DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 248 292 UD 023 775

AUTHOR Alkin, Marvin; And Others
TITLE Evaluation of the Permits with Transportation Program.
INSTITUTION Los Angeles Unified School District, Calif. Research and Evaluation Branch.
PUB DATE 1 Jul 83
NOTE 87p.
PUB TYPE Reports - Evaluative/Feasibility (142)

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC04 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS Academic Achievement; Busing; *Desegregation Effects; Desegregation Plans; Elementary Secondary Education; Minority Groups; Parent Attitudes; *Program Effectiveness; Program Evaluation; Racial Relations; Student Attitudes; *Student Transportation; Teacher Attitudes; *Transfer Students; Urban Schools; *Voluntary Desegregation
IDENTIFIERS Continued Voluntary Permits; *Los Angeles Unified School District CA; *Permits with Transportation

ABSTRACT

This report presents the 1982-83 results of an ongoing evaluation of two voluntary integration programs, Permits With Transportation (PWT) and Continued Voluntary Permits (CVP), which operate within the Los Angeles Unified School District. Information on implementation methods is presented for the use of district policymakers and for gauging progress in reducing the harms of racial isolation. A prologue considers the social, economic, and governmental context affecting the analysis and interpretation of findings. Chapter I provides a general introduction and a short history of the PWT and CVP programs. The purpose of PWT is stated to be the provision of opportunities for students to share multicultural and educational experiences in an integrated setting; nearly all of 21,000 participating students represent non-Anglo minority groups. CVP programs, it is said, exist to allow students who attended a paired or clustered school in 1980-81 under a mandatory plan to continue to participate in an integrated experience on a voluntary basis. Chapter II describes study methodology. A review of the purposes and issues underlying the investigation is followed by a description of the sampling, instrumentation, and data collection strategies. Chapter III contains findings and recommendations. It is organized according to questions related to (1) changes and effects of program mechanisms; (2) effects of school policies and practices on student interactions as well as efforts to incorporate participants into the regular school program; and (3) progress made in reducing the harms of racial isolation. A final section summarizes major findings, which were generally positive, and makes recommendations which mainly focus on improving the information distributed to parents and students, and on training teachers and involving them in the program's implementation. (KH)

Evaluation of the

Parmits With Transportation Program

by

Evaluation Planning Team

Marvin Alkin, Ed.D.
Nancy Atwood, Ph.D.
Eva Baker, Ed.D.
Winston Doby, Ed.D.
William Doherty, Ph.D.

with

Los Angeles Unified School District
Research and Evaluation Branch

July 1, 1983

Approved:
Floraline I. Stevens
Director
Research and Evalution Branch
Joseph P. Linscomb
Associate Superintendent, Instruction

TABLE OF CONTENTS

PROLOGUE

This report has been prepared as part of a two-year effort to evaluate the Voluntary Integration and Year-Round Schools (YRS) programs for the Los Angeles Unified School District (LAUSD). The report is intended to meet the requirement imposed by the Court Order of September, 1981. Specifically, the Superior Court ordered the Los Angeles Unified School District to provide by July 15, 1983 "...a full report of the measures taken and achieved under its voluntary integration plan." In response to this mandate, our studies have focused on both elements. With respect to "measures taken" we have considered the implementation of programs as well as the actions taken by the LAUSD in response to earlier findings of the Evaluation Planning Team (EPT). We base our judgments on the "results achieved" on the District's progress in ameliorating the harms of racial isolation as referenced in the original Crawford report. Our judgments of the District's efforts on both implementing measures and achieving results are based on multiple data sources. Quantitative and interpretive data from earlier reports and from the current year's studies are of course, important inputs. In addition, these data are complemented by our own interviews, discussions, and professional judgments based on three years of examining the Voluntary Integration and Year-Round Schools programs.

The Evaluation Planning Team members were originally invited to participate in the LAUSD evaluation efforts under the mandatory desegregation plan. The relationship of the Team to the District has been complex. The identification of issues has been shared by the Team and LAUSD. The development and design of specific evaluation questions, methodology, and instruments have been prerogatives of the Evaluation Planning Team, in consultation with District personnel. Data collection has been conducted using LAUSD personnel and personnel of neighboring universities, as well as the Team members. The analyses, interpretations, and recommendations for this report, as our earlier reports, represent the work of the Team members. Throughout, we have worked within the constraints of resources, time, personnel, and information bases.

Context

In our work, we have become especially aware of the importance of context in the analysis and interpretation of findings, particularly so because our process has extended over a number of years, and we have found that assumptions, points-of-view, and facts change over time.

Let us consider the context in three parts: 1) the nature of the greater Los Angeles Area served by the LAUSD, 2) the changes in LAUSD, and 3) the effect of State and Federal policy changes on the operations of LAUSD.

The Greater Los Angeles Area. The area serviced by LAUSD is a clear factor in any District study. Its boundaries include 464 square miles, within which could be placed the combined areas of all of Boston, Cleveland, Denver, Manhattan, Milwaukee, Philadelphia, Providence, and Washington, D.C. The District serves all of the city of Los Angeles, seven other incorporated cities, and portions of 18 other municipalities. The city of Los Angeles is more than 50 miles across at its widest point, split by the Santa Monica Mountains. The San Fernando Valley alone, with an area of 235 square miles and a population of 1.5 million, is second only in size to Los Angeles in California and seventh in population in the country.

Demographically, the Los Angeles area is enormously diverse. Seventy language groups (requiring bilingual attention) are represented in the District. The majority of students in the District come from Spanish speaking environments, many from families of Mexican descent. There are, as well, substantial numbers from other Latin American countries and a small but growing population from Asia. The demographic changes in the area have been dramatic in the last decade and have strongly influenced the District's educational efforts.

The size of the Los Angeles region, in part, has created sets of intact communities, many with the appearance of insularity. Rather than a single city with a ring of suburban areas, Los Angeles is more like a confederation of communities. Newer immigrants tend to settle in older parts of the city near families of similar backgrounds, although the San Fernando Valley has substantial new immigration as well. Residential housing patterns have developed based on the initial location of immigrants and on the dominance of Anglo population in the San Fernando Valley. Although one would expect residential distinctions to reduce over time, the high property values in the

area with other factors have mitigated against substantial population shifts and natural integration of racial and ethnic groups. These population patterns result in school areas in some parts of the District that are overcrowded while others are underpopulated.

Context of LAUSD. Because the scope of effort and public concern is normally broad, we will consider only a few contextual factors (listed below) which have impact on the processes of the Voluntary Integration and Year-Round Schools programs and the District.

- The leadership in LAUSD has changed during this period, permitting the new Superintendent to define his own program goals, activities, and relationships with the LAUSD Board of Education, staff, and with other constituencies.

- The schools have experienced some of the same financial constraints felt by other public sectors since the tax reform efforts, culminating with Proposition 13. Thus, the District has been required to notify substantial numbers of teachers that they might not be rehired because of fiscal limitations.

- Paradoxically, almost throughout, a teacher shortage has existed in mathematics and science.

- The racial distribution of the District in 1982-83 included about equal proportions of Black and Anglo students (22% each), about 8% Asian, and approximately 49% Hispanic students. More than 544,000 students (1982-83 figures) are taught by teachers in 826 schools.

State and Federal Context. Education has been topical throughout the last few years with attention given to funding bases, student academic performance, educational equity and educational quality as central issues. Policy changes in available funds for categorical programs reduced the amount of federal support to LAUSD in 1982-83. The Serrano suit deliberations have resulted in the use of

"per pupil costs" as a proxy measure of educational quality. The decision has also increased the State's interests in influencing local school districts. California's 1982 election sharpened the issues related to the role of State leadership in education, and focused attention on performance and academic preparation.

Nationally, the question of educational quality has also been raised by the Federal Commission on Educational Excellence and by other national reports assessing the quality of schooling. The concern for educational quality has been directed mainly at student performance shown, for instance, by tightening requirements for admission to California universities and by systems of statewide assessment and proficiency testing. In California, as in some other states, the educational quality issue has been extended to teachers through the administration of skill tests for teachers in areas termed "basic" literacy. Further reports in national media have raised questions about the quality of people entering the teaching profession. There has been less rhetoric and attention, both state-wide and nationally to the issue of educational equity or the specific concern about the education of minority students. The joint concerns of student and teacher performance have led to some positive movement in increasing: 1) the expectations for students, 2) the meaning of grades, and 3) the basic skill requirements at the local level. It is against the general context of these social facts and orientations that this report is presented.

Chapter I
Introduction

The Voluntary Integration Planning Team in collaboration with the Research and Evaluation Branch of the Los Angeles Unified School District has been conducting an ongoing evaluation of Voluntary Integration programs in the District since the 1980-81 school year. This document presents the 1982-83 results of the investigation for the Permits With Transportation (PWT) and Continued Voluntary Permits (CVP) programs. Separate reports were prepared covering the Magnet and Year-Round Schools programs operating in the District during 1982-83. The primary purpose of this report is to provide information to the District on the methods used in implementing the PWT and CVP programs as well as the progress achieved in reducing the harms of racial isolation as specified in the Crawford case.

Organization of the Report

The Prologue preceding this section provides a general discussion of the context in which the evaluation was conducted. An Evaluation Summary of this report is presented in the Los Angeles Unified School District Research and Evaluation Publication 436. The reader is encouraged to review the Prologue and the Evaluation Summary prior to reading this report. The report is organized into three chapters: Chapter I provides a general introduction and a brief history of the PWT and CVP programs; Chapter II describes the methodology used in conducting the study. A review of the purposes and issues which provided the focus for the investigation is followed by a description of the sampling, instrumentation, and data collection strategies. Chapter III contains the findings of the study. The results are organized and presented in accordance with the evaluation issues outline contained in Chapter II. The study design plan, supplemental tables, and data collection instruments are contained in the Appendix to this report.

The PWT Program

The Permits With Transportation program, commonly referred to as PWT, can be traced back to 1968 when the District first provided transportation to achieve voluntary integration. This first effort, then called the Voluntary

Transportation program, began with 550 students. In 1972 The Permits With Transportation program was created through the merger of the Voluntary Transportation program and a program developed to provide transportation for students displaced from schools not considered earthquake-safe.

According to published information on the program, the purpose of PWT is to provide opportunities for students to share multicultural and educational experiences in an integrated setting. While there are no special requirements for acceptance into PWT, students must reside in the Los Angeles Unified School District, be in grades 1-12, and complete an application during the spring preceding the school year. Continuing students do not have to reapply. Students are assigned to designated receiving schools according to Court directives and District guidelines; and school selections are determined by the PWT program.

Since the PWT program does not offer a specialized course of study, all PWT students are enrolled in the regular school program and may participate in any special programs (academic or extracurricular) offered at the receiving school, including athletics, band, drill team, drama, clubs, honors courses, student government, etc. There are no program or transportation costs for PWT students or their parents to participate in school/community activities. In just a decade, the PWT program has grown from 3000 students in 1972-73 to approximately 21,000 students in 1982-83 who attend 137 designated receiving schools.

Table I-1 shows the PWT enrollment in receiving schools during the 1982-83 school year, by grade level and ethnicity. Overall, about ninety-nine percent of program participants are Hispanic, Black, Asian or Other non-Anglo. Nearly two-thirds of all students participating in the program are Black, while Hispanic students make up one-fourth of the program enrollment. The pattern varies considerably by grade level. For example, Black students comprise nearly seventy-five percent of the high school population and less than fifty percent of the elementary school enrollment. By contrast, Hispanic students represent forty-five percent of the elementary school enrollment and only sixteen percent at the high school level. Approximately four-fifths of the PWT students are enrolled in secondary schools (grades 7-12), while the remaining one-fifth are enrolled in the elementary grades (K-6).

Table 1-1
PWT Enrollment in PWT Receiving Schools: 1982-83

Grade Level	No. of Schools	American Indian	Asian	Black	Hispanic	White	Total
Elementary	88	1.3% (59)	5.2% (241)	46.2% (2123)	44.9% (2064)	2.3% (106)	(4593)
Junior High	29	.5 (44)	10.4 (909)	64.6 (5646)	23.5 (2056)	1.0 (88)	(8743)
Senior High	20	.4 (33)	8.4 (619)	74.3 (5460)	16.2 (1189)	.7 (49)	(7350)
Total	137	.7% (136)	8.6% (1769)	64.0% (13229)	25.7% (5309)	1.2% (243)	(20686)

Continued Integration Programs

Continued Integration programs (CIP) were among the voluntary integration efforts the District included in its plan for desegregation submitted to the Court in June, 1981, following the conclusion of the mandatory desegregation program. Under the mandatory plan some schools were joined in pairs and clusters to achieve desegregation. The CIP provided opportunities for students who attended a paired or clustered school in 1980-81 under the mandatory plan to continue to participate in an integrated experience on a voluntary basis by: 1) continuing to attend a school with which their resident school was paired or clustered (Continued Voluntary Permits or CVP); 2) participating in inter-school projects with pupils from formerly paired or clustered schools (inter-school learning activities or ISLA); and 3) participating in planned inter-school activities focusing on enhancing leadership skills (Student Leadership Exchange or SLE).

In 1982-83 Continued Voluntary Permits (CVP) was the only segment of the Continued Integration programs (CIP) available to students. The CVP differs from PWT in that participating students attend receiving schools which were previously paired or clustered with their resident schools. During the 1982-83 school year, over 2,800 students were attending 75 schools under the CVP program. Table I-2 summarizes the enrollment in CVP by grade level and racial/ethnic background of students. As in the PWT program, nearly all (ninety-five percent) CVP students are predominantly Hispanic, Black, Asian or Other non-Anglo (PHBAO). Hispanic (45%) and Black students (41%) are about evenly represented overall; however, their representation varies greatly by level. Hispanic students make up nearly fifty percent of the elementary school enrollment and only one-quarter at the junior high level. By contrast, sixty percent of the junior high school enrollment is Black as compared to only thirty-nine percent at the elementary school level. Nearly ninety percent of the CVP enrollment is in grades K-6 since most pairs and clusters in the mandatory plan were elementary schools; and no high schools were included in this aspect of the program.

Chapter II describes the methodology employed in collecting, analyzing and reporting the data used in this study, while Chapter III is devoted to a presentation of the findings.

Table I-2
CVP Student Enrollment: 1982-83

Grade Level	No. of Schools	American Indian	Asian	Black	Hispanic	White	Total
Elementary	70	1.2% (30)	7.1% (179)	38.6% (976)	47.5% (1201)	5.7% (143)	(2529)
Junior High	5	.6 (2)	11.5 (36)	61.7 (193)	25.9 (81)	.3 (1)	(313)
Senior High	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Total	75	1.1% (32)	7.6% (215)	41.1% (1169)	45.1% (1282)	5.1% (144)	(2842)

Chapter II
Methodology

This chapter describes the methodology used in conducting the evaluation of the Permits With Transportation (PWT) and Continued Voluntary Permits (CVP) programs. Included are a review of the purposes and issues which provided the focus for this inquiry and a description of the sampling, instrumentation, data collection, and analysis strategies.

Purposes and Issues

A brief history of the PWT and CVP programs was presented in Chapter I of this report. While these programs are technically separate enterprises under the District's voluntary integration effort due to their historical evolutions, they are virtually identical in program purpose and implementation mechanism. The primary purpose of each is to provide a mechanism for students to share multicultural and educational experiences in an integrated setting. The principal mechanism for achieving this purpose is to provide free bus transportation for students to attend selected integrated receiving schools. The principal difference between PWT and CVP is the method for determining the receiving school a student may attend -- CVP determined by a prior pair or cluster and PWT determined by the PWT staff.

Based on similarities between the two programs, the Evaluation Planning Team in conjunction with District staff decided to review these two programs together. The primary purpose of this review is to provide information to the District on the methods used in implementing the programs as well as information on the progress achieved in reducing the harms of racial isolation.

Table II-1 presents the critical evaluation issues addressed in this report. These issues were derived from discussions with District personnel, a review of preliminary findings contained in previous evaluation reports and studies of PWT and CVP, an examination of published program literature, and direction from the Court. Since the District, in general, and these programs, in particular, had undergone many changes over the past several years, the District was especially interested in information which would help them improve the programs. Thus, "process" information received primary attention in the evaluation.

Preliminary findings contained in the 1980-81 and 1981-82 reports provided the framework for focusing the study on critical areas of interest, such as: mechanisms for explaining program options to students and parents, post-secondary plans and opportunities for P/NT students, and counseling and advising of P/NT students.

A review of program literature and discussions with program administrators were particularly helpful in clarifying the principal program purposes and mechanisms. Finally, the Court provided direction in identifying the harms of racial isolation to be used as a framework for measuring District progress. The four areas examined were academic achievement; attitudes of students and school personnel; post-secondary opportunities for students; and social interactions among students from different racial/ethnic backgrounds.

The process evaluation focused on three major categories: 1) program mechanisms; 2) desegregation/integration policies and practices; and 3) school practices. In the first category, we examined changes in District policies and procedures for presenting programmatic offerings to parents and students, and the effects of these procedures as reflected in the characteristics of participating students and schools. Under the desegregation/integration category, we were concerned with District and school policies and procedures which contribute to or inhibit meaningful interracial interactions both inside and outside the classroom setting. The importance of staff perceptions, attitudes and actions taken to address ongoing concerns were especially targeted for further inquiry. Finally, in category three, we were concerned with the context within which the programs operate. Regular school practices referred to efforts taken to incorporate students into the regular school program and to accommodate the special needs of program participants.

The outcome issues correspond to the four harms identified in the Crawford case. We examined the degree of progress made in reducing each of these harms for participating students. Post-secondary plans and opportunities were given special attention during this investigation.

The evaluation issues provided the conceptual framework for the design of the evaluation methodology. Preliminary plans for sampling, instrumentation, data collection, and data analysis methods and procedures were guided by these issues as were the refinements and final adopted strategies.

Table II-1
1982-83 Evaluation Issues: PWT and CVP Programs

Evaluation Issues	Program PWT	Program CVP
A. Process Evaluation		
1. Mechanisms		
a. What changes have been made in mechanisms for explaining program options to parents and students during 1982-83?	X	X
b. What are the characteristics of students chosen to participate?	X	X
c. Do program mechanisms result in students being enrolled in desegregated schools?	X	X
2. Integration/Desegregation		
a. How do policies and procedures inhibit or contribute to integration?	X	X
1. administration		
2. classroom		
3. extracurricular		
b. What types of services are delivered as part of the program?	X	X
c. What are the perceptions and attitudes of school personnel toward the program?	X	X
d. What additional arrangements have been undertaken during 1982-83 to address particular areas of concern?	X	X
3. School Program		
a. What efforts are made to encourage the incorporation of transfer students into the regular school program?	X	X
b. What actions are taken to accommodate the needs of program participants?	X	X
B. Outcome Evaluation		
1. What progress appears to have been made in reducing the harms set forth by the Court in the Crawford decision?		
a. Achievement	X	X
b. Attitudes	X	X
c. Post-secondary opportunities	X	
d. Social interaction	X	X

Sampling

PWT program. The evaluation of the PWT program focused on "receiving schools", that is, schools to which PWT students were bussed. In 1982-83 over twenty thousand PWT students were attending 137 different PWT receiving schools, 20 senior high schools, 29 junior high schools, and 88 elementary schools. Because feeder patterns between schools of various grade levels were of major interest in the study, a sampling approach was adopted which allowed the Team to study the transition of PWT and non-PWT students as they progressed through the normal receiving school feeder patterns.

Implementation of this linked sampling strategy began with a stratified random sampling of senior high schools. In order to insure variation in the proportion of receiving schools that were PWT and the racial composition of PWT students, the percentage of students in the school that were PWT and the percentage of PWT students who were Black were used as stratification dimensions. Eleven senior high schools were selected into the sample using this approach.

Then, for those senior high schools selected into the sample, a sample of their feeder junior high schools was drawn. Finally, for those junior high schools selected, a sample of their feeder elementary schools was chosen. Feeder junior high and elementary schools were required to be PWT receiving schools to be included in the sample. The probability of a feeder school being selected was proportional to the percentage of its students being sent on to a sampled school at the next grade level. For example, an elementary school's probability of being selected was based on the percentage of its students which would be sent on to junior high schools selected into the PWT sample. This approach insured that the sampled schools had sizeable numbers of students from their feeder schools sampled at the lower grade levels. It also provided considerable variations along the stratification dimensions used for the senior high school sample within the sampled junior high and elementary schools. Eleven senior high, 15 junior high, and 18 elementary schools, were included in the sample for the 1981-82 study. Prior to the start of the 1982-83 study, three of the selected elementary schools were closed by the District due to underenrollment. This decreased the 1982-83 elementary school sample to 15 and the total sample to 41 schools. Table II-2 presents the senior high school PWT sampling matrix. Junior high and elementary schools were selected along the same dimensions.

Table [illegible]-2

Sampling Matrix for PWT Receiving Junior High Schools

PWT Ethnic Enrollment

Percent of Receiving School Enrollment that is PWT	Percent of PWT Enrollment 70% or more Black		Percent of PWT Enrollment 20% or more Hispanic and less than 70% Black		Percent of PWT Enrollment 20% or more Asian and less than 70% Black	
Percent	No. Schools	No. Schools in Sample	No. Schools	No. Schools in Sample	No. Schools	No. Schools in Sample
0-10	4	4	2			
11-20	11	9	2	2	2	
21-30	4	2	2	1	1	1
31-40	1	1	1			
Total	20	16	7	3	3	1	1

Teachers and school staffs within selected PWT receiving schools were drawn using a stratified random sampling approach. The stratification dimensions for teachers were grade level and academic subject matter. Because of the interest in all levels of the educational process, pivotal grades (5,6,8, and 12) were selected to represent the entire spectrum. Employing the same sampling strategy as in 1981-82, English teachers and physical education or other non-academic subject teachers comprised the teacher sample at the secondary level.

CVP Program. The treatment of the schools involved in the formerly designated Continued Integration programs (CIP) largely paralleled that employed for the other Voluntary Integration programs. A sample of 23 schools was selected for participation in the 1981-82 survey study and a sample of six schools, for participation in the observational study. Selection of these schools was performed through stratified random sampling using three stratification dimensions: grade levels (elementary and junior high schools), participation in the PWT program, and a measure of program intensity. The latter factor was regarded as particularly important, since services, especially those low in intensity, would be difficult to accurately gauge and investigate. In order to use the available resources to the best advantage, the Team decided to restrict the observational sample to "high" intensity schools. Measurement of intensity level was based on the number of student participants, with "high" intensity programs having at least fifty participants in the CVP programs, "medium" intensity having 30 to 49 participants, and "low" intensity having less than thirty participants. All elementary schools that participated in both PWT and CVP were excluded from this sample so that potential confounding of the two programs would be eliminated. A random sample of six elementary schools from each intensity category (see Table II-3) was selected for study. All five participating junior high schools were included in the 1981-82 study. Three of the selected junior high schools and three elementary schools were dropped from the 1982-83 study due to low CVP student enrollment, resulting in a sample of 17 schools.

Table II-3

CVP Elementary School Sample

Number of CVP Participants	CVP Schools	CVP Schools in Sample	Combined PWT and CVP Schools (Excluded from Sample)*
Less than 30	11	3	30
30-49	11	6	8
Greater than 50	7	6	9

Instrumentation

Table II-4 presents the instrumentation specifications for the PWT and CVP programs. These specifications reflect the modifications in evaluation issues previously discussed in this chapter.

The instruments used for data collection in 1982-83 were modified to satisfy the specifications shown in Table II-4. These instruments include:

Abstracts:
- Application Data
- Enrollment Data

Site Administrator Questionnaire
Teacher Questionnaire
College Advisor Questionnaire
Student Post-Secondary Expectations Questionnaire
Student Interaction Observation Form
Published measures for students:
- Comprehensive Tests of Basic Skills (CTBS)
- Survey of Essential Skills (SES)
- District Competency Tests
- School Attitude Measure (SAM)

The abstracts provided information on the profiles of students participating in PWT or CVP as well as the racial/ethnic composition of PWT or CVP receiving schools. Administrator, teacher, and college advisor questionnaires yielded information on policies and procedures related to school integration/desegregation, program services, perceptions and attitudes of school personnel toward the programs, and actions undertaken during the year to address particular areas of concern or to accommodate the special needs of program participants.

The Student Post-Secondary Expectations Questionnaire was used to assess students' post-secondary plans and opportunities. The Student Interaction Observation Form measured the quantity and quality of students' integrated interactions outside the classroom setting. The District administered tests (Comprehensive Tests of Basic Skills, Survey of Essential Skills, and District competency tests) were used to measure student academic achievement and the School Attitude Measure (SAM) was used to assess students' attitudes toward school.

Table II-4
Instrumentation Specifications: PWT Program

Evaluation Issues Addressed	Variables	Measures	Data Source
A. Process Evaluation			
1. Mechanisms			
a. What changes have been made in mechanisms for explaining program options to parents and students during 1982-83?	Content and media of program information dissemination	District Documents Questionnaire	District and school administrators
b. What are the characteristics of students chosen to participate?	Race/ethnicity Sex Grade level	Abstract	District documents
c. Do program mechanisms result in students being enrolled in desegregated schools?	Race/ethnicity Sex Grade level	Abstract	District documents
2. Integration/Desegregation			
a. How do policies and procedures inhibit or contribute to integration?	Administrative policies/procedures Classroom practices Extra-classroom practices	Questionnaire	Site administrators Teachers
b. What types of services are delivered as part of the program?	Nature of services Intensity Duration	Questionnaire	Site administrators Teachers
c. What are the perceptions and attitudes of school personnel toward the program?	Attitudes toward program	Questionnaire	Site administrators Teachers

Table II-4 (Continued)
Instrumentation Specifications

Evaluation Issues Addressed	Variables	Measures	Data Source
d. What additional arrangements have been undertaken during 1982-83 to address particular areas of concern?	Areas of concern Action undertaken	Questionnaire	Site administrators Teachers
3. School Program			
a. What efforts are made to encourage incorporation of transfer students into the regular school program.	Administrative policies/procedures Classroom practices	Questionnaire	Site administrators Teachers
b. What actions are taken to accommodate the needs of program participants?	Administrative policies/procedures Classroom practices	Questionnaire	Site administrators Teachers
B. Outcome Evaluation			
1. What progress appears to have been made in reducing the harms set forth in the Crawford decision?			
a. Achievement	Basic skills (reading and math)	SES, CTBS	Students
b. Attitudes	Student attitudes	SAM	Students
c. Post-secondary opportunities	Academic preparation	Competency tests	Students
	Post-secondary eligibility	Questionnaire	Students
	Post-secondary expectation	Questionnaire	Students
d. Social behavior of students toward other ethnic groups	Student inter-group relations	Observation form	Schools

Data Collection

Data collection was managed by the LAUSD Reseach and Evaluation Branch staff. These activities were conducted from December through June, as summarized by the schedule presented in Table II-5. Briefly, these tasks included:

- completion of abstract forms;
- start-up tasks involving notification of the sample and preparation for data collection;
- distribution, collection, and quality control of site Administrator, Teacher, and College Advisor questionnaires;
- completion of observations at each sub-sample school for each specified setting on two separate days;
- distribution, training, collection, and quality control of School Attitude Measure testing, and Student Post-Secondary Expectation questionnaire;
- collection of school-level (by grade) summaries of CTBS and SES scores and competency test results.

Analysis

The nature of the analyses was largely descriptive with a heavy reliance on frequencies, cross-tabulations, and measures of central tendency and dispersion. Measures of association such as correlation were used to help identify factors related to program success. Where appropriate, comparisons employing techniques such as t-tests or analysis of variance were used.

In the reporting of the results, every effort was made to provide concise and readily understandable statements of the findings. Charts, graphs, and other figures needed to convey the analytic results, were used as appropriate.

Table II-5
1982-83 Data Collection Schedule for
PWT Programs

Task	Timeline: Dec.	Jan.	Feb.	March	April	May	June
Complete abstracts of archival data	Dec.-	Jan.					May - June
Prepare introductory letters to region superintendents			Feb.				
Order SAM materials	Dec.						
Prepare mailing labels and other ancillary data collection materials	Dec.-	Jan.					
Schedule sites for observation			Jan.-	Feb.			
Train observers			Feb.				
Send introductory letters to region superintendents and principals of sampled schools			Feb.				
Distribute and collect Site Administrator, Teacher and College Advisor Questionnaires			Mid-Feb.	-	April		
Conduct observations				March	-	May	
Administer SAM and Post-Secondary Expectation Questionnaire					April		
Maintain quality control of the administration of the questionaires and SAM and prepare the materials for keypunching.					April	-	May
Collect District summaries of achievement data							May - June

Chapter III
Findings

Chapter III contains the findings and recommendations resulting from our review of the PWT and CVP programs. The information in this chapter is presented in four sections which correspond to the evaluation issues summarized in Chapter II, Table II-1. Section one considers the questions related to changes and effects of program mechanisms. Section two reports the effects of school policies and practices on student interactions as well as efforts to incorporate participants into the regular school program. Section three reviews the progress made in reducing the harms of racial isolation. As a result of the changes occurring throughout the District during the past three years, the major focus of our analysis was on program mechanisms and the effects of changes over time. Section four presents a summary discussion of the findings and recommendations.

Mechanisms

What changes have been made in mechanisms for explaining program options to parents and students during 1982-83?

Opportunities to apply for PWT and other Voluntary Integration programs are provided during the spring preceding the school term. The 1981-82 interim PWT evaluation report indicated that the primary vehicle for informing parents and students about the PWT program was the application brochure. Additional information was provided through parent meetings hosted by sending schools, although a very small percentage of parents (5%) and students (4%) reported actually attending these information sessions. It was also reported that very few PWT parents and students were aware of other options available to them under the Voluntary Integration programs.

In 1982-83 the District developed a one page flyer and an information brochure called "Choices", which contained a description of PWT and Magnet programs, including the names, addresses and phone numbers of all continuing magnet schools and centers, application procedures and deadlines, and a single 1983-84 application form for the PWT or the Magnet programs. (See the Appendix.)

The one page flyer, in English and Spanish, was given to every student in the District. Overcrowded and predominantly Hispanic, Black, Asian and Other non-Anglo (PHBAO) schools received a "Choices" brochure for each student enrolled. All other schools received a basic allotment of 200 brochures in English and the requested number in Spanish, to be given to students and parents only upon request. (This procedure was later revised so that a "Choices" brochure was made available to every student.) Information meetings for parents were not held in Spring, 1983.

The "Choices" brochure contained 18 pages, including the application and instructions. One page was devoted to "questions and answers about PWT" while 15 pages were used to describe the various options available under the Magnet School programs. District personnel stated that not much additional information could have been added about PWT. They also felt the brochure produced many additional applications for the Magnet programs. District personnel also reported that some parents had difficulty understanding the single PWT/Magnet application, and consideration was being given to returning to a separate application for 1984-85.

While some difficulty was noted with the single "Choices" brochure and application, the advantage for parents and students of having available information about all student integration options was viewed as desirable as an aid to parents and students. The following suggestions are offered as an alternative to abandoning the single brochure and for improving the existing mechanism. These recommendations encompass the introduction, overall readability level, attention devoted to the Magnet programs vs. PWT, and the complexity of the application.

The question and answer format was a useful vehicle for presenting basic information about the PWT program. Perhaps an introductory section setting a context for the programs and explaining the brochure's contents would enhance parents' understanding of how best to utilize the information. The section might begin with a brief overview of the District's philosophy with respect to student integration options, a summary description of student integration options, and include a "How to Use this Booklet" section.

In order to determine the reading level of "Choices" a readability analysis of the English version was conducted using the Dale-Chall and the Flesch readability formula.[1] The analysis focused on pages 2-4 in the section titled "Questions and Answers about PWT and Magnets". These pages contained basic information about the programs. The analysis of the PWT portion of the brochure revealed that this section was written at about the eleventh to twelfth grade reading level. This may have contributed to the difficulty parents had in understanding the brochure. It is recommended that the District field test future versions of the brochure using a sample of parents to determine presentation clarity and the readability level of the materials.

The relatively small amount of space devoted to PWT in the brochure has already been noted. Similarly, the single page flyer was all about magnet school choices so one is hardpressed to determine where PWT fits in. An unintended outcome may be that parents could interpret this as the District favoring magnet schools over PWT schools as an integration option. Information about the character of PWT receiving school environments and educational program offerings could be provided. These issues could be pursued during the development and field testing phase of the next brochure.

In addition to the readability level, consideration should be paid to the complexity of the single application. The multicolor approach was helpful in distinguishing the PWT program from the Magnet program. However, parents should be queried regarding the clarity of the questions and the accompanying instructions as well as the format. With respect to question 12 on the application for PWT, only, (see the Appendix) what does a parent do if more than one child in the family is attending PWT receiving school(s)?

What are the characteristics of students chosen to participate?

Table III-1 presents the composition of the PWT program by racial/ethnic groups. Of primary interest are the changes in enrollment over time. Thus, Table III-1 includes enrollment data for the three-year period 1980-83, as well as changes in enrollment by year. The following changes are noteworthy.

---

[1] We would like to thank Dr. Alan Crawford of the California State University at Los Angeles for conducting this analysis.

• Over the three year period, the program increased in total enrollment by nearly 50%, from 13,812 in 1980-81 to 20,686 in 1982-83. The enrollment increases varied considerably from year to year. Nearly three-quarters of the increase occurred between the first and the second year, when the enrollment grew to 18,876, as compared to less than 10% growth between the second and third year.

• While each ethnic group's enrollment increased during 1980-82, there was significant variation among the groups. The largest increases were registered by Hispanic (169%) and American Indian (127%) students, respectively, followed by Asian (86%), White (43%), and Black (24%) students.

• Black students had the largest enrollment (13,229) although their percentage of total enrollment actually declined from 77% to 64%, with virtually no increase in enrollment from 1981-82 to 1982-83.

• The proportion of Hispanic students nearly doubled from only 14% in 1980-81 to 26% in 1982-83. While most of this increase occurred in the first year (102%) there was also a 33% increase between the second and third year, representing nearly three-quarters of the total second year increase in the program.

• The increase in Asian student enrollment was relatively even over the period covered, slightly more than 400 in each year, representing a relative increase of 44% and 29%, respectively. Together, Hispanics (72%), and Asian (22%) students accounted for nearly all of the increase in the 1982-83 program enrollment.

• The total increase in American Indian students occurred in 1981-82, whereas most of the increase (86%) in White students occurred in 1982-83. Each of these groups represents approximately one percent of the total program.

• Table III-2 and III-3 show where enrollment changes occurred in the program. The data are presented by racial/ethnic group and by grade level. These tables show enrollments at the elementary, junior high, and senior high levels for 1981-82 and 1982-83, respectively. Enrollment data were not available by level for 1980-81. The tables also give the enrollment at each level as a percentage of the total enrollment.

Table III-1
Composition of PWT Program
By Racial/Ethnic Group: 1980-83

	Indian	Asian	Black	Hispanic	White	Total
1980-81	60 0.00	950 0.07	10,660 0.77	1,972 0.14	170 0.01	13,812 1.00
1981-82	136 0.01	1,370 0.07	13,192 0.70	3,991 0.21	187 0.01	18,876 1.00
1982-83	136 0.01	1,769 0.09	13,229 0.64	5,309 0.26	243 0.01	20,686 1.00
81-82 Increase as % of 80-81 Enroll.	126.67	44.21	23.75	102.38	10.00	36.66
82-83 Increase as % of 80-81 Enroll.	126.67	86.21	24.10	169.22	42.94	49.77
82-83 Increase as % of 81-82 Enroll.	0.00	29.12	0.28	33.02	29.95	9.59
81-82 Increase as % of 1 Yr. Increase	1.50	8.29	50.00	39.87	0.34	100.00
82-83 Increase as % of 1 Yr. Increase	0.00	22.04	2.04	72.82	3.09	100.00

o Comparing overall figures, it is interesting to note that program enrollment increased at the elementary and junior high school levels and decreased at the senior high school level. Whereas 40% of the program enrollment was at the senior high school level in 1981-82, only 35% of the PWT students were in senior high school in 1982-83. On the other hand, the percentage of elementary students increased from 18% to 22% and junior high school students increased from slightly less than 42% to slightly more than 42%, although the absolute number of junior high students rose by only 700.

o As was noted in last year's report, ethnic enrollment varies considerably by school level. Over 86% of the Asian enrollment was in secondary schools and over 51% was at the junior high school level. Similarly, nearly 82% of the Black students were enrolled in secondary schools. However, they are evenly divided between the junior high and the senior high school levels. By contrast, American Indian (43%), White (44%), and Hispanic (39%) groups have a much larger proportion of students enrolled at the elementary level, although in all cases it is still less than half.

o These enrollment trends would suggest that as overall enrollment continues to increase at the elementary and junior high school levels and decreases at the senior high school level, Hispanic and Asian students will represent a larger proportion of the total program enrollment. Conversely, this trend will reduce the percentage of Black students.

Do program mechanisms result in students being enrolled in desegregated schools?

Table III-4 contains the racial/ethnic composition of sampled PWT receiving schools and PWT students by school level. This table shows the mean percent and standard deviation for the enrollment of American Indian, Asian/Pacific Islander, Black, Hispanic, and White students in the PWT receiving schools and in the PWT population within the schools. At each level, the mean percentage of White students, and the combined percentage of PHBAO students fell within the 60-40% range, established by the District as a desegregated environment. Thus, it can be concluded from this table that, on the average, PWT program mechanisms result in students being enrolled in desegregated schools. This finding is consistent with that contained in the interim report on the PWT program.

Table III-2
Composition of PWT Programs 1981-82
By Racial/Ethnic Group and Level

	Indian	Asian	Black	Hispanic	White	Total
Elementary	27 0.01	180 0.05	1,933 0.55	1,260 0.36	57 0.02	3,517 1.00
Junior High	59 0.01	615 0.08	5,673 0.71	1,588 0.20	108 0.01	8,043 1.00
Senior High	50 0.01	575 0.07	5,923 0.77	1,118 0.14	55 0.01	7,721 1.00
Total	136 0.01	1,370 0.07	13,529 0.70	3,966 0.21	220 0.01	19,281 1.00
Elementary/Total	19.85	13.14	14.29	31.77	25.91	18.24
Junior High/Total	43.38	44.89	41.93	40.04	49.09	41.71
Senior High/Total	36.76	41.97	43.78	28.19	25.00	40.04
Secondary/Total	80.15	86.86	85.71	68.23	74.09	81.76

Table III-3
Composition of PWT Programs 1982-83
By Racial/Ethnic Group and Level

	Indian	Asian	Black	Hispanic	White	Total
Elementary	59 0.01	241 0.05	2,123 0.46	2,064 0.45	106 0.02	4,593 1.00
Junior High	44 0.01	909 0.10	5,646 0.65	2,056 0.24	88 0.01	8,743 1.00
Senior High	33 0.00	619 0.08	5,460 0.74	1,189 0.16	49 0.01	7,350 1.00
Total	136 0.01	1,769 0.09	13,229 0.64	5,309 0.26	243 0.01	20,686 1.00
Elementary/Total	43.38	13.62	16.05	38.88	43.62	22.20
Junior High/Total	32.35	51.38	42.68	38.73	36.21	42.27
Senior High/Total	24.26	34.99	41.27	22.40	20.16	35.53
Secondary/Total	56.62	86.38	83.95	61.12	56.38	77.80

Table III-4
Racial/Ethnic Composition of Sample
Permits With Transportation Receiving Schools and
PWT Students by Level

Racial/Ethnic Group	Elementary (N=15)				Junior High (N=15)				Senior High (N=11)			
	Total School		PWT Students		Total School		PWT Students		Total School		PWT Students	
	Mean Percent	SD	Mean Percent	SD	Mean Percent	SD	Mean Percent	SD	Mean Percent	SD	Mean Percent	SD
American Indian	.34	.45	1.43	1.95	.72	.88	.31	.36	.30	.19	.57	.52
Asian/Pacific Islander	7.63	3.66	4.25	6.23	9.00	5.55	9.74	16.87	8.10	3.65	10.56	15.10
Black	8.91	6.00	45.85	39.11	17.71	10.21	61.61	30.85	17.23	10.13	68.11	29.01
Hispanic	27.51	12.98	47.95	36.28	22.76	8.91	27.11	21.60	18.47	10.66	19.16	17.77
White	55.62	11.35	.52	1.49	49.78	7.32	1.24	1.93	55.90	9.52	1.60	2.55

In addition to reviewing the sample schools' data, a school level analysis of the enrollment of all PWT receiving schools was conducted. A summary of the results of this analysis is presented in Table III-5. This table shows the mean percent and range of White enrollment in all PWT receiving schools by level. The table also gives the number and proportion of schools falling above, within, and below the 60-40% desegregated range. Overall, 97 of the 137 PWT receiving schools (70%) fell within the 60-40% range, 31 (22.5%) fell above the range and nine (6.5%) fell below this range. Two of the nine schools fell considerably below the 60-40% range while 15 of the 31 schools were significantly above the range and had White enrollments in excess of 70%.

Impact of School Policies and Practices on Student Interaction and Participation

This section examines the relationship between school policies and practices and PWT and resident student interactions as well as their effects on the participation of PWT students and their parents in school activities. Teachers and administrators at PWT receiving schools provided information regarding their perceptions of these issues. The results are organized and reported according to the questions outlined in Chapter II. Where appropriate, the findings are compared to those reported in 1981-82.

Table III-6 summarizes administrators' reports of school practices related to student interactions. Administrators were asked how student interactions were determined at their school in settings outside the classroom: whether by school-wide policy, discretion of school personnel, or students. The findings confirm results reported in the interim report. At the elementary school level, school-wide policy tends to determine student interactions; whereas at the secondary school level, these interactions are left to the discretion of school personnel and to the students themselves. This finding is consistent with the notion of giving more responsibility for social interactions to the students as they become older.

Administrators also reported on the extent school-wide procedures or school personnel could positively influence integrated student interactions at school in settings external to the classroom. Their responses are summarized in section "B" of Table III-6. The results are based on a five point scale

Table III-5
Permits With Transportation Ethnic Enrollment of Receiving Schools

evel	Percent White 0 - 39% f	%	40 - 60% f	%	60 - 100% f	%	Total	Mean	Range
Elementary	5	5.7	58	65.9	25	28.4	88	54.8	27.4 - 75.9
Junior High	3	10.3	25	86.2	1	3.4	29	48.8	23.5 - 72.4
Senior High	1	4.8	14	66.7	5	23.8	20	56.0	37.0 - 75.6
Total	9	65.2	97	70.8	31	22.5	137		

where "1" = little influence and "5" = great influence. Again, the findings are consistent with the interim results. Secondary administrators, on the average, felt that school policies or personnel did have some influence on students' interactions while primary school administrators felt the influence of school-wide procedures or personnel was even stronger.

Administrators were asked to identify actions undertaken at their school to encourage interaction among PWT and resident students in a variety of non-classroom settings. Five actions were listed, ranging from assignment of students to activities to restructuring the physical plant. Section "C" in Table III-6 gives the number and proportion of respondents who indicated taking each action. The action reportedly taken by most administrators was to actively recruit students to participate in organized activities. Eighty percent of junior high, 79% of senior high, and 72% of elementary school administrators indicated having actively recruited PWT students to participate in organized school activities. The next most frequently reported activity was the assignment of students to particular games/activities, however there was much variation by school level. This action was taken by nearly three-fourths of the elementary school administrators, 50% of the junior high, and slightly more than a quarter of the senior high school administrators. As students become older, they are less likely to be "assigned" to activities by school personnel.

Inservice training of school personnel was the third most frequently reported action. Again, the response rate varied inversely with the school level. Forty-one percent of elementary school administrators reported taking this action compared to one-third of junior high and only 21% at the senior high school level. On the other hand, while the absolute frequencies are small at all levels, the number of administrators reporting a modification of school policies to encourage interaction among PWT and resident students increased as the grade level increased. Four times as many secondary school administrators reported taking this action than elementary school administrators.

In summary, most school administrators recognize the need to be proactive regarding the interaction of PWT and resident students. The primary focus of this action is on the students themselves and less on school personnel or policies. Although the proportions vary slightly, these trends are consistent with those contained in the 1981-82 interim report.

Table III-6
PWT Receiving Schools: Administrator Reports of Practices Relative to Student Interactions

	Elementary (N = 18)		Junior High (N = 30)		Senior High (N = 19)	
	Mean*	SD	Mean	SD	Mean	SD
A. Factors influencing integrated student interactions						
Recess/nutrition	1.31	0.70	2.57	0.84	2.53	0.87
Lunch/cafeteria	1.44	0.81	2.38	0.80	2.53	0.87
Lunch/outside eating area	1.44	0.81	2.43	0.90	2.53	0.87
Lunch/playground	1.31	0.70	2.25	0.89	2.47	0.92
B. Overall rating of school policies and personnel on student interaction in settings outside the classroom	4.41	0.71	3.50	1.20	3.47	0.96

C. Actions taken to encourage interaction among PWT and resident students outside of class at	Frequency	%	Frequency	%	Frequency	%
Assignment to particular games/ activities	13	72.22	15	50.00	5	26.32
Active recruitment for organized activities	13	72.22	24	80.00	15	78.95
Inservice training of school personnel	8	41.44	10	33.33	4	21.05
Modification of school policies	1	5.56	4	13.33	4	21.05
Restructuring features of physical setting	1	5.56	0	0.00	0	0.00
Other	0	0.00	1	3.33	2	10.53

*. Note: 1 = none or almost none, 2 = few, 3 = some, 4 = many, 5 = all or almost all

Administrators were asked to identify activities or services provided at their school to meet the social and academic needs of PWT students. Eleven types of services were listed and respondents were asked to check all that were provided at their school. Table III-7 summarizes administrators' responses for each service or activity. The frequency and percent of positive responses are given for each item.

Administrators were asked to indicate whether a needs assessment was conducted. Responses varied by school level. Half of the elementary school administrators, two-thirds at the junior high school level, and nearly three-fourths at the senior high school level reported conducting a needs assessment.

Four items related to academic needs were included. At the secondary level, activities to meet the academic needs of PWT students were a priority, particularly for senior high school administrators. Guidance and counseling was indicated by 100% of the senior high school administrators and over 90% percent at the junior high school level. Similarly, tutorial services were listed by over 94% at the high school level as compared to 73% of the junior high school respondents. Curriculum enrichment was noted by over 84% of the senior high school administrators, while specialized instructional approaches were indicated by less than 50%. This relatively low response rate may reflect a lack of information about this activity.

Academic activities were also reported by a majority of elementary school administrators. Tutorial services had the highest response rate of 77.9% followed by curriculum enrichment with a 72.2%. Over 60% of these administrators also identified specialized instructional approaches as well as guidance and counseling.

In summary, the academic needs of PWT students appear to be a priority for administrators at all levels, but especially at the senior high school level, with most administrators indicating having implemented specific activities to meet the needs of PWT students.

Administrators were questioned about the provision of activities directed at the social adjustment needs of PWT students: special activities to promote intergroup understanding and acceptance, a buddy system, additional supervision, and special interaction activities. At the elementary school level, these activities were indicated by fewer administrators than at the

Table III-7
PWT Receiving Schools:
Administrator Reports of School Activities
for PWT Students

Service or Activity	Elementary (N = 18)		Junior High (N = 30)		Senior High (N = 19)	
	Frequency	%	Frequency	%	Frequency	%
Needs assessment	9	50.00	20	66.67	14	73.68
Special activities to promote intergroup understanding and acceptance	10	55.56	23	76.67	15	78.95
Inclusion in formal evaluation	6	33.33	16	53.33	8	42.11
Buddy system	10	55.56	9	30.00	5	26.32
Tutorial services	14	77.79	22	73.33	18	94.74
Curriculum enrichment	13	72.22	19	63.33	16	84.21
Specialized instructional approaches	11	61.11	13	43.33	10	52.63
Auxiliary transportation	4	22.22	28	93.33	18	94.74
Guidance and counseling	11	61.11	28	93.33	19	100.00
Additional supervision	6	33.33	23	76.67	14	73.68
Special interaction activities	12	66.67	25	83.33	17	89.47
Other	4	22.22	4	13.33	3	15.79

secondary level. This may indicate a somewhat lower priority given to social adjustment needs than to academic needs at this level. Nearly two-thirds of the elementary administrators reported special interaction activities and over half reported special activities to promote intergroup understanding and acceptance and utilizing a buddy system. Only one-third reported the need for additional supervision.

Social adjustment needs were more of a concern to secondary school administrators. Over three-fourths of these respondents indicated instituting special activities to promote intergroup understanding and acceptance, additional supervision, and special interaction activities. The very high number indicating guidance and counseling activities (100% in senior high and 93% in junior high schools) may also indicate a concern for the social needs of PWT students in addition to their need for academic advisement or simply reflect the availability of resources at this level.

Administrators' responses were compared to the reports of a similar sample of administrators to the same questions last year. Overall, there were only slight differences in the responses of elementary school administrators. On the other hand, secondary school administrators reported a substantial increase in activities for PWT students. Higher percentage responses were indicated on eight of the 11 response categories. The differences were especially noteworthy for tutorial services, where junior high rates rose from 42% to 73% and senior high school rates increased from 76% to nearly 95%. Similarly, curriculum enrichment was indicated by 84% of the senior high school administrators in 1982-83 as compared to only 52% a year ago. These trends denote an increasing awareness among secondary school administrators of the need to provide special academic support for PWT students.

The projected increase in the size of the PWT program in 1981-82 and the changing perceptions of receiving school teachers toward these students led the Team to recommend a review of inservice activities for PWT receiving school teachers, particularly at the secondary level. We further recommended that, where necessary, these activities should be revised to include activities related to the needs of PWT students and parents. Specific topics were suggested for possible inclusion. Table III-8 presents administrators' reports of inservice training related to the PWT program for staff. The topics recommended in the 1981-82 interim report provided the frame of

Table III-8
Administrator Reports of Training Inservice for School Staff on the PWT Program

	Elementary		Junior High		Senior High	
	f	%	f	%	f	%
PWT Program (objectives, participants, etc.)	7	37	21	70	16	84
Strategies for promoting intergroup understanding	11	61	19	63	14	73.7
Methods for diagnosing needs of students from diverse backgrounds	11	61	16	53	9	47.4
Strategies for meeting individual needs of students from diverse backgrounds	15	83	19	63	12	63
None	0	0	2	6.7	1	5.3
Other	0	0	4	13	2	10.5

reference. Over 95% of the respondents reported conducting some type of inservice program covering at least one of the recommended topics, and most indicated covering at least three of the four topics. Strategies for meeting the individual needs of students from diverse backgrounds and for promoting intergroup understanding were reported by over 60% of administrators at all levels. A high percentage of junior high (70%) and senior high school (84%) administrators indicated covering information about the PWT program.

Administrators and teachers were queried regarding activities or services for staff to better meet the needs of PWT students and to incorporate them into the regular school program. Seven types of activities were provided as options with respondents being able to write in other activities as appropriate. Tables III-9 and III-10 summarize administrators' and teachers' reports of these activities, respectively. In general, administrators indicated more frequently that activities occurred than teachers reported participating in these activities. This is not too surprising in that some activities are probably limited to non-teaching personnel. For example, inservice training for staff was reported by over 70% of administrators at all levels. Yet, relatively few of the sampled teachers reported participating in inservice trgining on the needs of PWT students, with responses ranging from a high of 27% of senior high school teachers to less than 14% of elementary and 13% of junior high school teachers, respectively.

All of the elementary and junior high school administrators reported visiting successful PWT programs at other schools as compared to only 21% of senior high school administrators. Very few teachers reported having this opportunity, none at the elementary level, only one percent at the senior high, and 3.5% at the junior high levels.

Elementary teachers and administators were more likely to correspond with PWT parents than their secondary counterparts. Elementary teachers reported participating in staff meetings to share successful strategies at twice the rate of senior high school and three times that of junior high teachers, respectively. These trends are similar to those found in 1981-82. It is also interesting to note that all of the elementary school administrators reported at least one additional activity as compared to only 10% of junior high and 15.8% of senior high school administrators.

Table III-9
PWT Receiving Schools: Administrator Reports of Staff Activities

	Elementary (N = 18)		Junior High (N = 30)		Senior High (N =19)	
	Frequency	%	Frequency	%	Frequency	%
Staff Activities Provided:						
Inservice training	13	72.22	31	70.00	15	78.95
Visits to successful PWT programs	18	100.00	30	100.00	4	21.05
Tour of sending areas	2	11.11	8	26.67	7	36.84
Meeting with sending school faculty	2	11.11	5	16.67	2	10.53
Language acquisition program	7	38.89	5	16.67	5	26.32
Sample letters to PWT parents	12	66.67	14	46.67	8	42.11
Staff meetings to share successful strategies	10	55.56	16	53.33	10	52.63
Other	18	100.00	3	10.00	3	15.79

Table III-10
PWT Receiving Schools: Teacher Reports of Participation in PWT Related Activities

PWT Related Staff Activities	Elementary (N = 58)		Junior High (N = 143)		Senior High (N = 96)	
	Frequency	%	Frequency	%	Frequency	%
Inservice training on needs of PWT students	8	13.79	18	12.59	26	27.08
Visits to successful PWT programs	0	0.00	5	3.50	1	1.04
Tour of sending school areas	3	5.17	10	6.99	12	12.50
Meeting with sending school faculty	1	1.72	4	2.80	2	2.08
Language acquisition program	6	10.35	6	4.20	7	7.29
Distribution of letters to PWT parents	42	72.41	46	32.17	21	21.88
Staff meetings	39	67.24	30	20.98	30	31.25
Other	3	5.17	4	2.80	4	4.17

Teachers were asked to indicate classroom practices used to meet the academic and social needs of PWT students. Their responses are reported in Table III-11. Thirteen different classroom practices were included. These practices were identical to those included in the 1981-82 survey of teachers and sought to identify practices designed to address students' academic and social needs. Three of the practices primarily address students' academic needs: tutorial arrangements, curriculum enrichment, and specialized instructional approaches. In each of these instances, elementary school teachers responded at nearly twice the rate of secondary school teachers.

It is of interest to note that elementary teacher responses are similar to those given by elementary school administrators to a similar set of questions (see Table III-7). On the other hand, the proportion of secondary teachers who reported utilizing these classroom practices is significantly lower than the proportion of secondary administrators' reports of these activities being employed at their school. For example, only 19% of junior high and 33% of senior high school teachers reported utilizing tutorial arrangements in their classrooms. Yet, 73% of junior high and 95% of senior high school administrators indicated these services were provided for PWT students at their school. The discrepancy in response rates may be due to several factors. One plausible explanation is that tutoring is more likely to be "centralized" at the secondary school level with arrangements made by administrative personnel; or that tutoring is focused on classes not represented in the teacher sample (mathematics, science, etc.). Similarly, as compared to administrators' responses, significantly fewer secondary teachers reported enriching their curriculum to meet the needs of PWT students.

Several of the classroom practices (mixed seating or grouping arrangements, interactive activities, cooperative workgroups, a buddy system, and special activities to encourage intergroup understanding and acceptance) focused on the students' social adjustment in a multicultural environment. Teacher responses to these items varied by school level and by item. Two-thirds or more of all elementary teachers reported utilizing each of the practices related to social adjustment, ranging from a low of 67% for the buddy system to 98% employing mixed grouping and seating arrangements. In all cases, a greater proportion of elementary school teachers reported utilizing these classroom practices than did secondary teachers. For example, junior

Table III-11
PWT Receiving Schools
Teacher Reports of Classroom Practices
Used to Meet the Academic and Social Needs of PWT Students

Classroom Practice	Elementary (N = 58)		Junior High (N = 143)		Senior High (N = 96)	
	Frequency	%	Frequency	%	Frequency	%
Mixed seating arrangements	57	98.28	134	93.71	84	87.50
Mixed grouping arrangements	57	98.28	105	73.43	67	69.79
Cooperative work groups	48	82.76	86	60.14	71	73.96
Interaction activities	56	96.56	62	43.36	37	38.54
Curriculum enrichment	51	87.93	60	41.96	38	39.58
Specialized instructional approaches	41	70.70	52	36.36	38	39.58
Buddy system	39	67.24	39	27.27	31	32.29
Parental communication	53	91.38	115	80.42	58	60.42
Meetings with parents	46	79.31	106	74.13	50	52.08
Classroom orientation program	36	62.07	56	39.16	37	38.54
Tutorial arrangements	34	58.62	28	19.58	32	33.33
Special activities to encourage intergroup understanding and acceptance	42	72.41	43	30.07	37	38.54
Needs assessment	41	70.70	55	38.46	38	39.58
Other	7	12.07	6	4.20	7	7.29

high school teachers' responses to these practices ranged from a low of 27% for the buddy system to a high of nearly 94% for mixed seating arrangements.

It should be noted that many of the differences between levels may reflect as much the differences in teaching styles and methodologies between elementary and secondary schools as they do differences in conscious efforts to meet the needs of the PWT students. Two areas which do provide some indication of conscious differences by level are the buddy system and special activities to encourage intergroup understanding and acceptance. The proportion of elementary school teachers utilizing these practices was more than double the proportion of secondary teachers.

Finally, teachers were asked to report on their practices relative to communicating or meeting with parents of PWT students. Again, the responses varied by school level, ranging from highs of 91% and 79% for elementary teachers to lows of 60% and 52% for senior high teachers, respectively. At each level a greater proportion of teachers reported communicating with parents as opposed to meeting with them.

In summary, it appears efforts are being made by some teachers to address the academic and social needs of PWT students, although the overall magnitude of effort appears to diminish as students get older. Elementary teachers who have students for the entire day appeared more sensitive to meeting the social and academic needs of PWT students and implemented practices to address these needs. This pattern is consistent with that found in 1980-81 and 1981-82.

After-School Participation

In 1980-81, the Team reported that participation of PWT students in organized after-school activities was limited and recommended that the District investigate barriers to PWT students' participation and implement procedures to promote their assimilation into this component of the receiving school program. The Team was particularly concerned with transportation arrangements and scheduling of activities since these factors appeared to have the greatest impact on PWT student involvement in after-school sports, clubs, and social events, particularly at the secondary school level. District administrators noted that special transportation arrangements are made for PWT students to participate in extracurricular activities. In addition, two-

thirds of senior high school and three-fourths of junior high school administrators, respectively, reported scheduling more activities in the daytime to encourage more PWT student involvement.

Table III-12 summarizes administrators' reports of actions to encourage after-school participation of PWT students in 1982-83. As in the prior years, the focus was on the scheduling of activities and transportation arrangements. Administrators' responses to the transportation issue were consistent with last year. There was a large increase in the percentage of secondary school administrators (from 66% to 79%) reporting an increase in the scheduling of activities and a major decrease at the elementary level (from 67% to 39%). We suspect that elementary administrators simply have viewed this issue as not being a critical problem.

Efforts to Enhance Parental Involvement

The 1980-81 study of PWT also indicated that PWT parent involvement in school activities was considerably less than that for resident parents. In the following year, elementary and secondary school administrators identified a variety of methods for increasing communication with and involvement of PWT parents. Special communications (flyers, phone calls, mailings) were the most frequently cited method used to communicate with parents, while parent meetings at school were the principal means of parental involvement. None of the methods cited were viewed as particularly successful in increasing PWT parental involvement in the school.

Administrators were again asked to identify activities provided to increase communication with or involvement of PWT parents at their school. (See Table III-13.) Eight possible activities were provided. With a few notable exceptions, responses parallel those reported in 1982-83 with some fluctuations probably due to sampling variations. For example, as in the two previous studies, special communications and school meetings for parents were again identified by most administrators at all levels as the principal means of communicating with parents. Similarly, a high proportion of secondary school administrators again reported scheduling special activities at accessible times to accommodate PWT parents. While on the other hand, in 1981-82 none of the elementary school administrators reported having a Neighborhood Home program. This year 100% of elementary school administrators

Table III-12
PWT Receiving Schools: Administrator Reports of Actions to Encourage After-School Participation of PWT Students

	Elementary (N = 18)		Junior High (N = 30)		Senior High (N = 19)	
	Frequency	%	Frequency	%	Frequency	%
Activities to Encourage Participation						
Additional transportation arrangements	11	61.11	28	93.33	19	100.00
Daytime scheduling of activities	7	38.89	23	76.67	15	78.95
Other	3	16.67	8	26.67	3	15.79

Table III-13
PWT Receiving Schools:
Administrator Report of Activities to Increase Communication with or Involvement of PWT Parents

	Elementary (N = 18)		Junior High (N = 30)		Senior High (N = 19)	
	Frequency	%	Frequency	%	Frequency	%
Activities						
School meetings for parents	14	77.78	22	73.33	16	84.21
Special communications	16	88.89	23	76.67	16	84.21
Community liaison	7	38.89	11	36.67	8	42.11
Accessible scheduling of special activities	3	16.67	21	70.00	17	89.47
Survey of parents for suggestions	7	38.89	11	36.67	4	21.05
Late afternoon phone service	7	38.89	17	56.67	6	31.58
Sponsorship of parent meetings in sending area	1	5.56	7	23.33	7	36.84
Neighborhood home program	18	100.00	2	6.67	3	15.79
Other	3	16.67	2	6.67	2	10.53

indicated implementing this program. However, there was a major reduction in the proportion of high school administrators utilizing late afternoon phone service in 1982-83 (32%) as compared to 1980-81 (62%).

College advisors also provided information related to parent participation. Specifically, they were asked to approximate the percentage of PWT parents and resident parents who participate in a variety of counseling related activities. Their responses are summarized in Table III-14. Again, these percentages are approximations made by college advisors based on their personal experiences. The college advisor sample size was small and there were large variations in responses. Thus, the results are inconclusive and tentative at best. However, they are consistent with the perceptions of teachers and administrators as reported in prior studies of PWT.

Three types of counseling services were listed on the questionnaire: individual counseling, college advisement, and career advisement. With respect to individual counseling, college advisors estimated, on the average, that the proportion of resident parents (27.8%) who participated was twice the participation rate of PWT parents (13.3%). Four items relate specifically to college preparation: meetings with college representatives, meetings with the counselor regarding college entrance exams, classes on college entrance requirements, and on financial aid. In these cases, the mean proportion of resident parents who participated was nearly three times the mean proportion of PWT parents. Finally, the mean proportion of parents who participated in activities related to career advisement was about the same for PWT as for the resident parents. We wish to re-emphasize the need for a follow-up study on PWT parents to better understand the factors influencing their involvement in school activities.

Orientation for Parents and Students

Given the influx of new students into the PWT program in 1981-82, the Team perceived a need to provide these students and their parents with information related to the program and to the receiving school. In response to this need we recommended that students and parents new to a receiving school should participate in an orientation program with transportation provided by the District. Several topics were suggested for inclusion in the orientation: introduction to school personnel; tour of the school and

Table III-14
College Advisor Reports of Parent Participation in Counseling Related Activities

	% PWT Parents	% Resident Parents
Individual counseling	13.3	27.8
Meeting with College Representatives	12.7	34.4
Meeting with counselor re: college entrance examinations	8.9	21.7
Meetings or classes on college entrance exams	9.8	31.0
Meetings on career choices	45.5	50.0
Career Day with guest speakers	90.0	90.0
Meetings on financial aid	10.5	24.1

facilities; academic counseling and advising services; extracurricular activities; activities for parents; transportation arrangements; school and program expectations of students and parents. School administrators provided information on the extent to which these recommendations had been implemented. Table III-15 presents administrators' responses to items related to a PWT orientation program for parents and students at receiving schools. Over 85% of secondary school administrators reported providing an orientation program for students and parents as compared to only 4.4% of elementary school administrators. Of those schools indicating that an orientation was held, virtually all said transportation was provided and the topics included those recommended by the Team and are summarized above.

It is unfortunate that the Team did not solicit information regarding attendance. All but two schools indicated that the orientation was voluntary and it would have been useful to know the parental response. Based on past experience, it may be an assumption that parents and students would not attend if the orientation was not mandatory.

Outcomes

This section examines the progress made in reducing the harms associated with racial isolation as a result of students attending desegregated schools under the PWT program. More specifically, we examined areas in achievement, attitudes, post-secondary plans and opportunities, and social interactions of participating students. The interim report on PWT included a summary of administrators' and teachers' perceptions of PWT students' social and academic success, an assessment of PWT students' attitudes toward school, a review of students' preparation for college and post-secondary plans and expectations, an analysis of PWT and resident students' social interaction patterns in a variety of non-classroom school settings, and a summary of students' performance on District administered achievement tests. Similar information has been compiled again this year to facilitate an assessment of what changes have occurred. We also noted in the interim report that many factors (some beyond the control of the school) influence students' social and academic success as well as their attitudes toward school, and thus, it is important to review these findings within that larger context.

Table III-15
PWT Orientation Program for Parents and Students at Receiving Schools

	Elementary (N = 18)		Junior High (N = 30)		Senior High (N = 19)	
	Frequency	%	Frequency	%	Frequency	%
Orientation program was held	7	.39	26	.87	16	.84
Orientation program participation						
was mandatory	0	0.00	0	0.00	2	10.53
was voluntary	7	1.00	26	1.00	14	.88
Transportation was provided by the District	6	.86	23	.88	15	.94
Topics and activities included:						
Introduction of school personnel	5	.71	26	1.00	16	1.00
Introduction of school plant and facilities	7	1.00	26	1.00	13	.81
Academic program at school	7	1.00	26	1.00	16	1.00
Counseling and advising services	3	.43	26	1.00	16	1.00
Extra curricular activities for students	5	.71	26	1.00	15	.94
Activities for parents	5	.71	24	.92	13	.81
Transportation arrangements	5	.71	24	.92	16	1.00
Expectations for parents and students	6	.85	24	.92	15	.94
Other	0	0.00	9	.30	3	.19
Orientation program topics mailed in advance to parents and students	4	.57	22	.85	12	.75
Material provided in:						
English	7	1.00	26	1.00	16	1.00
Spanish	5	.71	14	.54	6	.38
Other	0	0.00	0	0.00	1	5.26
Not Applicable	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00

Teachers' and Administrators' Perceptions of PWT Success

Tables III-16 and III-17 summarize teachers' and administrators' perceptions of PWT students' success in 1982-83. Teachers and administrators were asked to compare PWT students to resident students in seven areas. Four of these areas relate primarily to social adjustment: overall classroom adjustment, peer acceptance, social interaction, and participation in after-school activities.

Two areas provide information of students' academic success. Of these, one (achieving academically) is an indication of achievement (grades), while the other (improving academically) is a measure of progress (changes in grades). These areas were rated using a five-point scale where "1" = considerably less than resident students and "5" = considerably more than resident students. A rating of "3" indicates that PWT students are perceived as experiencing about the same level of success as resident students.

Elementary teachers' perceptions of PWT students' social and academic success appear to have improved slightly from 1981-82. Except for opportunities to participate in after-school activities (a circumstance influenced greatly by transportation concerns), PWT students are perceived to experience about the same social success as resident students and the mean ratings show improvement in each category. A similar trend is noted in the two academic categories. While PWT students were rated slightly below resident students in achieving academically, the mean difference is considerably less than reported for 1981-82. The large standard deviations indicate substantive variation in reponses to these items.

There was no change in the perception of junior high teachers from 1981-82. PWT students are still perceived to experience less social and academic success than resident students and the mean differences remained virtually unchanged in each of the seven areas.

The responses of senior high school teachers also indicated modest improvement in their perceptions of PWT students' success, particularly in the academic categories. PWT students are rated about the same as resident students in improving academically, and slightly below resident students in achieving academically. In the latter category, however, the mean difference was reduced from .47 to .24.

Table III-16
Teacher Perceptions of PWT Student Success

Area of Success	Elementary (N = 58)		Junior High (N = 143)		Senior High (N = 96)	
	Mean*	SD	Mean	SD	Mean	SD
Overall classroom adjustment	3.03	0.46	2.69	0.86	2.84	0.56
Peer acceptance	2.90	0.55	2.64	0.68	2.72	0.72
Social interaction	2.91	0.66	2.56	0.86	2.59	0.83
Participation in after-school activities	1.67	0.81	2.82	1.21	2.95	0.97
Parental communication	2.63	0.84	2.78	0.90	2.70	0.86
Parental participation in school activities	1.95	0.81	2.22	0.89	2.30	0.88
Achieving academically	2.48	0.75	2.49	0.89	2.76	0.73
Improving academically	2.90	0.69	2.72	0.88	3.04	0.78

*On a scale of 1 to 5 where 1 = considerably less than resident students, 3 = about the same as resident students, and 5 = considerably more than resident students.

Table III-17
PWT Receiving Schools:
Administrator Perceptions of PWT Student Success

Area of Success	Elementary (N = 18)		Junior High (N = 30)		Senior High (N = 19)	
	Mean*	SD	Mean	SD	Mean	SD
Overall school adjustment	3.06	0.54	3.07	0.37	2.84	0.37
Peer acceptance	2.89	0.32	2.80	0.48	2.84	0.50
Achieving academically (grades)	2.61	0.50	2.67	0.76	2.37	0.60
Participation in student government and extra-curricular activities	3.06	0.24	3.10	0.99	2.89	0.57
Improving academically (progress)	3.00	0.69	3.13	0.63	2.89	0.74
Parental communication	2.83	0.71	3.10	0.78	2.79	0.63
Parental participation in school activities	2.28	0.75	2.14	0.74	2.16	0.83
econdary Only						
Course registration	----	----	3.20	0.42	3.47	0.84
Utilization of college course advisement	----	----	3.00	0.26	3.26	0.81

*On a scale of 1 to 5, where 1 = considerably less than resident students, 3 = about the same as resident students, and 5 = considerably more than resident students.

Elementary school administrators perceived PWT students as having about the same success socially as resident students, and were slightly less successful in terms of academic achievement. These ratings are consistent with those reported in 1981-82. Similarly, secondary administrators perceived PWT students as having experienced about the same success as resident students in overall school adjustment, participation in student government, and extracurricular activities, but experienced slightly less success in peer acceptance. On the other hand, senior high school administrators perceived PWT students as being less successful academically this year in relation to resident students, but slightly more successful than resident students in opportunities to register for courses.

Academic Achievement

Achievement tests administered each year by the District to elementary and secondary students were used to measure PWT students' achievement. The Survey of Essential Skills (SES) is used to measure achievement of basic skills in reading, mathematics, and composition at the elementary level. The Comprehensive Tests of Basic Skills (CTBS-Form S) measures the reading and mathematics achievement of junior high school students. The SHARP, TOPICS, and WRITE:SR tests are used to assess minimum competency in basic skills of senior high school students.

Table III-18 shows the 1982-83 performance of grades 5 and 6 PWT students on the SES. The mean and standard deviations of the raw score distributions as well as the percent of items answered correctly are shown for reading, mathematics and composition, respectively. A comparison of these scores with those reported in 1981-82 shows improvement in reading, mathematics and composition for grade 5 students, and in reading and mathematics for grade 6 students. The performance of grade 6 PWT students in composition remained relatively unchanged since 1981-82.

Table III-19 compares the achievement of grades 5 and 6 PWT students on the SES with District averages. The mean percent of correct items is used as the comparison measure. Grades 5 and 6 PWT students fell below District averages in reading, mathematics and composition. A comparison of mean differences in 1981-82 and 1982-83 shows that grades 5 and 6 PWT students were slightly further below District averages in 1982-83 than in 1981-82, although their scores improved.

Table III-18
Achievement Test Results: Survey of Essential Skills (SES)
PWT Students

Grade Level	Reading			Mathematics			Composition		
	Mean Raw Score	SD	Percent Correct	Mean Raw Score	SD	Percent Correct	Mean Raw Score	SD	Percent Correct
Grade 5	31.90	4.98	72.00	39.24	5.91	69.54	32.69	5.32	73.82
Grade 6	37.06	2.10	76.82	31.32	3.13	64.64	25.46	1.56	70.18

Table III-19
Comparison of PWT SES Achievement With District Averages

Grade Level	Reading		Mathematics		Composition	
	Percent Correct		Percent Correct		Percent Correct	
	PWT	District	PWT	District	PWT	District
Grade 5	72.00	78.0	69.54	72.0	73.82	79.0
Grade 6	76.82	83.0	64.64	70.0	70.18	76.6

Table III-20 shows achievement test results of grade 8 students on the CTBS. The mean raw scores, standard deviations, and national percentile rankings of all students in PWT receiving schools, PWT students, and all grade 8 students in the District who took the CTBS are compared. While the mean performance of PWT receiving schools was well above the District averages in reading and mathematics, the scores of PWT students fell considerably below the District averages on the CTBS. Further, a comparison of reading and mathematics mean scores reported in 1981-82 and 1982-83 indicates that District averages remained relatively unchanged in reading but improved in mathematics, while PWT students' means appear to have declined slightly in reading and improved in mathematics. PWT students' national percentile rank declined in both reading and mathematics. Thus, grade 8 PWT students have not made progress in the areas of reading and mathematics achievement as measured by their scores on the CTBS.

Table III-21 gives the performance of grade 12 PWT students on the SHARP, TOPICS, and WRITE:SR tests. The mean percent of students in the District who took the tests and passed is shown for PWT students and for all grade 12 students, for 1982 and 1983. The performance of PWT students improved in all three areas in 1983 over 1982. The percentage of PWT students passing the proficiency tests exceeded District averages in 1982 and 1983. Thus, grade 12 PWT students made continuous progress in the areas of reading mathematics, and writing achievement as measured.

Attitudes

The School Attitude Measure (SAM) was used to assess PWT students' attitudes toward school in five areas: motivation for schooling, academic self-concept performance-based, academic self-concept reference-based, students' sense of control over performance, and instructional mastery. As was noted in the interim report, the SAM results are extremely difficult to interpret when mean scores cluster around the 50th percentile, or median, since small differences in mean scores translate into large differences in national percentile scores. The reader is again cautioned against over interpretation of small differences in means. The results are reviewed in an overall fashion to identify trends.

Table III-20
Comprehensive Tests of Basic Skills (CTBS): Grade 8

	Reading			Mathematics		
	X	SD	NP*	X	SD	NP*
Receiving Schools (N=15)	58.49*	4.30	50	68.07*	5.81	54
PWT Students	44.28*	7.93	31	53.17*	9.55	41
District	51.7	-	42	61.74	-	50

* Difference statistically significant ($p<.05$)

Table III-21
Competency Test Performance (Percent Passing)

Group	TOPICS		SHARP		WRITESR	
	1982 Mean	1983 Mean	1982 Mean	1983 Mean	1982 Mean	1983 Mean
Grade 12 PWT	96.3	98.4	97.3	99.7	97.2	99.8
Grade 12 District-wide	93.2	95.6	94.5	96.9	94.6	97.0

Table III-22 contains the 1982-83 SAM scores for PWT students. These scores have been compared with 1982-83 results for all students in PWT receiving schools who took the SAM and with 1981-82 scores for PWT students. Mean scores, standard deviations, and corresponding national percentile rankings are provided in each of the five areas for grades 5, 6, 8 and 12.

In spite of the limitations of this measure, some progress may be noted for PWT students. In 1982-83 grades 5 and 6 PWT students were at or above the 50th percentile on the national norms in three of the measured areas. Whereas, in 1981-82, they fell slightly below this level in every area except in motivation for learning. Grade 6 PWT students' means improved in all five areas. Similarly, grade 12 PWT students scored at or above the median percentile rank on each of the five scales, showing improvement over 1981-82 in four of the five areas. By contrast, grade 8 PWT students fell slightly below the median in all measured areas except in motivation for schooling. Table III-23 summarizes the direction of changes in PWT means from 1981-82 to 1982-83.

Looking at Tables III-22 and III-24 one can compare PWT students' 1982-83 scores on the School Attitude Measure (SAM) with the 1982-83 scores of students in PWT receiving schools, including, PWT students. Grades 5 and 6 PWT students consistently fell below the school means, whereas the trend was reversed at the secondary level. At the elementary level the trend was similar to 1981-82. However, at the secondary level, the comparison is more favorable to PWT students in 1982-83.

In summary, PWT elementary students' attitudes toward school improved slightly over last year and continued to fall at or near the national median but below the receiving school means. Grade 12 PWT students showed consistent improvement over 1982-83, continued to score above the national norms and above the PWT receiving school means. Grade 8 PWT students, on the other hand, tended to fall slightly below the national norms, showed no improvement over 1981-82, but continued to fall slightly above PWT receiving school means. Thus, attitudes of grades 5, 6, and 12 PWT students showed signs of improving whereas attitudes of grade 8 students remained unchanged or slightly worse.

Table III-22
PWT Receiving Schools: School Attitude Measure (SAM) Performance
PWT Students

	Motivation for Schooling			Academic Self-Concept-Performance Based			Academic Self-Concept-Reference Based			Sense of Control Over Performance			Instructional Mastery		
Grade Level	**Mean**	**SD**	**NP***	**Mean**	**SD**	**NP**	**Mean**	**SD**	**NP**	**Mean**	**SD**	**NP**	**Mean**	**SD**	**N**
Elementary (N=15)															
Grade 5	46.46	3.95	52	39.46***	3.71	43	40.31	4.63	55	42.92	3.38	50	43.08***	4.50	42
Grade 6	47.67	2.82	58	40.13	3.64	47	39.67	3.02	50	44.47	3.80	47	44.67**	2.64	52
Junior High (N=15)															
Grade 8	51.93**	1.87	52	45.67***	1.40	49	45.80	1.90	49	49.07	2.12	47	46.20	2.43	45
Senior High (N=11)															
Grade 12	60.55**	2.50	50	55.73	4.17	65	54.00	3.41	66	64.82	2.52	60	57.91	2.07	58

* National Percentile
** Difference Statistically Significant ($p < .01$)
*** Difference Statistically Significant ($p < .05$)

Table III-23
A Comparison of 1981-82 and 1982-83
SAM Results for PWT Students

Grade Level	Motivation for Schooling	Academic Self-Concept--Performance Based	Academic Self-Concept--Reference Based	Sense of Control Over Performance	Instructional Mastery
Grade 5	-	-	+	-	+
Grade 6	+	+	+	+	-
Grade 8	0	+	-	-	-
Grade 12	+	+	0	+	+

+ = 1982-83 higher
0 = Same in both years
- = 1981-82 higher

Table III-24
PWT Receiving Schools: School Attitude Measure (SAM) Performance
Resident and PWT Students

	Motivation for Schooling			Academic Self-Concept-Performance Based			Academic Self-Concept-Reference Based			Sense of Control Over Performance			Instructional Mastery		
Grade Level	**Mean**	**SD**	**NP***	**Mean**	**SD**	**NP**	**Mean**	**SD**	**NP**	**Mean**	**SD**	**NP**	**Mean**	**SD**	**NP**
Elementary (N=15)															
Grade 5	47.27	2.66	57	41.27	2.05	57	41.40	1.92	62	44.60	1.59	60	45.47	2.56	57
Grade 6	47.60	1.92	58	41.33	1.91	57	40.87	2.17	59	45.20	1.82	52	46.33	1.76	64
Junior High (N=15)															
Grade 8	49.87	0.99	40	44.47	0.92	43	45.67	1.05	48	48.73	1.16	46	45.53	1.13	43
Senior High (N=11)															
Grade 12	57.64	1.36	38	54.45	1.51	58	53.91	1.30	66	63.82	1.08	55	57.36	1.03	55

* National Percentile

Post-Secondary Opportunities

A significant finding of the 1981-82 interim evaluation of PWT was that grade 12 students appeared to be less well prepared for college than resident students based on self-reported information on college preparatory courses completed, grades, and test scores. In order to validate this finding, grade 12 students in PWT receiving schools were again asked to "self report" information about their academic preparation as well as their plans after high school. The following highlights are noted from Table III-25 which summarizes their responses. Where appropriate, responses are compared to 1981-82 (see Table III-20 on page 65 of the interim report, 1981-82, for that year's results).

Achievement

- The proportion of grade 12 PWT students who expected to graduate is about the same as the proportion of resident students. The proportions were higher for both groups in 1982-83 than in 1981-82.
- On the average, PWT students took fewer college preparatory courses than resident students in every subject area except history. Both PWT and resident students reported completing fewer academic courses, on the average, in 1982-83 than in 1981-82.
- The self-reported grade point average (2.50) of PWT students is significantly lower than the GPA reported by resident students (2.78). Both PWT (-.09) and resident students (-.11) reported lower GPA's, on the average, in 1982-83 than in 1981-82.
- A higher percentage of PWT students (51%)[1] reported taking the SAT than resident students (46%). The percentage of PWT students reportedly taking the SAT is considerably higher this year (+8%) than last year while the percentage of resident students is considerably lower (-10%).
- The mean scores of resident students were significantly higher than the mean scores of PWT students on both SAT-verbal (465 vs. 425) and SAT-mathematics (541 vs. 485). The mean scores of both groups were considerably lower than the averages reported in 1982-83.

---

[1] These percentages are based on the number of respondents who actually completed the item rather than the total number of respondents.

Table III-25
PWT Receiving Schools: Grade 12 Student Academic Preparation and Post-Secondary Plans

	PWT Students		Resident Students	
	Frequency	%	Frequency	%
• High School Diploma (June 1983)				
Yes	730	96.69	3,439	97.28
No	25	3.31	96	2.72
Not Sure	0	0.00	0	0.00
Number taking Scholastic Aptitude Test (SAT)	281	51.00	905	46.00
Eligible to attend UC*	83	10.31	892	23.99
Eligible to attend CSUC*	131	16.27	1234	33.18

• College Preparatory Courses	Mean	SD	Mean	SD
Years of History	1.68	0.13	1.72	0.16
Years of English*	2.32	0.25	2.51	0.28
Years of Mathematics*	1.87	0.23	2.11	0.27
Years of Laboratory Science*	1.47	0.13	1.68	0.15
Years of Foreign Language*	1.69	0.17	1.97	0.15

Academic Achievement	Mean	SD	Mean	SD
High School GPA*	2.50	11.66	2.78	10.39
SAT Performance - Verbal*	424.90	59.23	465.49	54.33
- Mathematics*	484.60	54.80	541.19	18.77

Note: Estimates of UC and CSUC eligibility are based on students self-reported college preparatory subjects, GPA, and SAT scores, and are reported at school level.

*Differences are statistically significant $p < .01$

Table III-25 (continued)
Grade 12 Student Academic Preparation and
Post-Secondary Plans

	PWT		Resident Students	
	Frequency	%	Frequency	%
Plans After High School				
Full-time job	49	6.09	251	6.75
Attend a technical school	85	10.56	232	6.24
Attend a 2-year community college	225	27.95	928	24.95
Attend a UC campus	60	7.45	482	12.96
Attend a CSUC campus	120	14.90	610	16.40
Attend another 4-year public college	37	4.60	137	3.68
Attend a 4-year private college	47	5.84	224	6.02
Other	82	11.63	356	9.60

Eligibility for UC and CSUC

Post-secondary opportunities of students are largely determined by their academic achievement in high school. The four-year public colleges and universities in California each have published freshman admission requirements. Students' self-reported grade point averages, SAT scores, and college preparatory courses completed were used to estimate the proportion of PWT and resident students who were likely to be eligible to attend the University of California and the California State University and Colleges, respectively. These estimates were based on requirements currently in effect and do not reflect announced changes scheduled to be implemented in the future.

A student was assumed to be eligible for UC if the student completed the minimum number of required academic subjects (called the A-F requirements) and: a) had a grade point average (GPA) greater than or equal to 3.3 (on a 4-point scale) or b) had a GPA between 2.78 and 3.3 and the required minimal SAT score established by the UC eligibility index table.[1]

A student was counted eligible for CSUC if the students: a) had a GPA of at least 3.2, or b) had a GPA between 2.0 and 3.2 and the required minimal SAT score established by the CSUC eligibility index table.[2]

It is important to point out that these assumptions only aproximate UC and CSUC admissions requirements. The reader is further cautioned that the data are student self-reported and determination of eligibility is more complex than suggested by these assumptions. However, while the estimated proportions eligible may not be precise, they are useful for relative comparisons:

- The proportion of resident students (24%) estimated to be eligible to attend the University of California was more than double the proportion of PWT students (10.3%) eligible to attend UC. Similarly, the proportion of resident students estimated to be eligible to attend the California State University and Colleges (33.2%) was also double the PWT estimated eligibility rate. The proportional differences (2:1) were approximately the same in 1981-82.

---

[1]University of California Admission Booklet, 1982-83

[2]California State University and College Admission Application, 1982-83

• The proportions of PWT and resident students estimated to be UC and CSUC eligible in 1982-83 were less than the proportions estimated to be eligible in 1981-82.

• In summary, in comparison to resident students, PWT students appear to be less well prepared for college as determined by self-reported information on courses taken, grades earned, and scores achieved on the Scholastic Aptitude Test (SAT). Further, the differences between the groups remained relatively unchanged over a two-year period, although the achievement of both groups appeared to decline in 1982-83. Finally, the proportions of PWT students who were UC and CSUC eligible, respectively, were approximately half the proportions of resident students. These findings confirm the results reported in 1981-82.

Post-Secondary Plans

The percentage of PWT students planning to continue their education after high school was about the same as the percentage of resident students with very little variation in plans noted from 1981-82 to 1982-83. Further, the plans of PWT and resident students appear to be consistent with their estimated eligibility rates. Approximately 33% of PWT students in 1982-83 plan to attend a four-year college or university as compared to approximately 27% who were estimated to be eligible to attend UC or CSUC.

The post-secondary plans of PWT and resident students in the highest achievement group (UC eligible) are summarized in Table III-26. Overall, the plans of UC eligible PWT and resident students are similar. Eighty percent of UC eligible PWT students plan to attend a four-year college or university as compared to 85% of resident students. In 1981-82 these proportions were approximately 82% and 87%, respectively.

Social Interaction

Students in PWT receiving schools were observed in a variety of non-classroom settings to determine the extent to which social interaction was occurring among predominantly Hispanic, Black, Asian, and Other non-Anglo (PHBAO) students and White students. Observations were conducted during recess/nutrition, lunch in the cafeteria and outside eating area, and on the playground after lunch. Each setting was characterized according to the

Table III-26
Post-Secondary Plans of
UC Eligible PWT and Resident Students
1981-82 and 1982-83

	PWT		Resident Student	
	1982-83	1982-83	1982-83	1982-83
Job	1.54	2.63	1.24	1.23
Technical School	2.31	2.63	0.69	1.60
Community College	10.00	7.89	6.04	6.27
UC	43.85	40.79	44.51	44.40
CSUC	16.15	22.37	22.12	22.76
Other four-year public college	6.92	0.00	3.02	3.94
Four-year private college	15.38	17.11	16.90	14.51
Other	3.85	6.58	5.49	5.29

ethnic make-up of the group, the extent of interaction of White and PHBAO group interaction, the friendliness of the interaction and the extent to which the social interaction is influenced by the setting. Table III-27 summarizes the findings of these observations for elementary, junior high, and senior high levels. The mean proportion of White and PHBAO students observed in settings at the elementary and junior high levels were roughly even, whereas at the senior high school level, the mean percentage of White students observed in each setting was roughly double the proportion of PHBAO students.

The extent of White and PHBAO intergroup interaction observed varied considerably by school level. The highest interaction was observed in the elementary schools and the least in the senior high schools for both White and PHBAO students. Interactions at the elementary and junior high school levels were observed to be somewhat friendly and warm in all settings, whereas they tended to be mixed to somewhat friendly at the senior high school level.

In summary, elementary and junior high school students were observed to engage in integrated social interactions in a variety of settings and these interactions tended to be warm and friendly. The findings were similar in 1980-81 and 1981-82 at the elementary level. The 1982-83 findings suggest increased interaction at the junior high level. At the senior high school level, the observed low level of White and PHBAO interaction indicates significant social resegregation at this level. The trend of social segregation at the senior high school level appears to be persisting.

Major Findings

This section contains a summary of the major findings of this study. The findings are summarized under the categories contained in this chapter: program mechanisms, school policies and practices, and outcomes.

Program Mechanisms

1. The "Choices" brochure was used to inform parents and students in the District about options available under the Voluntary Integration programs. This brochure contained information about the various Magnet School programs as well as the PWT program.

Table III-27
Permits With Transportation Receiving Schools:
Observations of Social Interaction

Grade Level Setting	Percent Whites in Setting		Percent PHBAO in Setting		Extent of White Intergroup Interaction		Extent of PHBAO Intergroup Interaction		Friendliness of Interaction		Influence of Situation on Social Interaction	
	Mean	SD	Mean	SD	Mean*	SD	Mean*	SD	Mean**	SD	Mean***	SD
Elementary Level												
Recess/Nutrition	48.21	17.24	51.79	17.24	3.60	1.38	3.57	1.24	4.43	0.79	4.21	0.57
Lunch/Cafeteria	53.33	15.28	46.67	15.28	4.33	0.58	4.33	0.58	5.00	0.00	3.83	0.76
Lunch/Outside Eating Area	49.64	19.60	50.36	19.60	3.50	1.44	3.43	1.51	4.36	0.75	3.86	0.63
Playground After Lunch	48.93	16.95	51.07	16.95	3.50	1.29	3.36	1.31	4.57	0.53	3.93	0.61
Junior High Level												
Recess/Nutrition	46.88	8.75	53.75	7.34	3.19	1.49	3.25	1.31	4.19	0.46	3.88	0.88
Lunchroom/Cafeteria	50.00	----	50.00	----	4.00	----	4.00	----	4.00	----	3.00	----
Lunch/Outside Eating Area	46.44	8.73	53.56	8.73	3.19	1.62	3.25	1.41	4.25	0.46	3.94	1.02
Playground After Lunch	45.93	9.52	54.07	9.52	3.00	1.58	3.00	1.44	4.36	0.48	3.86	1.07
Between Periods	49.13	7.87	51.50	6.51	3.06	1.64	3.19	1.49	4.19	0.46	3.63	1.03
Senior High Level												
Recess/Nutrition	67.50	20.62	32.50	20.62	2.00	0.84	2.08	0.74	3.50	0.32	3.00	0.00
Lunchroom/Cafeteria	56.25	25.62	43.75	25.62	1.88	0.63	1.88	0.63	3.50	0.41	3.00	0.00
Lunch/Outside Eating Area	70.71	20.24	29.29	20.24	1.93	0.61	2.00	0.58	3.36	0.48	3.00	0.00
Playground After Lunch	59.17	23.96	39.17	23.54	1.67	0.61	1.33	0.52	3.17	0.41	3.00	0.00
Between Periods	70.93	20.25	28.36	20.61	1.79	0.86	1.71	0.70	3.50	0.41	3.14	0.38

* Note: 1 = none or almost none, 2 = few, 3 = some, 4 = many, and 5 = all or almost all
** Note: 1 = hostile, 2 = distant/cool, 3 = mixed, 4 = somewhat friendly/warm, and 5 = very friendly/warm
*** Note: 1 = greatly hinder, 2 = somewhat hinder, 3 = no influence, 4 = somewhat encourage, 5 = greatly encourage.

2. While the "Choices" brochure represented a significant improvement in providing information to students and parents, the reading level was too high and the organization of material was somewhat complex for the intended audience.

3. PWT enrollment increased by nearly 50% from 13,812 students in 1981-82 to 20,686 in 1982-83. Three-quarters of the increase occurred in 1981-82 and was attributed to the existence of fewer PWT receiving schools under the mandatory busing program in 1980-81. Between 1981-82 and 1982-83 the program increased by slightly less than 10%.

4. As overall program growth continued at the elementary and junior high school levels and leveled off at the senior high school level, Hispanic and Asian students represented a larger proportion of the total program enrollment while the percentage of Black students continued to decline.

- While every ethnic group increased in enrollment, the largest two-year gains were registered by Hispanic (169%), Native American (127%), and Asian (86%) students, respectively.
- Black students still retained the largest enrollment in the program (77% to 64%), with virtually no increase between 1981-82 and 1982-83.
- The proportion of Hispanic students in the program increased from only 14% of total enrollment in 1980-81 to 26% in 1982-83. While most of this increase occurred between 1980-81 and 1981-1982, enrollment grew by one-third in 1982-83 as well, representing nearly three-fourths of the total second year change in PWT enrollment.
- Hispanic (72%) and Asian (27%) students accounted for virtually all the program enrollment increase in 1982-83.

5. The PWT program results in over 20,000 predominantly Hispanic, Black, Asian, and Other non-White (PHBAO) students attending desegregated elementary, junior high, and senior high schools in LAUSD.

School Policies and Practices

6. School policies and practices related to student social interactions vary by school level. That is, elementary schools exert more control over student social interactions than do junior high schools. At the high school level these interactions are determined by the individual student.

7. Most school administrators acknowledged the need to be proactive regarding the social interaction of students from different racial/ethnic groups. They actively recruited PWT and resident students to participate in organized school activities and felt their actions could have some influence on student interactions.

8. The academic needs of PWT students were a high priority for elementary and secondary school administrators while social adjustment needs were more of a concern of secondary school administrators.

9. Elementary and secondary school administrators conducted inservice training for school personnel on the needs of PWT students and parents; yet relatively few teachers (between 13% and 27%) reported participating in in-service training covering these topics.

10. Efforts are being made by some elementary and secondary teachers to address the academic and social needs of PWT students in the classroom, although the overall magnitude appears to diminish as students get older. Elementary teachers who have students for the entire day were more likely to address these concerns.

11. Elementary and secondary school administrators have not found a successful strategy for increasing PWT parental involvement in school related activities. Senior high school counselors, in particular, perceived PWT parent participation in counseling related activities as significantly lower than parents of resident students.

12. In response to a recommendation contained in the 1981-82 interim evaluation report, over 85% of secondary schools and 44% of elementary schools provided an orientation program for PWT students and parents covering a variety of topics including: introduction to school personnel; tour of school facilities; academic counseling and advising service (secondary only); extracurricular activities for parents; transportation arrangements; and program expectations of students and parents.

Outcomes

13. Elementary teachers and administrators perceived PWT students as having the same success socially and slightly less success academically than resident students. At the junior high level, PWT students were perceived to be less successful both academically and socially than resident students;

while senior high school administrators and teachers rated PWT students as less successful academically but equally successful socially in comparison with resident students.

14. Grades 5 and 6 PWT students' performance improved on the Survey of Essential Skills (SES) although their scores fell below District averages in reading, mathematics, and composition in 1981-82 and 1982-83.

15. In comparison to resident students scores in PWT receiving schools, District averages, and national norms, grade 8 PWT students have not made comparable progress in the areas of reading and mathematics achievement as measured by their scores on the Comprehensive Tests of Basic Skills (CTBS).

16. The peformance of grade 12 PWT students on the District' proficiency tests (TOPICS, SHARP, and WRITE:SR) improved in 1983 over 1982. The percentage of PWT students passing all three proficiency tests exceeded District's averages the last two years (1982 and 1983).

17. The attitudes toward school of PWT elementary students improved slightly and continued to be at about the national median. On the other hand, grade 8 PWT students tended to fall slightly below the national norms on the School Attitude Measure (SAM). However, their scores were consistently higher than the PWT receiving school mean scores. Grade 12 PWT students showed consistent improvement in their attitude scores over 1981-82. They continued to score above the national median and above the PWT receiving school means.

18. In comparison to resident students, PWT students were less prepared for college. On the average they completed fewer college preparatory courses and had significantly lower grades and SAT verbal and math scores. As a result, the proportion of resident students estimated to be eligible to attend the University of California (UC) and the California State Universities and Colleges (CSUC) was double the proportion of PWT students estimated to be eligible to attend these institutions.

19. The post-secondary plans of PWT and resident students were consistent with their academic achievement, and there were no significant differences in the plans of PWT and resident students with similar academic preparation.

Recommendations

1. A single brochure similar to "Choices" should continue to be used to inform parents and students about options available under the Voluntary Integration programs in the District. However, the reading level of these materials should be lowered to at least the seventh or eighth grade level and the organization and presentation of material should be simplified. In addition, a better balance should be achieved between the space allotted to PWT and the Magnet programs. Finally, separate applications should be included (perhaps back-to-back) for PWT and Magnet programs.

2. District staff should insure that inservice training is provided for all PWT receiving school personnel. Topics should include:

- Changing size and character of the PWT program: implications for instructional programs, academic support services, and training needs of school personnel.
- Goals and expectations for school personnel in meeting the needs of all students, including PWT students.
- Importance of parent involvement in a successful program and strategies for attaining parent participation.
- Effective strategies for meeting the individual academic and social needs of students from diverse backgrounds and for promoting intergroup understanding and acceptance.
- Significant findings and recommendations of the PWT evaluation.

3. Special efforts should be made to involve PWT receiving school teachers in the planning and implementation of the inservice program.

4. A special study of the factors influencing the lack of involvement of parents of PWT students in school activities should be undertaken.

5. An orientation for all new students and their parents should be conducted at every PWT receiving school and every effort made to maximize the attendance of PWT students and their parents. Topics should include:

- Introduction to school personnel
- Academic program opportunities and qualifications to participate
- Special academic support services (counseling, advising, tutoring, etc.)
- Need and opportunities for parent involvement
- Academic and social expectations of students

- Extracurricular activities
- Transportation arrangements

6. Information presented in the orientation session should be provided in writing to every student and parent, but especially to those who were unable to attend the orientation.

7. A special study should be conducted of the factors affecting the academic achievement of PWT students. The study should include an assessment of course selection patterns, articulation between sending and receiving schools, curriculum, PWT students' "quality of effort" toward school work, academic expectations of PWT students and parents, and characteristics of "successful" PWT students.