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

ED 018 474 UD 004 631

EVALUATION OF 1966 EOA ELEMENTARY SUMMER SCHOOLS. RESEARCH REPORT.

BY- RICHARDSON, JOY B.
OAKLAND PUBLIC SCHOOLS, CALIF.

REPORT NUMBER OPS-1 PUB DATE 12 SEP 66
EDRS PRICE MF-$0.25 HC-$1.36 32P.

DESCRIPTORS- *PROGRAM EVALUATION, *SUMMER SCHOOLS, *ELEMENTARY SCHOOLS, *DISADVANTAGED YOUTH, READING INSTRUCTION, QUESTIONNAIRES, TEST RESULTS, MATHEMATICS, ACADEMIC ACHIEVEMENT, STUDENT IMPROVEMENT, TABLES (DATA), ATTENDANCE, ENRICHMENT ACTIVITIES, TEACHER AIDES, OAKLAND, CALIFORNIA, ECONOMIC OPPORTUNITY ACT

THIS REPORT IS AN EVALUATION OF A SUMMER SCHOOL PROGRAM FOR DISADVANTAGED ELEMENTARY SCHOOL CHILDREN IN FOUR OAKLAND SCHOOLS. IN HALF-DAY SESSIONS THE CHILDREN WERE OFFERED READING, MATHEMATICS, AND ENRICHMENT ACTIVITIES, FIELD TRIPS, AND PSYCHOLOGICAL SERVICES. THE EVALUATION IS DERIVED FROM THE ATTENDANCE DATA, RESPONSES OF PARENTS, TEACHERS, AND STUDENTS TO QUESTIONNAIRES, AND SCORES ON PRE- AND POSTTESTS IN ACHIEVEMENT. IT IS FELT THAT "POSITIVE PROGRESS" WAS MADE IN MEETING ACADEMIC AND ENRICHMENT GOALS. TEST RESULTS SHOWED "MODERATE" PUPIL GROWTH IN ACADEMIC ACHIEVEMENT, AND MANY PARENTS NOTED IMPROVEMENT IN READING AND MATHEMATICS. STUDENTS IN GRADES 3, 4, AND 5 RESPONDED POSITIVELY TO THE PROGRAM. TEACHERS WELCOMED THE HELP OF THE PARENT AND NEIGHBORHOOD YOUTH CORPS AIDES. HALF OF THE REPORT CONSISTS OF SAMPLES OF THE VARIOUS FORMS USED IN THE EVALUATION. (NH)

RESEARCH REPORT

EVALUATION OF 1966 EOA ELEMENTARY SUMMER SCHOOLS

OAKLAND PUBLIC SCHOOLS

1966-67

Report Number 1

EVALUATION OF 1966 EOA ELEMENTARY SUMMER SCHOOLS

Prepared by:

Oakland Public Schools
Research Department

In Cooperation with:

Division of Elementary Education
Dept. of Special Urban Educational Services

INTRODUCTION

The Economic Opportunity Act provided funds for the operation of four summer elementary schools. Students ranging from kindergarten to fifth grade attended one of four schools (Webster, Melrose, Sobrante Park and Santa Fe). The objectives of the summer program were to help students improve academic work and to minimize learning loss during the summer. The program was intended to provide experiences to stimulate interest and to motivate higher aspirational levels.

The federal funds stipulated that they be applied to a limited number of children of Oakland residents who are culturally and economically disadvantaged. Principals notified parents to complete applications for summer school. Applications for enrollment were accepted on the approval of the principal that the student resided in the target area. Quotas for each school were filled on the basis of priority of applications, which had been dated on receipt.

Students attended from 8:45 to 12:05. The program allotted one hour each to reading, mathematics, and enrichment activities. Enrichment activities included field trips and classroom projects in science, language art, music, etc.. Teachers chose activities that stimulated the interests of their students, and met their educational needs. Activities were frequently coordinated with the preparation for, the summation of, and the expansion of field trip experiences.

PROCEDURE

The summer school program was evaluated not only for its academic and enrichment objectives, but also for its impact and impression on the children who participated and on their parents. Teachers expressed their evaluations of the efficiencies and limitations of the program and made judgments concerning the amount of progress in learning and motivation.

Summer School Attendance Summary

Since enrollment and attendance in summer school was voluntary, the stability of attendance served as an indication of the degree to which the program met the expectations of its students and their parents. Each teacher made periodic enrollment reports for his class. Teachers reported the total enrollment on the first day, at the beginning of the second week and on the last day of the school. Eliminations were enumerated and reasons were specified.

Children's home schools, schools attended in Spring, 1966, were listed. Each principal summarized the report for his school. The form for reporting attendance is presented in Appendix A.

Teachers' Evaluation of Summer School Programs

Summer school teachers completed a questionnaire evaluating the program. The questionnaire is presented in Appendix B. A scale of four degrees of results from "No Results Evident" to "Distinctive Positive Results" was devised. Teachers rated the degree to which the program had demonstrated results in improvements in academic subjects and study habits and increments in motivation for learning and self-confidence.

Teachers also indicated the features that aided and others that limited effectiveness of the summer school operation. Suggestions for improvement were requested. Instructional techniques and approaches that had been found particularly effective were briefly described.

Parent Evaluation of Summer School

Parent evaluation of the summer school was surveyed by requesting a sample of parents to anonymously complete a questionnaire. One out of every four parents was randomly selected to participate in the parents' evaluation. Parents rated their child's growth in academic work (reading and mathematics), school attitudes and getting along with other children. Their answers to questions indicated how summer school helped their child and what improvements could be made. The form for the parents' evaluation is presented in Appendix C.

Student Evaluation of Summer School

At the close of summer school students in the third, fourth, and fifth grades completed a questionnaire. The questionnaire, Student Evaluation of Summer School, is presented in Appendix D. Students indicated their degree of satisfaction from attending summer school. They listed the three things they liked most and three things they liked least. They also reported their thoughts on how the summer school program could be improved.

Report of Enrichment Activities

The summer school program provided many enrichment experiences for pupils. Trips and excursions were planned in many classrooms. Teachers listed and described the trips taken by each class and indicated the number of children involved.

Projects in art, science, music, etc., were planned. Teachers listed these classroom enrichment activities. The form, Teachers' Report of Special Enrichment Activities in Elementary School, is presented in Appendix E.

Psychological Services

Three consultants were assigned to the 4 summer schools. One consultant worked at 2 schools (Melrose and Webster). The consultants kept records of the time they devoted to various activities during the week. The designation of activities and the form for reporting psychological services is presented in Appendix F.

Achievement Tests

Pre and post tests were administered in grades 3, 4 and 5 to measure growth in reading and arithmetic achievement. Because time for instruction in summer school is limited, the requirements for testing were kept at a minimum by testing half of the classes in mathematics and the other half in reading achievement.

Subtests of the Stanford Achievement Test were selected to measure achievement in reading and arithmetic. Word Meaning and Paragraph Meaning subtests measured reading achievement. Arithmetic Computation and Arithmetic Concepts subtests measured achievement in mathematics for the third grade. The fourth and fifth grade took an additional subtest, Arithmetic Applications. Form W was administered in the first week of summer session and Form X in the last week. Primary II was administered to the third grade classes and Intermediate I was administered to the fourth and fifth grade classes.

RESULTS

Attendance:

Enrollment reports indicate that 970 students enrolled on the first day of summer school and a week later 961 students remained in the program. At the end of summer school 905 students were in attendance. Total enrollment figures are presented in Appendix A.

Students from 31 Oakland Public Schools attended one of the 4 summer schools. Parochial schools in Oakland contributed 36 students or 3.7% of the total summer school enrollment.

Teachers' Evaluation of Summer School

The data in Table 1 indicates that the majority (58% to 79%) of the teachers rate the results of the summer program as either "Distinctively Positive" or "Satisfactory." Less than 10% of the teachers indicated there were "No Results Evident." Teachers more frequently noted "Distinctive Positive Results" in "Increased motivation for learning" and "Increased self-confidence" than they indicated for "Improvements in academic subjects" or "Improvements in study habits."

Table 1
Teachers' Estimates of Results Achieved
During Elementary Summer Program

	N	Distinctive Positive Results		Satisfactory Results		Moderate Results		No Results Evident		No Response	
		N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
Improvements in academic subjects	48	2	4	30	63	14	29	2	4	0	0
Increased motivation for learning	48	12	25	25	52	10	21	1	2	0	0
Improvements in study habits	48	1	2	27	56	16	33	3	6	1	2
Increased self-confidence	48	13	27	25	52	7	15	3	6	0	0

Teachers' responses to the questions on the Teachers' Evaluation of Summer School were tabulated and are presented in Appendixes B-2, B-3, and B-4. Among the more frequently listed features of the summer program that helped teachers to work more effectively with the children were the use of parent aides, and the Neighborhood Youth Corps helpers, the small class size and the many trips and excursions. Features which most frequently limited effectiveness of the teachers were the wide range of skills, abilities and interest of the children, and the delayed arrival of materials.

When teachers considered improvements for next year, they described in detail many of the items they had listed in question 4. Additional suggestions for improvement included better preparation of the teachers' aides.

The teachers' reports of effective instructional techniques and approaches were diverse and for the most part individualistic. However, teachers frequently found activities in oral language, particularly employing records and the tape recorder, as effective approaches to learning. The use of learning games and grouping children to teach each other were popular and profitable classroom techniques of instruction.

Parent Evaluation of Summer School

Questionnaires were delivered to 228 parents and 191 or 84% returned the form. The frequency and the percentages of responses are indicated in Appendix C. More than two-thirds of the parents noted increases in the amount of reading in the home and improvements in working with numbers. Better school attitudes were noted by 79% of the parents and expanded interests were noted by 87% of the parents. The majority (62%) of the parents noted improvements in the ability of their children to get along with other children.

Parents' responses to the question, "In what ways has summer school helped your child?" were tabulated and are presented in Appendix C-1. Increments in skills necessary for reading and mathematics were noted most frequently, although parents frequently commented on general improvements and many others indicated broadening of interest, because of trips and excursions.

In answering the question, "In what ways could summer school be improved?" parents frequently indicated satisfaction with the program. Most frequently mentioned suggestions were to extend the number of weeks and to enlarge the program to allow more children to attend. Some parents (7%) would like to have more homework assigned. Parents whose children participated in the summer school would in overwhelming numbers send their children to a similar summer school next year.

Student Evaluation of Summer School

The multiple choice answers of 430 students in grades 3, 4, and 5 were tabulated. The majority (60%) indicated they enjoyed summer school "very much" and another 27% indicated that summer school was "all right." The majority (59%) indicated they would be interested in attending summer school next year.

The students' answers to questions concerning "likes" and "dislikes" were tabulated and are presented in Appendixes D-1 to D-4. Curriculum areas most frequently liked were reading and arithmetic. Snacks and trips were popular features of the summer program.

"Dislikes" were less frequently mentioned than "likes." In answering the question, "What three things have you liked least about summer school?" students frequently indicated satisfaction with the program. The most frequently mentioned "disliked" curriculum areas, viz., reading and math, were also the most frequently "liked" curriculum areas. Among the "disliked" features not specifically related to curriculum areas, snacks were frequently mentioned. However, snacks received a far greater frequency of mention among the "liked" features.

In responding to the question, "What things about summer school do you think should be changed to make it better?", students repeated or expanded comments they had made for the first two questions. Students frequently indicated a desire for more work and for more recesses. More trips and more play equipment were suggested areas for improvement. Students frequently indicated more reading, more arithmetic, and more art as areas of improvement. Some students indicated areas of improvement, but did not specify the change needed.

Teachers' Reports of Special Enrichment Activities

Thirty-four classes participated in two field trips, which included various combinations of experiences. Museums, zoos, parks, aquariums were frequently visited. The city of Oakland and the San Francisco harbor were toured. Police Departments and assembly plants were visited. Lectures and concerts were attended. Outdoor experiences at beaches and parks were included.

A few classes (4) visited 3 or more sites. Six classes made one trip, but they had chosen distant locations, e.g., California Maritime Academy at Vallejo and Mission San Juan Bautista. Activities and number of children participating are presented in Table 2.

Classroom enrichment activities were also planned. Table 3 presents a list of the enrichment activities and the number of classes and children participating. The data presented in the table should not be considered a definitive account of experiences. Interrelated activities including more than one curriculum area were tallied in each area mentioned. However, teachers' reports varied from brief to very detailed. Some teachers reported activities that required the entire 5 weeks and others described only the activities that they judged to be outstanding. The enrichment activities presented in Table 3, therefore, indicate range and variety more than emphasis of particular curriculum areas.

Students participated in a variety of enrichment activities. Although activities in art were most frequently mentioned, most of the teachers' reports indicated art was one of several curriculum areas that correlated with oral and written language experiences, science projects and social science units. Various approaches to teaching oral and written language were frequently reported. Half of the 38 teachers reported studies and projects, both group and individual, in science.

Table 2
Teachers' Report of Special Enrichment Activities
In Elementary Summer School, 1966

Field Trips and Excursions	Number of Classes	Total Number of Students
Tour of Oakland (City Hall, Jack London Square, Lake Merritt, Rotary Science, Mormon Temple, Knowland Park)	1	33
Lake Merritt (Fairyland)	5	102
Lake Merritt boat ride, naturalist lecture	3	56
Snow Museum (BART Subway Construction)	4	106
Tilden Park	2	41
Knowland Park Zoo	11	202
Chabot Observatory, Science Academy	3	58
Rotary Science Center	4	75
Golden Gate Park (Aquarium, Science Center, Tea Gardens, DeYoung)	2	39
San Francisco Zoo	15	299
Steinhart Aquarium	10	127
San Francisco Harbor Cruise	8	176
San Francisco Historical Maritime State Park (Sausalito)	7	146
Moss Beach	6	108
Maritime Academy, Vallejo	2	87
Mission San Juan Bautista & State Park	4	78
Oakland Police Department	1	20
Berkeley Folk Festival & Children's Concert	1	18
General Motors Assembly Plant	2	36
Inter-school sports	1	9-11

Table 3
Classroom Enrichment Activities

Enrichment Activities	Number of Classes	Number of Children Participating
Oral Language		
Choral reading of plays and poems	3	61
Dramatizing literature	5	114
News reporting	1	19
Creative puppet plays (Class made puppets)	4	81
Children interview each other	1	11
Simultaneous head sets- records- filmstrips	2	39
Written Language		
Stories (Imaginary and descriptive)	9	175
Letters	1	19
Synopsis of movies	1	16
A-Z Stories	1	16
Writing related to music appreciation	1	48
Literature		
Stories read orally (Teacher)	5	88
Oral reading (Children)	1	19
Poetry Appreciation	2	34
Fairy Tales (Cultural values emphasized)	1	19
Science		
Animals	5	102
Ecology	1	22
Plants	2	40
Bacteria	1	19
Electricity	1	22
Solar system (Individual projects)	1	21
Medical skills	1	20
Space	1	21
Water	2	38
Man interrelated to environment	1	20
Health & Safety		
General	3	61
Dental	2	39
Safety	1	17

Table 3 (Continued)

Enrichment Activities	Number of Classes	Number of Children Participating
Mathematics		
Scale Drawing	1	19
Liquid and scale measurements	1	19
Time	1	21
Practical measurement and graphs	1	19
Geometry	1	19
Number facts and number sentences	1	17
Geography		
General	1	21
Map reading skills	5	104
Physical	2	42
Library		
Independent reading	3	56
General use	2	41
Book Club (Read then share)	1	18
Multi-media center	2	43
Social Sciences		
Japan (Music, art, movies)	2	64
Hawaii (Filmstrips, flat pictures, records)	1	24
Children's Homes in many lands	1	20
Early Americans (Historical men)	1	21
Cowboys	1	17
Music		
Guitar and harmonica demonstration	1	11
Folk music	1	17
Singing (Tone matching and rhythm instruments)	1	17
Individual experiments with autoharp	1	19
Music appreciation (Great composers)	1	18
Appreciative listening (Tone, mood, and impressions)	1	18
Interrelationships of music and art	2	22
Dancing (Folk and rhythm)	3	59

Table 3 (Continued)

Enrichment Activities	Number of Classes	Number of Children Participating
Art		
Collage, crayon scratching, murals, paper mosaics, plastic bottle construction, puppets, crayon resist, portraiture, finger painting, chalk, chalk dust, 3-dimension, clay, paper maché, painting, etc.	26	533
Individual research projects	2	32
Individual Projects in science	2	37
Interrelated activities in spelling and reading	1	20
Democratic procedures (Elections)	1	20
Work folders	2	38

Psychological Services

The total number of hours devoted by the consultants to each area of service is presented in Table 4. Conferences with principals and teachers required the greatest portion of the consultant's time. Time devoted to individual test administration and confering with parents and children combined to comprise 42% of the consultants' total time. Consultative services were available on the basis of one consultant to approximately 335 students.

Table 4
Number of Hours and Percent of Total Hours
For Services Rendered by Consultants

Areas of Service	Number of Hours for 26 Day Period	% of Total Service Hours
1. Test Administration		
a. Individual Tests	48	14.3%
b. Group Achievement Tests	21 3/4	6.5%
2. Conferences With:		
a. School Personnel (ex. prin., teachers)	75½	22.5%
b. Children	56	16.7%
c. Nurse	7½	2.2%
d. Outside Referral Agencies	4	1.2%
e. Parents	35¼	10.5%
f. Parent Groups	0	0
g. Others	1	.3%
3. Report Writing	29½	8.8%
4. In-Service Meetings	17	5.1%
5. Other Activities	39 3/4	11.9%
Total	335¼	100.0%

Achievement Tests

The test data, reported in medians and quartiles for each of the grades tested in reading achievement, are reported in Table 5.

Table 5
Median and Quartile Grade Equivalents on Reading Subtests
Of The Stanford Achievement Test

		Stanford Achievement Test			
		Word Meaning		Paragraph Meaning	
		June 22	July 20	June 22	July 20
		G.E.*	G.E.*	G.E.*	G.E.*
5th Grade	Q3	4.7	4.7	4.2	4.4
	Mdn	3.9	4.1	3.9	3.9
	Q1	3.6	3.5	3.1	3.2
	N	63	63	63	63
4th Grade	Q3	3.9	3.9	3.9	4.1
	Mdn	3.2	3.3	2.9	3.6
	Q1	2.9	3.1	2.7	2.8
	N	60	60	60	60
3rd Grade	Q3	3.0	3.3	3.0	3.0
	Mdn	2.7	2.7	2.4	2.3
	Q1	2.1	2.0	1.8	1.9
	N	79	79	79	79

*Grade Equivalent

The Stanford Achievement Test scores are reported in grade equivalents. The first digit indicates grade level and the second indicates tenths of a school year. The average student completing the third grade would have a grade equivalent of 3.9 on subtests of the S.A.T. Average fourth graders would score 4.9 and average fifth graders would score 5.9.

At the beginning of the summer school, median and quartile grade equivalents for grades 3, 4, and 5 on the reading subtests ranged from 1.2 to 2.0 years retardation. Pre and post-test comparisons of median grade equivalents indicated gains of none to 7 tenths of a school year. Although gains in grades 3 and 5 were at most, 3 tenths, the fourth grade's gain of 7 tenths of a school year in Paragraph Meaning attests to the value of the program.

Negative differences between pre and post-test medians and quartiles may be noted in 3 of the 18 comparisons included in Table 5. Since these negative differences were small, one tenth of a school year, they may indicate slight differences in the comparative difficulty of the two forms. Although test authors and publishers attempt to construct forms comparable in difficulty, slight differences may remain. Because of the fairly recent revision of the S.A.T. the Research Department has not had sufficient time to analyze these possible inequities, should they exist.

Negative differences between the pre and post-test scores may also be the result of a relationship that exists between the purpose for which the test was constructed and the situation in which it was administered. The Stanford Achievement Test, constructed to measure academic growth for the full year or at mid-year intervals, may not contain sufficient gradients of measurement in a single subtest to measure growth over so short a period as 5 weeks. Hence, the results indicating loss in grade equivalents or no improvement may be the result of administering a test whose gradients of measurement are too gross. Similarily measurements of increments may also be somewhat depressed.

Table 6 presents median and quartile grade equivalents on the arithmetic subtests for grades 3, 4, and 5.

Table 6
Median and Quartile Grade Equivalents On Arithmetic Subtests
Of The Stanford Achievement Test

		Stanford Achievement Test					
		Arith. Computation		Arith. Concepts		Arith. Application	
		June 22	July 20	June 22	July 20	June 22	July 20
		G.E.*	G.E.*	G.E.*	G.E.*	G.E.*	G.E.*
5th Grade	Q3	4.6	4.8	4.8	4.8	4.2	4.2
	Mdn	3.9	4.0	3.3	4.1	3.6	3.4
	Q1	3.3	3.6	2.3	3.0	3.2	3.0
	N	72	72	72	72	72	72
4th Grade	Q3	4.1	4.1	4.0	4.5	3.9	3.9
	Mdn	3.6	3.5	2.7	3.6	3.2	3.4
	Q1	3.1	3.1	2.2	2.5	2.9	3.0
	N	67	67	67	67	67	67
3rd Grade	Q3	3.4	3.4	2.8	3.0		
	Mdn	2.8	2.8	2.5	2.6		
	Q1	2.4	2.3	2.1	2.2		
	N	79	79	79	79		

* Grade Equivalent

At the beginning of summer school median grade equivalents indicated students tested ranged from 1.1 to 2.6 years below grade level. Median gains in arithmetic achievement ranged from none to 9 tenths of a school year.

Although 4 differences between pre- and post-test medians and quartiles in subtests measuring Arithmetic Computations and Arithmetic Applications were negative, they were modest in comparison to the gains made in Arithmetic Concepts, particularly in grades 4 and 5. Gains in Arithmetic Concepts in the 4th grade ranged from 3 to 9 tenths of a school year. Median and first quartile gains in grade 5 in Arithmetic Concepts were 8 tenths and 7 tenths, respectively. Similarly in the 3rd grade gains made in Arithmetic Concepts were 1 tenth to 2 tenths greater than the gains made in Arithmetic Computation. The test data tends to suggest teachers placed more emphasis on understanding arithmetic concepts than they did on computations or applications.

DISCUSSION

The immediate evaluation of the summer school program indicates positive progress in meeting its academic, as well as its enrichment objectives. Standardized test scores indicate moderate growth in academic achievement. Teachers' observations of students' work confirm the test results and indicate substantial growth in study habits and increased self-confidence. More than two-thirds of the parents, as indicated by a questionnaire sampling, noted improvement in reading and mathematics. Students in the third, fourth, and fifth grades indicated they enjoyed summer school and by their responses indicated more features that they liked than disliked.

The field trips and excursions, frequent and varied, provided the students with a wide variety of experiences. The classroom activities capitalized on these learning situations to open avenues of expression and interest.

Features of this year's program that aided the teachers' effectiveness were the use of parent aides and the Neighborhood Youth Corps. Teachers found aides and assistants most helpful in providing activities to meet the needs of the wide range of children's abilities and interests.

Joy B. Richardson
Teacher on Special Assignment
Research Department

Approved:
Alden W. Badal
Director of Research

JBR:pda/sj
9/12/66

OAKLAND PUBLIC SCHOOLS
COORDINATOR OF ELEMENTARY EDUCATION

Appendix A

SUMMER SCHOOL ATTENDANCE SUMMARY, 1966

Sobrante, Melrose, Santa Fe, Webster
School

____
Teacher or Principal

Instructions: To be filled in by each teacher for his class and summarized by each principal for his school.

1. Total enrollment, 6/24 970
2. Total enrollment, 7/1 961
3. Total enrollment, 7/22 905
4. Eliminations:

Did not report	80
Irreg. attendance	1
Vacation, camp	2
Health, accident	3
Lack of interest	6
Moved	6
Poor behavior	1
Transportation	6
Other causes	5
Emotional	

5. Enrollment by grade level, 7/1:

Total 5th graders	158	16.4%
Total 4th graders	155	16.1%
Total 3rd graders	204	21.2%
Total 2nd graders	195	20.2%
Total 1st graders	125	13.0%
Total Kindergarten	124	12.9%
Total Pre-school		
Total Special		

6. Total boys, 7/1 518 53.9%
   Total girls, 7/1 443 46.1%

7. Total parochial/private 7/1 36 3.7%

8. "Home" schools, including parochial:

School	Quota	7/1 Enrolled
Total		

EPL:sj
7/9/66

OAKLAND PUBLIC SCHOOLS
Research Department

Appendix B

TEACHER'S EVALUATION OF SUMMER SCHOOL PROGRAMS, 1966

1. At what grade level did you teach in summer school?_____grade

   If departmentalized, what were your areas of teaching or activity responsibilities?

2. For each of the general objectives of summer school, please indicate your rating of the results which were actually achieved with the majority of the students

	Distinctive Positive Results	Satisfactory Results	Moderate Results	No Results Evident
1. Improvements in academic subjects				
2. Increased motivation for learning				
3. Improvements in study habits				
4. Increased self-confidence				

3. Please cite two or three features of this year's summer school operation that helped you most to do effective work with the children.

   (See attached tabulation of responses to Questions 3 and 4.)

4. What problems were there in this year's operation that may have limited the effectiveness of your work with children?

TEACHER'S EVALUATION OF SUMMER SCHOOL PROGRAMS, 1966 - Page 2

5. If a similar program were offered next year, what suggestions for improvement would you make?

(See attached tabulation of responses to Questions 5 and 6.)

6. Please comment on any instructional techniques or approaches which you have used this summer which you felt were particularly effective.

EPL:sj
7/8/66

TEACHER'S EVALUATION OF SUMMER SCHOOL PROGRAMS, 1966
Tabulation of 48 Teachers' Responses

3. Please cite two or three features of this year's summer school operation that helped you most to do effective work with the children.

I.	Staff and Personnel Features	
	Aides (parent)	36
	Librarians	2
	Principal	8
	Tutors	3
	General assistants in the office	2
	Guidance, nurse, psychologist	4
	Youth Corps helper	11
	High School aides	2
	Faculty	1
II.	Enrichment Emphasis	
	Excursions and trips	10
	General comments	1
	Departmentalization	2
III.	Availability of Equipment and Materials	
	Audio-visual	4
	New readers	3
	Library Books and materials	7
	General Comments	8
IV.	Nutrition program	2
V.	General organization and orientation	
	Small Class size	33
	Flexible program plan	3
	High motivation of students and staff	3
	Limited parties	1
	Close range of abilities	2
	Shorter school day	1
	Additional time for planning	1

4. What problems were there in this year's operation that may have limited the effectiveness of your work with children?

I.	Limitations in Time/Schedule	
	General comments on shortness of session	5
	Longer break between sessions	1
II.	Problems involving students and class organization	
	Behavior problems (disturbers)	5
	Too wide range of skills, abilities and interests in one class.	13
	Classes too large	1
	Departmentalization	1
	Dropouts	1
	Insufficient information to prepare materials before class.	3

Teacher's Evaluation of Summer School (continued)

III.	Delayed arrival of materials	15
IV.	General	
	Need extended library hours	2
	Additional preparation of Teachers and/or Student aides	5
	Inadequate yard space	1
	Too many aides	1
	Adjustments due to changes in teaching staff	1

5. If a similar program were offered next year, what suggestions for improvement would you make?

I.	Staff and Classroom helpers	
	Preparation of youth corps workers	9
	Preparation of parent aides	6
	More student aides	1
	More parent aides	1
	Fewer aides in classroom	1
II.	Materials and supplies	
	More and/or different text books	6
	More supplies	5
	Delayed Supplies	4
III.	Students and class organization	
	Earlier return test results	1
	Less spread of abilities	3
	More information on children before session	5
	Removal of discipline problems	1
	Selection of students by interest	3
IV.	General Organization	
	Enrichment vs. remedial	3
	Longer Session	1
	More departmentalization	4
	Limit program to one or two curriculum areas	3
	Less departmentalization	1
	More emphasis on A.V. use	1
	More emphasis on creativity	1
	More experimentation with new ideas	1
	More Parent-Teacher conferences	2
	More schools and more teachers	2
	Use of Public libraries	1
	Fresher food	1
	Extended school day for individual projects	1
	Provide transportation	1

Teacher's Evaluation of Summer School (continued)

6. Please comment on any instructional techniques or approaches which you have used this summer which you felt were particularly effective.

I. Instructional Approaches	
Reading	
Choral reading	2
Reading words (Dolch list)	1
Phonetic Spelling and reading	1
Reading charts	1
Fairy Tales	1
Art	
Paper sculpture	1
Math	
Use of concrete objects	2
SMSG math	1
Speed practice	1
Review and drill	1
Scale drawing	1
Map work	1
Language Arts	
Oral Language (records & recorder)	8
Creative drama (puppets)	3
Writing biographies & descriptions	2
Music related to poetry	1
Interrelated activities	
Reading & Writing & Math related to trips	3
II. Instructional Techniques	
Grouping	
Children teach each other in groups	5
Teacher aides helping small groups	2
Individualized work	4
Creative Club organization	1
Class government	1
Games	
Learning games	9
Phonovisual games	6
Math workshop games	1
Flash cards	2
Audio-visual materials	3

OAKLAND PUBLIC SCHOOLS
RESEARCH DEPARTMENT

PARENT EVALUATION OF SUMMER SCHOOL, 1966

WE WANT TO KNOW WHAT YOU THINK AND HOW YOU FEEL ABOUT YOUR SON'S OR DAUGHTER'S BEING IN THE SUMMER SCHOOL THIS YEAR. PLEASE ANSWER THE QUESTIONS AND ASK YOUR SON OR DAUGHTER TO TAKE THIS FORM TO SCHOOL TOMORROW IN THE ENVELOPE PROVIDED.

A. FOR EACH ITEM, PLEASE CHECK ( ) IN FRONT OF THE WORDS THAT TELL MOST NEARLY HOW YOU FEEL AND THINK ABOUT THE PROGRAM.

1. ABOUT READING AT HOME, MY CHILD:
   - A. ☐ 61 / 32% READS MUCH MORE NOW
   - B. ☐ 78 / 41% READS A LITTLE MORE NOW
   - C. ☐ 43 / 22% READS ABOUT THE SAME AMOUNT NOW
   - D. ☐ 5 / 3% READS A LITTLE LESS NOW
   - E. ☐ 1 / .5% READS MUCH LESS NOW

2. COMPARED TO SCHOOL LAST WINTER, MY CHILD:
   - A. ☐ 120 / 63% LIKES SUMMER SCHOOL MUCH BETTER
   - B. ☐ 31 / 16% LIKES SUMMER SCHOOL A LITTLE MORE
   - C. ☐ 26 / 14% LIKES SUMMER SCHOOL ABOUT THE SAME
   - D. ☐ 2 / 1% LIKES SUMMER SCHOOL A LITTLE LESS
   - E. ☐ 3 / 2% LIKES SUMMER SCHOOL MUCH LESS

3. IN WORKING WITH NUMBERS MY CHILD:
   - A. ☐ 82 / 43% SEEMS TO WORK WITH THEM MUCH BETTER NOW
   - B. ☐ 64 / 34% SEEMS TO WORK WITH THEM A LITTLE BETTER NOW
   - C. ☐ 43 / 22% SEEMS TO WORK WITH THEM ABOUT THE SAME NOW
   - D. ☐ 0 SEEMS TO WORK A LITTLE MORE POORLY NOW
   - E. ☐ 0 SEEMS TO WORK MUCH MORE POORLY

4. COMPARED TO YEARS WHEN MY CHILD DID NOT GO TO SUMMER SCHOOL, THIS YEAR HE OR SHE:
   - A. ☐ 87 / 46% GOT ALONG MUCH BETTER WITH OTHER PEOPLE
   - B. ☐ 31 / 16% GOT ALONG A LITTLE BETTER WITH OTHER PEOPLE
   - C. ☐ 62 / 33% GOT ALONG ABOUT THE SAME WITH OTHER PEOPLE
   - D. ☐ 3 / 2% GOT ALONG A LITTLE WORSE WITH OTHER PEOPLE
   - E. ☐ 0 GOT ALONG MUCH WORSE WITH OTHER PEOPLE

5. COMPARED TO LAST SCHOOL YEAR, MY CHILD IS:
   - A. ☐ 114 / 60% NOW INTERESTED IN MANY MORE THINGS
   - B. ☐ 51 / 27% NOW INTERESTED IN A FEW MORE THINGS
   - C. ☐ 20 / 10% ABOUT THE SAME INTERESTS AS BEFORE
   - D. ☐ 1 / .5% NOW INTERESTED IN A FEW LESS THINGS
   - E. ☐ 0 NOW INTERESTED IN MANY LESS THINGS

* NOTE: PERCENTS WILL NOT TOTAL 100% AS SOME STUDENTS DID NOT FOLLOW DIRECTIONS.

B. IN WHAT WAY HAS SUMMER SCHOOL HELPED YOUR CHILD? (SEE ATTACHED TABULATION OF RESPONSES ON 191 QUESTIONNAIRES)

C. IN WHAT WAYS COULD SUMMER SCHOOL BE IMPROVED?

D. IF FUNDS ARE AVAILABLE FOR A SUMMER PROGRAM NEXT YEAR, WOULD YOU BE INTERESTED IN HAVING YOUR CHILD ATTEND AGAIN?

PARENT EVALUATION OF SUMMER SCHOOL 1966
Tabulation of 191 Parent Responses

Question B. "In what way has summer school helped your child?"

I.	Comments indicating general, or unspecified benefits to children.	35
II.	Comments specifying improvements in:	
	A. Self Confidence	6
	B. Behavior	4
	C. Getting along with others	13
	D. Assuming responsibility and being independent	3
	E. Constructive use of free summer time	3
	F. Desire to study/learn/get ahead	2
	G. Readiness for beginning school in fall	4
III.	Comments noting significant broadening of the interests and experiences of the children (many specifying excursions as being beneficial)	28
IV.	Comments indicating higher level of interest in:	
	A. Independent reading	8
	B. "Reading"	7
	C. Arithmetic	8
	D. Science	1
	E. "School" in general	7
V.	Comments noting improved performance and skills in:	
	A. Language (writing)	11
	B. Reading	50
	C. Arithmetic	54
	D. Spelling	5
	E. Oral expression	7
	F. Social studies	2
	G. Work-study habits	4
VI.	Comments indicating no improvement	5
	A. No comment	1
	B. Don't know	1

Parent Evaluation (continued)

Question C. "In what ways could summer school be improved?"

I.	Comments indicating no changes needed/liked program as operated.	37
II.	Comments regarding length of program:	
	A. Longer day needed	7
	B. Shorter day	1
	C. Longer period (weeks)	13
III.	Comments regarding size, staff, and location:	
	A. Enlarge program so more could attend	11
	B. Only remedial children should attend	1
	C. Need more aides/teachers	4
	D. Sites should be closer	1
	E. Transportation should be provided	1
IV.	Comments indicating more emphasis needed and/or more of:	
	A. Reading	5
	B. Arithmetic	4
	C. Science	1
	D. Specialized help in "weak" areas	3
	E. Academic work/homework	14
	F. Music, swimming	1
	G. Arts & Crafts	1
V.	"Don't know" and "no comment"	8
VI.	Assorted low frequency suggestions	9
	Need progress reports	3

Question D. "If funds are available for a summer program next year, would you be interested in having your child attend again?

I.	"Yes" responses	185
II.	"No" responses	1

OAKLAND PUBLIC SCHOOLS
Research Department

STUDENT EVALUATION OF SUMMER SCHOOL, 1966

We are asking for your ideas and suggestions for improving summer school next year.

A. Please check if you are a BOY 54% /230/ or GIRL 46% /200/

Grade 3-155 36%
4-143 33%
5-132 31%

B. How much did you like coming to summer school?

60% /259/ Very much
27% /116/ It was all right
5% /22/ Not very much
6% /26/ Not at all
.2% /1/ No Response

C. Would you be interested in coming to summer school again next year?

59% /252/ YES
38% /163/ NO
3% /15/ No Response

Note: Percent totals will not be 100% as some students did not follow directions.

D. What three things have you liked most about summer school?

1. (See attached tabulation of responses on 430 questionnaires)
2. _____
3. _____

E. What three things have you liked least?

1. _____
2. _____
3. _____

F. What things about summer school do you think should be changed to make it better?

_____

_____

_____

_____

_____

_____

STUDENT EVALUATION OF SUMMER SCHOOL, 1966
Tabulations of 430 Student Responses

Question D. "What three things have you liked most about summer school?" (Frequency of mention tabulations)

1. Curriculum areas favorably mentioned:

Reading	163
Arithmetic & math activities	167
Arts and crafts activities	88
Language arts	41
Science	26
P.E.	17
Music	9
Geography	44
"Working & Learning"	41
Library	32

2. Special areas related to organization and materials favorably mentioned:

Departmentalization	12
Traffic	3
Play and recess	64
Books	3
Movies	20
Tape recorder	1
Snacks	141
Trips	176
Listening	1

3. General features favorably mentioned:

Teachers	76
Principal	5
Helper	18
Other adults	12
Party	1
"Everything"	30
Friends	18
Homework	2
Tests	1
Games	12

Question E. "What three things have you liked least?"

1. Curriculum areas unfavorably mentioned:

Reading	61
Arithmetic & math activities	60
Art	25

Question E. (Continued)

Literature	5
Language arts	33
Science	17
P.E.	12
Music	9
Departmentalization	1
Geography & Social Studies	39
"Everything"	6
Classroom	1
Library	2
Working	13
Homework	12

2. Special areas related to organization and materials mentioned unfavorably:

Principal	1
Teacher	2
Nurse	1
Other adults	9
Classmates	20
Recess	20
Coming early	20
Staying after school	7
Traffic	2
Recess too short	10
Snacks	32
Movies	19
Trips	9
Noise	1
Fights	12

3. General areas unfavorably mentioned:

School Maintenance	3
Observing school rules	8
Tests	12
No games	3
Playground	1
Play equipment	3
Loose desk lids	2
Walking	2
Open house	2

4. Comments indicating no dislikes 40

Question F. "What things about summer school do you think should be changed to make it better?"

1. Comments suggesting more in following areas:

Arithmetic	27
Art	26

Question F. (Continued)

Music	7
Reading	23
Spelling	7
Science	4
P.E.	9
"More work"	30
More and longer recesses	40
Shorter recesses	1
More assemblies	1
More activities	11
More equipment	9
More play equipment	29
More tests	1
More teachers	9
More departmentalization	3
More movies	6
More food	16
More books	2
More trips	32
More children	1
More parties	4
More helpers	1
More play area	7
More art supplies	2
More homework	1
More library work	1
School maintenance	5
Wearing play clothes	4
Better observance of school rules	21
2. Comments suggesting longer summer school	16
More schools	1
3. Comments suggesting fewer or less of:	
Less or easier work	4
Fights	12
Traffic	3
Tests	8
Children	2
Workbooks	1
Departmentalization	5
Observing school rules	5
Food	1
Stories	1
Less school	1
Shorter hours	8
Homework	6
Geography	1
No reading	1
Fewer recesses	4

Question F. (Continued)

Trips	1
No snacks	1
Loose desk lids	5
Everything	4
4. Unspecified change	
Principal	2
Teachers	10
Geography and Social Studies	5
Class	9
Split shift	3
Time	5
Date	3
Hours	1
Library	2
Dictionary	2
Animals	2
5. Comments indicating no improvements needed	42

Appendix E

OAKLAND PUBLIC SCHOOLS
Research Department

TEACHER'S REPORT OF SPECIAL ENRICHMENT ACTIVITIES IN ELEMENTARY SUMMER SCHOOL, 1966

Directions:

One of the major objectives of this year's Summer School Program was to provide a variety of "enrichment experiences" for students. "Enrichment" is used here to refer to special activities designed to extend, or broaden, the students' first-hand knowledge of and experience with art, science, music, the rich resources of the community, etc. It is a broad term applicable to activities both in and out of the classroom.

Please give brief descriptions of the enrichment activities you have had during the summer, including the numbers of students involved.

* *

Teacher_____ Grade Level_____ School_____

I. Enrichment Activities Away From School Site

Brief Description of Nature and Location of Activity	Transportation	Number of Students

II. Enrichment Activities at School Site

	Number of Students

EPL:pda
7/9/66

OAKLAND PUBLIC SCHOOLS
Research Department

PSYCHOLOGICAL SERVICES: EVALUATION AND GUIDANCE

1966 Summer School
Check one: ESEA____ EOA____

Directions: Estimate the portion of your time per week devoted to the following activities:
(Hours should total 20 or more per week.)

	1st Week					2nd Week					3rd Week					4th Week					5th Week					Total
	Th	F	M	T	W	Th	F	M	T	W	Th	F	M	T	W	Th	F	M	T	W	Th	F	M	T	W	Th	F	Hours
I. TEST ADMINISTRATION																											
A. Individual Tests																											
B. Group Achievement Tests																											
II. CONFERENCES WITH:																											
A. School Personnel (ex. prin., teachers)																											
B. Children																											
C. Nurse																											
D. Outside Referral Agencies																											
E. Parents																											
F. Parent Groups																											
G. List Others																											
III. REPORT WRITING																											
IV. IN-SERVICE MEETINGS																											
V. LIST OTHER ACTIVITIES																											

TOTAL _____

GR:pda
6-8-66

Appendix F