

## EVALUATION OF THE ONE WORLD EDUCATION PROGRAM IN DC CHARTER SCHOOLS: IMPROVING THE RESEARCH AND WRITING SKILLS OF STUDENTS

*Edward Comstock and Quentin Wodon*

*April 2016*



### Evaluation Partners



## KEY MESSAGES:

- One World Education, a non-profit based in Washington, DC, implemented an innovative argumentative writing program in three charter schools in the fall of 2015. This brief summarizes results of an independent evaluation of the One World Education program.
- Student writing showed statistically significant improvement after the program, especially for the students who initially fared the worst. Teacher and student perceptions are also favorable.

### Introduction

In the fall of the 2015-16 school year, One World Education, a nonprofit based in the District of Columbia (DC), worked with three charter schools to implement a program for argumentative writing in those schools. The program aims to improve student research, writing, and presentation skills. Some 556 students from four different grades participated in the program in the three schools.

This brief summarizes results from an evaluation of the program in these schools. In addition to the results from the evaluation, perceptions data about the program are also provided from focus groups with students (from both charter and public schools) and a web survey for teachers (from public schools where the program was also implemented as part of the Cornerstones initiative in DC public schools). The evaluation suggests that the program led to a positive and statistically significant improvement in the ability of students to write argumentative essays in the three schools. The gains were larger for students who had weaker writing skills before the start of the program. The value of the program appears to be confirmed by the perceptions data from both teachers and students.

### Box 1: District of Columbia Education Series Primer

**Why a series of briefs on innovations in education in the District of Columbia?** While much of the work of the Education Practice at the World Bank focuses on low and middle income countries, insights from innovations in OECD countries can also be highly valuable when thinking about education policy. This series focuses on innovative programs in Washington, DC.

**What are the topics discussed in the series?** The series looks at a number of innovative programs related among others to the curriculum, student learning, tutoring, and skills for the labor market. Private provision through charter schools is also discussed. Many of the programs have received support from the World Bank Community Connections or individual Bank staff

**What are the questions asked in this note?** The question is: What is the impact of the One World Education Program on the argumentative writing skills of charter school students? (Another brief in the series focuses on the program in DC public schools).

**How is the question answered?** Scoring of writing assignment before and after the implementation of the program for a sample of students is used to measure gains in writing skills associated with the program. The analysis is complemented by perceptions data from a sample of participating teachers and students.

**The One World Education Program aims to improve research, writing, and presentation skills for middle and high school students in DC charter schools.**

One World Education is a nonprofit organization whose mission is to improve research, writing, and presentation skills for middle and high school students. Based on a rigorous curriculum, units of study leverage student ideas, perspectives and solutions about self-chosen topics to engage learners and advance research, writing, and presentation skills critical for college and career success.

The One World Education program took about four weeks to complete. It was implemented in the fall of 2015. The program is aligned to Common Core State Standards adapted to each grade level. Students in grades 6, 7, 8, and 12 participated in the program in the three charter schools. The program had three components:

- *Curriculum*: Each middle and high school grade level benefits from a unit of 10 lesson plans that teach students key elements of strong research, writing, and presentation. The program builds its curriculum around past students' writing, allowing current students to engage in peer learning that fosters greater engagement and motivates participants to develop their own argument about an issue that matters to them.
- *Professional Development (PD)*: To ensure effective training, PD was provided to the teachers/schools. The program also includes training for one teacher from each school to lead PD sessions for colleagues, ensuring that program expertise is always in the school.
- *One World Student Journals*: Each student receives a journal to guide them through every step of the unit (see Box 2). The workspace allows students to demonstrate their skills through exercises and assessments for reading comprehension, research, writing, and presentation. Each exercise leads students to their final project – an Argumentative Reflection.

Additional resources are made available to students and two events are organized to showcase their work.

- *Research and writing resources*: A Research Portal and Student Writing Library is provided on the One World Education website. The portal includes a database of vetted sources where students can generate evidence for their arguments. The Student Writing Library is a collection of writing by students who have completed the program. It provides models of exemplary grade-level writing and creates a forum for peer-to-peer learning.
- *Events*: A College and Career Senior Challenge enables seniors nominated by their teacher to present their essay to a panel of judges made up of city, business, and government leaders.

Seniors at the Challenge compete for college scholarships. To prepare for the event, students engage in a six-week after-school program led by One World staff and teachers. In addition, the One World Celebration is an annual event recognizing each year's Student Ambassadors. These students, also nominated by their teachers, get their work published in the Student Writing Library on the One World Education website. The idea is to showcase essays that can provide inspiration to other students of similar age and background. The Senior Challenge and Celebration also provide the community with a rare glimpse of the teaching and learning that takes place in school.

Apart from core resources – curriculum, professional development for teachers, and student journals, other resources are made available to students and teachers, including a research portal and a student writing library.

**Box 2: The Argumentative Program Has Four Stages: Reading Comprehension, Research, Writing, Presentation**

The program consists of four stages. The first stage is *reading comprehension*. Students learn the vocabulary of argumentative writing and its importance in college and career success. They complete a close read of exemplary samples of argumentative writing by former One World Program participants and choose their own essay topic. The second stage is *research*. Students learn to create an in-depth research plan, conduct research, and analyze research. The One World Research Portal offers a range of resources at varying reading levels for each One World Unit. The third stage is *writing*. Students review the Argumentative Reflection rubric before transferring their research into an outline and an Argumentative Reflection draft. A series of peer-to-peer and teacher feedback exercises guide students as they write a final Argumentative Reflection. The last stage is *presentation*. Throughout the program, students practice public speaking in preparation for a formal presentation about an issue that matters to them. Presentations can be held in small peer groups, whole classes, or in a school assembly.

**Writing samples more than two hundred participating students have been collected for an independent evaluation of the impact of the One World Program.**

Data for the evaluation were collected by teachers from students participating in the program. Students included in the evaluation are from four different grades. Participation in the evaluation was voluntary on the part of teachers collecting essays by students. The evaluation is therefore not based on a randomized controlled trial and caution is needed when comparing results across schools, grade levels, or school types (writing samples were also collected from students in public schools). It could also be that some of the better performing teachers chose to participate in the evaluation, which could lead measured impacts to be higher than those that would apply to the

student population as a whole. Overall though, the data for the evaluation is likely to be robust since out of 556 students participating, writing assignments were collected from 203 students or 36.5 percent of all students.

With more than a third of participating students included in the evaluation, evaluation results are likely to be robust.

**Table 1: Participating Schools and Evaluation Sample**

Participating schools	Grades in evaluation	Sample size
El Haynes	6, 8, 12	165
Potomac Prep	8	14
William E. Doar Jr.	7	24
Total	-	203

Source: Authors.

For each student in the evaluation sample, two essays were scored – one written before the program, and one after. American University writing instructors from the College Writing Program in the Department of Literature scored essays on a scale from 12 to 20, with 12 indicating the lowest performance, and 20 the highest. Scores were provided for four Common Core State Standards for argumentative writing: introduce a claim (1.A), supply evidence for claims and counterclaims (1.B), create cohesion between claims and reasons (1.C), and provide a concluding statement (1.E). In addition, an overall score is computed (average of the four scores).

**The evaluation suggests gains in the quality of the students’ writing after the program; students initially performing less well had the largest gains.**

Table 2 presents average student scores for each of the grades separately and for all students taken together. The last column in the table tests whether the gains in score are statistically different from zero at the five percent level of confidence. All gains but one are indeed statistically significant. Students in grades 6, 8, and 12 had similar gains, Gains were higher for students in grade 7, but this may be related to the particular school/teacher involved. The average gain across grades is one point on a scale from 12 to 20. Findings for the evaluation of the program implemented in DC public schools are very similar. Importantly, students with weaker performance before the program recorded higher gains. This is shown in Figure 1 which displays the relationship between the initial average score on the horizontal axis and gains in performance on the vertical axis. The trend line through the scatter plot shows how gains tend to be higher for weaker students, starting at more than two points for the students with the lowest average score before the start of the program.

The average gain for students across all grades was one point on a scale from 12 to 20, but gains were larger for initially weaker students. About seven in ten students improved their average score after the program.


**Table 2: Student Scores Before and After the Program**

	Pre test	Post test	Diff.	Stat. sign.
Grade 6 (75 observations)				
Introduce claim	14.6	15.5	0.83	Yes
Supply evidence	14.6	15.2	0.68	Yes
Create cohesion	13.9	14.7	0.83	Yes
Provide concluding statement	14.1	14.6	0.52	Yes
Average score	14.3	15.0	0.71	Yes
Grade 7 (24 observations)				
Introduce claim	14.5	16.4	1.92	Yes
Supply evidence	14.4	16.5	2.17	Yes
Create cohesion	13.6	15.3	1.75	Yes
Provide concluding statement	14.0	15.7	1.71	Yes
Average score	14.1	16.0	1.89	Yes
Grade 8 (71 observations)				
Introduce claim	13.6	14.8	1.27	Yes
Supply evidence	13.6	14.7	1.03	Yes
Create cohesion	13.8	14.7	0.87	Yes
Provide concluding statement	13.6	14.7	1.03	Yes
Average score	13.7	14.7	1.05	Yes
Grade 12 (33 observations)				
Introduce claim	14.6	15.5	0.94	Yes
Supply evidence	14.4	15.2	0.79	Yes
Create cohesion	14.1	15.4	1.24	No
Provide concluding statement	14.1	14.8	0.75	Yes
Average score	14.2	15.1	0.92	Yes
All Grades (203 observations)				
Introduce claim	14.2	15.4	1.13	Yes
Supply evidence	14.2	15.2	1.00	Yes
Create cohesion	13.9	14.9	1.02	Yes
Provide concluding statement	13.9	14.8	0.88	Yes
Average score	14.0	15.0	1.00	Yes

Source: Authors.

Note: Statistical significance estimated at the 5 percent level.

**Figure 1: Average Gain versus Initial Performance**



Source: Authors.

Table 3 provides data on the share of students that improved their writing. Seven in ten students improved their average score, one in ten saw no change in score, and two in ten saw a decline in score. The fact that some students see a decline in their score is not surprising.

First, student performance on writing assignments may vary from one day to the next. Second, there is some inherent level of subjectivity in scoring that can lead to (apparent) losses in performance. As shown in Figure 1, losses in score tend to be more frequent among students who performed better on the initial writing assignment.

**Table 3: Students Improving their Average Score**

	Gain (%)	No change (%)	Loss (%)
Grade 6	68.0	8.0	24.0
Grade 7	75.0	-	25.0
Grade 8	71.8	9.9	18.3
Grade 12	60.6	15.2	24.2
All Grades	69.0	8.9	22.2

Source: Authors.

**Teacher and student perceptions data also suggest that the program is improving students’ writing skills.**

Perceptions from teachers (in public schools) where the program was also implemented were gathered through a web questionnaire sent to all teachers who participated in the program. Responses were anonymous to avoid bias.

**Table 4: Public School Teacher Perceptions about the Program – Share Agreeing with Statements (%)**

	Strongly agree	Agree	Dis-agree	NA
Professional development sessions were a valuable use of my time	35.3	52.9	11.8	0.0
Facilitator(s) effectively prepared me to implement the Cornerstone	41.2	52.9	5.9	0.0
I had the knowledge/materials I need to implement the program effectively	29.4	64.7	0.0	5.9
There was time to collaborate and adapt the program to meet the needs of my students	23.5	52.9	23.5	0.0
This program brings both rigor and relevance to my students	29.4	64.7	5.9	0.0
Using the close read, my students’ reading comprehension skills improved through the program	17.7	58.8	17.7	5.9
My students’ research skills improved through this program	23.5	70.6	0.0	5.9
My students’ writing skills improved through this program	29.4	58.8	5.9	5.9
My students’ presentation skills improved through this program	29.4	41.2	17.7	11.8
My students were engaged in the learning process	35.3	64.7	0.0	0.0
One World Education offered or delivered support for me to successfully implement the program	58.8	41.2	0.0	0.0
With the revisions based on teacher feedback, I would recommend this program for next year	41.2	52.9	0.0	5.9
I would feel comfortable being evaluated for impact while implementing the program	23.5	52.9	23.5	0.0

Source: Authors. Note: modalities are strongly agree; agree; disagree.

A total of 17 teachers responded to the survey. As shown in table 4, on all questions, feedback was favorable, even

if some areas for improvements were identified, for example to enable teachers to collaborate and adapt the Education to meet the needs of their students.

Perceptions data from teachers gathered through an anonymous web questionnaire suggest strong support for the program. Data from focus groups among participating students also suggest that the program is beneficial.

Perceptions data were also obtained through two focus groups from students nominated by teachers to become Student Ambassadors for the program. These students participate in a follow up program to improve their essay for publication in the Student Writing Library. While these students may not be representative of the overall student body, the focus groups suggested that most students found the program beneficial. The students appreciated especially the fact that they could work on a topic of their choice for the essay, and that they had to take steps to conduct their own research. For many students, this was also the first assignment that they had to complete in which they were required not only to provide an argument, but also to discuss counter-arguments to their own claims.

**Conclusion**

This brief has provided an evaluation of the One World Education program implemented in 2015-16 in three charter schools in DC. While the evaluation is not based on a randomized controlled trial, it is based on data collected from more than a third of participating students and is therefore likely to be robust. Scoring of the student’s argumentative writing skills before and after the program suggest statistically significant gains in writing skills after the program. Perceptions data from (public school) teachers gathered through an anonymous web questionnaire suggest strong support for the program. Focus groups among public and charter school students also suggest that the program is beneficial.

**Reference:** Comstock, E., and Q. Wodon, 2016, Improving Student Writing in the District of Columbia: Evaluation of the One World Education Program, Washington, DC: The World Bank.

*Detailed results from the evaluation are at [www.oneworldeducation.org](http://www.oneworldeducation.org) and [www.rotarianeconomist.com](http://www.rotarianeconomist.com). The authors are with American University and the World Bank. This series of briefs was launched as a collaborative effort between the Education Practice at the World Bank, the Community Outreach Program at the World Bank, and the Rotary Club of Capitol Hill. Please contact Quentin Wodon at [qwodon@worldbank.org](mailto:qwodon@worldbank.org) for information. The brief series is part of the SABER Equity and Inclusion program that benefitted from the support of the Global Partnership for Education. The opinions expressed in this brief are those of the authors only. They may not represent the views of the World Bank, its Executive Directors, or the countries they represent, nor those of DC charter schools.*