DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 410 686 EA 028 587

AUTHOR	Wong, Kenneth K.; Meyer, Stephen J.
TITLE	The Effectiveness of Title I Schoolwide Projects: A Synthesis of Findings from the First Years of Evaluation.
PUB DATE	1997-03-00
NOTE	37p.; Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development (Baltimore, MD, March 22-25, 1997).
PUB TYPE	Reports - Research (143) -- Speeches/Meeting Papers (150)
EDRS PRICE	MF01/PC02 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS	*Academic Achievement; Categorical Aid; Educationally Disadvantaged; Effective Schools Research; Elementary Secondary Education; Meta Analysis; Performance; *Program Effectiveness; Program Evaluation; Program Implementation; School Demography; School Effectiveness; Synthesis
IDENTIFIERS	*Elementary Secondary Education Act Title I

ABSTRACT

The 1988 Hawkins-Stafford Elementary and Secondary School Improvement Amendments to Chapter 1 (now Title I) have enabled broad expansion of Title I schoolwide projects. The regulatory changes provide funding to entire schools, rather than targeting services to meet the needs of the most disadvantaged subpopulations. This paper reviews what is known about Title I schoolwide projects and their effectiveness, focusing on three aspects: characteristics of schools and districts with schoolwide projects; programmatic and organizational characteristics of schoolwide project schools and districts; and student-performance outcomes. The study reviewed 12 evaluative publications, all of which were based on data collected between 1985 and 1995. The paper presents some cautions about data interpretation and suggests implications for future evaluation of schoolwide projects in schools and districts. It concludes that evaluations of student performance have yielded mixed and inconsistent results. Reliable, longitudinal evaluations must continue to be conducted beyond the initial phase. Three tables are included. Appendices contain district-level studies of program effectiveness and student performance. (Contains 23 references.) (LMI)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED 410 686

The Effectiveness of Title I Schoolwide Projects: A Synthesis of Findings from the First Years of Evaluation

Kenneth K. Wong & Stephen J. Meyer
Department of Education
The University of Chicago

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

☐ This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.

☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy.

PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE AND DISSEMINATE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

S. Meyer

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

Prepared for presentation at the Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development (ASCD) Annual Conference; Baltimore, MD; March 22, 1997. Direct correspondence to Kenneth Wong, Associate Professor, Department of Education, University of Chicago, 5835 S. Kimbark Ave., Chicago, IL 60637, e-mail: stdwong@cicero.spc.uchicago.edu , phone: 773-702-0753.

This research is supported by the Mid-Atlantic Regional Laboratory for Student Success at the Center for Research in Human Development and Education, Temple University.

T402858587

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

Abstract

The Hawkins-Stafford Elementary and Secondary School Improvement Amendments to Chapter 1 (now Title I), passed in 1988, have enabled broad expansion of Title I schoolwide projects to over 8,000 schoolwide projects during the 1995-96 school year. These regulatory changes have the potential to reduce the historically fragmented or "categorical" character of Title I programs and improve the effectiveness of entire schools rather than targeting services to meet the needs of the most disadvantaged subpopulations. Despite the dramatic increase in the number of schoolwide projects, however, there remain a number of questions about their effectiveness relative to traditional Title I programming. This paper presents a review of what is known about Title I schoolwide projects and their effectiveness, focusing on three aspects: characteristics of schools and districts with schoolwide projects; programmatic and organizational characteristics of schoolwide project schools and districts; and evidence of the effectiveness of schoolwide project schools, particularly in terms of student performance. In addition to reviewing these evaluation findings, we present a handful of cautions related to their interpretation. Finally, we suggest implications for future evaluation and for administrators in schools and districts with schoolwide projects.

Background

Since the Great Society era of the 1960s, the federal grants-in-aid system has been used as the primary tool to address equity issues in elementary and secondary education. One of the major federal categorical programs that survived partisan shifts is compensatory education, enacted as Title I of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act in 1965. Consistent with the redistributive purpose in the original act, Title I has provided supplementary resources to schools with large numbers of low-income students throughout the past three decades. For Fiscal Year 1995, the Clinton Administration allocated almost $8 billion in Title I funds to over 4 million students. Enjoying bipartisan support over the years, Title I was not targeted for elimination by the Republican majority in the Congress during 1995 and 1996.

Federal funding support notwithstanding, policymakers in Washington have paid increasing attention to classroom learning among disadvantaged students in recent years. Since the publication of *A Nation at Risk* in 1983, there have been renewed concerns for blending Title I with a core academic curriculum (Kirst, 1988). Policy analysts have directed their attention to program redesign at the school level in ways that would strengthen the schools' overall organizational capacity to develop more comprehensive (i.e., less fragmentary) strategies for helping disadvantaged children (Wong & Wang, 1994; Millsap, et al., 1992; Commission on Chapter 1, 1992). Further, previous research has documented the stigmatizing impact of pullout programs on students, their disruptive impact on classroom instruction, and the organizational complexity resulting from the targeting provision that only means-tested, eligible children may be served (Glass & Smith, 1977; Leinhardt, et al, 1986; Winfield & Hawkins, 1993).

In light of these concerns, the U.S. Congress passed the Hawkins-Stafford Elementary and Secondary School Improvement Amendments to Chapter 1 (now Title I) in 1988 which encouraged schoolwide projects in schools where at least 75% of the students come from low-

income backgrounds to operate them (without asking for local matching funds). The 1994 Improving America's School Act further encouraged the adoption of schoolwide projects by lowering the eligibility threshold for schoolwide projects to schools with 50% low-income students by 1996-97. In big-city districts, the lower threshold permits virtually all Title I schools to operate schoolwide projects. These regulatory changes have the potential to reduce the historically fragmented or "categorical" character of Title I programs and improve the effectiveness of entire schools rather than targeting services to meet the needs of the most disadvantaged subpopulations. The schoolwide project option allows schools to develop instructional programs which coordinate resources between Title I and regular instructional programs in the school as well as foster increased programmatic coordination between federal, state, and local staff in schools that serve large numbers of disadvantaged students.

As a result of these federal legislative changes, the number of schoolwide projects grew from fewer than 1,200 to over 4,500 between 1991 and 1995, representing an increase from 10% to 47% of all eligible Title I schools. During 1995-96, over 8,000 schoolwide projects were in operation out of a total 16,853 eligible school sites. Despite this rapid expansion, however, little is known about the nature of schoolwide projects and their effectiveness relative to traditional Title I programming.

The Need for a Synthesis of Title I Evaluation Findings

At the time of the passage of the Improving America's School Act, there were few empirical studies on the implementation of schoolwide projects and only a handful of studies have been conducted during the years following the 1988 legislation. Nationwide evaluations of the first years of the Hawkins-Stafford reform suggested mixed effects of schoolwide projects and offered little information with respect to their impact on student performance (U.S. Department of Education, 1992;1993b). Further, several evaluations were conducted within particular school districts and their findings have not yet been integrated. Thus, there is a need to develop a more

systematic understanding of how schoolwide projects have worked during their initial years. As evaluation data continues to become available, it becomes increasingly important to integrate research findings and develop an informed picture of schoolwide project implementation thus far.

This paper endeavors to synthesize what is known, to date, about the effectiveness of Title I schoolwide projects. In particular, our synthesis focuses on three primary aspects:

- characteristics of schools and districts with schoolwide projects,
- programmatic and organizational characteristics of schoolwide project schools and districts, and
- evidence of the effectiveness of schoolwide project schools, particularly in terms of student performance.

In addition to reviewing these research findings, we present a handful of cautions related to their interpretation. Finally, we suggest implications for future evaluation and for administrators in schools and districts with schoolwide projects.

Overview of Evaluation Studies

A total of twelve evaluative publications are reviewed in this analysis. [INCLUDE METHODS FOR IDENTIFYING/LOCATING STUDIES?] Their characteristics are summarized in Tables 1 and 2. All are based on data collected between 1985 and 1995 and were published in the early 1990s. Two reports --the interim and final reports of the National Assessment of the Chapter 1 Program-- aggregate findings from a variety of related research studies (U.S. Department of Education, 1992; 1993b). The remaining ten present analyses of schoolwide projects at either the national or district level conducted by school districts, independent research organizations, and university researchers. The richest information about schoolwide project effectiveness in terms of student performance is from district-level studies of schoolwide project schools. The last six entries listed in Tables 1 and 2 describe these district-level studies. Some evaluation studies of Title I were excluded because reports to date present little information specifically related to schoolwide projects. Excluded, for example, are studies based on data from the *Prospects* database (U.S. Department of Education, 1993a) and those based upon state performance reports

(Sinclair & Gutmann, 1996).

Samples and Data Collection Methods (see Table 1)

Study designs range from large-scale surveys to in-depth case studies of particular school sites; ranging, for example, from a mail survey of nearly 2,000 schools to an in-depth case study of eleven schoolwide project schools. Thus, their findings are of varying generalizability. However, all focus primarily on elementary schools and, frequently, on a subset of grades between Kindergarten and eighth grade. Studies either base findings on samples of schoolwide project schools or present comparative analyses of schoolwide projects and schools with traditional Title I programming. Similarly, the samples of schools or districts used in these studies are either drawn randomly (to provide regional representativeness) or purposefully (to reflect variation across particular types of programs or student characteristics).

Data collection methods include: administration of mail questionnaires and on-site interviewing with individuals at the school, district and state levels (e.g., principals, classroom teachers, instructional aides, state and district Title I coordinators, and parents); observation of classroom instruction and other school activities; use of extant data maintained by schools and districts; document review; and, administration of student achievement tests. The studies represent a fairly even mix of cross-sectional and longitudinal designs. In most cases, however, longitudinal studies focus exclusively on standardized measures of student achievement.

Analytical Constructs and Data Analysis Methods (See Table 2)

Table 2 summarizes the type of data collected and the data analysis methods for each study. The majority of studies present some basic descriptive information about: schoolwide project schools and districts (e.g., school poverty, school and district size, grades served) and the students and families served by schoolwide project schools (e.g., race/ethnicity, educational disadvantage, limited English proficiency). These data, in most cases, were collected via questionnaire or interview of individuals at the school, district, or state levels and through review of district data records.

Most studies devote their attention to the implementation process for schoolwide projects--in particular, elements of the proposal and planning process and the specific elements added as components of the schoolwide project. Components include both those related to school organization, management, and governance (e.g., hiring of additional staff, the establishment of shared decision making structures, and increased staff development or parent involvement activities) as well as those related to curriculum and instruction (e.g., the distinction of Title I services from those in the regular program, changes in classroom instruction, and the inclusion of components associated with effective schools). These data were collected via questionnaire and interview with individuals at the school, state, and district level as well as through observation at the school site.

To assess schoolwide project effectiveness, studies used both qualitative assessments by principals or district staff (e.g., perceived advantages or disadvantages of schoolwide projects) and quantitative measures of student performance (i.e. test scores). The majority of studies that present student performance measures use normal curve equivalent (NCE) gains on norm-referenced tests. Nearly all studies which present norm-referenced test scores do so for both reading and math. Scores in all cases are from widely-used, standardized tests, such as the California Achievement Test (CAT), Metropolitan Achievement Test (MAT), and the Comprehensive Test of Basic Skills (CTBS). Only one study considers an additional measure of student performance --student report card marks. Two studies also consider student attendance as an indicator of schoolwide project effectiveness. Finally, school participation in program improvement efforts is also used as an indicator of program effectiveness in three cases.

A variety of analytic techniques were used to generate findings from these data. Many findings are based upon aggregation of results from questionnaires, interviews, and observation. These findings tend to be primarily descriptive (e.g., characteristics of schools and districts with schoolwide projects, or inventories of components of schoolwide projects). Analyses of student performance measures, in most cases, are longitudinal, comparing cohorts of students in schools

with and without schoolwide projects which have been matched on some other characteristics. Nearly all analyses present changes in NCE scores, averaged across grades within districts. In fewer cases, findings are based on performance measures from schoolwide project schools only, considering average, grade-level test scores or measures of attendance before and after the point of schoolwide project implementation. Finally, in one case, findings are presented that are based only on a single, point-in-time analysis of test scores from schools with and without schoolwide projects.

Very few of the studies present analyses which link student performance measures to characteristics of schoolwide project schools or students. Two studies relate school characteristics (e.g., school-level organization, instructional strategies) to student achievement scores and three relate student characteristics (e.g., gender, race/ethnicity, prior achievement) to student achievement scores.

Findings

Characteristics of Schools and Districts with Schoolwide Projects

A wealth of basic descriptive information about schools and districts with schoolwide projects originates from a survey of nearly 500 districts and nearly 2,000 schools with schoolwide projects conducted by Schenck and Beckstrom during the 1991-92 school year. Over half of the schoolwide projects operating in 1991-92 were in districts with 25,000 or more students. Schoolwide project schools reported an average poverty level of 85 percent and served an average of 70 percent educationally disadvantaged students. Over half of schoolwide project schools served students from urban areas and nearly a quarter served students from rural areas. The remaining quarter of schoolwide project schools served small towns/communities and suburban areas.

Over three-fourths of schoolwide project schools were elementary schools; another 12.4% served elementary grades in combination with one or more secondary grades; and only 10% were

secondary schools. Schoolwide project schools tend to have higher percentages of African-American and Hispanic students than the districts in which they operate and nearly 20 percent of students enrolled in schoolwide project schools demonstrated limited English proficiency (Schenck & Beckstrom, 1993).

Implementation Progress

Nearly all studies devote some attention to the implementation process of schoolwide project schools, endeavoring to describe the particular changes at the school level that occurred as a result of the schools' adoption of the schoolwide approach. Two general areas of implementation progress are presented: 1) elements of the proposal and planning process and 2) components of school organization, management, governance, and curriculum and instruction which have been initiated, strengthened, or modified as a result of schoolwide project implementation.

Elements of the Proposal and Planning Process

According to the 1991-92 survey of schools with schoolwide projects, "more flexibility in service delivery or instructional grouping" was cited most often (by 85 percent of principals) as a reason for establishing the schoolwide projects. "Better fit [of the Title I program] with the total school program", "more discretion in the use of [Title I] funds", and "access to additional funds" were also cited often --by 57 percent, 46 percent, and 21 percent of principals, respectively. Only 11.7 percent of principals selected "a response to being identified for Title I program improvement" as a reason for seeking schoolwide project status. (Schenck & Beckstrom, 1993).

Nonetheless, a great deal of evidence indicates that the endorsement of schoolwide projects by personnel at the district and state level exerts a strong influence. For example, a survey of Title I Coordinators during the 1990-91 school year indicates that, although only 28 percent of all districts with eligible schools had established schoolwide projects, 65 percent of districts with eligible schools established schoolwide projects in districts whose state education agencies have encouraged consideration of the option (Millsap, et al, 1992). Indeed, there are many examples of school districts and state education agencies initiating the planning and application process to

establish schoolwide projects (Philadelphia School District, 1992; Stringfield, et al, 1994; Wong, et al, 1996). Almost none of the schools indicated that the district played no role in applying for the schoolwide project; however, one-fifth indicated that state department staff played no role (Schenck & Beckstrom, 1993).

Most schoolwide project schools spent relatively little time in the process of planning and needs assessment. Nearly half reported spending less than six months and almost 90 percent reported spending less than a year. Schools encouraged by the district or state to apply for schoolwide project status spent even less time planning. The relatively short planning period may be, in part, a result of district influence on the design of schoolwide projects, which was reported as a factor in three-quarters of schoolwide project schools. Most schools, however, involved administrators, teachers, parents, and other individuals in the planning process, although one study describes parents' role in planning schoolwide projects as having been limited (Schenck & Beckstrom, 1993; Millsap, et al, 1992).

Because a fundamental purpose of the schoolwide project option is to provide schools with greater flexibility to use resources to meet the needs of all students at the school, a central question is how schools have taken advantage of this flexibility. In particular, what types of school organization, management, and educational practices have been instituted, strengthened, or changed as a result of schoolwide project implementation. We focus on two general types of components of schoolwide projects: 1) components of schoolwide projects related to school organization, management, and governance and 2) components of schoolwide projects related to curriculum and instruction.

Components Related to School Organization, Management, and Governance

Schoolwide projects have allowed schools to introduce new activities or programs as well as strengthen existing ones. Evidence from the first few years of their operation shows that emphasis has been placed primarily on strengthening existing programs and activities (Schenck & Beckstrom, 1993; Stringfield, et al, 1994). Further, preliminary evidence indicates that the shift to

a schoolwide project is often accompanied by changes in school management such as a reduction of class size. Of those schools which introduced new activities or programs, the most frequently introduced were activities for "parent education/involvement" and "adoption/adaption of a generic instructional program or approach." Many other programs and activities were strengthened, however. During their first years, schools introduced an average of one or two activities, programs or strategies and strengthened five or six (Schenck & Beckstrom, 1993).

Reduced Class Size/ Hiring of Additional Staff

Reduced class size was identified as a component of schoolwide project implementation by principals in slightly more than half of schoolwide project schools. The average reduction in school class size was from 27 to 19 children. Despite the prevalence of this component, schools that reduced class size introduced and strengthened other activities to a similar extent as schools which did not reduce class size (Schenck & Beckstrom, 1993). Teachers have expressed enthusiasm about this component, arguing that reductions in class size allow them to enhance their curricula and instruction. In fact, class size has been reduced selectively in some cases, only for those teachers who express a willingness to tie the reduction to a change in their instructional practice. Finally, addition of new staff has not been limited to teachers. Counselors, social workers, school-family coordinators, and schoolwide project coordinators have also been hired as components of schoolwide projects (Millsap, et al, 1993).

Staff Development

Case studies of schools with schoolwide approaches indicate that successful implementation of a schoolwide project is linked, in part, to the provision of significant resources for staff in-service training in particular instructional techniques and continuing opportunities for staff interaction (Stringfield, et al, 1994). Preliminary implementation evidence shows that staff development activities have been implemented or significantly strengthened in over three-fourths of schoolwide project schools. During the first years of implementation, a majority of districts report that staff development at schoolwide projects schools is more inclusive of teachers and involves more total

hours than regular Title I schools. Staff development activities in schoolwide project schools have included training in reading/language arts instruction, instruction for low achieving students, and mathematics instruction (Schenck & Beckstrom, 1993). According to principal reports, the average teacher at a schoolwide project school receives an average of 29 hours of staff development, which is 6 hours more than that received by typical teachers in Title I schools without schoolwide projects (Schenck & Beckstrom, 1993; Millsap, et al, 1993).

Shared Decision Making and Teacher Input

The schoolwide project option encourages increased teacher input into decisions affecting the school, emphasizing teacher input into decisions about assessments. Based on reports by principals in a major urban school district, teachers indicate having only a moderate level of input into decisions affecting the school. The majority of teachers have some level of input into decisions about assigning students and teachers to classrooms, hiring staff, and selecting materials or purchasing hardware. Teachers, however, had the greatest input in decisions about selecting materials or purchasing hardware and had the least input in decisions about teacher assignment and replacement (Winfield & Hawkins, 1993).

Parental Involvement

Acknowledged as a key component of all Title I efforts, parental involvement has also been a component of many schoolwide projects. Parent education and involvement is reported to have been introduced or significantly strengthened in over three-fourths of schoolwide project schools. The most common types of parent involvement activities mentioned were: informal contact between parents and teachers, parent volunteering in the school, and parent help with student school work in the home. School-based adult education and family literacy programs were mentioned less frequently (Schenck & Beckstrom, 1993).

Principal reports in a large urban school district indicate that, despite a range of parent involvement activities, small percentages of parents were actually involved with these activities. For example, only five to ten percent of parents were reported as having been involved in

volunteering in classrooms and attending workshops. Higher proportions of parents were involved in other school activities (e.g., receiving information from teachers or home demonstrators, monitoring homework, and attending PTA meetings); however, this occurred in relatively few schools (Winfield & Hawkins, 1993). Case studies of Title I schools with particular programmatic "special strategies" indicate that, of several approaches, schoolwide projects are particularly well-positioned to foster parent involvement (Stringfield, et al, 1994).

Components of Schoolwide Projects Related to Curriculum and Instruction

Distinction of Title I Services from the Regular Program

A central component of the schoolwide project option is the provision of Title I activities and services to all students in Title I schools. One indicator of a program's inclusiveness is the extent to which Title I services cannot be distinguished from services offered for all children (e.g., one that lacks pullout programs which serve only a subset of students). Sixty percent of schoolwide project school principals report that their schools operate programs in which Title I services are indistinguishable from services for all children. Among those schools in which Title I services were distinguishable from the regular program, the most common distinction was the provision of additional services to educationally disadvantaged students who would have received Title I services in a traditional, targeted program. Only 12 percent of schools reported using a pullout model (Schenck & Beckstrom, 1993). Similarly, principals in a major urban school district reported that at least one-fourth of schools had pre-existing Title I programs that were still operating in the context of the schoolwide project after the first three years of implementation (Winfield & Hawkins, 1993).

Classroom Instruction

Perhaps the most critical components of schoolwide projects are those which have the potential to directly influence what takes place in the classroom. Schoolwide project principals reported having introduced or significantly strengthened the following components related to curriculum and instruction: computer assisted instruction (over three-fourths); provision of a coordinated and

integrated curriculum and supplemental instruction (two-thirds); and provision of an extended school day (less than one-fourth) (Schenck & Beckstrom, 1993). Some schoolwide project schools have adopted particular programs or curricula, such as "Reading Recovery" or "Success for All," as part of their schoolwide projects (Millsap, et al, 1992). In fact, the majority of "Success for All" schools are Title I schoolwide projects (Slavin, et al, 1995).

It is difficult, however, to obtain a clear picture of the particular ways in which the schoolwide project option actually impacts classroom instruction. In-depth, case study analysis (Stringfield, et al, 1994) begins to inform this question, however. There is also evidence that schoolwide projects increase the capacity of schools and teachers to provide instructional services more flexibly, as particular student needs arise; whereas traditional Title I pullout programs have typically required a more formal process of student selection (Millsap, et al, 1992).

Components Associated with Effective Schools

Another important indicator of schoolwide project implementation progress is the inclusion of components associated with effective schools. State Title I coordinators reported that 62 percent of schoolwide projects in their states incorporated components of effective schools programs as a main feature of their programs (Turnbull et al, 1990; U.S. Department of Education, 1992). A survey of district coordinators indicates that a number of effective schools components were implemented as part of schoolwide projects through activities such as needs assessment, staff development, changes in classroom instruction, and changes in school management (Millsap, et al., 1992). The presence of characteristics associated with effective schools may, reciprocally, impact the successful implementation of schoolwide projects, in that the factors that make good schools may also facilitate innovation and change. Case studies suggest that factors which facilitate innovation include: strong principal leadership and management skills, meaningful, universally agreed upon goals, a nurturing school culture, well-qualified staff, and organizational mechanisms to support schools problem-solving (Stringfield, et al, 1994).

These preliminary findings lend some insight into the components which have been included as

part of schoolwide projects and also begin to form the basis for an understanding of what comprises a "successful implementation" of the schoolwide project approach. For example, one assessment describes successful implementation as schools which have "implemented schoolwide decision making, created effective working plans for improvement, integrated other existing categorical programs into a coherent instructional program for all children, allocated available resources more effectively, provided ongoing support to classroom teachers, learned how to monitor program effectiveness better, and instituted instructional reforms for their disadvantaged student population" (U.S. Department of Education, 1993b, p. 111). The larger, remaining questions, however, are what impacts schoolwide projects have had relative to traditional Title I service delivery approaches and their effectiveness in terms of improving student performance.

Schoolwide Project Effectiveness and Student Performance

Perceptions of Schoolwide Project Effectiveness

Preliminary indicators of program effectiveness are reflected in school and district staff perceptions of the advantages and disadvantages of schoolwide projects. Concerns have been raised, for example, that school principals and district coordinators consider the primary advantages of schoolwide projects to be factors related to administrative convenience (e.g., reductions in class size, better use of materials and equipment), rather than to initiate instructional reform or improve student outcomes (U.S. Department of Education, 1992). Nonetheless, many principals and teachers consider the schoolwide project option as a way to do away with what they perceive to have been negative features of their previous Title I services such as pullout programs, formal or inflexible procedures for targeting Title I services, and an emphasis on remediation rather than prevention (Millsap, et al, 1993). Further, principals and district coordinators report a range of advantages, related primarily to instructional benefits for students and a simplification of administrative responsibilities through increased flexibility of programs and funds (Schenck & Beckstrom, 1993).

The disadvantages reported most frequently by principals and district coordinators are:

additional paperwork; additional time for planning, evaluation, and teacher preparation; and the belief that Title I children receive fewer services (Schenck & Beckstrom, 1993). State and district Title I coordinators also have expressed the concerns that schoolwide projects may dilute the resources for Title I programs and that they do not adequately meet the needs of the lowest achieving students (Millsap, et al, 1992).

Student Performance

Information about the impact of schoolwide projects on student achievement is very limited. The only such information available at the national level is based on generalized principal and Title I district coordinator reports of schoolwide project effectiveness and on aggregate information on the number of schools which have met their three year accountability requirement. Seventy-eight percent of principals of schoolwide project schools which had been in operation for at least three years during the 1991-92 school year reported that evidence favored the schoolwide project (Schenck & Beckstrom, 1993). Of those schools considered to comprise the first group of schoolwide projects after the enactment of the Hawkins-Stafford amendments and assessed at the end of three years, only 10 percent failed to show the achievement gains required to continue as a schoolwide project (Turnbull, et al, 1992; U.S. Department of Education, 1993b). Finally, of a total of 128 schools in the Philadelphia school district, 40% of schoolwide project sites and 55% of non-schoolwide project sites were required to participate in mandated program improvement (Davidoff & Pierson, 1991).

Richer information about student performance, however, is available at the local level, where a handful of studies of schoolwide projects have been conducted within particular districts (see Appendix A for more detailed summaries of these district-level studies). Studies have been conducted using data from the school districts of Philadelphia, Houston, Minneapolis, and a fourth unspecified urban school district which provide further insight into the impact of schoolwide projects on student achievement. These district-level studies focus primarily on comparison of NCE reading and math scores across schoolwide project and non-schoolwide project schools. Of

those studies that conduct tests of statistical significance, most report only a handful of significant differences in measures of student performance between schoolwide and non-schoolwide project schools. Further, where significant differences appear, they tend to be small (see Table 3 for a summary of findings from four of these district-level studies).

A study conducted by the Houston Independent school district, for example, compared reading and math achievement scores for its first year of schoolwide project implementation (Nechworth, et al, 1990). A handful of significant differences were identified, indicating higher reading and math scores in non-schoolwide project schools. The differences are slight, however. Another study in an unidentified major urban school district presents a mixed picture of schoolwide project effectiveness (Winfield & Hawkins, 1993). Following a cohort of first grade students for five years, the study found mostly non-significant differences in reading and math scores of students from the two types of schools. Significant differences were found among reading scores of students for two of the five years, suggesting mixed (both positive and negative) effects of schoolwide project status on reading achievement scores.

A study conducted by the School District of Philadelphia, on the other hand, presents evidence in favor of schoolwide projects (Davidoff & Pierson, 1991). Although no tests of statistical significance are presented, a variety of comparisons favor schoolwide projects. Comparing four measures of student achievement during the 1988-89 school year, the study found that a higher percentage of schoolwide projects met the state-required measures of reading and math achievement than schools with traditional Title I programming. Further, following gain scores in reading and math across eight grades between the 1988-89 and 1989-90 school years, the study found that, for a majority of grades, a higher percentage of students from schoolwide project schools have higher post-test scores in reading and math than their counterparts in non-schoolwide project schools.

The Philadelphia study also compared student performance in schoolwide project schools before and after schoolwide project implementation, finding improved performance subsequent to

implementation. The study showed that, for the majority of schoolwide project schools, the percentage of students receiving report card marks of "A", "B", or "C" across four curricular areas increased after schoolwide project implementation. Comparing average achievement gains in reading and math for the period prior to and after the implementation schoolwide projects, the study found that about half of schoolwide project schools had higher average gains in reading scores after implementation and about one-fourth had higher average gains in math scores. Lastly, three-fourths of schoolwide project schools showed improvement in student attendance after becoming schoolwide projects.

Finally, a study of student achievement in schoolwide and non-schoolwide project schools in Houston (for the 1993-94 through 1994-95 school years) and Minneapolis (for the 1989-90 through 1992-93 school years) found mostly non-significant differences in average NCE gain scores in reading and math for students from schoolwide and non-schoolwide projects (Wong, et al, 1996). Significant differences were found for average student math scores in the Houston school district which favor non-schoolwide project schools. However, comparison of math and reading scores over time for students in the Minneapolis school district suggests that students in schoolwide project schools were making gains at a faster rate than students in schools with traditional Title I programming. Another analysis from this study indicates that, for students in the Minneapolis School District, schoolwide project status contributed to equalizing differences in math achievement score gains between Title I eligible and ineligible students, when controlling for racial and social backgrounds. In the Houston School District, however, Title I eligible students in schoolwide projects did not gain as much as they did in non-schoolwide project schools.

Interpretative Cautions Regarding the Evaluation of Schoolwide Projects

A number of factors should be taken into account before making conclusions based upon these or other evaluation findings.

Lessons from the Initial Phase of Implementation

The Hawkins-Stafford amendments were passed in 1988 and implementation of the schoolwide project option did not begin in earnest in a number of sites until 1989. Thus, these findings are based, in most cases, on the first experiences of schools implementing schoolwide projects, and because broad-based school change is a slow process, they should be regarded as preliminary. The Houston Independent School District study, (Nechworth, et al, 1990) for example, presents test score data from the first year of schoolwide project implementation and is based only on this single year. Indeed, there is evidence that the presence of components of schoolwide project implementation is related to the number of years the schoolwide project has operated. For example, a study of an unidentified major urban school district found that hours of staff development activities were directly related to the year in which the schoolwide project started (Winfield & Hawkins, 1993). This study also found that the percentage of schools which reallocated resources to provide instruction to all students was increasingly higher over a three year period. As components of schoolwide projects become more integral to the life of schools beyond the initial phase, we expect evaluation results to be more meaningful.

Methodological Issues Related to Schoolwide Project Evaluation

The nature of Title I schoolwide project implementation presents a number of challenges to evaluation. First, students in schools with schoolwide projects are by definition, the neediest in their districts in terms of poverty, which is often linked with educational disadvantage. Therefore, finding an adequate comparison group of students from schools without schoolwide projects is difficult and students from comparison schools may demonstrate achievement differences which are linked to other factors. Further, high rates of student mobility in Title I schools create complexities for comparisons across schools as well as for longitudinal studies of particular cohorts of students.

Also, as discussed earlier, these evaluations vary greatly in terms of their samples and consequent generalizability. Thus, the representativeness of study samples must be considered in the interpretation of any findings. The most generalizable findings are, of course, those based on

nationally representative samples. However, data from these samples tends to be limited, particularly with respect to measures of student performance. Great variability in instructional strategies within and across schoolwide approaches has also been documented which suggests the need to collect detailed information which is not often feasibly collected on a large scale (Stringfield, et al, 1994). Therefore, although small or non-random samples may be particularly useful for understanding the components of schoolwide projects which affect student learning, their limited generalizability must be recognized.

School districts have a good deal of flexibility in the methods they use to meet schoolwide project accountability requirements and, indeed, the evaluations reflect a variety of methods. An analysis of data from students in the School District of Philadelphia highlights this flexibility, delineating and exploring the multiple ways a Philadelphia school can meet its accountability requirement (School District of Philadelphia, 1992). Although, most measures yield consistent decisions about continuation of schoolwide projects at particular schools, there are a number of inconsistencies across measures. Thus, it should be noted that some methods are better suited to detect schoolwide project effects than others. Similarly, data analysis methods also vary. Some involve traditional methods for establishing statistical significance, while others rely on more qualitative assessments of data. These differences should also be taken into account.

Implications for Future Evaluation

A number of implications follow naturally from these cautions. Evaluations need to continue beyond the initial phase of schoolwide project implementation and should be longitudinal in order to capture effects that may not be fully apparent during the first years. Careful selection of comparison groups and thoughtful sampling procedures will also increase the utility of subsequent evaluations. The variety of evaluation methodologies used thus far, however, is not necessarily a liability in that it provides a multifaceted picture of program effectiveness, using a variety of methods. Methodological studies which review the various methods used to measure student performance and meet accountability requirements for schoolwide projects have concluded that

multiple measures should be used (U.S. Department of Education, 1993c; School District of Philadelphia, 1992). Further, as student achievement expectations continue to broaden --departing from an emphasis on basic skills-- current approaches to student testing may become increasingly limiting.

A handful of evaluation studies devote attention to the role of the school district in the implementation of schoolwide projects. Case studies of schoolwide project schools indicate that school and classroom practices are shaped by district-level activities, such as encouragement and support for particular programs or for school-based management (Wong, et al, 1996; Stringfield, et al, 1994). Further, a national survey of school principal and Title I district coordinators indicates that the role of districts in the implementation of schoolwide projects varies greatly (Schenck & Beckstrom, 1993). Because schoolwide projects endeavor to support school-level, shared decision making, however, the appropriate role of the district is unclear. Evaluations should continue to explore the role of school districts and their impact on schoolwide project effectiveness.

Because there is great flexibility afforded to schools with schoolwide projects, more attention should be given to the process through which changes at the school-level --resulting from schoolwide project implementation-- impact student performance. Case studies of special instructional strategies implemented on a schoolwide basis indicate great variability in project implementation both within programs and across programs (Stringfield, et al, 1992). Therefore, studies which aggregate findings across school sites may indicate relatively little about the specific components related to their effectiveness. Evaluations need to pursue a better understanding of particular characteristics of schoolwide projects and the mechanisms through which they lead to changes in educational outcomes.

Implications for Educational Administrators

Schoolwide projects have the potential to address three interrelated challenges in the nation's

most disadvantaged schools. First, schoolwide projects provide increased flexibility to school-site professionals to address the "concentration effects" of disadvantaged pupils in poor neighborhoods. Second, schoolwide projects can reduce curricular and instructional fragmentation in the classroom. Third, and of immediate interest to national policymakers, schoolwide projects are designed to improve accountability at a time when there is growing public concern over the general quality of public education.

Federal legislative expectations for Title I programs have been expanded to include challenging state content and performance standards (U.S. Department of Education, 1996). By the 1997-98 school year, states will be expected to establish content and performance standards for Title I students which reflect the same knowledge, skill, and performance levels that are expected of all children. Title I program services must be aligned with the state content standards and, ultimately, states will be expected to develop or adopt student assessments which are aligned with their content and performance standards.

Because Title I schoolwide projects incorporate a stronger accountability component, they offer the organizational potential to meet these new federal legislative expectations. Further, schoolwide project schools and districts should take the opportunity to think beyond basic accountability requirements and consider broadening the ways in which evaluation and assessment are used. For example, student assessment for Title I accountability purposes might also be used to guide instruction and improve teaching practice. Increased and alternative uses of student assessments might lead to more coordination at the district level and across units and departments. Dissemination of evaluation and assessment information as well as greater alignment of content and performance standards and assessments can help foster coherent links between curriculum, instruction, and assessment.

Schoolwide projects also create a context in which roles of principals and district staff might be expanded or redefined. As discussed, schoolwide project schools have spent relatively short periods of time planning prior to implementation and have received mixed levels of support from

the district level. Further, although there is evidence that schoolwide projects have increased the number of hours of staff development, the content of the activities and their relationship to the implementation of schoolwide projects has not been emphasized. District staff might emphasize methods for phasing out pullout programs or for integrating traditional Title I reading and math curriculum with that of the whole school.

The opportunity to redefine decision making roles at the school may also facilitate the creation of new structures which better serve students. For example, professional networks among teachers in the school might be fostered which encourage teachers to "buy into" aspects of the schoolwide project approach and cultivate changes at the classroom level. Similarly, schoolwide projects offer opportunities to explore broader governance issues. For example, alternative approaches to the functions of and relationships between the district, school, and classroom can be explored as well as particular types of parental involvement.

The research on the effectiveness of Title I schoolwide projects in terms of student performance has yielded mixed and inconclusive results. Nonetheless, the fact that perceptions by district and school staff and decisions about continuation of schoolwide projects have tended to be favorable suggests that subsequent evaluations of schoolwide projects may begin to show more positive effects. It is also clear that the adoption of Title I schoolwide projects by schools and districts has been much faster than the availability of evaluation findings about their effectiveness. Despite the fact that there were over 8,000 schoolwide projects operating during the 1995-96 year, only a small handful of sites have produced reliable evaluation data. Thus, although the data presented here do not offer compelling evidence for or against schoolwide projects, it should be noted that these reflect only a small subset of the schoolwide projects operating in the nation. It is therefore critical that reliable, longitudinal evaluations continue to be conducted beyond this initial phase. Further, as state content and performance standards begin to be implemented more widely, they will offer continued opportunities to understand whether and how schoolwide projects impact student achievement.

Appendix A

District-level Studies of Program Effectiveness and Student Performance

Houston Independent School District (Nechworth, et al, 1990)

The Houston Independent School District conducted an analysis of the effects of schoolwide projects on reading and math achievement scores using data from the 1989-90 school year. Data from a total of 42 schoolwide projects and 68 non-schoolwide projects are analyzed. Scores from students in grades 2 through 5 in both schoolwide and non-schoolwide projects schools are compared. Few significant differences were found, and where they exist, they are small. For non-limited English proficiency (LEP) students, slight significant differences were found which favor the non-schoolwide projects. In grade 2, both reading and math scores are significantly higher for students in non-schoolwide project schools. In grade 4, one of the two math scores is significantly higher for students in non-schoolwide project schools. And, when data from grades 2 through 5 are pooled the math scores for students in non-schoolwide project schools are significantly higher. Using a different assessment tool for LEP students, the study found no significant differences in reading scores between students in the two types of schools and found only slight significant differences in math scores which, again, favor non-schoolwide project schools.

Unidentified Major Urban School District (Winfield & Hawkins, 1993)

Another analysis, conducted of student data records from 40 schoolwide project schools and 20 matched non-schoolwide project schools in a major urban school district, yielded mixed effects. Data were analyzed for students who entered the first grade in the 1986-87 school year, through their fifth grade year (1990-91). A regression analysis was conducted for each grade level using a school's status as either a schoolwide or a non-schoolwide project school as a predictor of student achievement scores in reading. The analysis showed a mixed effect of schoolwide project status, finding significant differences in reading scores only for 2 grade levels -- positive and negative

effects on reading achievement scores for grades 2 and 3, respectively.

A second analysis, featured in the same report, was conducted using student data records for the school years 1986-87 through 1990-91 and survey data (collected during the 1989-90 school year) from 40 schoolwide projects in a major urban school district. This study linked student characteristics and components of schoolwide projects to student reading achievement scores. Three general categories of schoolwide project components were identified: 1) "school district framework" (e.g., inclusion of a school community coordinator), 2) "resource allocation" (e.g., providing classroom assistants), and 3) "existing programs" (e.g., computer lab). The total number of components within each category was added to create a scale indicating the presence of these components in sample schools. Several other components of schoolwide projects were measured using scales constructed from items on questionnaire mailed to principals including: degree of teacher involvement in decisions about how human resources are used; degree of teacher involvement in selecting basic material and purchasing instructional tools; degree of parent involvement in various types of activities; and percent of parents who attend parent-teacher conferences.

The variables were entered into a regression equation using average student reading achievement scores for grades 1 through 5 as a dependent variable. The analysis adjusts for length of schoolwide project implementation and for other contextual and demographic characteristics of students and schools. Although no effect sizes are large, there are a number of significant effects. The components which appear to have the strongest effect are those included in the "district framework" category--having significant positive effects in all five grades except grade three, in which the effect is significantly negative. The "resource allocation" and "existing programs" categories of components each also show significant effects in at least two of the five grades--effects are positive for "existing programs" and mixed for "resource allocation". The effects of teacher involvement in decisions about instructional resources, parent involvement, and parent conference attendance on student reading achievement are also significant (indicating both negative and positive effects) for at least two of the five grades. Teacher involvement in selection of

materials has a significant positive effect in only one of the five grades.

School District of Philadelphia (Davidoff & Pierson, 1991)

The School District of Philadelphia conducted a number of studies which address the question of schoolwide project effectiveness. One study uses a data from a sample of 62 schoolwide project schools and 66 non-schoolwide project schools for the school years 1985-86 through 1990-91. The study considers the impact of the schoolwide projects on: student achievement in reading and math, report card marks, and average daily attendance.

These analyses indicate that, for both reading and math, most evidence favored the schoolwide project sites over other Title I schools. Four measures of student achievement were considered, based upon statutory goals (required of Title I schools by the state of Pennsylvania) during the 1988-89 school year. Comparing the four measures for both schoolwide and non-schoolwide project sites, the study found that a higher percentage of schoolwide project sites met the four state-established criteria for reading achievement than did non-schoolwide project sites . In mathematics, however, a higher percentage of schoolwide project sites met only three out of the four criteria.

In another comparison, the percentage of students with higher post-test scores in reading and math (administered in Spring,1989 and Spring, 1990) and the average NCE gain scores for each grade from 1 through 8 are considered. These two indicators are compared for schoolwide projects versus all other Title I reading services. The comparison of the percentages of students with higher post-test scores in reading favors schoolwide projects in six of the eight grades. The comparison of average NCE gain scores in reading favors schoolwide projects in five of the eight grades. The results are similar for math, favoring schoolwide projects in six of the grades and seven of the grades for percent higher post-test scores and average NCE gain scores, respectively.

Other analyses which compare student performance in schoolwide project schools before and after schoolwide project implementation also support schoolwide project effectiveness. Another analysis considered report card marks of students in schoolwide project schools, finding that in the

majority of the 37 "cohort 1" schoolwide project schools in each curricular area (reading, math, science, and social studies), the percentage of students receiving a grade of "A", "B", or "C" increased after schoolwide project implementation. Comparing achievement gains in reading and math for the period prior to and after the implementation schoolwide projects, however, yielded less compelling findings about their effectiveness. In reading, only 21 of the 37 "cohort 1" schools (grades 2 through 8), demonstrated achievement gains as a schoolwide project which exceeded those during the three, prior pre-program years. In math, only 9 of the 37 schools demonstrated such achievement gains. Finally, 28 of the 37 "cohort 1" schools had improved their attendance since becoming schoolwide projects.

Houston and Minneapolis School Districts (Wong, et al, 1996)

Finally, another analysis compares the achievement scores of students in the school districts of Houston and Minneapolis. Data representing students from 35 schools (4 with schoolwide projects) in Minneapolis for the school years 1989-90 through 1992-93 were analyzed. A subsample was created that consisted of students who started the first grade in 1989 and remained in the same school until the third grade. Students were classified into six groups according to type of school (schoolwide project, advantaged Title I, or disadvantaged Title I) and student eligibility (Title I eligible or Title I ineligible). Average NCE gain scores for reading and math were compared across the six student groups for the years 1990-93. An analysis of variance (ANOVA) found no significant differences between mean gain scores for students attending different types of schools. Analysis of NCE test scores over a period of three years, however, suggests a narrowing of the gap between the performance of students in schoolwide projects and students in other types of schools over time. Although not a statistically significant finding, this suggests that students in schoolwide project schools were making gains at a faster rate than students in other types of schools.

Data from 164 schools (116 with schoolwide projects) in Houston for the school years 1993-94 and 1994-95 were also analyzed. A subsample was created that consisted of students who

started the third grade in 1993 and remained in the same school until the fourth grade (1993 cohort). Again, students were classified into six groups according to type of school (schoolwide project, advantaged Title I, or disadvantaged Title I) and student eligibility (Title I eligible or Title I ineligible). Average NCE gain scores for reading and math were compared across the six student groups for the years 1993-94. An ANOVA found no significant differences in the rate of academic growth among the six groups of students in reading; however, some differences were apparent in math. The largest gains in academic growth as measured by math achievement scores were made by Title I eligible and non-eligible students attending non-schoolwide project schools. An analysis of NCE test scores across the two years, identified a substantial (though non-significant) gap between the performance of Title I eligible and ineligible students. Comparison across school types shows that, regardless of school type, this gap was maintained across the two years.

A hierarchical linear model (HLM) was also used to analyze NCE test scores for the Minneapolis and Houston samples. At the student level, NCE gain scores were modeled as a function of: starting scores, Title I eligibility, race/ethnicity, and poverty. At the school level, the average gain scores, effect of starting scores, Title I gap, minority gap, and poverty gap were modeled as a function of schoolwide project status. For students in the Minneapolis School District, when the effect of school type on academic growth is considered, no significant differences in average gain scores between schoolwide projects and non-schoolwide projects were found. When controlling for racial and social backgrounds, however, schoolwide project status contributed to equalizing differences in academic gains between Title I eligible and ineligible students, particularly in math. In other words, the gap between Title I eligible students and ineligible students was not as large in schoolwide projects, particularly in math.

In the Houston School District, however, Title I eligible students in schoolwide projects did not gain as much as they did in non-schoolwide project schools. Particularly in math, the performance gap between students classified as Title I eligible and those classified as Title I ineligible within a school is larger in schoolwide projects than in non-schoolwide project schools.

References

Commission on Chapter 1 (1992). *Making Schools Work for Children in Poverty.* Washington, D.C.: Council of Chief State School Officers.

Davidoff, S.H., & Pierson, E.M. (1991). *"A Continued Look at the Promise of Schoolwide Projects."* Paper presented at the annual meeting of the American Educational Research Association. Chicago, IL.

Glass, G.V., & Smith, M. (1977). *Pullout in Compensatory Education.* Boulder, CO: University of Colorado, Laboratory of Educational Research.

Kirst, M. (1988). "The Federal Role and Chapter 1: Rethinking Some Basic Assumptions," in *Federal Aid to the Disadvantaged: What Future for Chapter 1?* edited by D. Doyle and B. Cooper. London: Falmer Press: 97-115.

Leinhardt, G., Bickel, W., & Palley, A. (1982). *Unlabeled but Still Entitled: Toward More Effective Remediation.* Teachers College Record, 84 (2), 129-151.

Millsap, M.A., Moss, M. & Gamse, B. (1993). *The Chapter 1 Implementation Study: Final Report.* Cambridge, MA: Abt Associates.

Millsap, M. A., Turnbull, B., Moss, M., Brigham, N., Gamse, B., & Marks, E. (1992). *The Chapter 1 Implementation Study: Interim Report.* Cambridge, MA: Abt Associates.

Nechworth, J., Cisneros, E., Sanchez, K.S. (1990). *Chapter 1 Instructional Program: Final Report 1989/90.* Houston, TX: Houston Independent School District.

Philadelphia School District (1992). *"The Moment of Truth: Year Three Continuation for Schoolwide Projects."* Paper presented at the annual meeting of the American Educational Research Association. San Francisco, CA.

Schenck, E.A., & Beckstrom, S. (1993). *Chapter 1 Schoolwide Project Study: Final Report.* Hampton, NH, RMC Research Corporation.

Sinclair, B., & Gutmann, B. (1996). *State Chapter 1 Participation and Achievement Information 1993-94: Summary Report.* Rockville, MD: Westat, Inc.

Slavin, R., et al. (1995). *Success for All: A Summary of Research.* Paper presented at the annual meeting of the American Educational Research Association. San Francisco, CA.

Stringfield, S., Winfield, L., Millsap, M.A., Puma, M.J., Gamse, B., & Randall, B. (1994). *Urban and Suburban/ Rural Special Strategies for Educating Disadvantaged Children: First Year Report..* Washington, D.C.: U.S. Department of Education.

Stringfield, S., Billig, S., & Davis, A. (1991). "Chapter 1 Program Improvement: Cause for Cautious Optimism and a Call for Much More Research," *Educational Evaluation and Policy Analysis* 13 (4): 399-406.

U.S. Department of Education (1996). *Mapping out the Assessment of Title I: The Interim Report.* Washington, D.C.: U.S. Department of Education.

References (continued)

U.S. Department of Education (1993a). *Prospects: The Congressionally Mandated Study of Educational Growth and Opportunity, The Interim Report.* Washington, D.C.: U.S. Department of Education.

U.S. Department of Education (1993b). *Reinventing Chapter: The Current Chapter 1 Program and New Directions, Final Report of the National Assessment of the Chapter Program.* Washington, D.C.: U.S. Department of Education.

U.S. Department of Education (1993c). *Reinforcing the Promise, Reforming the Paradigm: Report of the Advisory Committee on Testing in Chapter 1.* Washington, D.C.: U.S. Department of Education.

U.S. Department of Education (1992). *National Assessment of the Chapter 1 Program: The Interim Report.* Washington, D.C.: U.S. Department of Education.

Winfield, L.F., & Hawkins, R. (1993). *Longitudinal Effects of Chapter 1 Schoolwide Projects on the Achievement of Disadvantaged Students.* Baltimore, MD: Johns Hopkins University.

Winfield, L.F., Hawkins, R., & Stringfield, S.S. (1992). *A Description of Chapter 1 Schoolwide Projects and Effects on Student Achievement in Six Case Study Schools.* Baltimore, MD: Johns Hopkins University.

Wong, K. K., Sunderman, G.L., & Lee, J. (1996) *Redesigning the Federal Compensatory Education Program: Lessons from the Implementation of Title I Schoolwide Projects.* Chicago, IL: University of Chicago, Department of Education, report submitted to the National Center on Education and the Inner Cities at Temple University.

Wong, K. K., & Wang, M.C., eds. (1994). *Rethinking Policy for At-Risk Students.* Berkeley, CA: McCutchan Publishing Corporation.

Table 1: Overview of Evaluation Studies (Samples and Data Collection Methods/ Sources)

Evaluative Report	Organization/ Authors, Date of Publication	Sample	Data Collection Methods/ Sources
National Assessment of the Chapter 1 Program: The Interim Report	U.S. Dept. of Education (1992)	n/a	summary of findings from recent research studies
Reinventing Chapter 1: The Current Chapter 1 Program and New Directions	U.S. Dept. of Education (1993)	n/a	summary of findings from recent research studies
Chapter 1 Schoolwide Project Study: Final Report	RMC Research Corporation (Schenck & Beckstrom, 1993)	nationally representative sample of 431 districts and 1,889 schools operating schoolwide projects during the 1991-92 school year sample of 6 schoolwide project schools around the U.S. chosen to reflect geographic and demographic diversity during the 1991-92 school year	questionnaires mailed to Chapter 1 district coordinators and schools case study (interviews with individuals at the school and district level; classroom and informal observation; document review)
The Chapter 1 Implementation Study: Interim Report	Abt Associates (Millsap, Tumbull, Moss, Brigham, Gamse & Marks, 1992)	nationally representative sample of 1,400 public school districts receiving Chapter 1 funds during the 1990-91 school year sample of 54 schools around the U.S. chosen to reflect diversity in geography, demography, and other school and district characteristics during the 1990-91 school year	questionnaires mailed to Chapter 1 district coordinators case study (interviews with individuals at the state, district, and school levels)
The Chapter 1 Implementation Study: Final Report	Abt Associates (Millsap, Moss & Gamse, 1993)	nationally representative sample of 1,000 Chapter 1 schools (including 48 schoolwide project schools) during the 1991-92 school year	questionnaires mailed to principals, classroom teachers, and teachers aides
Urban and Suburban/Rural Special Strategies for Educating Disadvantaged Yonth: First Year Report	Johns Hopkins University/ Abt Associates (Stringfield, Winfield, Millsap, Puma, Gamse & Randall, 1994)	sample of 25 schools (including 6 with schoolwide approaches), chosen to reflect diversity on programmatic "special strategies" during the 1990-91 school year	case study (classroom and student observation; interviews and surveys of school staff, parents, district coordinators, and children); district data records (CTBS scores in reading and math, grades, absence records, student writing samples)
Longitudinal Effects of Chapter 1 Schoolwide Projects on the Achievement of Disadvantaged Students	Johns Hopkins University (Winfield & Hawkins, 1993)	non-random sample of 40 schoolwide project schools and 20 matched non-schoolwide project schools in an unidentified major urban school district for the school years 1986-87 through 1990-91 sample of 40 schoolwide project schools in a major urban school district during the 1990-91 school year	district data records (CTBS scores in reading) questionnaires mailed to principals
A Continued Look at the Promise of Schoolwide Projects	School District of Philadelphia (Davidoff & Pierson, 1991)	sample of 62 schoolwide project schools and 66 non-schoolwide project schools in the Philadelphia School District for the school years 1985-86 through 1990-91	district data records (Citywide Test scores in reading and math; student grades; attendance)
The Moment of Truth: Year Three Continuation for Schoolwide Projects	School District of Philadelphia (1992)	sample of 37 schoolwide project schools in the Philadelphia school district which operated during the school years 1985-86 through 1990-91	district data records (Citywide Test and CTBS scores in reading and math)
A Description of Chapter 1 Schoolwide Projects and Effects on Achievement in Six Case Study Schools	Johns Hopkins University (Winfield, Hawkins & Stringfield, 1992)	sample of 11 schoolwide project schools in the Philadelphia School District between 1989 and 1990, selected to reflect variation in instructional framework, length of time as a schoolwide project site, principal background, and school size sample of 6 schoolwide project schools in the Philadelphia School District which operated between the 1985-86 and 1989-90 school years; case study data collected during the 1989-90 school year	case study (interviews with principals, teachers, parents; classroom observation; observation of meetings at the school, district, and central office levels; analysis of school documents) case study (interviews with principals, teachers, parents; classroom observation; observation of meetings at the school, district, and central office levels; document review); and district data records (CTBS scores in reading and math, attendance records)
Redesigning the Federal Compensatory Education Program: Lessons from the Implementation of Title 1 Schoolwide Projects	University of Chicago (Wong, Sunderman & Lee, 1996)	35 Title I schools (including 4 schoolwide projects) in Minneapolis and 164 Title I schools (including 116 with schoolwide projects) in Houston for the school years 1989-90 through 1992-93 and 1993-94 through 1994-95, respectively 12 schoolwide project schools and 10 non-schoolwide project schools in Minneapolis and Houston during 1993-94 and 1994-95 school years chosen to reflect diversity in race/ethnicity and student performance	district data records (California Achievement Test scores in reading and math for Minneapolis; Texas Assessment of Academic Skills scores in reading and math for Houston) case study (interviews with principals, Title I coordinators, teachers, and instructional aides; district Title I program staff)
Chapter 1 Instructional Program Final Report 1989/90	Houston Independent School District (Nechworth, Cisneros & Sanchez, 1990)	42 schoolwide project schools and 68 non-schoolwide project schools which operated in the Houston Independent School District during the 1989-90 school year	district data records (Metropolitan Achievement Tests, Spanish Assessment of Basic Education in reading and math)

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

Table 2: Overview of Evaluation Studies (Analytical Constructs and Data Analysis Methods)

Evaluative Report	Characteristics of Schools and Districts with Schoolwide Projects	Measures of Schoolwide Project Implementation Progress		Measures of Schoolwide Project Effectiveness		Data Analysis Methods
		Elements of the Proposal/ Planning Process	Components of Schoolwide Projects	Perceptions of Schoolwide Project Effectiveness	Student Performance	
National Assessment of the Chapter 1 Program: The Interim Report	X	X	X	X	X	synthesis of research findings across multiple studies
Reinventing Chapter 1: The Current Chapter 1 Program and New Directions		X	X	X	X	synthesis of research findings across multiple studies
Chapter 1 Schoolwide Project Study: Final Report	X	X	X	X		descriptive analysis of questionnaire data; qualitative analysis of case study data
The Chapter 1 Implementation Study: Interim Report	X	X	X	X		descriptive analysis of questionnaire data
The Chapter 1 Implementation Study: Final Report	X					descriptive analysis of questionnaire data; qualitative analysis of case study data (few findings are presented for schoolwide projects)
Urban and Suburban/Rural Special Strategies for Educating Disadvantaged Youth: First Year Report	X	X	X			qualitative analysis of case study data
Longitudinal Effects of Chapter 1 Schoolwide Projects on the Achievement of Disadvantaged Students	X		X		X	regression analysis (schoolwide project status, prior achievement, programmatic components, student and family characteristics used as predictors of average NCE scores); descriptive analysis of questionnaire data
A Continued Look at the Promise of Schoolwide Projects					X	comparisons of: percentages of schoolwide and non-schoolwide projects meeting state criteria for student achievement; average NCE gain scores for schoolwide and non-schoolwide projects; and report card marks and student attendance in schoolwide project schools before and after schoolwide project implementation
The Moment of Truth: Year Three Continuation for Schoolwide Projects					X	comparisons of schoolwide and non-schoolwide project schools using a variety of methods to make continuation decisions about schoolwide projects (using data from above study)
A Description of Chapter 1 Schoolwide Projects and Effects on Achievement in Six Case Study Schools	X	X	X		X	qualitative analysis of case study data; comparison of NCE gain scores and student attendance rates for schoolwide and non-schoolwide project schools
Redesigning the Federal Compensatory Education Program: Lessons from the Implementation of Title 1 Schoolwide Projects	X	X	X		X	comparisons in average NCE gain scores between schoolwide and non-schoolwide project schools, using analysis of variance; hierarchical linear modeling of student and school level effects on NCE gain scores; comparisons of trends in achievement for students in schoolwide and non-schoolwide project schools; qualitative analysis of: the impact of district policies, school organization, and instructional strategies on schoolwide project effectiveness
Chapter 1 Instructional Program Final Report 1989/90	X				X	comparison of average grade-level NCE scores among schoolwide and non-schoolwide project schools using analysis of covariance; separate analyses for limited English proficiency (LEP) and non-LEP students

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

Table 3: Summary of Findings from Four District-Level Studies of Student Performance

Note: only significant findings or findings emphasized by report authors are presented.

Evaluative Report	Summary of Measures	Evidence which Favors Schoolwide Projects	Evidence Against Schoolwide Projects	Evidence Suggesting Mixed Effects
"Chapter 1 Instructional Program . . ." (Houston School District)	two sets of average, grade-level reading scores and two of math scores for students in grades 2 through 5 in 42 SWP and 68 non-SWP schools in the 1989-90 school year		(non-limited English proficiency students) for grade 2, reading and math scores are significantly higher for students in non-SWP schools; for grade 4, one of two math scores is significantly higher for students in non-SWP schools; for grades 2 -5 pooled, math scores for students in non-schoolwide project schools are significantly higher (limited English proficiency students) for grade 2, one of two math scores is significantly higher for students in non-SWP schools; for grades 2-5 pooled, math scores for students in non-SWP schools are significantly higher	
"Longitudinal Effects . . ." (unidentified major urban school district)	average, grade-level reading scores for a cohort of students beginning first grade in the 1986-87 school year (followed through grade 5) in 40 SWP schools and 20 non-SWP schools	significant positive effect of a school's SWP status on average reading scores for grade 2	significant negative effect of a school's SWP status on average reading scores for grade 3	
	survey data about SWP components (during 1989-90 school year) linked to average, grade-level reading scores for a cohort of students beginning 1st grade in the 1986-87 school year (followed through grade 5) in 40 SWP and 20 non-SWP schools	"district framework" components have a significant positive effect on reading scores in four of five grades; teacher involvement in selection of materials has a significant positive effect on reading scores in one of five grades "existing program" components have a significant positive effects in two of five grades	"district framework" components have a significant negative effect on reading scores in grade 3	"resource allocation" components have mixed (significant positive and negative effects) on reading scores in two of five grades
"A Continued Look . . ." (School District of Philadelphia)	percentage of schools meeting four state-established criteria for reading and math achievement (62 SWP and 66 non-SWP schools) for the school years 1985-86 through 1990-91	a higher percentage of SWP schools met the four state-established criteria for reading achievement than did non-SWP schools; a higher percentage of SWP schools met three out of the four criteria for math achievement		teacher involvement in decisions about instructional resources, parent involvement, and parent conference attendance have mixed effects (significant positive and negative effects) on student reading scores in at least two of the five grades
	percentage of students showing positive gains in reading and math scores and the average gain scores for each grade from 1 through 8 in 62 SWP and 66 non-SWP schools for the school years 1988-89 through 1990-91	a higher percentage of students showed positive gains in SWP schools in six of eight grades for both reading and math; the average gain scores in reading and math were higher in SWP schools in five and seven of eight grades, respectively		
	end-of-year report card marks for the 1987-88 and 1989-90 school years in each of four curricular areas (reading, math, science, and social studies) for students in 37 SWP schools before and after SWP implementation	the percentage of students receiving a grade of "A", "B", or "C" increased after SWP implementation in the majority of schools		
	achievement gains in reading and math for students in grades 2 through 8 for the period prior to and after the implementation SWPs for 37 SWPs for the 1985-86 through 1989-90 school years	21 of the 37 SWP schools demonstrated reading achievement gains as an SWP which exceeded those during the three pre-program years; 9 of the 37 schools demonstrated such achievement gains in math.		
	attendance rates for the period prior to and after the implementation SWPs for 37 SWPs (between Spring, 1989 and Spring, 1990)	28 of the 37 SWP schools improved their attendance since becoming schoolwide projects		
"Redesigning the Federal Compensatory . . ." (Houston and Minneapolis School Districts)	average, grade-level gain scores in reading and math for a cohort of Minneapolis students beginning the first grade in 1989-90 (followed through grade 3) in 4 SWP and 31 non-SWP schools	qualitative comparison of trends in test scores over a period of three years suggests that students in SWP schools were making gains at a faster rate than students in other types of schools		no significant differences were found between mean gain scores in reading and math for students attending different types of schools
	average, grade-level gain scores in reading and math for a cohort of Houston students beginning the third grade in 1993-94 (followed through grade 4) in 116 SWP and 48 non SWP schools		significant differences were found among the students attending different types of schools in math; the largest gains were made by students attending non-SWP project schools.	no significant differences were found between mean gain scores in reading for students attending different types of schools
	HLM analysis (controlling for school and student characteristics); average, grade level gain scores in reading and math for Minneapolis cohort (described above)	when controlling for racial/ethnic and social backgrounds, SWP status contributed to equalizing differences in academic gains between Title I eligible and non-eligible students, particularly in math		no significant differences were found in average gain scores in reading and math between SWP schools and non-SWP schools
	HLM analysis (controlling for school and student characteristics); average, grade level gain scores in reading and math for Houston cohort (described above)		Title I eligible students in non-SWP schools showed significantly larger gains in math than those in SWP schools	no significant differences were found in average gain scores in reading between SWP schools and non-SWP schools or between other types of students in math

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

EA 028 587

U.S. Department of Education
Office of Educational Research and Improvement (OERI)
Educational Resources Information Center (ERIC)

REPRODUCTION RELEASE

(Specific Document)

I. DOCUMENT IDENTIFICATION:

Title: THE EFFECTIVENESS OF TITLE I SCHOOLWIDE PROJECTS: A SYNTHESIS OF FINDINGS FROM THE FIRST YEARS OF EVALUATION

Author(s): KENNETH K. WONG & STEPHEN J. MEYER

Corporate Source: UNIVERSITY OF CHICAGO, DEPT. OF EDUCATION LABORATORY FOR STUDENT SUCCESS (TEMPLE UNIVERSITY)

Publication Date: 3/22/97

II. REPRODUCTION RELEASE:

In order to disseminate as widely as possible timely and significant materials of interest to the educational community, documents announced in the monthly abstract journal of the ERIC system, *Resources in Education* (RIE), are usually made available to users in microfiche, reproduced paper copy, and electronic/optical media, and sold through the ERIC Document Reproduction Service (EDRS) or other ERIC vendors. Credit is given to the source of each document, and, if reproduction release is granted, one of the following notices is affixed to the document.

If permission is granted to reproduce and disseminate the identified document, please CHECK ONE of the following two options and sign at the bottom of the page.

☒ Check here
For Level 1 Release:
Permitting reproduction in microfiche (4" x 6" film) or other ERIC archival media (e.g., electronic or optical) *and* paper copy.

The sample sticker shown below will be affixed to all **Level 1** documents

PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE AND DISSEMINATE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

Sample

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

Level 1

The sample sticker shown below will be affixed to all **Level 2** documents

PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE AND DISSEMINATE THIS MATERIAL IN OTHER THAN PAPER COPY HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

Sample

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

Level 2

☐ Check here
For Level 2 Release:
Permitting reproduction in microfiche (4" x 6" film) or other ERIC archival media (e.g., electronic or optical), but *not* in paper copy.

Documents will be processed as indicated provided reproduction quality permits. If permission to reproduce is granted, but neither box is checked, documents will be processed at **Level 1**.

"I hereby grant to the Educational Resources Information Center (ERIC) nonexclusive permission to reproduce and disseminate this document as indicated above. Reproduction from the ERIC microfiche or electronic/optical media by persons other than ERIC employees and its system contractors requires permission from the copyright holder. Exception is made for non-profit reproduction by libraries and other service agencies to satisfy information needs of educators in response to discrete inquiries."

Sign here→ please

Signature:

Printed Name/Position/Title: STEPHEN MEYER, RESEARCH ANALYST

Organization/Address: CHAPIN HALL CENTER, 1313 E. 60TH STREET (6th St.), CHICAGO, IL 60637

Telephone: 773 753 2584

FAX: 773 753 5940

E-Mail Address: smey@spc.uchicago.edu

Date: 8/20/97

(over)

III. DOCUMENT AVAILABILITY INFORMATION (FROM NON-ERIC SOURCE):

If permission to reproduce is not granted to ERIC, or, if you wish ERIC to cite the availability of the document from another source, please provide the following information regarding the availability of the document. (ERIC will not announce a document unless it is publicly available, and a dependable source can be specified. Contributors should also be aware that ERIC selection criteria are significantly more stringent for documents that cannot be made available through EDRS.)

Publisher/Distributor:
Address:
Price:

IV. REFERRAL OF ERIC TO COPYRIGHT/REPRODUCTION RIGHTS HOLDER:

If the right to grant reproduction release is held by someone other than the addressee, please provide the appropriate name and address:

Name:
Address:

V. WHERE TO SEND THIS FORM:

Send this form to the following ERIC Clearinghouse:

ERIC Clearinghouse on Educational Management
1787 Agate Street
5207 University of Oregon
Eugene, OR 97403-5207

However, if solicited by the ERIC Facility, or if making an unsolicited contribution to ERIC, return this form (and the document being contributed) to:

ERIC Processing and Reference Facility
1100 West Street, 2d Floor
Laurel, Maryland 20707-3598

Telephone: 301-497-4080
Toll Free: 800-799-3742
FAX: 301-953-0263
e-mail: ericfac@inet.ed.gov
WWW: http://ericfac.piccard.csc.com