DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 039 870 JC 700 143

AUTHOR	Baehr, Rufus F.
TITLE	Project Success.
INSTITUTION	Chicago City Coll., Ill. Kennedy-King Coll.
SPONS AGENCY	Office of Education (DHEW), Washington, D.C.
PUB DATE	Dec 69
NOTE	64p.
EDRS PRICE	EDRS Price MF-$0.50 HC-$3.30
DESCRIPTORS	African American Studies, *Educationally Disadvantaged, *Junior Colleges, Negro Students, Remedial Courses, *Remedial Instruction, *Remedial Programs, Student Adjustment, *Student Attitudes, Student Characteristics, Student Improvement
IDENTIFIERS	*Illinois

ABSTRACT

This report reviews the remedial education program--Project Success--at the Urban Education Center, City Colleges of Chicago (Illinois). The major features of the program are outlined and its operation and evaluation are discussed. Student performance and characteristics are then tabularly compared, based on their groupings as "successful" (final GPA in the top quartile), "unsuccessful" (final GPA in bottom quartile), or "drop out" (withdrew from school before end of school year). Results of a questionnaire in which students evaluated their remedial training during their final exam week are presented. Finally, a follow-up survey of 67 Project Success students' attitudes to remedial training, adjustment as college freshmen, and performance are compared with 69 students receiving remedial training at other campuses of the City Colleges of Chicago. Results indicate that the students overwhelmingly support the principle of remedial education, that personalized remedial training significantly increases the will and desire to continue their college education (though not necessarily their academic success), and that remedial assistance cannot be limited to an intensified program during a single year. (JO)

PROJECT SUCCESS

A PROGRAM SUPPORTED BY

THE OFFICE OF EDUCATION IN COOPERATION WITH WILSON CAMPUS, CHICAGO CITY COLLEGE, AND ROOSEVELT UNIVERSITY

PROJECT NUMBER 68-23-0167

CHICAGO CITY COLLEGE
(NOW CITY COLLEGES OF CHICAGO)

WILSON CAMPUS
(NOW KENNEDY-KING COLLEGE)

FINAL REPORT BY:

RUFUS F. BAEHR
ACTING DIRECTOR

DECEMBER, 1969

TABLE OF CONTENTS

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

The Chicago City College wishes to express its appreciation to the U.S. Office of Education for its generous financial support in 1967 and again in 1968. The grants totalling $262,800.00 which helped fund the experimental and demonstration educational programs of the Urban Education Center have contributed to the continuous efforts of the Chicago City College to improve the effectiveness of its remedial educational programs.

Although there were many individuals who contributed much to the success of the Urban Education Center, special thanks and appreciation is extended to the following:

Chancellor Oscar E. Shabat and members of the Central Office Staff

Charles R. Monroe, President, Wilson Campus (now Kennedy-King College)

Maceo T. Bowie, President, Kennedy-King College

Jerome Brooks, former Director of the Urban Education Center

Elsa Richmond, reading consultant to the project and Director of the Roosevelt University Reading Institute

The Teaching and Counseling Staff. They developed the teaching materials and managed the students' learning experiences.

The Tutors who became very much aware of the students' learning process.

June Campbell, Doris Lawson and Rosetta Burton, secretaries who helped bring together much of the data.

Arthur Newell, a Chicago City College student, who assisted in the follow-up project and in the development of the statistical tables.

The Students who trusted that something good would come out of their stay at the Urban Education Center.

INTRODUCTION

Increasing numbers of high school graduates have entered the Chicago City College with academic handicaps so serious that they have been unable to function in a College community. Ten years ago the Chicago City College, consistent with its "Open Door" policy, created a one year basic program to meet this growing crisis. Although some students have been saved by the basic program, the numbers have been so few that both faculty and administration have been disappointed. Both faculty and administration have supported continued experimentation and the development of new curricula in the hope that more effective means of remediation might be found. Student unrest during the past school year, as observed in the activities of black student organizations, has created new pressure for reform of existing basic programs. The black student organizations have argued that since most of the students enrolled in the basic programs are black, the experience is essentially demeaning for black students and contributes little toward the development of a positive self image. They also argue that there are other educational issues of a far more fundamental nature that must be recognized and acted upon. The simple remediation of reading and writing skills is not enough. More urgent in their eyes is the development of a Black Studies Program that will bring them a sense of pride and purpose. Student pressure has prompted many campuses to discontinue their basic programs and to encourage faculty-student cooperation for the purpose of developing a mutually agreed upon alternative.

Although somewhat isolated from the campuses, the two years of work in remedial education sponsored by the Urban Education Center was the result of a reform movement which began four or five years ago, this time by a group of faculty members led by Edward Dixon of the Southeast Campus. With support from the central administration, the group became known as the Committee for the Disadvantaged. It was through the efforts of this committee that the U.S. Office of Education, under Title III of the Higher Education Act of 1965, gave the Chicago City College, through the Wilson Campus, a grant of $158,800.00 in 1967 and an additional grant of $104,000.00 in 1968 to help develop a demonstration project for basic students. Under the direction of Mr. Jerome Brooks, a faculty interested in working with low achieving students was recruited to develop and implement an innovative program in remedial education.

The purpose of this report is to review what has been accomplished at the Urban Education Center during its second year of work with underachieving students. There has also been enough information collected about the college adjustment of our 1967-68 students to warrant some discussion about the success of their first year away from intensive remedial training.

SECTION I. THE REMEDIAL TRAINING PROGRAM

A. Descriptive Analysis

There were approximately four major features of the Urban Education Center's remedial training program. They were related to the following general categories: the content of the curriculum, the granting of college credit, the teacher work load, and the degree of student participation in the total life of the school.

There were two requirements placed upon the content of the curriculum being taught at the Urban Education Center. First, the content of each course taught was to be maintained at the college level. This decision was partly based upon the assumption that college level ideas and concepts are powerful motivators for all young adults, not simply for those who happen to be good at reading and writing. When the time came to apply this principle, some teachers began to experience difficulty. It was discovered that some readings that had been assigned simply could not be read by many of the students. The reading competence of the students had not improved sufficiently to enable them to cope with the reading demands made by some of the assigned materials. This discovery necessitated a search for reading selections that preserved the essential ideas of the original assignment while using a less complex writing style. Although the teachers found the task of discovering new readings time consuming, it proved to be rewarding for all concerned. As the year progressed, reading difficulties that hindered progress in class became the occasion for referring students to a tutor for help.

The second requirement placed upon the curriculum was that it be made relevant. Since all of the students had lived in Chicago for most of their lives and most of them were black, a relevant curriculum simply called for an urban-black studies program. Thus, the readings and text requirements in the literature and social science courses and, to some extent, in the biology sequence reflected this emphasis. Implementation of this aspect of the program proved to be quite successful. The students as a whole found the curriculum emphasis both challenging and interesting.

A variable amount of college transferable credit was given to the students registered in the four courses offered at the Urban Education Center. The number of college transferable credit hours each student earned was dependent upon the amount and quality of his work. A student might earn a maximum of 18 hours of transferable college credit and total of 12 hours of non-transferable institutional credit during the course of the

academic year. The transferable credit hours were distributed among the four courses as follows:

Course	Hours Credit
English 101	3 hrs
Literature 121	3 hrs
Social Science 101, 102	6 hrs
Biology 101, 102	6 hrs
Total	18 hrs

The rationale for this decision to give credit was based, in part, upon the belief that students who were registered in college level courses should be entitled to receive some college transferable credit after successfully completing the course requirements. The granting of college credit also gave recognition to the fact that remedial education, however it is defined, is a legitimate and proper function of a community college.

The faculty implemented the variable credit principle by agreeing that an earned grade of C or better would entitle the student to the full amount of transferable credit assigned to the course in question. Thus those students who received a C or better in all of their courses earned the full 18 hours of college transferable credit.

With respect to teacher load, each full-time teacher was responsible for one course preparation each semester. The 72 students registered in the program were divided into four groups of 18 members each. Each language teacher was responsible for two of the four groups while the social science and biology teachers were responsible for all four groups. Each teacher conducted two three-hour classes each week. The language classes had an enrollment of 18 students while the social science and biology classes had an enrollment of 36 students. The reduced class load and the reduced class size for the language teachers gave each instructor a block of free time in which to develop new working relationships with his students. Each teacher conducted small seminars usually composed of nine to eighteen students as well as holding individual conferences with his students. The intent of this strategy was to provide the teacher with enough time to get well acquainted with the learning process of each student and thereby become more effective in helping the student overcome particular learning difficulties that would otherwise go unnoticed. The assumption underlying this strategy was the belief that the remedial process could be accelerated to the point where the student could successfully cope with his college career within a year's time. Although some students enrolled at the Urban Education Center have shown remarkable progress and may indeed be ready for regular college courses next fall, the remedial gains made by the majority of our students have not significantly departed from the progress observed in

students enrolled in the more traditionally organized remedial programs. It may be that our lack of success indicates that we have not yet discovered the methods and techniques that are appropriate to a more individualized style of remedial education. However, the results of our work may also suggest that we are expecting too much to be accomplished by our students in too short a period of time.

A phenomenon observed last year and again this year which seems to be related to a more personalized educational program was the increased determination shown by so many students to continue with their college plans. One student expressed this well when he said, "Most of us came here almost ready to give up. Our stay here at the Center has given us new hope that a college education is a real possibility after all."

The final characteristic of the Center's program was the development of a procedure by which the students could govern their own behavior and also share in the Center's policy-making decisions. There were approximately four areas of policy making in which the faculty welcomed student participation. They were the planning of student-faculty activities, curriculum planning, the development of the counseling service, and matters pertaining to the Center's budget. There were some areas in which students would be involved but would not participate in the final decision. They were the granting of credit, the hiring and firing of staff, scheduling classes and the assignment of grades.

With the view of implementing the above objectives the staff created a model of student participation in which two committees were created, that is, a student-faculty discipline committee with a membership of three students and two faculty members and the student-faculty activities committee with a membership of five students and three faculty members. In addition to the committees some teachers included in their course outlines a procedure by which dissatisfied students might add something new to the course, modify an existing requirement and in some cases abolish a requirement.

Part of the intent of this aspect of our program was to provide additional means by which students could be valued, important and responsible members of an academic community. It was felt that this objective could best be accomplished by modifying the traditional hierarchical arrangement of educational institutions.

The model of student involvement that was to bring the faculty, staff and students into a working relationship for the school year had a life of about two months. The committee system came to an end by student request. This action of the students did not mean they were not interested in student power. They were very interested. However, it did mean that they wanted a voice in how their involvement in the school would be structured.

The process of student reaction to the Center's student participation model roughly went through four stages of development. The initial stage can be described as the stage of dependence. During orientation week when the model was explained almost everyone was pleased and happy about what the faculty and staff had done for them. One staff member reminded the students that they were unique among students in that "liberation" had come to them as part of their enrollment. The next phase of the process can be called the stage of compliance. Meetings were called. Student representatives to the various committees were elected and the committee structure began to function. Along with this compliance there was a show of independence which was later to become dominant. That is, the students created a student committee that would function without faculty or staff involvement. The third phase, which culminated in the middle of November, 1968, can be characterized as the phase of rebellion and withdrawal. Students were becoming progressively disappointed and impatient with the committee's lack of productivity. Promises that had been made had not been fulfilled. The climax of this phase of student participation came in the publication of a list of student grievances which were submitted to the faculty and administration. The series of meetings that followed ended the old committee system and began a new phase of cooperation in which the students demonstrated greater independence. An executive committee was created during the November meetings which included representatives from administration, faculty, students, and clerical staff but it never functioned successfully as a formal deliberative body. Effective student involvement in the life of the Center came out of informal structures that the students alone created and implemented. When students saw fit to raise issues of importance to the faculty and administration, they did so. The debate and discussion that followed was open and involved everyone. In most cases, the decisions that followed grew out of community consensus. Thus, student involvement was accomplished in some areas of the Center's life, but not through the structures originally proposed.

B. Research Findings

Faculty and Student Body

The faculty and staff consisted of two administrators, four teachers, one counselor, a person in charge of research, and a reading consultant from Roosevelt University. Four of the eight principal staff members were black. All of the black staff members were recruited from outside the Chicago City College faculty. At the close of the program, three of the four chose not to remain with the Chicago City College, and have either returned to graduate school or to private industry. In addition to the teaching staff, five tutors were employed. Each tutor worked fifteen hours a week. Two hours of their time were spent in consultation with the Center's reading consultant. Because of the difficulty in recruiting suitable graduate students who were working on master's programs, active tutoring did not begin until midway through the first semester.

A total of 72 students were enrolled in the program. The recruitment and selection procedure differed from that employed in the first year of the program. Rather than accepting students who were to enter basic programs at the Loop and Wilson Campuses as was done in the first year, students were recruited directly from high schools. Counselors and teachers who were working with Chicago High School seniors supplied the Center with most of its students. Students planning to attend college were referred to the Center either when their composite ACT score showed a standard score of 13 or below or, in cases where ACT scores were not available, when a teacher or counselor judged that the student would benefit from the program. Each applicant was interviewed at the Center. An article on student unrest was mailed to each student along with other information prior to the interview. The purpose of the interview was to obtain information about each student's reading and writing development as well as his emotional readiness for the program. Each student was asked to spend thirty minutes writing a theme based upon the article that was sent to him earlier. He was also asked to read orally a selection of the article as well as spend some time getting acquainted with one member of the staff. At the close of each day of interviewing, the staff would meet and decide which of the candidates were to be accepted and which were to be rejected. Of the 147 students who filled out applications, 62 students did not keep their appointment to be interviewed. Of the remaining 85 students who were interviewed, eight who were accepted by the Center chose not to enter the program and five were rejected by the staff, leaving a total of 72 students who were both accepted by the staff and who chose to enter the program. The results of this intake procedure seems to show that students who are

judged by their high school counselors and teachers to be in need of some kind of additional training before entering college, often decide against enrolling in such programs.

Immediately following acceptance, each student was referred to the Roosevelt University Reading Institute for two days of diagnostic testing and 17 individualized reading training sessions. Each training session lasted a minimum of two hours and often was extended to three or three and one half hours depending upon the student's needs. Appointments were on a weekly basis.

The reading program consisted of two courses, that is, the Regular Course and the Special Work program. If the diagnostic tests indicated that the student had specific deficiencies beyond those inefficiencies typical of the average literate adult, and they were limiting enough to preclude his benefiting from the Regular Course, he was assigned to the Special Work program.

Here the effort was made to attack the student's specific problem: whether it lies in a lack of familiarity with the basic phonic principles or other word attack skills, an inability to analyze a paragraph, a failure to have discovered the multiplicity of meaning in words, or a lack of experience in drawing inferences, or in all of these areas.

All the work was entirely individual. The curriculum was varied from session to session with drill or recapitulation or a leap ahead as the needs of the student demanded with the ultimate goal of preparing him for the more advanced work at the earliest time.

In this one-to-one situation there must somehow be created a student-teacher relationship that allows for the development of reciprocal concern and trust. Only when the student feels that it is "safe for him to be wrong," is he "open to hearing," open to the integration of new information, and the habituation of new patterns of reading.

Only 14 per cent of the students tested by the Reading Institute were ready for the Regular Program. Thus, at the beginning of their reading training, most of the students were placed in the Special Work program. At the end of the 17 individualized training sessions, however, the percentage enrolled in the Regular Program had risen to 33 per cent of the student body.

It was originally intended that all students would have their work at the Roosevelt University Reading Institute completed by the time classes began in September, 1968. However, the task proved to be larger than expected. Thus, many students were enrolled in the reading program along with their normal fall semester course work at the Urban Education Center. After

students completed their work at the Reading Institute, there were some who wished to continue. A limited number of scholarships were made available; otherwise each student who wished to continue developing his reading skill paid for additional lessons.

The student body was composed of 37 males and 35 females whose ages ranged from seventeen to twenty years. The median age was 18. Sixty-six were Afro-Americans, one was a Spanish-American, two were Caucasian-Americans, and three were of a mixed racial background.

An estimation of the student's social class membership was made. The estimation was based upon an index of urban status developed by Richard Coleman (1959). The Coleman index of urban status is unique in that the sample used in its development included both Afro-Americans and Caucasian-American. Using Mr. Coleman's seven-point scale of social status, the occupational status and educational background of the students' parents were ranked. Table 1 shows the distribution of the student body by estimated social status.

The birthplace of the students is shown in Table 2. Sixty-seven per cent of the student body was born in Illinois which means the City of Chicago or an adjacent community.

With regard to the family life of the students, little information was systematically collected. Tables 3 and 4 give information about the number of siblings for each student and the parental availability for each student.

TABLE 1

DISTRIBUTION OF STUDENTS BY ESTIMATED SOCIAL STATUS

Social Status Scale	Number of Students		
	Male	Female	Total
Upper Class	--	--	--
Upper Middle	--	--	--
Middle Middle	1	2	3
Lower Middle	8	8	16
Better Working	15	15	30
Lower Working	10	9	19
Lowest Class	3	1	4
Totals	37	35	72

TABLE 2

BIRTHPLACE OF STUDENTS

State	Number of Students		
	Male	Female	Total
Illinois	23	25	48
Mississippi	9	4	13
Arkansas	2	1	3
Tennessee	1	2	3
Alabama	1	1	2
Louisiana	1	--	1
Outside of the United States	--	2	2
Totals	37	35	72

TABLE 3

NUMBER OF SIBLINGS FOR EACH STUDENT

Number of Siblings	Number of Students		
	Male	Female	Total
8 or more	10	4	14
6-7	7	7	14
4-5	10	15	25
2-3	9	6	15
Only child	1	3	4
Totals	37	35	72

TABLE 4

PARENT AVAILABILITY FOR EACH STUDENT

Parent Availability	Number of Students		
	Male	Female	Total
Both parents in home	18	16	34
2nd marriage for 1 parent	1	6	7
1 parent absent - death	2	2	4
1 parent absent- separation	11	9	20
Both parents absent	5	2	7
Totals	37	35	72

Research Design

The design of the Urban Education Center's 1968-69 demonstration project in remedial education did not include the use of a control group because of the high cost. Loss of the control group removed an important means by which the training program could be evaluated. The research objectives that were set forth were three in number. The first objective was to describe the behavioral and attitudinal changes that might have occurred following one year of remedial training. A battery of tests was selected to be given at the beginning and again at the end of the school year. The pre-testing schedule was met with little difficulty; however, as the year progressed the post-testing plans were brought into question and finally had to be abandoned. Unexpected staff reductions and the consequent reorganization of personnel forced the cancellation.

The second objective was exploratory in nature; that is, a comparison was made between the high and low achieving students. Students with final grade point averages in the upper fourth of the class were considered high acheivers while those defined as low acheivers had grade point averages in the bottom fourth of the class. A third group was added which included those who had dropped out of the program before its completion. If indeed there are differences other than academic achievement that distinguish the three groups of learners, then the information gained might help in the development of a more effective teaching program. The final objective was the development of a procedure by which the students could participate in the evaluation of their year's training.

Issues and Hypotheses

The focal issue and central hypothesis of this study was: There is a positive relationship between a more personalized college remedial program and the academic success of "high risk" college-bound high school graduates. In this study personalization of remedial instruction was accomplished through the reduction of class size and teacher class load, the introduction of an urban-black studies program, tutoring assistance, individualized reading instruction and finally the encouragement of student participation in the policy making decisions of the Center. The "high risk" college-bound high school graduates include students who received standard ACT composite scores of 13 or below.

In addition a subsidiary, although not unimportant, hypothesis was explored. It states that there is a positive relationship between a more personalized college remedial program and the number of students who chose to return and continue their college education.

Although the research design for the 1968 demonstration project suffered serious limitations which made the testing of the above hypothesis untenable, enough is known about the first year college adjustment of the Center's first group of students to permit some evaluation of these hypotheses. Section II of this report will discuss the findings of the Project Success Follow-Up Study with reference to the above hypotheses.

Tests

The test battery that was administered to the students at the beginning of the school included the following:

1. The Raven Progressive Matrices (Raven, 1965). The Progressive Matrices is a non-verbal test of reasoning ability designed for use with children, adults, and in general with people who for any reason have difficulty understanding or using the English language.

2. The Taylor Manifest Anxiety Scale. The Taylor Manifest Anxiety Scale is a personality test designed to measure the individual's level of overt or manifest anxiety.

3. Mooney Problems Check List (Mooney, 1950). The Mooney Problems Check List is a list of troublesome problems which often face students in college, that is, problems of health, money, social life, relations with people, religion, studying, selecting courses, and the like.

4. Attitude Questionnaire. The Attitude Questionnaire is a semantic differential test which was developed locally. It is designed to give information about student attitudes toward other people, classmates, himself, rules, teacher, knowledge, school and the like. The results of this test are not available at this time because of delay in computer analysis.

5. The Phonics Test. The Phonics Test consists of 64 nonsense words which measure ability to recognize and pronounce written signals of the major sound patterns.

6. The Nelson-Denny Reading Test for High School and College (Brown Revision, 1960). The Nelson-Denny Reading Test measures vocabulary and reading comprehension. The test is given under two different testing conditions, that is, timed and untimed. Time is kept on both the vocabulary and comprehension sections and the distance is marked at the end of each timed portion after which the student is allowed to finish the test at his own pace. It is assumed that the untimed part of the test shows the student's real power and potential since the test

score is no longer limited to what can be completed in a given span of time. The distinction between rate of performance and level of power is important for inner city students who have little test sophistication and a time-sense not typical of middle class U.S.A.

7. Traxler High School Reading Test (Traxler, 1942). The Traxler High School Reading Test measures reading rate and comprehension. The reading of the article is timed to provide a reading rate score, but the answering of the questions to determine quality of comprehension has been removed from the time limitation. The norms of this test show that the average college freshman will read 250 words per minute with 65 per cent comprehension.

8. Otis Self-Administering Test of Mental Ability (Otis, 1928). The Otis Test was not given as a test of mental ability. Instead, it was given to determine the student's rate of performance and per cent correct of that portion covered in order to have another rate and comprehension measure.

9. "Krambambuli," an Informal Narrative Reading Test. The Informal Narrative Reading Test is a test of reading comprehension which requires the student to write essay answers to eleven questions, necessitating the selection of the significant facts, the structuring of these facts to see the thrust of the reading, as well as the implications of the whole. The test provides a rate of reading score in terms of words per minute as well as a diagnostic facility for comprehension. Krambambuli is a short story, German in origin, 4,050 words long.

Results

Three homogeneous groups, that is, the successful students, the unsuccessful students, and the student drop-outs, were separated from the total sample. The successful students were those whose final grade point average placed them in the top quartile of their class. The unsuccessful students were those whose final grade point average placed them in the bottom quartile. Student drop-outs were those who withdrew from school before the end of the school year, and thus received a W or failing grades from their teachers.

The purpose of this comparative study was to obtain more information about the learning process of each of the three student group. The only systematic information available to assist in this inquiry was the data obtained from the test battery given to all students at the beginning of the school year. A comparison of the test performance of the three student groups will be accomplished by means of small sample statistics.

The first comparison to be made was between the successful and unsuccessful students. Prior to examining test performance, the social status, family background, age, and sex of each group was studied. With regard to social status, family background and age, no differences could be found. However, the results on Table 5 show that a relationship exists between sex and academic achievement. Females predominate in the successful group while the unsuccessful group is largely composed of males. It is difficult to speculate why there should be such a sharp contrast between the achievement of the male and female in this program. Perhaps the move toward personalizing the remedial process has been more threatening to the male than to the female. Further research may help to clarify the question.

TABLE 5

HIGH AND LOW GRADE POINT AVERAGES
OF STUDENTS COMPARED BY SEX

Group	Grade Point Average		N	X^2	Po
	Upper Quartile	Lower Quartile			
Male	4	11	15		
Female	12	4	16	7.22	.01

The performance of the successful and unsuccessful students on the diagnostic tests given at the beginning of the school year is summarized in Table 6. Two tests show mean ($\bar{X}$) differences that reach significance or near significance. They are the Phonics Test and the Mooney Problems Check List. The Phonics Test results seem to indicate that the unsuccessful students came to their remedial training equipped with poorer reading skills. Thus the small academic gains made by the unsuccessful students may be partly due to the seriousness of their reading handicap. The results of the Mooney Problems Check List open up a different issue. This test helps to provide information about one aspect of the students' coping behavior; that is, how they recognize or fail to recognize their problems. For example, the test results show the successful students to be generally more open and willing to identify their problems. The test results for the unsuccessful students, on the other hand, show less openness about problems and even a tendency to deny them when the facts of reality are taken into consideration. The remedial student who tends to be secretive and

guarded about his problems will have far more to overcome on his road to academic recovery than his fellow classmates who have already learned how to recognize and who are beginning to cope with their academic problems.

The second comparison was between the successful students and the student drop-outs. Contrary to what one might have expected, there was no selective withdrawal from remedial training based upon sex. Males and females were both equally represented. The performance of the successful students and the student drop-outs on the diagnostic tests given at the beginning of the school year is summarized in Table 7. Examination of the test performance of the student drop-outs showed a comparatively stable pattern. They would do quite well, often equalling the performance of the successful students, on the timed sections of the tests which emphasized speed. On the other hand, they would do rather poorly often worse than the unsuccessful students on the untimed portions or those sections that emphasized accuracy. This pattern nearly reaches statistical significance in the Otis Test of Mental Ability. The total number of items tried by the student drop-outs exceeds that of the successful students while the per cent correct was sufficiently below the mean of the successful students to reach the .06 level of confidence. Although more research is needed, the student drop-out seems to have an adjustment pattern in which he attempts to hide his underachievement from himself and others by putting on a show of competence. The need to appear competent can be partly understood by examining the results of the Taylor Manifest Anxiety Test. The student drop-outs show the highest mean ($\bar{X}$) anxiety score of the three groups. The difference becomes significant when compared with the unsuccessful students as shown in Table 8. When the student of this type enters remedial training it doesn't take long for his protective facade of competence to be exposed for what it is. In the normal course of his academic life he will be repeatedly brought face to face with his learning deficiencies which in turn may so mobilize his general doubts and fears about himself that he must flee the learning environment in order to find relief. When this happens, there is very little for the school to do but to await his return. In addition to anxiety, the student drop-outs show greater need to enumerate their problems, which suggests that they are hurting more than the unsuccessful students.

TABLE 6

TEST PERFORMANCE OF SUCCESSFUL STUDENTS
COMPARED WITH UNSUCCESSFUL STUDENTS

Test	Students With High G.P.A. N=16		Students With Low G.P.A. N=15		t	P_o
	$\bar{X}$	S.D.	$\bar{X}$	S.D.		
Phonics Test	26.25	8.65	18.00	10.73	2.26	.03
Nelson-Denny						
Vocabulary						
Timed	19.06	12.32	17.33	16.59		
Untimed	47.81	19.07	49.00	28.87		
Comprehension						
Timed	20.63	13.85	15.40	16.22		
Untimed	47.50	19.99	39.87	31.99		
Traxler						
Reading Rate	157.13	44.91	156.80	64.97		
Comprehension	50.94	12.28	41.33	20.57		
Krambambuli						
Reading Rate	162.00	51.26	148.73	85.68		
Comprehension						
Timed	30.00	13.04	26.33	18.66		
Untimed	34.69	15.54	25.00	21.21		
The Otis						
Total Items	47.81	12.27	41.80	13.37	1.23	.20
Per Cent Correct	67.00	12.94	61.67	21.34		
Mooney Problems						
Total Circled	16.75	14.72	10.67	9.07	1.35	
Total Underlined	46.25	28.07	29.53	16.08	1.99	.06
Taylor Manifest						
Anxiety Scale	18.50	7.74	16.20	6.19		
Raven Progressive						
Matrices	45.25	11.11	43.87	8.41		

TABLE 7

TEST PERFORMANCE OF SUCCESSFUL STUDENTS
COMPARED WITH STUDENT DROP-OUTS

Test	Students With High G.P.A. N=16		Student Drop-Outs N=12			
	$\bar{X}$	S.D.	$\bar{X}$	S.D.	t	P_o
Phonics Test	26.25	8.65	21.58	17.68		
Nelson-Denny						
Vocabulary						
Timed	19.06	12.32	24.00	24.57		
Untimed	47.81	19.07	41.75	26.71		
Comprehension						
Timed	20.63	13.85	19.25	20.79		
Untimed	47.50	19.99	30.83	23.60	1.89	.08
Traxler						
Reading Rate	157.13	44.91	160.67	62.89		
Comprehension	50.94	12.28	42.50	17.77	1.34	
Krambambuli						
Reading Rate	162.00	51.26	162.50	103.39		
Comprehension						
Timed	30.00	13.04	19.17	17.17	1.75	.09
Untimed	34.69	15.54	28.33	18.01		
The Otis						
Total Items	47.81	12.27	50.50	19.36		
Per Cent Correct	67.00	12.94	52.92	21.67	1.92	.06
Mooney Problems						
Total Circled	16.75	14.72	14.83	16.55		
Total Underlined	46.25	28.07	48.00	26.68		
Taylor Manifest						
Anxiety Scale	18.50	7.74	22.42	6.54		
Raven Progressive						
Matrices	45.25	11.11	43.50	6.37		

TABLE 8

TEST PERFORMANCE OF UNSUCCESSFUL STUDENTS COMPARED WITH STUDENT DROP-OUTS

Test	Students With Low G.P.A. N=15		Student Drop-Outs N=12			
	$\bar{X}$	S.D.	$\bar{X}$	S.D.	t	P_o
Mooney Problems Total Underlined	29.53	16.08	48.00	26.68	2.03	.05
Taylor Manifest Anxiety Scale	16.20	6.19	22.42	6.54	2.61	.02

Student Evaluation of Their Remedial Training

Student participation in the evaluation of the Urban Education Center was accomplished by providing each student with a questionnaire that reviewed most all aspects of the program. The questionnaire was administered during the final examination week. Students were asked not to reveal their identity so that privacy might be maintained. Fifty-four of the sixty students who finished their work at the Center answered the questionnaire. The following discussion will deal with results that give additional information about three of the four major characteristics of the Center's program.

The students were first asked to give a general overall rating of the Center's effectiveness in helping them overcome their educational "hang-ups". Table 9 shows 81 per cent of the respondents divided equally between the first two categories. In addition to the favorable attitude registered toward the work of the Center a sizable number of the students recognized that their academic problems still need further attention.

With respect to the curriculum students were asked to rate the kinds of learning activities in terms of their helpfulness to them. The results on Table 10 show a favorable regard for all forms of learning activity. Learning activities possibly considered by the students as more passive and therefore less productive, that is, teachers' lectures and help from a tutor, received somewhat less support. Table 11 shows clear student support for the use of black authors and black topics in the curriculum.

TABLE 9

QUESTION: HOW WOULD YOU RATE THE URBAN EDUCATION CENTER'S ATTEMPT TO HELP YOU OVERCOME YOUR EDUCATIONAL HANG-UPS?

Category	Total
Very helpful.	22
Not as helpful as I had expected	22
I'm disappointed. I expected much more from the Center.	6
This year has been a waste of time.	3
No response.	1
Total	54

TABLE 10

RATE THE KINDS OF LEARNING ACTIVITIES IN TERMS OF THEIR HELPFULNESS TO YOU.

Learning Activities	No Response	Not Helpful	Helpful	Very Helpful
Teachers' Lectures	5	14	25	10
Class Discussions	3	5	22	24
Reading the assigned books	4	4	26	20
Writing the assigned papers	3	3	24	24
Preparing your research paper	3	5	22	24
Discussions with teacher outside of class	2	7	22	21
Help from a tutor	4	12	24	17

Some of the effects of the Center's emphasis upon individualized instruction are shown in Tables 12 and 13. Each student was asked to compare his present performance in reading, writing, and speaking with his performance at the beginning of the year. Table 12 shows that the students reported their greatest gains in reading. Reading was the skill receiving the most individualized attention at the Center. Students were also asked to evaluate each staff member with respect to his or her ability to care or not care for students. Table 13 shows the students' evaluation when the staff is separated by race. With only several exceptions the results show that regardless of race, the students recognized the staff as caring for them. Student criticism of staff also cut across racial lines. Although one white staff member attracted considerable criticism, the results show that the students had doubts about two white and two black staff members.

Table 14 shows student responses to the Center's effort to increase the level of student participation. Thirty per cent of the students agreed that the student participation model had worked; while 59 per cent agreed that it had worked sometimes. Table 15 attempts to give students who were critical of the student participation model an opportunity to identify those responsible for its failure. The results show that 51 per cent of the responses regarded lack of action by students as the major reason for the failure of student participation. The students seemed to be harder on themselves than they were on the administration. It may be that they regard greater student involvement as an objective that will be accomplished by students alone rather than sharing the job with faculty and administration.

TABLE 11

QUESTION: ESTIMATE THE AMOUNT OF EMPHASIS PLACED UPON BLACK AUTHORS AND BLACK TOPICS IN EACH OF YOUR COURSES

Course	No Response	Not Enough Emphasis	About Right	Too Much Emphasis	Total
English	3	2	45	4	54
Social Science	4	1	41	8	54

TABLE 12

QUESTION: HOW DO YOU COMPARE YOUR PRESENT PERFORMANCE IN CLASS WITH YOUR PERFORMANCE AT THE BEGINNING OF THE YEAR?

Skills	No Response	Performance Worse	About The Same	Performance Better	Much Better	Total
Reading	2	0	8	28	16	54
Writing	2	1	13	23	15	54
Speaking	2	1	22	18	11	54

TABLE 13

STUDENT RATINGS OF THE URBAN EDUCATIONAL CENTER STAFF BY RACE

Race of Staff member		A person who cares about students	A person who appears not to care but actually cares	A person who appears to care but actually doesn't care	A person who doesn't care about students	Don't know person well enough to judge	Did not answer question	Total
Black	1.	47	1	0	0	2	4	54
	2.	26	3	3	1	16	5	54
	3.	37	2	6	2	3	4	54
	4.	24	10	11	1	4	4	54
	5.	30	2	2	0	13	7	54
	6.	18	2	1	0	25	8	54
	7.	17	1	14	4	12	6	54
White	1.	24	2	1	0	19	8	54
	2.	39	0	2	0	7	6	54
	3.	3	2	20	15	10	4	54
	4.	25	3	1	0	18	7	54
	5.	31	0	2	0	14	7	54
	6.	10	1	9	7	23	4	54
	7.	35	2	1	0	10	6	54

TABLE 14

QUESTION: DO YOU BELIEVE THAT THE PRINCIPLE OF STUDENT PARTICIPATION IN THE CONTROL OF PUBLIC SCHOOL EDUCATION HAS WORKED HERE AT THE URBAN EDUCATION CENTER?

Category	Total
Yes	16
Has worked sometime	32
No	5
No response	1
Total	54

TABLE 15

REASONS FOR STUDENTS' DISAPPOINTMENT IN STUDENT INVOLVEMENT AT THE URBAN EDUCATION CENTER

Category	Total
The director of the Center supported the idea of student participation in words but not in actions.	3
The teachers supported the idea of student participation in words but not in actions.	1
The students supported the idea of students' participation in words but not in actions.	19
Students who checked all three of the above categories.	3
Students who checked two of the above categories:	
The director and faculty	2
The director and students	3
The faculty and students	0
No response	6
Total	37

SECTION II. PROJECT SUCCESS FOLLOW-UP REPORT

A year has passed since the first group of students received their remedial training at the Urban Education Center. It is appropriate at this time to ask how they have progressed. What is learned, hopefully, will increase our knowledge about the remedial process and may also contribute to the development of a more effective remedial training program.

The design of last year's program included a control group of 69 students who were receiving their remedial training at the Loop and Wilson Campuses. The experimental group consisted of 67 Project Success students who received their remedial training at the Urban Education Center. The selection procedure used to obtain subjects for the experimental and control groups produced two reasonably matched samples. For the most part students whose ACT scores and English placement tests required that they receive remedial training were given the opportunity to choose in which remedial training program they would enroll. During the course of the year some students withdrew which reduced the number of students in both groups. Table 16 shows the timing and amount of the withdrawals. The original N of both the experimental and control groups will be used when comparisons are made between them since the follow-up plans called for obtaining information on all subjects, including those who withdrew before they had completed their remedial training.

The follow-up procedure included the mailing of a questionnaire to all members of both groups. Table 17 shows an 84 per cent return for the experimental group and a 49 per cent return for the control group. Thus 90 out of a possible 136 students filled out the questionnaire. The questionnaire gives little information about the students who withdrew since only one of the eight Project Success students and four of the seventeen control group withdrawals answered the questionnaire. An alumni social held in the fall of 1968 at the Urban Education Center was very helpful in obtaining the high percentage return for the experimental group. In addition to the questionnaire, transcripts of grades were requested from the schools in which students were enrolled. Students who did not respond to the questionnaires were contacted either by phone or by a visit to their home. Information obtained by telephone or a home visit was limited to ascertaining the educational, vocational, and marriage status of the students involved.

The results to be discussed in this report will deal primarily with the students' evaluation of their remedial training after having been registered as college freshmen for several months, and finally an evaluation of the students' adjustment as college freshmen.

TABLE 16

COMPARISON OF EXPERIMENTAL AND CONTROL GROUPS WITH NUMBER OF WITHDRAWALS DURING THE 1967-68 YEAR OF REMEDIAL TRAINING

Group		N	First semester withdrawals	Second semester withdrawals	Total
Experimental		67	6	2	8
Control		69	13	4	17
Loop	N = 35		(3)	(1)	(4)
Wilson	N = 34		(10)	(3)	(13)
	Total		19	6	25

TABLE 17

COMPARISON OF EXPERIMENTAL AND CONTROL GROUP RESPONSE TO FOLLOW-UP QUESTIONNAIRE

Group		Follow-up questionnaire		Total
		No response	Response	
Experimental		11	56	67
Control		35	34	69
Loop	N = 35	(14)	(21)	
Wilson	N = 34	(21)	(13)	
	Total	46	90	136

Information about student assessment of their remedial training was taken from the follow-up questionnaire. Since only 6 of the 25 students who withdrew filled out the questionnaire, the results tend to reflect the views of students who completed a full year of remedial training. Table 18 shows an overwhelming support of both the experimental and control groups for the direct usefulness of their training. Students were also asked to assess the degree to which their training was directly useful to them. Table 19 shows both groups almost equally divided between moderately and greatly useful. The heavy vote in favor of the moderate category may suggest student awareness of a need for further assistance as well as an awareness of program inadequacies that interfered with learning. The results of the two tables combined show an overwhelming student support for the principle of remedial education.

TABLE 18

COMPARISON OF EXPERIMENTAL AND CONTROL GROUPS' EVALUATION OF THEIR REMEDIAL TRAINING SIX MONTHS AFTER COMPLETION

Group	Question: Have you found your Project Success or Basic Program training to be directly useful to you?		
	No	Yes	Total
Experimental	2	54	56
Control	2	32	34
Loop N = 21	(0)	(21)	
Wilson N = 13	(2)	(11)	
Total	4	86	90

TABLE 19

DEGREE TO WHICH STUDENTS ASSESSED THE USEFULNESS OF THEIR REMEDIAL TRAINING

Group	No response	Slightly	Moderately	Greatly	Total
Experimental	3	4	24	25	56
Control	2	2	17	13	34
Loop N = 21	(0)	(2)	(11)	(8)	
Wilson N = 13	(2)	(0)	(6)	(5)	
Total	5	6	41	38	90

Tables 20, 21, 22, 23, and 24 show the results of an effort to explore some areas in which remedial training might be improved. The five factors singled out for student consideration were more reading training, more writing training, more tutorial help, more teacher strictness, and more student voice about what is taught. A quick overview of the five tables shows nearly three-fourths of both the experimental and control group supporting more training in reading and writing. It would appear that their experience as college freshmen helped them recognize the importance of the two skills. Although not quite as strong, the same general support was shown for more tutoring. The experimental and control groups differ about the need for greater teacher strictness as shown in Table 23. The tendency for some students of the experimental group to want more strictness may suggest a desire for stronger external control. This may be a reaction to last year's program, that is, the style of teaching and group counseling, which was designed to challenge the students' passivity and to encourage more self-direction. Table 24 shows the students of both groups are almost evenly divided over the issue of more student voice as a means of improving remedial training.

Students who chose to return and continue their college education following one year of remedial training are shown on Table 25. The results show an 82 per cent return for the experimental group and a 61 per cent return for the control group. It was learned that seven of the returning students--four experimental and three controls--had not completed their year of remedial training. Their determination to continue their college education in spite of the heavy odds against them is a phenomenon often observed.

The two procedures used to test the effectiveness of the remedial training of both experimental and control groups were student retention rate and academic achievement. Table 26 shows the retentior rate for the experimental and control groups. The results show that 75 per cent of the experimental group compared with 56 per cent of the control group finished their first semester. The results for the second semester show 60 per cent retention for the experimental and a 39 per cent for the control. Both semesters show the experimental group with an average of 20 per cent more students enrolled in their freshmen year of college. When a significance test is applied to the first year college retention rate, the results show that the higher college retention of the experimental group is significant at the .02 level of confidence for both semesters. This finding supports the hypothesis that greater personalization in college remedial education is related to increased student determination to stay in school.

A comparison of the mean ($\bar{X}$) grade point average of the two groups is shown on Table 27. The first semester's academic

TABLE 20

COMPARISON OF EXPERIMENTAL AND CONTROL GROUPS WITH RESPECT TO IMPROVEMENT OF COLLEGE REMEDIAL TRAINING THROUGH MORE TRAINING IN READING

Group		Improvement through more training in reading				Total
		No response	Not sure	No	Yes	
Experimental		4	3	4	45	56
Control		5	3	4	22	34
Loop	N = 21	(2)	(2)	(4)	(13)	
Wilson	N = 13	(3)	(1)	(0)	(9)	
	Total	9	6	8	67	90

TABLE 21

COMPARISON OF EXPERIMENTAL AND CONTROL GROUPS WITH RESPECT TO THE IMPROVEMENT OF COLLEGE REMEDIAL TRAINING THROUGH MORE TRAINING IN WRITING

Group		Improvement through more training in writing				Total
		No response	Not sure	No	Yes	
Experimental		3	4	4	45	56
Control		5	4	5	20	34
Loop	N = 21	(2)	(2)	(3)	(14)	
Wilson	N = 13	(3)	(2)	(2)	(6)	
	Total	8	8	9	65	90

TABLE 22

COMPARISON OF EXPERIMENTAL AND CONTROL GROUPS WITH RESPECT TO THE IMPROVEMENT OF COLLEGE REMEDIAL TRAINING THROUGH MORE TUTORIAL HELP IN PREPARING ASSIGNMENTS

Group		Improvement through more tutorial help				Total
		No response	Not sure	No	Yes	
Experimental		5	3	10	38	56
Control		5	1	9	19	34
Loop	N = 21	(1)	(0)	(7)	(13)	
Wilson	N = 13	(4)	(1)	(2)	(6)	
	Total	10	4	19	57	90

TABLE 23

COMPARISON OF EXPERIMENTAL AND CONTROL GROUPS WITH RESPECT TO THE IMPROVEMENT OF COLLEGE REMEDIAL TRAINING THROUGH GREATER TEACHER STRICTNESS

Group		Improvement through greater teacher strictness				Total
		No response	Not sure	No	Yes	
Experimental		3	7	18	28	56
Control		6	0	23	5	34
Loop	N = 21	(2)	(0)	(14)	(5)	
Wilson	N = 13	(4)	(0)	(9)	(0)	
	Total	9	7	41	33	90

TABLE 24

COMPARISON OF EXPERIMENTAL AND CONTROL GROUPS WITH RESPECT TO THE IMPROVEMENT OF COLLEGE REMEDIAL TRAINING THROUGH MORE STUDENT SAY

Group	Improvement through more student say				Total
	No response	Not sure	No	Yes	
Experimental	6	13	22	15	56
Control	4	3	15	12	34
Loop N = 21	(2)	(2)	(11)	(6)	
Wilson N = 13	(2)	(1)	(4)	(6)	
Total	10	16	37	26	90

TABLE 25

COMPARISON OF EXPERIMENTAL AND CONTROL GROUPS WITH NUMBER OF STUDENTS ENROLLED AS FIRST SEMESTER COLLEGE FRESHMEN (FALL SEMESTER, 1968)

Group	Unknown	Not in School	Trade School	College Freshmen	Total
Experimental	1	10	1	55	67
Control	3	20	3	43	69
Loop N = 35	(1)	(8)	(3)	(23)	
Wilson N = 34	(2)	(12)	(0)	(20)	
Total	4	30	4	98	136

TABLE 26

FIRST YEAR COLLEGE RETENTION RATE FOR EXPERIMENTAL AND CONTROL GROUP

Group	1st Semester Students			2nd Semester Students	
	N	Enrolled	Completed	Enrolled	Completed
Experimental	67	55	50	45	40
Control	69	43	38	34	27

TABLE 27

FIRST AND SECOND SEMESTER GRADE POINT AVERAGE OF THE EXPERIMENTAL AND CONTROL GROUP

Freshman Year	Experimental Group			Control Group				
	N	X	S.D.	N	X	S.D.	t	P_o
1st Semester	50	1.54	.54	38	1.51	.70		
2nd Semester	40	1.81	.70	27	1.53	.61	1.56	--

achievement of both groups is nearly the same. The average grade for each group is a D+. However, the second semester shows the experimental group improving its mean ($\bar{X}$) grade point average by .27 grade points while the control group shows only a .02 improvement. Although the grade point improvement of the experimental group is not enough to reach statistical significance, it does show an upward trend not appearing in the control group. The first and second semester withdrawals consisted largely of students who were doing failing work. Thus one would expect the mean ($\bar{X}$) grade point average of both groups to improve. Yet, improvement was found only in the experimental group.

In addition to the selective withdrawal from college which occurred among students of both the experimental and control group, the learning environment in which the students conducted their work is another factor which could influence the academic achievement of either group. Review of the 90 follow-up questionnaires showed that during the first semester members of both groups did not receive regular tutoring along with their course work which suggests that learning conditions were reasonably similar. One may assume that the same conditions prevailed for all students during the second semester; however, there is no general evidence available to either support or deny the assumption. Information related to this question was received from Roosevelt University. Eleven Project Success students were enrolled at Roosevelt University during the 1968-69 school year. Of the eleven who entered Roosevelt in the Fall, 1968, one left in good standing at the end of that semester, eight were placed on probation, and two concluded the term in good standing, that is, a 2.0 grade point average or better.

Early in the second semester two special courses were designed to meet the obvious needs of the students. The first course was called Freshman Tutorial 101A (2-4 semester hours credit). Students enrolled in the course were individually assigned to a tutor for assistance in a specific course. Tutors were students recommended by members of the faculty and selected through interviews conducted by the Reading Institute staff. Regular sessions with tutees were supplemented by weekly staff meetings or in-service workshops for tutors. The second course was called English 121C (2-4 semester hours credit). It was a specially created section of Developmental Reading, conducted by the staff of the Reading Institute. The student enrolled in this course received substantive individual help in improving skills in reading comprehension.

Six of the ten students chose to enroll in one or both of the above courses. Five of the six had been placed on probation at the end of the first semester. Three of the four students who

chose not to enroll had also been placed on probation at the end of the first semester. By the end of the second semester the achievement pattern of the group receiving assistance had reversed itself. Five students earned a grade point average of C or better while one made no improvement. The status of the four students who chose not to seek help remained virtually the same. One student increased his grade point average enough to be removed from probation while a second student lost his academic good standing. The remaining two students made no improvement, and were dropped for poor scholarship.

The second semester academic gains of the experimental group may be partly explained by the improvement of the Roosevelt University students. This is borne out by the fact that the mean ($\bar{X}$) grade point average of the experimental group was reduced from 1.81 to 1.71 when the six students receiving help were removed from the sample.

Although the freshman college academic achievement of the experimental group noticeably improved during the second semester while that of the control group remained stable, the improvement was not enough to give clear support to the central hypothesis of this study which states that there is a positive relationship between a more personalized college remedial program and the academic success of "high risk" college-bound high school graduates. The second semester academic improvement of the experimental group can either be interpreted simply as a chance occurrence with little or no possibility of being repeated or it can be interpreted as the beginning of a basic turn toward further academic improvement. The collection of additional follow-up data for at least another year would be required in order to resolve this issue.

Three conclusions emerge from the follow-up study of last year's students. First, the remedial students who chose to continue their college education approved of the principle of remedial education. In fact, they supported greater emphasis upon reading and writing training. Secondly, remedial training which is more personalized significantly increased the will and desire of students to continue their college education as shown by the higher retention rate of the experimental group. Thirdly, the remedial process cannot be limited to a single year of intensive training. Recent evidence seems to suggest that remedial assistance, that is, tutoring and further reading training, given during the freshman year significantly increases the student's chances of survival in college.

CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

Two years ago the staff of the Urban Education Center began its program of reform in remedial education. At that time, there was considerable confidence that the reforms proposed were certain to be successful. Since that time, however, this original optimism has disappeared and has been replaced by a realization that remedial education is a difficult job and will not yield easily to even the most well-intended remedies. Although the original expectations of the Center have not been completely fulfilled, much has been learned that may help others find new ways to cope with academic underachievement.

Perhaps an underlying factor which contributed to the loss of the original optimism of those involved in the project was an underestimation of the time needed for young adults to recover from the serious handicaps that block successful college achievement. From what little has been learned from this study about the recovery process of the underachiever, an increase in desire to pursue a college education usually occurs during the first year of remedial training. However, the basic skills, that is, reading, writing, and study habits improve more slowly. Although considerable gains are made during the first year, they are usually not sufficient to permit the student to make a successful college adjustment without assistance. Future research on the subject of remedial education should take into account the total recovery process of the underachiever and not simply focus upon the first year. If remedial assistance is given to "high risk" students during the course of their recovery instead of limited to one year, than the prognosis for underachievers who choose to remain in school may dramatically improve.

APPENDIX A

STAFF

Administration

Jerome Brooks*	Director	
Rufus Baehr, Ph.D.	Acting Director	
James Moldenhauer*	Assistant Director	

Faculty

Ross Adams, Ph.D.	Associate Professor (Biology)	Formerly of Booz, Allen Applied Research
Clara B. Anthony	Assistant Professor (English)	Formerly of Scott-Foresman and Morgan State College
Floyd Du Bois*	Assistant Professor (Counseling)	Chicago Board of Education
Michael Duane Ford	Instructor (Social Science)	Formerly graduate Student at Northwestern University
Mrs. Elsa Richmond	Reading Consultant	Director of the Reading Institute Roosevelt University
Judith E. Stein	Instructor (English)	Formerly of DuSable High School and Crane Campus

Student Tutors

Arlene F. Eskilson	English
B. Rae Lipscomb	English
Jon Martin Teich	English
Thomas Young	Social Science
Rosalyn Winston	Biology

* Left staff middle of second semester

APPENDIX B

Course Descriptions

English 101

Composition--Instruction in writing and speaking.* Writing units designed to develop the student's ability to use clear, correct English in written and oral forms. Introduction to the research paper. For students whose linguistic abilities are sufficient for success in college English. Prerequisite: Successful completion of pre-college workshops. Three periods per week. 3 credit hours.

Literature 121

Contemporary Urban Literature--Introduction to major themes of contemporary urban literature. Relationship of literary themes to literacy structure. Backgrounds of urban literature. Readings, focusing on the Afro-American, designed to develop the student's ability to understand and analyze literary forms. Prerequisite: Successful completion of pre-college workshops. Three periods per week. 3 credit hours.

Social Science 101 and 102

An introduction to the analysis of political life in urban settings. Courses will have as their focus an analysis of the salient aspects of urban political culture. The approach will include a critical examination of the important processes and developments that have shaped urban life styles, and important trends in urban government. Six periods per week. 6 credit hours.

Biology 101 and 102

These courses are designed to correlate human physiological functions with urban ecology to give students an understanding of environmental factors that affect life functions. Six periods per week consisting of lectures, seminars, audio-visual demonstrations and group discussions. Outside reading and report writing will be required. 6 credit hours.

*All students enrolled at the Urban Education Center were required to participate in a 17-session individualized reading program sponsored by Roosevelt University prior to being admitted into the Variable Ability Program.

APPENDIX C

Final Grade Summary of Students' Work for Urban Education Center

Course	Course Number	Credit Hours	Grade							Total
			A	B	C	D	F	F/ab	W	
English Composition	101	3	0	12	37	11	0	4	8	72
Contemporary American Negro Literature	121	3	0	20	26	13	1	4	8	72
General Biology	101	3	9	28	19	4	0	4	8	72
General Biology	102	3	9	28	19	4	0	4	8	72
General Social Science	101	3	5	14	34	7	0	4	8	72
General Social Science	102	3	5	14	34	7	0	4	8	72
Total			28	116	169	46	1	24	48	432

Final Grade Summary of Students' Work
for
Urban Education Center

Female

Course	Course Number	Credit Hours	Grade							Total
			A	B	C	D	F	F/ab	W	
English Composition	101	3	0	9	16	4	0	3	3	35
Contemporary American Negro Literature	121	3	0	15	11	3	0	3	3	35
General Biology	101	3	4	17	8	0	0	3	3	35
General Biology	102	3	4	17	8	0	0	3	3	35
General Social Science	101	3	3	9	17	0	0	3	3	35
General Social Science	102	3	3	9	17	0	0	3	3	35
Total			14	76	77	7	0	18	18	210

Final Grade Summary of Students' Work
for
Urban Education Center

Male

Course	Course Number	Credit Hours	Grade							Total
			A	B	C	D	F	F/ab	W	
English Composition	101	3	0	3	21	7	0	1	5	37
Contemporary American Negro Literature	121	3	0	5	15	10	1	1	5	37
General Biology	101	3	5	11	11	4	0	1	5	37
General Biology	102	3	5	11	11	4	0	1	5	37
General Social Science	101	3	2	5	17	7	0	1	5	37
General Social Science	102	3	2	5	17	7	0	1	5	37
Total			14	40	92	39	1	6	30	222

APPENDIX D

S T U D E N T E V A L U A T I O N
O F U R B A N E D U C A T I O N C E N T E R

1968-1969 School Year

1. How would you rate the Urban Education Center's attempt to help you overcome your educational hang-ups?

___ 1. Very helpful.

___ 2. Not as helpful as I had expected.

___ 3. I'm disappointed. I expected much more from the Center.

___ 4. This year has been a waste of time.

2. Rate the areas of training in terms of their helpfulness to you.

Courses of Study	Not Helpful	Helpful	Very Helpful
Roosevelt Reading Institute			
English			
Social Science			
Biology			
Mathematics (check only if you attended the class)			

3. Rate the kinds of learning activities in terms of their helpfulness to you.

Learning Activities	Not Helpful	Helpful	Very Helpful
Teachers' lectures			
Class discussions			
Reading the assigned books			
Writing the assigned papers			
Preparing your research paper			
Discussions with your teachers outside of class			
Discussions with your friends outside of class			
Help from a tutor			

4. Rate the kinds of counseling activities in terms of their helpfulness to you. (Check activity if it applies to you.)

Counseling Activities	Rating Scale: Not helpful	Helpful	Very helpful
Work-Study Service			
General Job Placement Service			
Field trips to college campuses			
College counseling class			
Personal talks with counselors			
Personal talks with teachers			

5. Do you believe that the principle of student participation in the control of public school education has worked here at the Urban Education Center?

_____ 1. Yes

_____ 2. Student participation has worked sometimes.

_____ 3. No

6. If you did not answer "yes" to the above question, why did the principle of student involvement fail to work at the Urban Education Center? (Check those statements that apply.)

_____ 1. The director of the Center supported the idea of student participation in word; but not in actions.

_____ 2. The teachers supported the idea of student participation in words but not in actions.

_____ 3. The students supported the idea of student participation in words but not in actions.

Give an example of its failure.

Give an example of its success.

7. Estimate the amount of material each teacher expected you to cover in his or her class.

Rating Scale

Class	Not enough material	About right	Too much material
English A & B			
English C & D			
Social Science			
Biology			

8. Estimate the difficulty of your assignments in each of your courses.

Rating Scale

Class	Assignments too easy	About right	Assignments too difficult
English A & B			
English C & D			
Social Science			
Biology			

9. Estimate the amount of emphasis placed upon Black Authors and Black Topics in each of your courses.

Rating Scale

Class	Not enough emphasis	About right	Too much emphasis
English A & B			
English C & D			
Social Science			
Biology			

10, Estimate your attendance record in each of your classes. (Include both excused and unexcused absences.)

Rating Scale

Class	Absent too much	Absent sometimes	Absent very little
English A & B			
English C & D			
Social Science			
Biology			

11. Estimate teachers' promptness in correcting and returning student papers and examinations.

Class	Rating Scale: Not prompt	Prompt sometimes	Always prompt
English A & B			
English C & D			
Social Science			
Biology			

12. Estimate the helpfulness and understandability of teachers' corrections of student papers and examinations.

Class	Rating Scale: Corrections don't make sense	Corrections understood sometimes	Corrections clearly understood
English A & B			
English C & D			
Social Science			
Biology			

13. Estimate the difficulty of teachers' class lectures and discussions.

Class	Rating Scale: Teachers' talk is too simple	Teachers' talk makes sense	Sometimes talks over students' heads	Talks over students' heads
English A & B				
English C & D				
Social Science				
Biology				

14. How do you compare your present performance in class with your performance at the beginning of the year?

Skill	Rating Scale: Performance is worse	About the same	Performance is better	Much better
Reading performance				
Writing performance				
Speaking performance				

15. The style of teaching here at the Urban Education Center can be described in which of the following ways?

Class	Rating Scale: Strict	Surface strictness but actually permissive	Surface permissiveness but actually strict	Permissive
English A & B				
English C & D				
Social Science				
Biology				

16. The grading policy here at the Urban Education Center can be described in which of the following ways?

Class	Rating Scale: Clear	Passed off as clear but actually unclear	Passed off as unclear but actually clear	Unclear
English A & B				
English C & D				
Social Science				
Biology				

17. Which of the five categories can be used to describe each of the following staff members of the Urban Education Center?

    1. He/she is a person who cares about the students.

    2. He/she is a person who <u>appears</u> to care about the students but actually <u>doesn't</u> care.

    3. He/she is a person who <u>appears not</u> to care about the students but actually cares.

    4. He/she is a person who doesn't care about the students.

    5. I don't know the person well enough to make a judgement.

Administration

___ Brooks, Jerome

___ Moldenhauer, James

Faculty

___ Adams, Ross

___ Anthony, Clara B.

___ Baehr, Rufus

___ DuBois, Floyd

___ Ford, Michael

___ Stein, Judith E.

Roosevelt Reading Institute

___ Richmond, Elsa

___ Your reading tutor

Tutors

___ Eskilson, Arlene

___ Lipscomb, Rae

___ Teich, Jon M.

___ Winston, Rosalyn

___ Young, Thomas

18. This page is reserved for any remarks you may wish to make about your stay here at the Urban Education Center.

APPENDIX E

URBAN EDUCATION CENTER

Follow-up Questionnaire
for
Project Success
1967-68

Your Name: _____ Sex: _____

Address: _____

_____ Phone: _____

Name of relative or friend who knows where you will live during the next two years.

Name: _____

Address: _____

_____ Phone: _____

Part I. Evaluation of Your Project Success Experience.

1. Have you found your Project Success training to be directly useful to you?

____ Yes

____ No

If yes, ____ slightly, ____ moderately, ____ greatly.

2. What improvements, if any, would you recommend for Project Success?

Areas for possible change	Yes	No	?
a. Teachers should be more strict with their students.	____	____	____
b. Students should have been given more say.	____	____	____

	Yes	No	?
c. Some courses of study were too vague.	___	___	___
If yes, which courses? _____			
_____			
_____			
d. Students needed more individual or tutorial help in preparing their assignments.	___	___	___
e. Students needed more training in reading.	___	___	___
f. Students needed more training in writing.	___	___	___
g. Other suggestions: _____			
_____			
_____			

3. What was your employment status while attending Project Success?

_____ Employed full time.

_____ Employed part time.

_____ Did not work during school year.

4. Did you feel working interfered with your studies?

a. If employed full time? Yes _____ No _____

b. If employed part time? Yes _____ No _____

Part II. What Are You Doing Now?

1. Are you attending college? Yes _____ No _____

2. If yes, what is the name of the college you are attending?

Name of School _____

Location _____

_____

3. Are you receiving any assistance from the school you are attending?

Type of Assistance	Yes	No
a. Financial aid.	_____	_____

If yes, what kind of financial aid?

_____

b. Tutorial help with your school work. _____ _____

If yes, how many hours per week? _____

What courses of study are involved?

_____

_____

c. Counseling help. _____ _____

If yes, how often? _____ times per week.

What kind of help? _____ School problems

_____ Job information

_____ Personal and family help

d. Other kinds of assistance.

Explain: _____

_____

4. Have you received help with your school work from people who are not working for your school? school? _____ _____

Explain: _____

_____ _____

_____

5. If you are not attending college, are you employed?

Yes _____ No _____

6. Are you employed in addition to your college work?

Yes_____ No_____

7. If you have answered yes to either of the last two questions, what is the name of the company?

Name of Company: _____

Location: _____

_____

8. If you are working, what kind of work do you do?

_____

_____

9. Is this job part time_____or full time_____?

10. Have you married since leaving Project Success?

Yes _____ No _____

11. If yes, are you expecting any children?

Yes _____ No _____

12. If you are married, is your wife or husband working or attending school?

Wife: Working full time_____ part time_____

Attending school full time_____ part time_____

Husband: Working full time_____ part time_____

Attending school full time_____ part time_____

13. If not married, are you engaged to be married?

Yes_____ No_____

14. With whom are you living?

___Your wife or husband and children

___Parents or relatives

___Share an apartment with a friend

___Dormitory for girls or boys, Y.W.C.A. or Y.M.C.A.

___Other (specify)

APPENDIX F

SUMMARY OF FINAL REPORT
PROJECT SUCCESS
1967-1968

by Jerome Brooks, Director

In September 1967, the Wilson Campus of Chicago City College, with funds made available under Title III of the Higher Education Act of 1965 and in collaboration with Science Research Associates, Incorporated, began a one year experimental and demonstration program at its Urban Education Center to remediate the skills deficiencies of 67 high school graduates admitted to the College as "high risk" students.

The objectives of this program, as stated in the approved proposal to the United Sates Office of Education, were:

a. to enable academically ill-prepared students to acquire the communications skills necessary to enter the regular academic or vocational-technical junior college program;

b. to offer an educational experience that would impart feelings of worth and competence in learning tasks;

c. to gain experience about and further refine a remedial program for adoption on the other campuses of the Chicago City College;

d. to train teachers in the specific skills required for effective remediation of the academically ill-prepared junior college student;

e. to develop materials and techniques appropriate to a program that emphasizes communications skills; and,

f. to provide a framework for a pilot study in the development of selection and diagnostic procedures that are appropriate to these students.

Of the 59 students completing the program in June, 1968, 37% were recommended by members of the project staff for subsequent placement in regular college courses and 63% were recommended for additional remediation in English. As of September 5, 1968, 56 of the 59 students completing the program had registered at some institution of higher learning to continue their educations:

34 Students	Registered at Campuses of Chicago City College
14 Students	Registered at other Illinois colleges
5 Students	Registered at out-of-state colleges
2 Students	Re-registered at the Urban Education Center
1 Student	Registered for X-ray Technology program at Chicago hospital
3 Students	Unlocatable

By objective measures (as provided in an outside evaluation of the program by Science Research Associates), students in the experimental group (Project Success) performed less well than students in the control groups (basic students at the Loop and Wilson Campuses of the Chicago City College) in "four of the five variables that showed significant differences between the groups. . . . Those tests that showed statistical significance were either directly related to vocabulary or a function thereof." Nevertheless, the SRA evaluation suggests that "significant changes in affective domain" occurred among students in the experimental group which did not occur among students in the control groups. Though no complete analysis of these latter changes has thus far been conducted, it seems that, in the content of 8 pre- and post-themes each experimental and each control student wrote and in the respective behavior and conduct of both experimental and control students during the post-test sessions, the experimental student was consistently less apathetic, more outspoken, and generally more resistant to the status quo than his peer in the control group. The causative factors for this apparent difference in attitude between the two groups cannot be isolated at this time, although a strong suspicion exists that the difference may at least in part be accounted for in terms of:

a. The concerted effort on the part of the Project Success staff to make students an integral part of the educational process;

b. more frequent formal and informal discussions between students and staff about subject matter relevant to the student's search for his own identity;

c. less rigid institutional and organizational structure, permitting all students equal access to administration and faculty;

d. the community-like atmosphere of the Urban Education Center, which encouraged all students--including those with high school histories of apathy and indifference--to realize their full participative rights as human beings.

In terms of the six objectives which it set for itself originally, Project Success achieved varying degrees of success. It appears to have been least successful in the attainment of its first objective, i.e., "to enable academically ill-prepared students to acquire the communications skills necessary to enter the regular academic or vocational-technical junior college program." If it was, in fact, less successful in the attainment of this objective than it might have wanted, this was certainly in part the direct result of its recognizing early that the objective itself was simplistic. The attitudes of many "academically ill-prepared" students towards all the facets of education are shaped by earlier educational and extra-educational experiences. Their academic "ill-preparedness," in other words, is not simply a result of stupidity or low intelligence. Along with their lack of preparation, they bring to the college, frequently, hostility to all the minutae of college life generally taken for granted in a middle-class sociate. If they are not actively hostile to the features of existing college life, they are at least indifferent to them as bearing little or no resemblance to the lives they have led. The work of education is conducted only accidentally under such conditions of hostility or indifference.

And it is clearly not merely the fault of such a student that he sees college as being generally irrelevant to him. The blame is also higher education's, which, (in terms of its tests and examination, its rules and regulations, its skills and subject matter requirements) demonstrably challenges him to find points of mutual concern in the image it offers up to him, and, failing to make an impression, goes on its protected way as though nothing had happened.

In other words, the Project Success staff discovered quickly that before it could make a serious effort to remedy the deficiencies of students in the program it needed to address itself to repairing the students' attitude towards education.

The program appears to have been most successful in the attainment of its second objective, i.e., "to offer an educational experience that would impart feelings of worth and competence in learning tasks." The attainment of such an objective is not easily measured quantitatively It must, perforce, be based on

subjective impressions. But sufficient evidence exists to suggest that:

a. Project Success students who, because of their low high school class standing, seldom participated in high school activities or seldom led their peers, emerged as leaders at the Urban Education Center;

b. many Project Success students, as a result of the atmosphere of welcome and acceptance at the Urban Education Center, came to school before classes began and needed to be forced out of school when the time came to close the school building;

c. more than the control students at either Loop or Wilson, Project Success students, because of their greater confidence in themselves, resisted more openly the administration of traditional examinations at the end of the year.

Again, it is not possible at this point to isolate the causes for these enhanced feelings of worth and competence. Provision for so doing is being made in the revised program for 1968-69.

With the experience of one year behind it, the Project staff has taken many steps to correct deficiencies or inadequacies in the first year of the program. Curricula have been more fully developed, setting forth program and course goals and objectives much more specifically and providing for more thoughtful and careful evaluation. The number of staff members has been reduced and staff responsibilities have been more clearly delineated. In the second year, all students prior to entering the program proper, have been exposed to a systematic and prolonged reading program individualized, offered by the Reading Institute of Roosevelt University. Many students, as a result of the gains they feel they have made in this Institute, are making arrangements to continue in that program on their own, financing tuition independently. This prior contact with the Reading Institute, moreover, will provide the Project staff with considerable diagnostic data on each student's reading and academic problems, hence, providing the Project staff, prior to the beginning of the program, with information that will serve to affect the curriculum and the methodology used in transacting that curriculum with the individual student. In addition, the Director of Educational Resources (who, in the first year of the project, had divided responsibilities as a teacher of Speech and as Director of the Learning Laboratory) will, in the second year, devote all his energies to coordinating a more consistent integration of the software and hardware of instructional technology into the program, enabling teaching faculty to make full use, as warranted, of the latest in programmed materials, electronic machines, audio-visual devices, etc.

As a result, too, of its new selection procedure, the staff feels it has narrowed considerably the sometimes wide academic gap that separated students in the first year of the program, even though each student admitted to the program in the first year had in common an ACT score of 13 or below. In the second year, students have been recruited directly from the high school upon, first, the recommendation of a responsible official of the high school and, second, an interview conducted by members of the staff. Second year students, like first year students, have in common an ACT of 13 or below. Unlike first year students, they have been required to write a short essay prior to being admitted into the program; this essay served to enable staff to screen from the program only those students who could be considered to be illiterate or with such gross reading and writing problems as to be irremediable during the course of a one-year program. The purpose of the high school recommendation was to determine only if the student, despite low ACT scores and poor earlier educational performance, had the motivation and apparent potential to gain from an academic program. This more careful deliniation of the target population will, it is felt, contribute significantly to teaching effectiveness and help the staff zero in more intelligently on the skills deficiencies of the students.

A final significant change in the second year's program finds the addition to the staff of the Director of the Roosevelt University Reading Institute, as a consultant. Under her supervision, faculty and teaching assistants (3) will receive concentrated instruction in the teaching of reading to individual students in the program, thus continuing the individualized reading program begun during the summer.

The overwhelming conclusion of the Project Success staff at the end of the first year of the program is that effective remediation of skills deficiencies among "high risk" students admitted to the Chicago City College requires more than merely exposing them to newer ways of teaching reading and writing, although increased proficiency in both reading and writing must remain essential aims of any program designed to put such students into the mainstreams of academic life. Institutional and faculty recognition of and sympathy with the different life styles of such students (different from, that is, the middle-class prototypes) is an important pre-condition for the success of programs of this type. Such recognition and sympathy inevitably results in changes, sometimes substantive, in the "normal" procedures of the college. When "high risk" students become conscious of the implementations of these changes--not in words but in concrete acts--they are more likely to find the institution hospitable and, as a consequence, are more likely to try hard to achieve. And in this greater drive to achieve, the staff believes, is to be found the promise of actual achievement.

APPENDIX G

PROGRESS REPORT

Period: July 1, 1968 through November 30, 1969

In its broadest outline, the second year of the Wilson Campus Project Success program was designed to rectify some serious deficiencies in the design of the original program.

Chief among the changes that the Project staff thought absolutely needed to be made were:

I. the overall philosophy of the program;
II. the staffing of the program;
III. the student selection procedure;
IV. the curriculum;
V. the technique of evaluating the program.

I. In terms of its overall philosophy, the Project staff found a clear need after the experience of its first year to define more precisely the general direction of the movement of the program. Specifically, it determined that the major thrust of its second year needed to be defined as the effort to give de facto dignity and status to "high risk students" by in fact allowing them, despite their academic deficiencies, to earn a modicum of college transferable credit at the same time that provisions were being made to give them special assistance in areas of skills and content weakness. The rationale behind this thrust is that if "high risk students" are to be able to mobilize their energies toward the attainment of academic goals they need to be provided with a real incentive for doing so, an incentive which does not exist in typical sub-college level remedial programs and which in part, at least, accounts for the little success such programs have enjoyed.

The need to provide such a real incentive is particularly relevant to the masses of minority students now in college, particularly the masses of black students who by default find themselves constituting the largest single minority group in the sub-college level program of the Chicago City College and similar institutions nationally.

These students are demanding an equal educational status and placement in college-level programs, not now generally available to them.

In effect, then, the Project Success philosophy suggests to such students that they may in fact participate in a college-level program and provides them with specific opportunities to remedy their deficiencies while they do so.

II. In order to implement this philosophy, it was necessary to make some changes in the staff of the Urban Education Center. Most importantly, because the student body in the program is predominantly black, more black staff were recruited. To date, it is apparent that this modification in staffing has been most helpful. Rapport between students and faculty in the second year of the program is considerably greater than it was in the first year.

III. This is partly due, too, to the modified student recruitment technique employed in the second year of the program. On the basis of experiences of the first year, it was apparent that selecting students on the basis of performance at the lowest decile of the ACT alone allowed a greater degree of heterogeneity in student ability than could be adequately handled by the staff. The ACT criterion was employed in recruiting students for the second year of the program, but in addition other techniques were also employed. Students were nominated to the program by high school counselors and teachers on the basis of potential. Students were interviewed by Project staff for the purposes of determining the degree of their motivation to attend college and complete it as well as to determine their real level of reading and writing competence.

As a result of the modified recruitment program, it is clear that the majority of the 72 students recruited for the second year program have in common a greater degree of interest in attending college and in acquiring those skills and habits essential to the completion of their college program.

IV. Changes in faculty staffing as well as in the techniques of selecting students for the program were augmented by a more concerted effort on the part of the staff, within the context of its more precise philosophy, to more carefully designed courses, each course prefaced by carefully ennuciated affective and cognitive objectives. Common to each of the three courses included in the curriculum of the program and resulting from the program's overall philosophy is the thesis that the students' life activities are relevant to the academic world as the academic world must be relevant to the students' life activities. Courses within the curriculum will be continually modified within the framework of that concept. Student reaction to a particular course has had and will continue to have important bearing on the course's overall structure and general flavor.

V. The changes outlined above suggest that new and more meaningful ways of evaluation than were used in the first year of the program need to be devised to evaluate the second year of the program. Clearly it is pointless to evaluate "high risk students" on exclusively traditional grounds when the very premise upon which such students are given an opportunity to function within the academic milieu is that they have a potential which the academic milieu has heretofore been unable to

tap and develop. Traditional cognitive measures, for example, will necessarily require review and possible revision, taking into account the life styles of a large group whose background has not provided them with the ingredients for meeting the requirements of a white, middle-class educational structure, but who nevertheless manifest the kind of creative intelligence that is characteristic of the truly educated person.

Finally, it must be noted in this progress report that the Project's relationship that grew out of the staff's awareness last year that students needed an individualized reading program exposure prior to complete participation in the academic program--was extremely well advised.

Almost all of the 72 students in the program the second year have completed the individualized reading program and have clearly profited from it. Many of the students indeed have arranged independently to continue their individualized program beyond the time allocated in the Federal budget. Twelve of the 72 students have failed to continue their program and are now being followed up by the Project counselor.

In conclusion, it should be said that the second year of the Project is a vast improvement over last year's experience. All 72 of the initially recruited students continue to be officially in the program. A more accurate appraisal of their success in terms of completing the requirements of the 18 hours of transferable college credit will not be possible until June. At this point, however, it appears likely that these 72 students will achieve a higher degree of academic success than the 59 students who completed the program in June of 1968.

APPENDIX H

PROJECT SUCCESS BULLETIN

The CHICAGO CITY COLLEGE is pleased to announce the receipt of a grant from the U.S. Office of Education under Title III of the Higher Education Act of 1965.

The grant will enable the College to develop and implement PROJECT SUCCESS, a one year educational program for high school graduates with the potential for completing college level work but with deficiencies in skills and academic areas.

Sponsored by the Wilson Campus in collaboration with Science Peasearch Associates, Inc., PROJECT SUCCESS will be implemented at the Chicago City College's new URBAN EDUCATION CENTER, 330 S. Honore Street. The CENTER has been remodeled to create an exciting educational atmosphere. It will include a learning laboratory (with electronically equipped study carrells) and informal library-reading area, in addition to classrooms and seminar rooms. The interior of the CENTER has been designed to encourage and facilitate a close and continuing interaction between students and staff. Located directly north of the University of Illinois Medical complex, the CENTER is accessible to public and private transportation (Congress Street Subway, Ashland Avenue bus, Eisenhower Expressway - Ashland or Damen exits).

STAFF for Project Success have been assembled from witnin and outside of the eight campuses of the Chicago City College. They have been carefully selected for competence in their respective academic areas, as well as for their imaginativeness and creativity. They are committed to innovation as a means of strengthening curriculum.

THE CURRICULUM which the staff is developing for PROJECT SUCCESS has one goal in sight: to make students in the program eligible for bona fide college courses at the earliest possible time.

The program will be self-paced, i.e., each student will proceed at his own speed under the direction of a member of the faculty. Where required, students will receive tutoring in reading, writing, and mathematics. Operating within an academic context not dissimilar from that of Oxford's don system, students will be encouraged, as the program proceeds and as their individual needs become apparent, to engage in independent study and to participate in workshops designed to increase their mastery of the art of communicating.

Unifying the program will be an interdisciplinary course taught by a practicing artist, an experimental biologist, and specialists in the humanities, language, mathematics, and the social sciences. From the perspectives of these disciplines, the staff will view a common subject-matter. Films, records, and field trips as well as textual materials will be used to stimulate discussions and dialogues.

Constant feedback from students - who will join with faculty in discussions about curriculum - will be invited and encouraged so as to insure the continuing relevance of the program to the student.

Individual and group counseling will be an integral part of the entire program.

THE PROJECT SUCCESS STUDENTS

The 60 students selected to participate in PROJECT SUCCESS will be drawn from applicants to the Loop and Wilson Campuses of the Chicago City College who seek admission to these campuses for the Fall Semester, 1967. Eligible applicants will be invited by mail to participate in the program. Prior to final selection, candidates for the program will be required to take the Chicago City College English Proficiency Examination.

REGISTRATION FEE

Students in the program will be required to pay the $10.00 registration fee required of all full-time students in the Chicago City College.

EMPLOYMENT

Students in the program will be permitted to work no more than 15 hours per week. Students in need of work in order to partially sustain themselves in the program will be counseled into appropriate jobs.

FOR ADDITIONAL INFORMATION ABOUT PROJECT SUCCESS, write:

Dr. Rufus Baehr, Acting Director
City Colleges of Chicago
180 North Michigan Avenue, 11th Floor
Chicago, Illinois 60601