R E P O R T R E S U M E S

ED 013 865 UD 004 361

ESEA TITLE I PROJECTS IN THE BERKELEY UNIFIED SCHOOL DISTRICT--A SHORT SUMMARY OF ACTIVITIES AND EVALUATION FOR THE SPRING SEMESTER, 1966.

BY- JONSSON, HAROLD A.

PUB DATE 66

EDRS PRICE MF-$0.25 HC-$0.56 14P.

DESCRIPTORS- FEDERAL PROGRAMS, *PROGRAM EVALUATION, *OBJECTIVES, *COMPENSATORY EDUCATION PROGRAMS, DISADVANTAGED YOUTH, ACHIEVEMENT GAINS, ACHIEVEMENT TESTS, ATTITUDE TESTS, GUIDANCE COUNSELING, SCHOOL INTEGRATION, BUS TRANSPORTATION, ELEMENTARY SCHOOLS, HIGH SCHOOLS, *READING PROGRAMS, SCHOOL INTEGRATION, TEACHER ATTITUDES, MOTHER ATTITUDES, STUDENT ATTITUDES, BERKELEY, CALIFORNIA, ESEA TITLE I

THIS SUMMARY AND EVALUATION OF THE ELEMENTARY AND SECONDARY EDUCATION ACT TITLE I PROJECT IN BERKELEY, CALIF., DESCRIBES COMPENSATORY ACTIVITIES IN FOUR TARGET ELEMENTARY SCHOOLS AND TWO TARGET ACHIEVEMENT TRACKS IN CORRECTIVE READING PROGRAMS IN THE HIGH SCHOOLS. THE OBJECTIVES IN THE TARGET ELEMENTARY SCHOOLS WERE TO RAISE EDUCATIONAL ACHIEVEMENT LEVELS (ESPECIALLY COMMUNICATION SKILLS), IMPROVE TEACHER SKILLS IN WORKING WITH DISADVANTAGED PUPILS, FOSTER EQUAL EDUCATION AND DEMOCRATIC ATTITUDES THROUGH SCHOOL INTEGRATION, AND ENCOURAGE POSITIVE PARENT AND STUDENT ATTITUDES TOWARD SCHOOL. METHODS USED TO ACHIEVE THESE GOALS INCLUDED SMALLER CLASSES, ADDITION OF ANCILLARY PERSONNEL, GUIDANCE AND COUNSELING SERVICES, ENRICHMENT, AND INSERVICE PROGRAMS FOR TEACHERS. A NONGRADED PROGRAM WAS USED IN ONE TARGET SCHOOL, AND 230 CHILDREN WERE BUSED TO SEVERAL WHITE MIDDLE-CLASS SCHOOLS. EVALUATION WAS BASED ON ACHIEVEMENT TESTING AND ON ATTITUDE AND OPINION DATA OBTAINED FROM MOTHERS, TEACHERS, AND CHILDREN. HOWEVER, FINDINGS WERE INCONCLUSIVE BECAUSE THE PROJECT WAS IN OPERATION FOR ONLY FOUR MONTHS. IT IS FELT THAT DATA ON FUTURE CHANGES WOULD BE MORE MEANINGFUL IF ACHIEVEMENT TEST BASELINES WERE ESTABLISHED IN TARGET, NONTARGET, AND RECEIVING SCHOOLS. ATTITUDES OF MOTHERS AND TEACHERS WERE GENERALLY FAVORABLE TO THE PROGRAMS, AND THE GUIDANCE FEATURES WERE WELL-RECEIVED. FINDINGS ON THE SUCCESS OF THE ACHIEVEMENT TRACKS IN THE READING PROGRAMS IN THE HIGH SCHOOLS, WHICH ARE ONLY BRIEFLY DESCRIBED, WERE INCONCLUSIVE. (NH)

ESEA TITLE I PROJECTS IN THE BERKELEY UNIFIED SCHOOL DISTRICT: A Short Summary of Activities ar for the Spring

By

Dr. Harold A. Jonsson
Associate Professor
Department of Interdisciplinary Studies in Education
San Francisco State College

Submitted to the

B E R K E L E Y U N I F I E D S C H O O L D I S T R I C T

1414 Walnut Street
Berkeley, California 94709

Dr. Neil V. Sullivan, Superintendent of Schools
Dr. Harold J. Maves, Assistant Superintendent
Mr. John L. Cleveland, Project Coordinator, ESEA Title I

INTRODUCTION

Title I of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965 provides for compensatory education in schools and classes containing large proportions of disadvantaged children. The funds made available to the Berkeley Unified School District under Title I in the spring of 1966, with allocation based on the number of children in low-income families, were used to undertake, implement, and evaluate compensatory activities in the four elementary schools and the two achievement tracks (in secondary schools) having the highest density of such children. These are referred to as "target schools" and "target tracks." Activities were in three areas, as follows:

1. Improvement of Target Elementary Schools

2. Remedial and Corrective Programs in Reading, Tracks 3 and 4, Grades 7 -12

3. Increased Guidance and Counseling Services in Target Elementary Schools

Each area of project activities was evaluated separately, except that attitude data collected were presumably related to both of the programs in the elementary schools. This report is a brief description of the form the project took in each area, with emphasis on evaluation strategies and results.

Improvement of Target Elementary Schools

Objectives

1. To raise educational achievement levels of children in target schools (as defined under ESEA Title I guidelines), with emphasis on communication skills.

2. To improve target-area teachers' understanding of the learning problems of educationally disadvantaged children and develop better skills for dealing with these problems.

3. To promote educational equality and democratic attitudes through social and racial integration in the schools.

4. To foster positive attitudes toward schools in target-area children and their parents.

Activities

Activities related to the above objectives included reduction of class sizes from between 28 and 37 to between 20 and 28 (1 above), addition of a full-time librarian at each target school (1), and hiring of various specialists and resource persons (1). Target-school teachers participated in curriculum development and other in-service training activities (2), a non-graded program was begun in one school (1), and a variety of cultural enrichment experiences were provided to target pupils (music, drama, field trips --1). Teachers were given released time for planning and conferring (1,2). Target schools were provided with additional books, programmed materials, and a wide range of audio-visual equipment (1). Parents were kept informed through a series of twelve newspapers distributed during the project semester, and a neighborhood worker served as liaison between school and home (4). Because of space limitations in the target schools, it was decided to achieve reduction in class sizes through busing 230 target-class children to other schools with predominantly middle-class, Caucasian pupil population (1), thus substantially increasing racial integration in many non-target classes (3).

Evaluation Strategy

It was recognized at the outset that the impact of ESEA Title I activities would probably not be reflected to any appreciable degree in the results of achievement testing carried out only four months after the inception of the project. In addition to the brevity of the period, there was at grades 1, 2, and 5 a lack of usable base line data for comparison with previous semesters. In view of these limitations, it was necessary to view the achievement data collected at the end of the semester primarily as base line data for future comparisons.

Other types of data collection were expected to produce more immediate evidence of the impact of project activities. It was decided to place considerable emphasis on the reactions of parents, teachers, and children to

the busing of target-area children to non-target schools, not only because this was the most innovative phase of project activities, but because the success of this aspect of the program seemed to hinge in large part upon the attitudes of those affected by it.

The following types of data were collected:

1. Achievement data:

   a. Change data based on achievement testing of all target and non-target pupils at grades 3, 4, and 6 at the beginning of the school year (October, 1965) and of random samples of both groups near the end of the project semester (May, 1966).

   b. Change data based on achievement testing in October, 1965 and May, 1966, of all target-area pupils in grades 3, 4, and 6 who were bused to schools outside the target area.

   c. Reading achievement data for grades 1 and 2 obtained in May, 1966, as part of the revised statewide testing program, to be used as comparison data in May, 1967.

2. Attitude and Opinion data:

   a. Responses of a random sample of 420 mothers (in four categories, with at least 100 respondents in each) to a Maternal Interview Schedule assessing attitudes toward the educational program, issues connected with social and racial integration, and busing of school children.

   b. Teacher responses to a written questionnaire whose content partially parallels that of the Maternal Interview Schedule (see a. above).

   c. Responses of a random sample of 30 bused fifth graders and 29 children in classes receiving bused children (26 fifth graders, 3 third graders) to separate interview schedules assessing their attitudes toward the busing and resultant integration.

   d. Teacher responses to a questionnaire regarding the value of Saturday sessions led by outside experts and focussing on teaching communication skills to educationally disadvantaged pupils.

In the last two weeks of the project semester, personal interviews of 420 mothers, in four contract groups of approximately equal size (none less than 100), were conducted by carefully prepared interviewers. The four groups sampled were target-area mothers whose children were bused (Group 1), target-area mothers whose children were not bused (Group 2), mothers whose children were in classes receiving bused children (Group 3), and mothers whose children were in the same schools, but not in the same classes, with bused children (Group 4). Procedures for selection of bused children suggest that there were some initial differences between mothers in Groups 1 and 2, with Group 1

mothers being more upward mobile and more favorable toward integration. Criteria for selection of receiving classes were such that the assumption of no systematic initial differences between Groups 3 and 4 seems justified.

Teachers in the target and receiving schools were asked to respond to a written questionnaire containing many items comparable to those of the Maternal Interview Schedule. For analysis, teachers were also classified into four groups: those of the target area who did or did not lose children to the busing program (Groups 1 and 2) and those of the receiving schools who did or did not receive bused children in their classes (Groups 3 and 4). As membership in Groups 1 or 2, on the one hand, and in 3 or 4, on the other, involved no self-selection, we may assume no initial systematic differences between the two groups of target-area teachers or between the two groups in the receiving area. Questionnaire data were collected in the final week of classes, with approximately 75% of the teachers sending in completed questionnaires. Presumably, the non-respondents were those who had the least time or interest - - perhaps those whose opinions were neither highly favorable nor highly unfavorable to the project activities. (Teacher anonymity was guaranteed.)

In the summer following the project semester, 59 children affected by the busing program were personally interviewed. In order to get the most reliable data, it seemed desirable to interview children in the upper elementary grades, but because of the very small number of fourth graders bused and the unavailability of sixth graders for follow-up interviewing next year, it was decided to limit the sample to bused children who had been in the fifth grade at the receiving schools and, insofar as possible, to receiving class children who had been in the same classes as the bused children interviewed. The interview sample was composed of 30 bused fifth graders and 29 receiving-class children of whom 26 had been in the fifth grade and three in the third. Because of the grade-level limitation, the children interviewed were at only three of the six receiving schools.

Findings

Change data. As noted above, the span of only four months between project initiation and the end-of-semester testing led to the expectation of inconclusive or negligible difference in rate of change over previous years. This was borne out by test results.

For reasons of economy and the desire to minimize interference in the school program, the May testing, except for the bused pupils, was done on a sampling basis. This procedure introduced sampling variability which reduced the sensitivity of score differences. The expected relationships were revealed among scores of non-target, bused, and target school pupils, with non-target scores highest and target scores lowest; however, the amount of change was not consistent.

The one grade level at which the target pupils evidenced a higher than expected increase in rate of achievement was at the 6th grade, where the pupils sampled (70 were re-tested) showed a change from 4.7 to 5.7 in Word Meaning and from 5.0 to 5.8 in Paragraph Meaning. These results may have been due in part at least to sampling procedures.

Interpretation of change data for the pupils bused is subject to fewer limitations than for the other two groups. Also, it is likely that their learning environment changed more dramatically than did that of pupils who remained in the target schools. As mentioned, at the grade levels tested, all bused pupils for whom October, 1965 scores were available were retested in May, so that the limitations of sampling do not apply.

Bused pupils who already tested several months higher than other target pupils at the October testing (an average of about 6 months across the three grade levels and two sub-scores), maintained or increased their achievement lead at every grade level and on both sub-scores except for grade 6 word meaning.

It would be rash to draw any firm conclusions on the basis of test data obtained in the May testing, except to recommend that all pupils at a given grade level be tested, instead of a sample, with careful attention to test manual directions. At most, the results justify a cautiously optimistic estimate of the effects of project activities on the achievement of target, bused, and non-target pupils. The interview and questionnaire data collected lend support to this interpretation.

In order to provide a more complete picture of the status and change in the scholastic achievement of each pupil category at each grade level, it will be necessary to expand the achievement testing program. Plans for this expansion have already been approved for the 1966-67 school year by district administrators.

Attitude data. The interviews of mothers revealed consistently positive attitudes toward the Berkeley schools and toward efforts to achieve integration, including specifically the busing of pupils. Effectiveness of Title I project activities in general is reflected in the majority view of target-area mothers whose children were not bused (Group 2) that their children did better in school during the project semester than previously. Success of the busing program in the eyes of most mothers in all groups is borne out by responses to all relevant items. Approximately half of all the mothers stated that their children liked school better this year, with a significantly greater proportion in Group 2 but no difference among the proportions for the other three groups. Comparisons for how well they thought the children were doing in their school work revealed the same pattern, with no difference in Groups 1, 3, and 4 - - approximately half saying "better" - - and a significantly higher proportion in Group 2 (60%). With regard to the busing per se, this means that mothers of bused children and mothers of children in classes with bused children responded that their children were progressing the same or better with about the same high frequency as did mothers of non-target children whose classes were unaffected by the busing project. In conjunction with many other data, this finding is conservatively taken to mean that satisfaction with the schools was not adversely affected by the busing.

With regard to the value of integration in general, over 75% of all of the interviewed mothers responded favorably to each relevant item, with the exception of Group 2 mothers on one item, where only 66% said that they thought contact with children from another neighborhood was "good" for children. There were other indications that Group 2 mothers are less optimistic about integration than are mothers of bused children, although they tended to espouse fewer reasons why integration might be undesirable for "middle-class" children.

In response to a question about the value of the busing to their own participating children, 91% of mothers of bused children (Group 1) said that the contact with children of other neighborhoods has been "good" and only one of the 116 said that it had been "bad," while 65% of the mothers of children in the receiving classes (Group 3) said that the contact had been "good" for their child and none said that it had been bad. (The remainder saw "no difference" except for about 5% who "don't know.") As to the amount of social integration attributable to the busing, all but one of the 116 mothers of bused children and 82% of the mothers of receiving-class children reported that their children had formed new interracial friendships during the year. There were very few negative responses and comments on any of the related items.

Teacher respondents (approximately 75% of all teachers in the target and receiving schools) also evidenced optimism and positive attitudes toward project activities and the district's efforts toward equal educational opportunity and educational integration, including favorable views toward the busing program. Their responses to all items regarding integration were positive, with between 79% and 91% of all groups responding favorably to each relevant question. For example, 89% favored improved racial and socio-economic balance in the schools (item 13) aside from measures to relieve over-crowding in the target area.

Although some receiving-school teachers reported specific drawbacks of the busing endeavor, in general the reported attitudes of teachers who received bused children do not differ from those of receiving-school teachers who did not receive bused children, and in some cases are more approving, rather than less. For example, significantly more of the Group 3 (receiving -class) teachers said their pupils liked school better this semester, and none said their pupils liked school less. In no case was a particular problem or adverse aspect of the busing brought out by more than a small proportion of Group 3 teachers. The main criticism was by four teachers (of the 30 respondents in this group) who indicated that arguing, fighting, and/or discipline problems had increased as a result of the arrival of the bused children. There were also two instances of Group 3 teachers saying that their classes had been held back by the addition of pupils at mid-year, and some target-area teachers (Group 1) said that some of their former pupils reported back that they felt uprooted or unhappy because of the transfer. However, these statements do not receive much support from the interviews of mothers and children.

Interviews of bused children and receiving-class children also produced predominantly favorable findings. Almost all of the bused children reported having valuable experiences both academically and socially, and the other children in their receiving classes showed good attitudes toward the bused children and perceived no loss to themselves accruing from the busing program. Asked how they felt about having been transferred, 25 of the 30 bused children said they were glad, four sorry, and one expressed "mixed" feelings. Two of the four who were sorry were the two who had not wanted to go at the outset, but whose mothers decided for them. Of receiving-class children, 22 of the 29 in the sample said that they were glad that the bused children had come into their classes, while five said they were neutral or indifferent, one had "mixed" feelings and one was "sorry." (This last child said she was opposed to busing from the outset.) In interpreting responses of receiving-class children, it is important to note that many of them had had their classes split and had changed teachers at mid-year. Comments by several children indicated that

any dissatisfaction that they felt with the project semester was due to the mid-year change of class and teacher. Very few made comments that could be viewed as uncomplimentary to the bused children.

The most general finding with regard to the bused children is that, while they perceived the receiving-school work to be harder, the quantity of work to be greater, and the school rules more strict, the strong relationship between these responses and the satisfaction indices shows that they liked adapting to all of these increased demands. They also expressed a sense of adequacy to meet the demands, as evidenced by the fact that over two-thirds said that the increased work and harder work was seldom or never more than they could handle (item 41). There is every indication that the majority of the bused children sought more challenge, better opportunity to achieve, and a quieter, more peaceful learning environment than they had previously had.

Almost all of the children in both groups reported forming several new interracial friendships at the receiving school, and it appears that most of the bused children participated in a wide variety of activities. The degree of structured and unstructured social interaction seems to have been great, especially in view of the fact that the transfer was at mid-year. Only one of the bused children inferred that she had been denied participation in an activity for arbitrary reasons. There is some indication that some of the bused children were, or were thought to be, too "shy" to participate, and it is of course very possible that "shyness" could be caused by feelings of being unwanted. It appears, however, that many of the bused children are somewhat retiring, and some seem mainly concerned with matters such as getting their homework done.

The general tenor of the interview protocols of bused children, supported by inferences from all of the other data analyzed, indicates the wisdom and efficacy of the procedures for selection of children to be bused. These apparently resulted in the selection of children who were quick to adjust to the academic requirements of the receiving school and to become a part of its social life. With very few exceptions, these children evidenced the achievement motivation and behavioral standards considered characteristic of middle-class and upward-mobile persons. These qualities appear to have contributed, perhaps in large part, to the generally excellent adjustment of the children bused and to the highly favorable reaction to the busing program on the part of receiving-class mothers, teachers, and children. Since the selection criteria seemed to have resulted in a high degree of homogeneity in these respects among the Negro children bused, they may not have produced, properly speaking, much increase in "social integration" in the fullest sense, but they seem to have succeeded in permitting racial integration to be viewed somewhat independently of class differences, in the sense that the white children of the receiving schools apparently tended to learn, among other things, that behavorial acceptability and academic adequacy are not dependent upon skin color.

All of the survey instruments included items assessing attitudes toward "reverse busing" or the busing of white, middle-class children into schools in less privileged neighborhoods. These were included partly for their own sake, and partly as a check on the veracity or sincerity of other pro-integration opinions. It seems encouraging that many mothers and teachers of the receiving area (and far more in the target area) are receptive to the reverse busing idea.

Approximately 27% of the receiving-area mothers and 41% of receiving-area teachers stated that they thought such a program would be beneficial to their children or pupils provided that participation were voluntary. The idea was favored by significantly more mothers of children already in classes with children bused from the target-area than mothers of receiving-school children who were not sharing classes with bused children. The proportions were 35% to 20%, a ratio of 7 to 4, of Group 3 and 4 mothers who answered with an unqualified "yes" or "yes, provided that he is already achieving well," and there were also fewer Group 3 mothers who said it would "definitely not" be beneficial (33% as against 44%). Many mothers and teachers giving negative responses qualified them in various ways apparently intended to free them of racial or other prejudicial implications.

Of the twenty-nine receiving-class children asked whether they would like to attend one of the schools the bused children came from, only four indicated that they would "like to go." Most of those who would "prefer to stay" stated that their reservations pertained to leaving their friends behind, and several said that they would be willing if they were accompanied by a group of friends. Six gave reasons pertaining to fears of the environment in the target-area schools, centering around expectations of fighting and "meanness" among the children there.

Defined in terms of the intent of the program, the major problem revealed by the child interviews seems to be lack of continuity (weekend and vacation contact) in the new social relationships formed at the receiving schools. Most of the children interviewed reported that they saw each other only at school. When asked why, most children in both groups said that it was because they lived too far apart. Perhaps the district can be instrumental, with the help of parent groups, in creating more opportunities for children of different neighborhoods to mingle informally outside of school, and particularly to maintain budding or established friendships begun at the receiving schools. Aside from social integration motives, since the children's interviews revealed decreased contact with former friends in their own neighborhoods, it would seem desirable from a mental health or emotional growth viewpoint to encourage and promote desired social contacts at the receiving school.

Another concern is the reliability of the busing schedule. When asked if the morning bus was ever late, 7 of the 30 respondents chose "yes, most of the time," and 16 "yes, some of the time." Regarding the afternoon bus, 12 said it was late "most ..." and 11 "some of the time." Unfortunately, although one of the interview schedules' main intents was to uncover problem areas, some possibilities were not anticipated, and this is a case in which the interview schedule should have gone further (the interviewers were not allowed to make up their own probes, and were to record comments only if the latter were unsolicited.) The schedule items did not ask the children how late the buses were, nor whether lateness of the morning bus, for example, caused tardiness in arrival at school. Although children, mothers, and teachers showed little tendency to express complaints about regularity of the buses' arrivals, this appears to be an area for further investigation.

As one studies the over-all results of this attitude survey, one might be inclined to complacency. It is true that a great majority of the mothers, teachers, and pupils whose attitudes were sampled evidenced a high degree of

satisfaction both with the schools in general and with project activities, and that the atmosphere for continued educational and social progress in Berkeley is very favorable. We cannot, however, overlook those relatively few problems and dissatisfactions that were reported, nor can we assume that all respondents were completely candid in expressing their views. In such a sensitive area as that of social integration in the schools, which may involve some sacrifices in well-being, real or imagined, temporary or permanent, we can expect some people to be hesitant in voicing their views. We can also anticipate that attitudes will fluctuate with conditions in the community, the neighboring communities, the state, and the nation. Perhaps the wisest reaction to the findings of this study would be an attitude of thankfulness that efforts to date have been well received, and a determination to continue to earn the confidence and support of the community.

Teacher evaluation of in-service training activities. The curriculum development team of 24 teachers did not attempt to produce a report of their progress in this initial stage of the project. Formal evaluation of the effectiveness of the ten meetings was considered premature. However, the principals of the four target-area schools report that the participating teachers felt the sessions to have contributed to heightened morale and enthusiasm, and to have produced many new insights into the educational problems of target-area pupils and ways of dealing with these problems.

A series of seven Saturday sessions on teaching communication skills to the disadvantaged, led by educational specialists from outside the district, was evaluated by participating teachers. Compilation of their reactions revealed that the teachers found these sessions profitable and almost all said that they would like to participate again next year.

Remedial and Corrective Programs in Reading
Tracks 3 and 4, Grades 7 - 12

Objective

To raise achievement levels in reading and related skills of secondary pupils in Tracks 3 and 4.

Activities

Track 3 and 4 English classes were substantially reduced in size through additional staffing and books, reading laboratory equipment, programmed learning materials and audio-visual equipment were purchased. Reading laboratories in all secondary schools were provided with the equipment needed for small group and individual instruction in reading. Secondary teachers involved in project activities participated in curriculum development projects related to teaching language skills to the educationally disadvantaged. This was as a sequel to a large-scale, year-long in-service program in this sphere of endeavor which had been offered the preceding year. General meetings concerned with increasing the effectiveness of the remedial reading program were also held. An experimental program was designed and initiated at McKinley High School, involving partial core programming, team teaching, increased staff, and utilization of community aides.

Evaluation Strategy and Results

The only available objective -test comparison data were 8th and 11th grade reading-achievement scores from October, 1965, which were available in percentile rank terms only. The tests were readministered in May, 1966 to a sample at these grade levels in the target tracks (3 and 4) and non-target tracks (1 and 2).

The change-data obtained revealed no statistically significant change in sample median percentile rank for target 8th graders at either junior high school, but for non-target 8th graders at Willard, a significant change from 71 to 93. (A "ceiling effect" is obviously operative at Garfield Junior High, where the population median is in the top ten percent.) Target pupils in grade 11 showed a statistically significant but modest upward change from a median 8 to 17, with no change in rank for non-target pupils.

It should be noted that test scores had not been analyzed by tracks in preceding years, so comparison of obtained sample medians with population medians or means was not feasible.

In addition to the shortness of the project period (four months) and the handicap of being confined to percentile rankings, there is every reason to infer that the tests used are too hard for the target pupils and too easy for the non-target pupils at both grade levels. As long as the State Testing Program requires that all pupils at a given grade level take the identical test, problems of "chance-score" and "ceiling effect" at the lower and upper ends, respectively, of the achievement range will tend to impede efforts to assess or compare the achievement rates to these two populations, especially in school districts where the two differ greatly.

Increased Guidance and Counseling Services in Target Elementary Schools

Objectives

1. In the area of guidance:

   a. To identify and meet the social and behavioral needs of target pupils.

   b. To help target-area children and parents to understand and cope with emotional and educational problems.

2. In the area of psychology:

   a. To facilitate remediation of achievement deficiencies through increased diagnostic evaluation of learning difficulties.

   b. To assist teachers in selection of appropriate remedial techniques.

   c. To improve teacher understanding of individual students' needs by supplying findings from classroom and playground observations and conferences with parents.

Activities

Staff was expanded to provide one full-time guidance teacher and one resident psychologist at each target elementary school. After-school activity programs, community-oriented programs, and parent-teacher planning opportunities were expanded, referrals of children for testing were facilitated, and teachers were provided with increased observational and test data about their pupils.

Evaluation strategy and results

Evaluation at this early stage of the project was confined to teacher questionnaire responses regarding the adequacy of the increased supportive services. At the end of the project semester, teachers were asked to rate each type of service as "excellent," "good," "fair," or "poor" for both fall and spring. The change is assumed to reflect ESEA Title I activities.

After less than a semester of increased supportive services, the average rating of services as "excellent" or "good" increased to 38% from less than 20%, and the average rating of services as "poor" decreased from 32% to just under 21%. Comments, which were solicited, showed no particular pattern of praise or criticism, however. It did appear that some teachers felt they had not been fully informed of added services or had not "gotten around to" availing themselves of them. Some apparently had expected a greater increase than they perceived in the availability of guidance and testing personnel to help them with their individual problem-cases. A few stated that increased services could not be evaluated after so short a time.