

**TITLE VI:  
ANNUAL EVALUATION REPORT  
2000-2001**



**Author:**

**Carol M. Speas, Ph.D.  
919-850-8946  
ccspeas@wcpss.net**

**Contributing Staff:**

**Nancy Baenen, Sr. Director of Accountability  
Mary Penta, Ph.D, Evaluation Specialist  
David Scudder, Ph.D., Evaluation Specialist  
Amy Overby, Evaluation Assistant**

May 2002  
E&R Report No. 02.11

**DEPARTMENT OF EVALUATION AND RESEARCH**

**WAKE COUNTY PUBLIC SCHOOL SYSTEM**



**TITLE VI:**  
**ANNUAL EVALUATION REPORT**  
**2000-2001**

***Background***

The Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965 (ESEA) was re-authorized in 1994 by the **Improving America's Schools Act**. The reauthorization provided a new 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 may develop specific projects. In addition, Title VI requires school districts to provide funding to interested private non-profit schools in operation within the district.

The Wake County Public School System 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. In the spring of 2001, funding was allocated for planning and training activities for new school improvement/reorganization efforts at seven schools under the "3a. Promising Educational Reform Programs: Effective Schools" category.

***Evaluation Plan***

**EVALUATION QUESTIONS**

One purpose of the earlier FY 1999 evaluation was to begin a renovation of the manner in which Title VI activities are planned, implemented, monitored, and evaluated. The results of that evaluation were used as the basis for an amended program plan for FY 2000. One of the challenges of that process was to identify techniques to improve the rigor of the arts education evaluation. The general evaluation questions 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 art teachers.
- Informal telephone conversations with the contact person 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 magnet 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.
- Attendance logs/participation records, documentation of completed activities, and school-based plans for reform of the seven 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 art 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 and curricular integration activities and (b) provide examples of 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 is the primary project conducted under the Title VI innovative program areas. Approximately 84 percent of the funds were used for this program area.

Eleven art teachers, representing between 0.3 and 1.0 FTE each, served in six schools. Together, they represent 9.8 FTE. The majority of the funding in this project was used for the salary of these teachers. A small amount was used for educational materials.

Approximately 3,000 students were served by Title VI teachers in arts rotations (i.e., meeting with a class). Additionally, 1,065 students were served by arts teachers in at least one elective. Most or all students take at least one elective class, while some take two or more performing arts electives. The four Title VI schools with Gifted and Talented magnet programs typically offer students access to arts instruction through regularly-scheduled arts rotations (at least weekly) plus a series of arts-based electives



that students can select every nine weeks. Although it is not a GT magnet, Conn also provides both arts rotations and electives. In Wiley's more focused approach, some students attend arts rotations, with a smaller number participating in an in-depth orchestral program. In contrast to Title VI schools, magnet programs at schools in the comparison group have a primary focus other than the arts, e.g., International Baccalaureate, Montessori, Classical Studies. Students at the comparison schools attend arts rotations but typically do not have access to arts electives.

## **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. Currently there are 51 private schools in Wake County. During FY 2000, ten schools elected to participate in the Title VI program.

Steps were implemented in FY 2000 to personalize the tone of communications with private schools, emphasize the willingness of WCPSS to work with them, and to invite them to participate in advisory groups. It was hoped that these steps would substantially increase the number of participating private schools. However, there was a net increase of only one school, and no private school representatives expressed an interest in participating in an advisory group.

## **PROJECT ACHIEVE**

In the spring of 2001, funding was allocated for planning and training activities for a new school improvement/reorganization effort at seven 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. The WCPSS Instructional Services staff identified a set of schools showing historical patterns of below-expectation growth in accordance with standards set in the State's ABCs Accountability System 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 on-going reform activities.



## *Effects of the Program*

### **VISUAL AND PERFORMING ARTS**

#### **Teacher Feedback on Program Effectiveness**

Eleven surveys pertaining to program implementation were sent to teachers at the six magnet schools receiving Title VI funds in spring 2000. Completed surveys were returned by eight teachers, with at least one teacher from each school providing information on that school's arts program(s).

The eight teachers who completed the survey specialize in a variety of subjects, including drama, dance, visual arts, and music, with three teachers leading classes in multiple subjects. 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, commercial-production, makeup and costuming, fairy tales and fables. Dance electives include both ballet and African movement, and visual art electives range from "classic" subjects such as drawing, pottery, and weaving, to innovative subjects such as "Math in Motion." The diversity of course offerings suggests that curricula are being developed to match students' needs and teacher and student interests.

This year, seven of eight teachers reported attending team meetings. Also, half of the respondents reported leading one or more staff development meetings with classroom teachers. Those who provided a description of these meetings indicated that they included demonstrations and brainstorming sessions.

Respondents differed in their impressions of their schools' integration of the arts with academic curricula. While one arts instructor reported "very much" integration, instructors in other schools reported seeing "little" incorporation of the arts by classroom teachers. On the whole, however, most teachers were positive about the possibilities of integration, with six teachers reporting at least "some" integration occurring within academic classrooms. Respondents provided illustrations of the ways in which classroom teachers have been able to capitalize on students' interests in the arts. At one school, some classroom teachers used creative movement within a poetry unit. Students at other schools created character portraits to illustrate stories, and engaged in dance movements while learning about shapes, the orbits of planets, and North Carolina folk history.

Almost all respondents stressed the relationship between instruction in the arts and higher-order thinking skills, especially critical thinking. Respondents also indicated that arts instruction taps into different learning styles and intelligences, and can "turn on" students who have failed to connect with traditional instruction, and reinforce classroom learning for students who are already succeeding in their core classes. Additionally, nearly all respondents pointed to the arts' ability to teach teamwork, creative thinking, and self-discipline as potentially beneficial within an integrated curriculum.



## **Impact on Student Achievement and Parent Perceptions**

The development of a rigorous method for evaluating the effectiveness of the Title VI arts education project is hindered by the difficulty in finding an adequate comparison group. An option selected for the 2000-01 evaluation is the comparison of student performance at other magnet elementary schools (without Title VI teachers) as a comparison group. For purposes of this study, Evaluation and Research staff members selected six comparison magnet schools against which to evaluate the Title VI magnet schools. They chose schools that were similar to the Title VI schools in terms of demographics and previous student performance - - but different in relation to their arts programs. This evaluation examined state accountability system (ABCs) outcomes and parent survey results for the Title VI schools and comparison schools.

A review of ABCs Expected and Exemplary Growth composites for Title VI and comparison schools (similar magnet schools) shows that *fewer Title VI schools (1 out of 6) than comparison schools (2 out of 6) attained expected or exemplary growth equal to or greater than the district. The pattern was the same for performance composites.* This pattern is the reverse of the pattern desired if, in relation to comparable schools with less arts exposure, performing arts programs help to improve student achievement at Title VI schools on the tests comprising the ABCs. At a minimum, we would hope results would be comparable, with the added bonus of arts instruction.

A different pattern emerged when parent survey results were contrasted for Title VI and comparison schools. *For Title VI schools, the percent of parents rating both the visual and performing arts programs as Good or Excellent was above the district for all six schools.* Parents at only one of the comparison schools gave such ratings for visual arts, and at only two of the comparison schools for performing arts.

A full report of the comparison study is attached (Attachment 1).

## **TITLE VI NON-PUBLIC SCHOOLS**

In 2000-01, non-public schools again spent Title VI funds primarily on materials, supplies, and equipment. Feedback was obtained informally through telephone conversations with the private schools.

An effort was made to collect and process purchase orders in a more timely fashion than the previous year. Purchase orders did come in somewhat earlier than in past years. However, based on feedback from the schools, some orders were still not received in a reasonable time. In follow up with the WCPSS person who processed the purchase orders, E&R staff discovered that a misunderstanding had taken place. Orders should have been processed as they came in - earlier overall than in the past - but a batch of orders accumulated before processing began. The misunderstanding was resolved, and orders were being processed more quickly in 2001-02.



## **PROJECT ACHIEVE**

The planned training activities did occur for school teams from seven schools participating in Project Achieve. Attendance logs, documentation of completed activities, and the individual school-based plans for reform are on file in E&R. Five elementary schools (Cary, Creech Road, Hodge Road, Rand Road, and Smith) and two middle schools (East Garner and East Wake) participated in the project.

## **EVALUATION SPECIALIST**

The evaluation specialist did provide 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 (ESEA Title VI program, CSR program, and Accelerated Learning program, for example).
- Assisted in the development of school drop-out data for the state, determination of graduation rates on students entering 9<sup>th</sup> grade in 1995, and assessment of differences in achievement outcomes between magnet grant schools and other schools.
- Provided training and guidance documents to school improvement teams interpreting ABC data relevant to improving growth and performance in individual schools.
- Provided reports of K-2 Literacy and Mathematics Assessment results to all elementary schools.
- Met with the purchase order processing person to discuss ways of improving the WCPSS budgetary process for the purchase and delivery of materials to participating non-public schools in Title VI.

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

## **CONCLUSIONS**

The arts teacher survey responses suggest that the core objective of the program - art education elective courses that address the needs and interests of the students - is well achieved. However, some components of program implementation could be improved. Participation in team meetings and staff development activities remains uneven across schools.

ABCs data in this evaluation do not provide evidence that academic growth and performance of students at Title VI schools, which provide arts rotations as well as electives, is more likely to be above that of the district than growth and performance at comparable magnet schools offering only arts rotations.



Parent survey results, however, indicate that parents' opinions about the visual and performing arts programs at Title VI schools are, in contrast to the comparison schools, more positive than opinions of parents throughout the system.

Project Achieve training and development did occur as planned in 2000-01. The project was implemented in the 2001-02 school year and is being evaluated.

### ***Potential Improvements***

Some potential areas of improvement are listed below:

- A continuing theme emerging from the surveys of arts teachers is the need for better coordination between regular classroom teachers and art teachers. Therefore, continuing emphasis by the arts coordinator should be placed on how to best improve communication with other teachers, initiate more team contact, and share integration strategies.
- Communication and monitoring should be aimed at ensuring consistent implementation across schools.
- Teachers who reported seeing "little" integration of the arts within the core courses also indicated that they had never initiated a curricular integration meeting. This suggests a need for increased commitment and/or more training in integration strategies for arts teachers as well as classroom teachers, and clear communication of this expectation from the arts coordinator.
- 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 was the preferred approach with available data. However, the search for more specific information regarding variations in the amount of art training that students receive in the program schools will continue. If the variations could be specified, possibly individual student or class (rather than school) achievement could then be compared. Ways to capture data on other student benefits of arts instruction could be undertaken with sufficient support of the arts coordinator.



***Attachment 1***

**Using ABCs Results and Parent Survey Information to Evaluate Title VI Schools.**

By Mary Penta, Ph.D.

In the 2001-01 school year, six Wake County Public School System (WCPSS) elementary schools had Title IV-funded arts teachers. All six are magnet schools that recruit students based on unique instructional programs. Gifted and Talented (GT) is the magnet program at four of the Title VI schools — Fuller Elementary, Powell Elementary, Washington Elementary, and Wendell Elementary. Magnet programs for the two others are Global Communications at Conn Elementary and International Studies at Wiley Elementary. Table 1 characterizes Title VI implementation at each school in terms of: number of positions funded by Title VI, approximate numbers of students served by Title VI teachers in arts electives and in weekly arts rotations, and the primary focus of Title VI classes.

**Table 1. Title VI Implementation**

<b>School</b>	<b>Magnet Program</b>	<b>Title VI Teachers</b>	<b>Students served by each teacher in at least one elective</b>	<b>Students served by each teacher in rotations</b>	<b>Focus of Instruction</b>
Conn	Global Communications	2	380	505	Visual and Performing Arts
Fuller	Gifted and Talented	2	190	456	Performing Arts
Powell	Gifted and Talented	1	173	530	Visual Arts
Washington	Gifted and Talented	3	170	602	Performing Arts
Wendell	Gifted and Talented	3	330	550	Visual Arts
Wiley	International Studies	1	22	30	Performing Arts

In addition to the six program magnets that received Title IV positions, Wake County has 15 other elementary schools that are program magnet schools (Appendix A). For purposes of this study, E&R staff members selected six comparison magnet schools against which to evaluate the Title VI magnet schools. They chose schools that were similar to the Title VI schools in terms of demographics and previous student performance — factors that can impact student achievement — but different from them in relation to their arts programs. Specifically, schools were matched on their percent of students receiving free or reduced priced lunches in 2000-01 (FRL) and the percent of their 3<sup>rd</sup> through 5<sup>th</sup> graders at or above grade level on state tests at the end of 1999-00 (state ABCs Performance Composite). For Title IV schools, the average percent



free/reduced price lunch was 30%; for schools in the comparison group it was 34%. The average 1999-2000 Performance Composite for Title VI schools was 79.48, and it was 78.98 for the comparison schools. Schools in each group are listed below (Tables 2 & 3).

**Table 2. Title IV Schools: 2000-01 Percent Free/Reduced-Price Lunch and 1999-00 Performance Composite**

School	Title VI Teachers	Magnet Program	Percent Free/Reduced-Price Lunch 2000-01	Performance Composite 1999-00
Conn	2	Global Communications	38	73.8
Fuller	2	Gifted and Talented	25	72.9
Powell	1	Gifted and Talented	35	82.9
Washington	3	Gifted and Talented	27	81.9
Wendell	3	Gifted and Talented	41	79.2
Wiley	1	International Studies	37	86.2

**Table 3. Comparison Schools: 2000-01 Percent Free/Reduced-Price Lunch and 1999-00 Performance Composite**

School	Title VI Teachers	Magnet Program	Percent Free/Reduced-Price Lunch 2000-01	Performance Composite 1999-00
Farmington Woods	0	International Baccalaureate	28	78.8
Joyner	0	Language Explorations	35	82.3
Lincoln Heights	0	Community Model	26	71.5
Millbrook	0	International Baccalaureate	38	77.0
Poe	0	Montessori	26	76.1
Root	0	Classical Studies	27	88.2



Though similar with regard to factors likely to affect student achievement, the Title VI and comparison schools have different arts programs. The four Title VI schools with Gifted and Talented magnet programs typically offer students access to arts instruction through regularly-scheduled arts rotations (at least weekly) plus a series of arts-based electives that students can select every nine weeks. Although it is not a GT magnet, Conn also provides both arts rotations and electives. In Wiley's more focused approach, some students attend arts rotations, with a smaller number participating in an in-depth orchestral program.

In contrast to Title VI schools, magnet programs at schools in the comparison group have a primary focus other than the arts, e.g., International Baccalaureate, Montessori, and Classical Studies. Students at the comparison schools attend arts rotations but typically do not have access to arts electives.

This evaluation examines state accountability system (ABCs) outcomes and parent survey results for the Title VI schools and comparison schools. Specifically, each school's Expected Growth Composite, Exemplary Growth Composite, and Performance Composite from the ABCs are compared to those same statistics for the district as a whole (Tables 4 and 5). Similarly, school-level opinions from the parent survey are compared to district results (Tables 6 and 7).

One aim of integrating arts into schools' instructional programs is to increase student performance in academic subjects. Because arts programs at the Title VI schools include rotations as well as electives, it is assumed that potential student achievement effects will accrue and that Title VI schools will be more likely to outperform the system than will schools in the comparison group. Likewise, because of the additional arts offerings at Title VI schools, it is hypothesized that parents of students attending these schools will express positive opinions about arts programs at the schools.

A review of ABCs Expected and Exemplary Growth Composites for Title VI and comparison schools shows that fewer Title VI schools (1 out of 6) than comparison schools (2 out of 6) attained expected or exemplary growth equal to or greater than the system. The pattern was the same for schools' Performance Composites: 1 out of 6 Title VI schools had Performance Composites above system, and 2 or 6 comparison schools outperformed the system (Tables 4 and 5). This pattern is the reverse of the pattern anticipated if, in relation to comparable schools with less arts exposure, visual and performing arts programs are helping improve achievement of students at Title VI schools on the tests that comprise the ABCs.



**Table 4. 2001-01 ABCs Growth and Performance Composites for Title VI Schools Compared to System Growth and Performance**

Title VI School	Expected Growth Composite 2000-01			Exemplary Growth Composite 2000-01			Performance Composite 2000-01		
	School	System	School $\geq$ System	School	System	School $\geq$ System	School	System	School $\geq$ System
Conn	0.85	0.58	Yes	0.38	0.10	Yes	77.3	87.0	No
Fuller	-0.14	0.58	No	-0.61	0.10	No	79.8	87.0	No
Powell	0.19	0.58	No	-0.30	0.10	No	78.1	87.0	No
Washington	0.38	0.58	No	-0.09	0.10	No	87.0	87.0	Yes
Wendell	0.38	0.58	No	-0.10	0.10	No	77.4	87.0	No
Wiley	0.54	0.58	No	0.07	0.10	No	78.7	87.0	No

**Table 5. 2000-01 ABCs Growth and Performance Composites for Comparison Schools Compared to System Growth and Performance**

Comparison School	Expected Growth Composite 2000-01			Exemplary Growth Composite 2000-01			Performance Composite 2000-01		
	School	System	School $\geq$ System	School	System	School $\geq$ System	School	System	School $\geq$ System
Farmington	0.82	0.58	Yes	0.34	0.10	Yes	86.2	87.0	No
Joyner	0.66	0.58	Yes	0.18	0.10	Yes	81.5	87.0	No
Lincoln Hts.	0.56	0.58	No	0.09	0.10	No	87.3	87.0	Yes
Millbrook	0.07	0.58	No	-0.42	0.10	No	79.0	87.0	No
Poe	0.27	0.58	No	-0.24	0.10	No	81.0	87.0	No
Root	0.49	0.58	No	0.02	0.10	No	87.7	87.0	Yes

When parent survey results are contrasted for Title VI and comparison schools, a different pattern emerges. For Title VI schools, the percent of parents rating both the visual and performing arts programs as *Good* or *Excellent* was above the system (80.35% and 70.47%) for all six schools (Table 6). Parents at only two of the six comparison schools (Farmington Woods and Joyner) gave ratings of *Good* or *Excellent* for visual arts. For performing arts, three of the six comparison schools (Joyner, Millbrook, Root) received parent ratings of *Good* or *Excellent* (Table 7).



**Table 6. Parent Survey Results for Title IV Schools**

Magnet School	Magnet Program	Parent Survey Results					
		Visual Arts			Performing Arts		
		School Percentage <i>Good or Excellent</i>	System Percentage <i>Good or Excellent</i>	School Above System?	School Percentage <i>Good or Excellent</i>	System Percentage <i>Good or Excellent</i>	School Above System?
Conn	Global Communications	87.1	80.35	Yes	90	70.47	Yes
Fuller	Gifted and Talented	81.81	80.35	Yes	86.15	70.47	Yes
Powell	Gifted and Talented	81.81	80.35	Yes	90.9	70.47	Yes
Washington	Gifted and Talented	87.5	80.35	Yes	90.63	70.47	Yes
Wendell	Gifted and Talented	84.7	80.35	Yes	82.14	70.47	Yes
Wiley	International Studies	91.38	80.35	Yes	91.38	70.47	Yes

**Table 7. Parent Survey Results for Comparison Schools**

School	Magnet Program	Parent Survey Results					
		Visual Arts			Performing Arts		
		School Percentage <i>Good or Excellent</i>	System Percentage <i>Good or Excellent</i>	School Above System?	School Percentage <i>Good or Excellent</i>	System Percentage <i>Good or Excellent</i>	School Above System?
Farmington Woods 414	International Baccalaureate	84.21	80.35	Yes	67.24	70.47	No
Joyner 456	Language Explorations	82.35	80.35	Yes	73.53	70.47	Yes
Lincoln Heights 476	Community Model	79.42	80.35	No	66.66	70.47	No
Millbrook 496	International Baccalaureate	78.13	80.35	No	76.19	70.47	Yes
Poe 532	Montessori	78.95	80.35	No	52.64	70.47	No
Root 548	Classical Studies	76	80.35	No	87.75	70.47	Yes



**Conclusion**

ABCs data in this evaluation do not provide evidence that growth and performance of students at Title IV schools, which provide arts rotations as well as electives, is more likely to be above the system than growth and performance at comparable magnet schools offering only arts rotations. It does, however, indicate that parents' opinions about the visual and performing arts programs at Title VI schools are, in contrast to the comparison schools, more positive than opinions of parents throughout the system.



**Appendix A**  
**to Attachment 1**

1999-00 Free/Reduced-Price Lunch Percentages and 2001-01 ABCs Performance Composites for Program Magnet Elementary Schools without Title VI

<b>School</b>	<b>Title VI Teachers</b>	<b>1999-00 Percent Free/Reduced-Price Lunch</b>	<b>Magnet Program</b>	<b>2000-01 Performance Composite</b>
Apex 308	0	10	Gifted and Talented	89.8
Bugg 352	0	25	A+ Program	80.5
Combs 376	0	26	Leadership	87.5
Douglas 396	0	36	A+ Program	78.0
Farmington Woods 414	0	28	International Baccalaureate	78.8
Hunter 448	0	27	Gifted and Talented	85.8
Joyner 456	0	35	Language Explorations	82.3
Lincoln Heights 476	0	26	Community Model	71.5
Millbrook 496	0	38	International Baccalaureate	77.0
Olds 524	0	17	University Connections	87.4
Poe 532	0	26	Montessori	76.1
Root 548	0	27	Classical Studies	88.2
Underwood 572	0	32	Gifted and Talented	75.1
Wake Forest 584	0	34	Gifted and Talented	78.3
Zebulon 632	0	49	Gifted and Talented	73.8



*Attachment 2*  
**ESEA/IASA Title VI**

**Magnet School—Arts Education Program**

**End of Year Evaluation**  
**ART Teacher's Questionnaire**

Thank you in advance for completing this questionnaire. It is important that we evaluate the impacts of the Title VI Art Education program, as well as instruction in the arts throughout Wake County Public Schools. Your views are crucial to understanding the impacts of arts education.

Your answers will be treated as confidential. Results will be reported as group information only. No individual respondents will be identified.

The following questions are based on some underlying assumptions about how instruction in the arts is provided. If you think additional or different questions should have been asked, please phrase some questions of your own in addition to trying to answer these.

If you desire to take more space to answer some of the questions, please feel free to do so. If you have materials that provide some understanding about how you provide instruction in the arts, such as course outlines or favorite lesson plans, please share them with me. I will need your answers by May 15, 2001. Please return by the courier addressed to:

David Scudder  
Evaluation and Research  
Administration Building



1. Briefly describe the elective art course(s) you teach. If you have course outlines or overviews you can share, please send them.

2. Approximately how many individual students will you have had in arts classes by the end of this school year? \_\_\_\_\_

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:

**2** elective art classes during the year? \_\_\_\_\_

**3 or more** elective art classes during the year? \_\_\_\_\_

5. To what extent do you think that instruction in the arts increases the development of personal assets such as a sense of identity, confidence, feeling empowered, or feeling engaged with the school and the community?

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

6. Please describe how you think this process works; that is, how does instruction in the arts increase personal assets?

7. To what extent do you think that instruction in the arts increases academic achievement?

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

8. Please describe how you think this process works, that is, how does instruction in the arts increase academic achievement. (Feel free to send favorite materials to illustrate.)



9. 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

10. 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

11. About how many teachers on average usually attend each staff development activity? \_\_\_\_\_

12. Please briefly describe the content of any staff development activities you have conducted this year. If you have an outline, please send a copy.

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

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

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

15. How often have you assisted in teaching activities outside of the arts this year, such as tutoring reading?

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

16. Please describe briefly any teaching activities outside of the arts you may have conducted this year.