
August 2001	Grade-level team and across-grade team planning sessions at the individual schools.
August 2001	Training for Instructional Resource Teachers and clerical assistants in use of assessment software (at the individual schools).
October 19, 2001	Process check: joint meeting centrally with school leadership teams.
October 2001	Group visit to Brazosport, Texas school district.

#### **PRIVATE NON-PROFIT SCHOOLS**

In FY 2001, there were 51 private schools in Wake County. Eleven (22%) of the schools elected to participate in the Title VI program. According to enrollment reports, 3,601 students were served at these sites.

As in past years, non-public schools again spent Title VI funds primarily on materials, supplies, and equipment. Feedback was obtained informally through a one-page survey with contact persons in the private schools.

## **Private School Surveys**

In spring 2002, surveys and a follow-up reminder were sent to the contact person/coordinator at each of the eleven participating private schools, and four were returned. Survey items for private school coordinators included questions about how Title VI funds were used, the specific benefits for students, and the extent to which instruction and efficiency of operations were improved by Title VI funds. Additionally, coordinators were asked to describe to what extent the program was better in 2001-02 than in the previous year, and were asked to note ways in which the program could be improved.

Three respondents reported that Title VI funds had been used to purchase books for their schools' media centers, and one respondent noted that the funds had been used to purchase two LCD projectors. These coordinators reported that the funds benefited students in various ways. One respondent observed that Title VI funds allowed them "to introduce new and up-to-date research materials" and another indicated that "The Accelerated Reader Program, which is new to our school this year, was made available to the first and second grades due to the books we were able to receive through [the] Title VI program."

All four respondents reported that the Title VI funds improved the effectiveness of instruction and improved the efficiency of school operations "much" or "very much." They were less consistent, however, in their estimation of the extent of the program's improvement, with two coordinators reporting it was "much" better, one reporting it was "some" better, and another reporting that "it was really the same."

Respondents offered different suggestions for improving the program, focusing especially on quicker delivery of curriculum materials and better communication about available funds. One coordinator also noted that, "The program could be improved for our school by allowing us to purchase some audio-visual materials as well as books."

## **EVALUATION SPECIALIST**

The evaluation specialist provided services in accordance with the grant application. In general, the specialist:

- Conducted specified recurring evaluation research projects as well as one-time-only services as called for in the annual E&R plan (providing reports on ABCs accountability, the Project Achieve program, dropout data, and graduation rates).
- Provided training and guidance documents to school improvement teams interpreting ABCs data relevant to improving growth and performance in individual schools.
- Assisted with the development and processing of a form to capture data for multiple programs and tests.

The evaluation and research reports are on file in E&R, and most are available on the WCPSS website at <http://www.wcpss.net>.

## **MAGNET ARTS TEACHERS' PERCEPTIONS**

Surveys pertaining to program implementation were sent to arts teachers at the six magnet schools receiving Title VI funds in spring 2002. Completed surveys were returned by four teachers from four schools, with each teacher providing information on that school's arts program(s).

The teachers who completed the survey specialize in a variety of subjects, including drama, dance, and visual arts. Instructors at different schools teach the same core courses, but there is some variety in the courses offered at each school. For example, drama instructors at each school teach courses in playwriting and/or acting; however, electives at other locations include puppetry, weaving, and printmaking. Dance electives include ballet, African movement, and "Math in Motion." Visual art electives include drawing, pottery, and weaving. The diversity of course offerings suggests that curricula are being developed to match students' needs.

Survey items included questions about the number of students served, the impact of arts instruction on students, involvement in staff development activities, and ways in which arts instruction was integrated into core curricular activities.

All respondents reported providing arts instruction to 100% of the students in their schools. The proportion of students taking two elective arts courses varied considerably, from approximately 30% at one school to approximately 70% at another, according to the survey respondents' estimates. Correspondingly, the proportion of students taking three or more arts electives varied as well, from approximately 15% to approximately 35%.

Respondents also differed in their impressions of their schools' integration of the arts with academic curricula. While two arts instructors reported "much" or "very much" integration, the other two instructors reported seeing only "some" or "very little" incorporation of the arts by classroom teachers. At the same time, three of four arts teachers did report working collaboratively with other teachers.

Respondents were positive about the extent to which instruction in the arts increased their students' appreciation of the arts, skills in the arts, self-confidence as learners, and involvement with the community. While one respondent reported "some" improvement in these areas, the other three respondents reported "much" or "very much" improvement on these items. Similarly, three of the respondents reported that instruction in the arts increased academic achievement "much" or "very much."

This year, all respondents reported attending team meetings, although the frequency of their attendance ranged from "rarely" (one teacher) to "very often." Two of the respondents reported that they had "never" led staff development activities, and two reported leading such activities either "sometimes" or "rarely," but all reported working collaboratively with individual teachers. Thus, the first two project objectives were met, while the third objective - providing staff development - was not met.

## **PARENT PERCEPTIONS AND STUDENT ACHIEVEMENT**

One of the purposes of introducing the arts into schools' regular instructional programs is to improve student achievement in core academic subjects. Schools receiving Title VI funds offer more arts instruction via electives and arts rotations, but also offer an integrated curriculum that meshes arts and academic instruction. Examples provided by Title VI teachers suggest that dance has been used to teach mathematics concepts ("Math in Motion"), and students in a language arts class may sing while using body movement to form appropriate punctuation marks for phrases and sentences. Students at some schools have created character portraits and murals to illustrate stories, and engaged in dance movements while learning about shapes, the orbits of planets, and North Carolina folk history. More exposure to an integrated arts curriculum may draw upon different learning styles and cognitive skills, leading to greater student engagement and motivation, resulting in increased academic achievement.

To clarify the hypothesized connection between increased arts instruction and student achievement, state *Growth* and *Performance Composites* for schools receiving Title VI funding were examined relative to composites for schools in a comparison group. Additionally, parent surveys were examined to determine how parents at Title VI and comparison schools perceive the quality of arts instruction at their children's schools.

To evaluate the potential impact of Title VI-funded arts instruction on student achievement, a criteria-based selection process was used to create a comparison group. The six magnet schools receiving Title VI funding for arts instruction were matched to six WCPSS elementary schools on the basis of their 2000-01 state ABCs Performance Composite (the percent of 3<sup>rd</sup>-5<sup>th</sup> grade students at or above grade level on End-Of-Grade (EOG) tests in spring 2001), and on the percent of students receiving free or reduced-price lunches in 2001-02. Additionally, the 2001-02 percentages of students enrolled in Special Education and/or English as a Second Language (ESL) programs were examined to narrow the list of possible matches.

For Title VI schools, the average percent of students receiving free or reduced-price lunches in 2001-02 was 34.1%; for schools in the comparison group, it was 31.6%. The average 2000-01 Performance Composite was 79.7 for both the Title VI schools and the comparison schools. Demographic data used to match Title VI schools to comparison schools are listed in Table 3.

**Table 3**  
**Demographic Data for Matched Pairs of Title VI and Comparison Schools, 2001-02**

<b>Title VI and Comparison Schools</b>	<b>%FRL (01-02)</b>	<b>Performance Composite (00-01)</b>	<b>% SP (01-02)</b>	<b>% ESL (01-02)</b>	<b>% AG (01-02)</b>
<b>Conn Elementary</b>	37.6%	77.3	13.6%	0.0	6.7%
<i>Aversboro Elementary</i>	34.1%	74.7	16.8%	0.0	7.4%
Difference	3.6	2.6	-3.2	0.0	-0.7
<b>Fuller Elementary</b>	31.2%	79.8	16.6%	0.0	13.6%
<i>Lynn Rd. Elementary</i>	29.6%	81.7	10.6%	0.0	6.8%
Difference	1.5	-1.9	5.9	0.0	6.8
<b>Powell Elementary</b>	36.7%	78.1	13.0%	0.0	4.9%
<i>Brooks Elementary</i>	30.9%	80.2	14.1%	0.0	7.7%
Difference	5.8	-2.1	-1.9	0.0	-2.8
<b>Washington Elementary</b>	28.3%	87.0	17.1%	0.0	13.5%
<i>Lacy Elementary</i>	26.0%	86.6	16.4%	0.0	13.5%
Difference	2.2	0.4	0.66	0.0	0.0
<b>Wendell Elementary</b>	40.4%	77.4	16.6%	0.0	3.8%
<i>Knightsdale Elementary</i>	40.8%	77.8	14.8%	0.0	4.0%
Difference	-0.4	-0.4	1.8	0.0	-0.02
<b>Wiley Elementary</b>	30.4%	78.7	17.1%	19.2%	11.3%
<i>Rolesville Elementary</i>	28.2%	77.2	12.9%	10.7%	3.9%
Difference	2.2	1.5	4.2	8.5	7.4
<i>Total Average Difference</i>	2.5	0.0	1.2	1.4	1.8

Note: Comparison schools are shown in italics.

It is important to note that the comparison group used in this evaluation differs from the one created for the 2000-01 Title VI evaluation. In the previous evaluation, Title VI schools were compared to other magnet schools (E&R Report #02.11). However, in this year's evaluation, other magnet schools and schools receiving funding for Project Achieve were eliminated from the list of possible matches because these schools already had special enrichment or instructional programs in place. This method allowed a cleaner analysis of whether having special offerings made an impact on student achievement.

### Parent Survey Results

As part of a yearly system-wide survey, parents at WCPSS elementary schools were asked to rate their children's school in helping their children "acquire skills or knowledge about visual and/or performing arts." In 2001-02, 89.1% of Title VI parents rated the arts instruction at their children's schools as "good" or "excellent," compared to 71.5% of parents at the comparison

schools, and 75.5% of parents in the system as a whole.<sup>1</sup> Thus, Title VI parents at Title VI schools rated their children’s arts instruction more highly than parents at comparison schools and parents in WCPSS in general.

Tables 4 and 5 show the parent survey results for Title VI and comparison schools. As Table 4 illustrates, arts instruction at all six Title VI schools received parental ratings higher than the system average, whereas parents at only three comparison schools rated their children’s arts instruction more highly than did WCPSS parents as a whole, as seen in Table 5.

Although a smaller percentage of parents at Title VI schools rated their children’s reading and math instruction as “good” or “excellent,” compared to parents in WCPSS as a whole, Title VI parents rated reading and math instruction at their children’s school more highly than parents at the comparison schools. Of those surveyed, 87% of Title VI parents rated their children’s reading instruction as “good” or “excellent,” compared to 83.2% of parents at comparison schools. Additionally, 84.3% of Title VI parents rated their children’s math education as “good or “excellent,” whereas only 80.1% of parents at comparison schools rated their children’s math instruction equally highly.

**Table 4**  
**Parent Survey Results for Title VI Schools, 2001-02**

<b>Title VI School</b>	<b>Percent of Parents Rating Arts Instruction Good or Excellent</b>	<b>Percent of Parents Rating Reading Instruction Good or Excellent</b>	<b>Percent of Parents Rating Math Instruction Good or Excellent</b>
Conn	88.7%	74.2%	74.2%
Fuller	84.2%	89.6%	80.6%
Powell	98.2%	84.1%	79.5%
Washington	95.0%	92.3%	90.5%
Wendell	88.3%	85.7%	83.0%
Wiley	79.7%	93.1%	94.8%
WCPSS	75.5%	91.1%	89.0%

Note: Shaded cells indicate ratings higher than the system average.  
N = 475

<sup>1</sup> Because the Parent Survey items were changed between 2000-01 and 2001-02, comparisons between parent survey results across school years are not possible.

**Table 5**  
**Parent Survey Results for Comparison Schools, 2001-02**

<b>Comparison School</b>	<b>Percent of Parents Rating Arts Instruction <i>Good or Excellent</i></b>	<b>Percent of Parents Rating Reading Instruction <i>Good or Excellent</i></b>	<b>Percent of Parents Rating Math Instruction <i>Good or Excellent</i></b>
Aversboro	56.5%	69.0%	84.4%
Lynn Rd.	82.9%	86.4%	79.7%
Brooks	62.5%	87.8%	81.6%
Lacy	78.2%	88.0%	88.0%
Knightdale	76.5%	76.1%	76.1%
Rolesville	72.0%	90.6%	79.2%
WCPSS	75.5%	91.1%	89.0%

Note: Shaded cells indicate ratings higher than the system average.  
N = 460

## State ABCs Results

### Expected Growth, High Growth, & Performance Composites

As shown in Tables 6 and 7, Title VI schools were slightly more likely than comparison schools to attain *High Growth* in 2001-02, and more achieved levels of growth greater than or equal to the system average.

- Five Title VI schools and five schools in the matched group achieved *Expected Growth* in 2001-02.
- Four Title VI schools also achieved *High Growth* in 2001-02, compared to three schools in the comparison group.
- Four Title VI schools attained *Expected* and *High Growth* Composites equal to or greater than the system average; compared to three schools in the comparison group.

An examination of 2001-02 Performance Composites (percent of students at or above grade level) reflects this same pattern. Three Title VI schools earned Performance Composites greater than or equal to the system average, compared to only one comparison school. Furthermore, the average Performance Composite for Title VI schools in 2001-02 was 87.6, compared to 83.5 for the match group.

**Table 6**  
**Title VI Schools: Expected Growth, High Growth, and**  
**Performance Composites, 2001-02**

Title VI Schools	Expected Growth Composite 2001-02		High Growth Composite 2001-02		Performance Composite (% of Students At/Above Grade Level) 2001-02	
	School	School >= WCPSS?	School	School >= WCPSS?	School	School >= WCPSS?
Conn	0.05	no	-0.43	no	80.7	no
Fuller	-0.10	no	-0.59	no	88.0	no
Powell	0.98	yes	0.51	yes	85.4	no
Washington	0.71	yes	0.24	yes	90.1	yes
Wendell	1.31	yes	0.84	yes	90.5	yes
Wiley	1.40	yes	0.90	yes	90.8	yes
WCPSS	0.50	NA	0.02	NA	89.7	NA

Note 1: Shaded areas indicate that the growth standard (school >= WCPSS) was met.

Note 2: Negative numbers indicate that a growth standard was not met.

**Table 7**  
**Comparison Schools: Expected Growth, High Growth, and**  
**Performance Composites, 2001-02**

Comparison Schools	Expected Growth Composite 2001-02		High Growth Composite 2001-02		Performance Composite (% of Students At or Above Grade Level) 2001-02	
	School	School >= WCPSS?	School	School >= WCPSS?	School	School >= WCPSS?
Aversboro	1.10	yes	0.64	yes	88.0	no
Lynn Rd.	0.85	yes	0.37	yes	82.1	no
Brooks	0.38	no	-0.31	no	83.6	no
Lacy	0.97	yes	0.50	yes	91.0	yes
Knightdale	-0.52	no	-1.00	no	76.1	no
Rolesville	0.17	no	-0.32	no	80.4	no
WCPSS	0.50	NA	0.02	NA	89.7	NA

Note 1: Shaded areas indicate that the growth standard (school >= WCPSS ) was met.

Note 2: Negative numbers indicate that a growth standard was not met.



### Performance Composites by Demographic Groups

Tables 8 and 9 show the average 2001-02 Performance Composite (percentage of students at/above grade level) for different demographic groups at Title VI schools, comparison schools, and in all elementary schools in the district as a whole.<sup>2</sup> It should be noted that the comparisons are not pre-post comparisons but are a snapshot of a single point in time. Additionally, the Title VI schools and comparison schools may differ from the district elementary schools overall in ways that we cannot measure. For example, ethnicity and free and reduced-price lunch (F/RL) status interact, and F/RL status is only a rough indicator of income, so that F/RL students in some schools could be in greater poverty than F/RL students in other schools.

Although there was a gap in the average Performance Composites of White and Black students at both Title VI and comparison schools, the gap was smaller at Title VI schools. Additionally, the gap decreased from the previous year at all six Title VI schools (but at only two comparison schools). With the exception of Black students at Conn Elementary, whose average Performance Composite was 13.5 percentage points lower than their counterparts at Aversboro Elementary, Black students at Title VI schools outperformed their counterparts at comparison schools. Additionally, a higher percentage of Black students at two Title VI schools attained Performance Composites higher than the district average for this demographic group (75.5%).

At four of six Title VI and comparison schools, there was a substantial gap between the average Performance Composite for students receiving free or reduced-price lunches (an indicator of low family income) and the average WCPSS Performance Composite for this group, indicating that at these schools, a lower percentage of F/RL students performed at or above grade level, compared to the overall percentage of WCPSS F/RL students who met this standard (74.2%). Additionally, students receiving free or reduced-price lunches at Title VI schools had lower average Performance Composites than their counterparts at comparison schools in four of six cases. However, at two Title VI schools, students receiving free or reduced-price lunches attained Performance Composites higher than the system average for this demographic group.

---

<sup>2</sup> Note: Due to low enrollment numbers, data were unavailable for Hispanic, Native American, and Multiracial students, and data for Asian students were available for only one school (Fuller Elementary). The cut-off used for minimum group size was 30.

**Table 8**  
**Title VI Schools: Performance Composites**  
**by Demographic Group, 2001-02**

Demographic Group	Conn	Fuller	Powell	Washington	Wendell	Wiley	WCPSS	Number of Schools >/= WCPSS
White	95.7	100	97.7	99.5	95.3	96.9	96.1	4
Black	66.9	65.7	77.0	65.9	83.7	71.4	75.5	2
Asian	*	98.6	*	*	*	*	96.6	1
Male	80.8	88.8	85.3	90.0	92.3	91.0	89.1	3
Female	80.7	87.3	85.6	90.2	88.6	90.6	90.6	1
F/RL	67.4	57.6	66.9	62.8	82.6	74.7	74.2	2

Note: Shaded areas indicate that the Performance Composite was greater than that of the district.  
\* Indicates that the minimum group size of 30 was not present.

**Table 9**  
**Comparison Schools: Performance Composites**  
**by Demographic Group, 2001-02**

Demographic Group	Aversboro	Lynn Road	Brooks	Lacy	Knightdale	Rolesville	WCPSS	Number of Schools >/= WCPSS
White	96.6	95.4	94.8	98.3	87.2	88.9	96.1	2
Black	80.4	61.6	72.7	63.0	66.5	65.3	75.5	1
Asian	*	*	*	*	*	*	96.6	*
Male	87.3	83.5	81.0	88.7	78.4	79.2	89.1	0
Female	89.0	80.4	86.2	92.7	73.9	81.4	90.6	1
FRL	76.8	59.3	73.3	69.0	67.9	64.3	74.2	1

Note: Shaded areas indicate that the Performance Composite was greater than that of the district.  
\* Indicates that the minimum group size of 30 was not present.

### Title VI Performance Composites Over Time

Table 10 illustrates the Performance Composites in reading and mathematics for Title VI schools from 1999-2002, tracing the performance of students across time (those students tested each consecutive year), focusing on students who began third grade in 1999-00, and following the progress of all students tested each year through fourth and fifth grades.<sup>3</sup>

<sup>3</sup> Because comparison schools were matched with Title VI schools on the basis on 2001-02 F/R lunch rates and 2000-01 Performance Composites, comparisons with Title VI schools prior to the 2000-01 school year may be invalid, and are therefore excluded from this evaluation.

*Examining the reading Performance Composites of this group (all students tested each year)<sup>4</sup> reveals that students at all schools, except one, achieved gains in the percent of students at or above grade level in reading as they moved from grade 3 to grade 5. However, the number of schools with reading Performance Composites equal to or greater than the WCPSS average remained stable. Each year, only one to two Title VI schools had an equal or higher percentage of students in this group at or above reading grade level, compared to the district average. (WCPSS performance improved overall during this period.)*

*In terms of mathematics Performance Composites, the 1999-00 third-grade group at all Title VI schools made gains in the percentage of students at or above grade level in math as they moved from grade 3 to grade 5. However, this group (all students tested at each grade for three consecutive years) did not attain the WCPSS average in spring 2002 at any Title VI school.*

---

<sup>4</sup> Due to students moving in and out of a school, the group composition of students tested at grade 3 -- and then again at grades 4 and 5 -- may differ over the three-year period.

**Table 10**  
**Percent of Students in Title VI Schools At or Above Grade Level**  
**by Grade and Subject for Three Years**

School	Grade	Reading			Math		
		99-00	00-01	01-02	99-00	00-01	01-02
Conn	3 <sup>rd</sup>	58.5	73.5	80.7	58.5	72.3	76.1
	4 <sup>th</sup>	78.9	64.6	76.7	78.9	84.8	87.7
	5 <sup>th</sup>	78.3	85.9	77.3	85.5	90.2	86.7
Fuller	3 <sup>rd</sup>	78.7	82.4	87.3	72.5	76.5	79.0
	4 <sup>th</sup>	73.5	88.4	86.7	77.4	87.0	91.7
	5 <sup>th</sup>	75.0	85.1	94.1	73.8	73.8	92.8
Powell	3 <sup>rd</sup>	70.3	71.1	81.2	58.7	62.9	78.6
	4 <sup>th</sup>	91.4	67.4	81.4	93.0	81.1	94.2
	5 <sup>th</sup>	87.1	95.9	89.9	95.7	97.3	87.8
Washington	3 <sup>rd</sup>	83.0	86.5	86.5	72.3	86.5	84.4
	4 <sup>th</sup>	84.0	83.0	92.0	87.7	95.7	95.0
	5 <sup>th</sup>	84.8	89.8	91.4	86.7	91.7	92.5
Wendell	3 <sup>rd</sup>	62.0	71.7	88.6	63.3	62.8	86.5
	4 <sup>th</sup>	73.3	76.2	89.9	91.9	87.2	96.7
	5 <sup>th</sup>	90.2	86.5	90.0	91.3	94.4	91.1
Wiley	3 <sup>rd</sup>	86.5	79.3	97.2	82.7	71.2	94.4
	4 <sup>th</sup>	85.0	75.9	86.0	93.3	89.5	98.0
	5 <sup>th</sup>	94.6	90.0	81.8	91.1	88.3	87.3
WCPSS	3 <sup>rd</sup>	83.1	85.3	87.6	80.0	84.0	87.1
	4 <sup>th</sup>	81.6	85.9	87.4	89.2	92.7	94.8
	5 <sup>th</sup>	87.7	90.8	92.3	88.9	92.1	93.8

Note: Shaded areas indicate the 1999-2000 third-grade cohort's movement from grade 3 to grade 5.  
The percentage each year reflects the performance of all students who were tested at a particular grade level.

Regarding the size of increases, however, *members of the third-grade 1999-00 cohort (all students tested each year) at Title VI schools made more rapid/greater gains in the percentage of students at or above grade level in both reading and mathematics, compared to the district average.* Table 11 shows the average change in Title VI schools' reading and math Performance Composites between spring 2000 and spring 2002.

Overall, the 1999-00 third-grade cohort at Title VI schools experienced an average gain of 14.3 percentage points in their reading Performance Composites, and an average gain of 21.7 percentage points in their math Performance Composites—both of which reflect more rapid gains than the WCPSS averages for reading (9.2 percentage points) and math (13.8 percentage points) over the three-year period.

**Table 11**  
**Title VI Schools: Change in Percent of 3<sup>rd</sup>-Grade Cohort**  
**At/Above Grade Level, from Spring 2000 to Spring 2002**

School	Percentage Pts. Gained in Reading	Percentage Pts. Gained in Mathematics
Conn	18.8	28.2
Fuller	15.4	20.3
Powell	19.6	29.1
Washington	8.4	20.2
Wendell	28.0	27.8
Wiley	-4.7	4.6
Average Gain in Percentage Points		
Title VI Schools	14.3	21.7
WCPSS Elem. Schools	9.2	13.8

### *Conclusions*

Conclusions and potential improvements are presented in the summary at the beginning of the report.

**ATTACHMENT 1**

School \_\_\_\_\_

***ESEA/IASA Title VI***  
**Magnet School—Arts Education Program**  
**2001-02 End-of-Year Evaluation**  
**ART Teacher's Questionnaire**

It is required that we evaluate the impact of the Title VI Art Education program in the Wake County Public Schools, and your views are crucial to understanding the impact of the program. (Your answers will be treated as confidential. Results will be reported as group information only. No individual respondents will be identified.)

**Please return by May 14, 2002**, by courier to: Carol Speas, Ph.D., Evaluation and Research, Administration Building

1. Briefly name and describe the elective art course(s) you teach. If you have course outlines or overviews of any new courses offered this year, please send them.
  
2. Approximately how many **individual** students will you have had in arts classes by the end of this school year?  
\_\_\_\_\_ (Note: If you served all students at least once, list the school enrollment.)
3. Approximately what proportion of your school's student body does this represent? \_\_\_\_\_
4. Of those individual students you have taught, approximately how many have taken:
  - **two** elective art classes during the year? \_\_\_\_\_
  - **three or more** elective art classes during the year? \_\_\_\_\_
5. To what extent do you think that instruction in the arts for the students in your classes this year has increased their development of assets such as:
  - Appreciation of the visual and/or performing arts?  
1. *Very Little*    2. *Little*    3. *Some*    4. *Much*    5. *Very Much*
  - Skills in the visual and/or performing arts?  
1. *Very Little*    2. *Little*    3. *Some*    4. *Much*    5. *Very Much*
  - Self-confidence as a learner?  
1. *Very Little*    2. *Little*    3. *Some*    4. *Much*    5. *Very Much*
  - Increased involvement with the school community and/or larger community?  
1. *Very Little*    2. *Little*    3. *Some*    4. *Much*    5. *Very Much*
6. To what extent do you think that instruction in the arts increased academic achievement in your school this year?  
1. *Very Little*    2. *Little*    3. *Some*    4. *Much*    5. *Very Much*

7. How often have you participated in team meetings this year with other teachers to develop techniques for integrating instruction in the arts with core curricular areas?

1. *Never*      2. *Rarely*      3. *Sometimes*      4. *Often*      5. *Very Often*

8. How often have you conducted staff development activities this year for other teachers concerning the integration of instruction in the arts with core curricular areas?

1. *Never*      2. *Rarely*      3. *Sometimes*      4. *Often*      5. *Very Often*

9. To what extent do you think grade teachers this year have been able to integrate instruction in the arts with core curricular areas?

1. *Very Little*      2. *Little*      3. *Some*      4. *Much*      5. *Very Much*

10. Please provide examples of how teachers this year have integrated instruction in the arts with core curricular areas.

11. How often have you assisted in teaching activities outside of the arts this year?

1. *Never*      2. *Rarely*      3. *Sometimes*      4. *Often*      5. *Very Often*

12. Please describe briefly any teaching activities outside of the arts, such as tutoring in reading, that you may have conducted this year.

THANK YOU FOR YOUR ASSISTANCE.

**ATTACHMENT 2**

School \_\_\_\_\_

*ESEA/IASA Title VI*  
**Non-Public Schools Program**  
**2001-02 End-of-Year Evaluation**  
***Participating School Questionnaire***

It is required that we evaluate the impact of the Title VI program, and your views are crucial to understanding the impact of the Title VI program for non-public schools. Your answers will be considered confidential, and results will be reported as group information only.

**Please return by May 14, 2002** to: Carol Speas, Ph.D., Evaluation and Research, WAKE COUNTY PUBLIC SCHOOLS, 3600 Wake Forest Rd., P.O. Box 28041, Raleigh, NC 27611-8041.

1. Please briefly describe what the Title VI funds were used to purchase. (For example, do not list titles or numbers of books, but do describe categories of books such as math or science classroom instruction, circulating library, reference, etc.)
  
  
  
  
  
  
  
  
  
  
2. Please briefly describe the specific benefits to students that resulted from these purchases.
  
  
  
  
  
  
  
  
  
  
3. To what extent do the Title VI funds improve the effectiveness of instruction as used in your school?  
1. *Very Little*    2. *Little*    3. *Some*    4. *Much*    5. *Very Much*
  
4. To what extent do the Title VI funds improve the efficiency of your school operations?  
1. *Very Little*    2. *Little*    3. *Some*    4. *Much*    5. *Very Much*
  
5. To what extent was the program better this year than last year?  
1. *Very Little*    2. *Little*    3. *Some*    4. *Much*    5. *Very Much*
  
6. Please describe how the program could be improved for your school.

***Thank you for your assistance.***



**TITLE VI:  
ANNUAL EVALUATION REPORT  
2001-02**

**Authors:**

**Carol Speas, Ph.D., Evaluation Specialist  
Amy Overbay, Evaluation Assistant**

**Contributing Staff:**

**Nancy Baenen, Senior Director of Program Accountability**

E&R Report No. 02.43  
February 2003

Department of Evaluation and Research  
Wake County Public School System  
Raleigh, North Carolina  
[www.wcpss.net/evaluation-research](http://www.wcpss.net/evaluation-research)