DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 059 330 UD 012 110

AUTHOR Stavros, Denny
TITLE Evaluation of the Summertime Right to Read Program, 1970.
INSTITUTION Detroit Public Schools, Mich. Dept. of Research and Development.
PUB DATE Sep 71
NOTE 31p.

EDRS PRICE MF-$0.65 HC-$3.29
DESCRIPTORS Compensatory Education Programs; Counseling Programs; Elementary School Students; *Inservice Teacher Education; *Program Evaluation; *Reading Instruction; *Remedial Reading Programs; Secondary School Students; Summer Programs; Summer Workshops
IDENTIFIERS Elementary Secondary Education Act Title I; ESEA Title I; *Michigan

ABSTRACT

The project, comprising five specific components, was based on the rationale that trained personnel, making a concentrated effort to correct reading deficiencies in content areas, as well as remedial situations, will increase student achievement and provide teachers the means to assist students to significantly reduce reading difficulties. The "Games and Books" component, enrolling approximately 1299 students, most of whom were in the upper elementary grades, used a tangible rewards motivational system. The "Seven and Ten" component enrolled approximately 3465 students. Its purposes were to: (1) strengthen the reading skills of entering seventh and tenth grade students; (2) provide these students with new confidence and higher expectations; and, (3) improve the skills of the teachers in using diagnostic data and in teaching reading. The Reading Specialist Seminar and the Reading Consultants Seminar were both designed to train school personnel to teach reading and handle reading problems. "The Strengthening Subject Learning Through Reading Improvement" component sought to assist the teaching of reading in content areas, specifically social studies, through in-service teacher training aimed at preparing content areas teachers to give corrective reading instruction to students as they develop their daily lessons. (Author/JM)

DESCRIPTION OF THE PROGRAM

Introduction

The Summertime Right to Read Project was composed of five specific components or programs, which are described below. Taken in sum, the project's rationale as stated in the proposal, was that:

> . . . trained personnel, making a concentrated effort to correct reading deficiencies in content areas, as well as remedial situations, will make a difference in the proficiency of students to achieve, and the ability of teachers to assist students to significantly reduce reading difficulties.

Since the objectives of the total project were to make significant improvements in student reading achievement as well as to provide instruction for teachers in the various phases of reading, a number of approaches were instituted to achieve these aims. These approaches reflect a perception of differential needs in the curriculum as they relate to reading. Each of the components was structured to treat a particular aspect of reading improvement, and while there were commonalities among and between the components, each was sufficiently dissimilar so as to require individual attention in the evaluation. A summary description of each component of The Summertime Right to Read Project follows.

Games and Books

Of a total of nineteen school facilities used by the Games and Books component and exclusive of one parochial school, nine were Title I schools. Four facilities were non-Title I high schools,[1] three out of seven junior high schools were Title I schools, and all but one of the seven public elementary schools were also Title I facilities. (Regular summer school programs did not operate in all of these facilities.)

Approximate student enrolment was 1299 with an average attendance of about 1100 students. The majority of the students were in the upper elementary grades. The Games and Books component staff included:

1. Four reading coordinators whose major responsibility was to see that the program was implemented in the various school facilities. (These four were regular elementary school teachers.)

2. Nine reading consultants who provided diagnostic services either directly with students identified as retarded readers[2]

---

[1]Local school district funds were used for units within the program involving non-Title I students.

[2]According to a proposal prepared by the Continuing Education Department, retarded readers: ". . . are those students who are reading significantly below their capacity rather than merely below their grade level. Both factors -- intellectual capacity and grade level--must be taken into consideration when defining a retarded reader."

or to assist other staff persons with diagnostic procedures. In addition, five of the nine reading consultants supervised student teachers. All nine consultants are teachers at the elementary level.

3. Six librarians, all of whom were regularly elementary school librarians, filled book requests and kept libraries open for book circulation.

4. Thirty reading "center" managers who were responsible for the instructional program. While the majority of the managers were regular elementary teachers, many of the managers were completing a teacher internship and would be placed as elemertary teachers in September, 1970. (For payroll purposes, the interns among the reading center managers were classified and paid at a paraprofessional scale.)

5. Seventy-five student tutors assisted the reading center managers. These seventy-five are regularly junior and senior high school students. A sixth category of personnel was to be a part of this component, but through bureaucratic dysfunction this group--school volunteers--was not brought into the program.

Such an elaborate organization of positions was developed in connection with an extensive program of services. Essentially, this program sought to improve the reading abilities of higher elementary level pupils through a process in which motivation was tied to tangible rewards. Pupils entered into an agreement (contract) to perform a reading task: read a book and answer questions prepared from the book's contents or complete a cross-word puzzle. For each reading task successfully completed, the pupil was rewarded with tokens or script which could then be exchanged for prizes. Prizes included such artifacts as watches, radios, flash cameras, sun glasses, phonograph records and a variety of games, e.g., Bingo, Chinese Checkers, and Monopoly. Rewards in the form of tokens were also earned for other kinds of behavior: punctuality, good attendance, use of the library, reading books in and out of class and recruiting other pupils.

This rewards system received additional reinforcement from such supportive and external motivational sources as provided by pupil peers and parents, the atmosphere of fun created through the use of games, and the individualized reading approach for each pupil through tutorial procedures and prescriptions of material based upon diagnoses.

An interesting facet of this component was the use of games to build reading skills. According to last mentioned proposal:

> Games offer children an approach to learning not usually found in the conventional reading program. They serve as a catalyst which can motivate children to generate maximum effort in learning skills. Reading games can teach recognition, comprehension, interpretation, appreciation, and use.

Games were assembled in what was termed the "Games Factory,"[1] with the intent of establishing a revolving bank of games to be available upon request for each reading center.

The instructional portion of the program operated in the mornings; staff meetings, in-service training, and games factory operations were scheduled for the afternoons.

Seventh and Tenth Grade Reading Project

The Seven and Ten component of the Summertime Right to Read Project operated in nineteen junior high schools, twelve with a Title I designation, and twenty-one senior high schools, nine with a Title I designation.

Approximately 3465 students were enrolled in this component, with an additional sub-grouping of 87 students participating in a variant program at the Kettering High School. The teaching staff numbered approximately 88 junior and senior high school teachers, plus three teachers at Kettering. Two supervisory positions were staffed by four persons who split the assignment into two time periods. (Two of the four are regular supervisors in the Language Education Department.) The supervisors assisted the teachers in identifying special reading-related problems among the students. A third supervisory position, staffed by one person throughout the length of the program, called for reading consultation services.

Specifically, the third supervisor monitored the distribution of materials to the teachers: worked with the senior high school teachers who, in many instances, needed assistance in teaching reading skills; and provided services to as many students as time would permit. The Seven and Ten component had available two BRL (Behavioral Research Laboratory) consultants, paid for by BRL. Both of these consultants had been teachers who were hired by BRL to act as consultants in the implementation of the BRL program into Model Cities Schools (September, 1969). In the present program they performed a similar service.

The rationale of this component, escerpted from the proposal, stated that:

> The time of change from one school level to the next higher one is a crucial period for many pupils. The average pupil who is retarded in school progress and has difficulty in reading tends to drop out of school when he completes the junior high school program and enters the senior high school. (Age 16 is the age of release for many.) The pupil leaving the elementary school to enter the junior high school is confronted with new freedoms of choice and action, and thrown into the exclusive company of youth going through the most difficult period of early adolescence.

---

[1] "Games Factory" was a term of convenience used to refer to the activity of construction and assembly of reading games for use in this component rather than referring to some kind of workshop.

> When the stresses of change and adolescence are compounded by poor reading skills that render the pupil incapable of doing the school work, the pupil goes from one frustration to another.[1]

Thus the stated purposes are to: (1) strengthen the reading skills of entering seventh and tenth grade students, (2) provide these students with a new measure of confidence and expectations for continuing school success, and (3) improve the skills of the teachers in the use of diagnostic data and in teaching reading, through the experience of participating in the program.

A built-in optional benefit of this program was the proposed transfer of credit for participation to a previous failure. Depending upon the discretion of principals, students participating in the Seven and Ten component would be permitted to make-up a previous English failure. Final decision for accepting this arrangement--which would save the student from having to repeat an English failure during the regular school year--was to be made by the principal acting through the school counselor with attention given to the student's attendance record, improvement shown in his classroom work, and his performances on standardized tests.

The EDL (Educational Developmental Laboratory) unit at Kettering High School differed from all other units in its use of sight and sound producing equipment. The instructional program consisted of a four-part cycle:

> . . . (1) perceptual accuracy and visual efficiency, (2) building experiences, (3) skill building, and (4) application and enrichment. This organizational cycle coincides effectively with observable attention spans of students with reading difficulties.

The Seven and Ten component conformed more to the typical summer school arrangement; morning classes five days a week.

Reading Specialist Seminar

This component's purpose was to provide an intensive training program in reading skills to a group of senior high school English teachers--one teacher from each of the Detroit senior high schools--with the expectation that these teachers would function as reading specialists in their respective schools beginning in September, 1970. That is to say, reading-assistance services would be made available to students with reading deficiencies, and the specialist would conduct in-service programs for staff members. The need for this kind of service in the senior high schools was especially keen in view of the fact that there were, with perhaps one or two exceptions, no senior high school reading coordinators.

---

[1]The proposal goes on to note that 4,450 pupils who would be entering the seventh grade in September, 1970, were reading at the fifth grade level or below and another 5,150 pupils, entering the tenth grade, were reading at the eighth grade level or below with almost one-half of these students three or more years retarded in reading ability.

The training program was in the hands of a master teacher who had completed a Master's Degree in reading, and the program's approach was that of providing practical experience. Lectures, field trips, special lectures by invited consultants, demonstration lessons, and shared experiences in reading formed the methodology of training. The formal training phase involved two afternoon sessions per week. A practice phase consisted of on-site work with summer school classes--teachers and students--each morning throughout the summer school term.

Reading Consultants Seminar

The Reading Consultants component was conceptualized in the proposal statement as forming a unit with the Reading Specialist Component:

> The high schools need one or two key people who know how to teach the essential developmental reading habits and skills in all curricular areas. The 22 English teachers and the 44 content area teachers /participants in the Consultants component/ will be trained in afternoon seminars during the summer to set up large group instructional reading classes.

As noted, the participants in this component, forty-four senior high school content area teachers, would be trained to incorporate reading elements into their teaching. More specifically:

> The summer school content area teachers must be retrained to teach all lessons in a highly relevant, sequential, developmental reading fashion. Most content area teachers are specialists in their field, but in most cases their college preparation was void of formal instructions /in reading/.

The Consultants component participants met twice a week for two-hour sessions. The instructor was a senior high school English teacher with a strong reading background who is a high school reading improvement teacher. The approach used was to focus on those basic reading skills having a direct and practical application to specific content areas. Emphasis was placed on developing lesson plans from current textbooks in the various senior high school subject areas, and many of these lessons were demonstrated to the participant-members.

Strengthening Subject Learning Through Reading Improvement[1]

In many respects the Reading Improvement component was a composite of elements found in both the Reading Specialist and Reading Consultants components. The most apparent, though superficial, difference was the participation of junior high school teachers in the Reading Improvement component.

[1]Hereafter referred to as the Reading Improvement component.

The rationale for this component, as stated in the proposal, expressed the view that:

> . . .content area teachers are expected to give corrective reading instruction to students as they develop their daily lessons. Many students show reading aptitude on standardized tests but fail to reach the potential suggested by this aptitude in reading. In other cases, a student's reading scores can be satisfactory, while the student performs poorly in certain content areas. As a result of training received in this component of the reading program, teachers will be able to establish instructional strategies consistent with the reading deficiencies of pupils and the content area for which they are responsible.

The participants in the Reading Improvement component were junior high school English, social studies, or mathematics teachers. All were teaching summer school classes, although all twenty of the summer facilities in which they collectively taught were not junior high schools. These summer school classes were an integral part of the program, since they served as a kind of laboratory for the application of techniques learned and the testing of materials developed in the training or instructional phase of this component. The number of participants in the first weeks of the program was in excess of sixty, but by the end of summer school, the stable enrolment figure was given as fifty-four. In addition, the administrative-instructional staff included a director, three subject area specialists (English, social studies, and mathematics) and three reading demonstration specialists. From the last two mentioned groups, three consultation pairs were formed. In other words, a consultation pair included one of the subject area specialists and a reading demonstration specialists. Their respective responsibilities were to those participants who shared a common subject area.

Perhaps the goals of this component may be best understoood by quoting from the final reports prepared by each consultation pair:

> The goal . . . was to assist teachers in the teaching of reading in the content areas, specifically social studies by:

1. Helping them become knowledgeable of reading goals.

2. Helping them to apply these goals to their particular discipline:

   a) Through the presentation of reading methods
   b) Through the use of the five-step reading approach for planning. /These are vocabulary, idea or theme, sequence, detail and inference/
   c) Through the demonstration of reading techniques.
   d) By providing them with ready reference materials that reinforce reading goals, methods, planning, and techniques.
   e) Through guided teacher preparation of materials to teach reading.

3. By observing teacher's individual application of these goals and individually reinforcing the teacher's direction and use of these goals.

4. By enriching the teacher's background in the reading process and in language development.

Speaking to the factors which were identified as facilitating the achievement of component goals, the English subject matter specialist, from a second consultation pair, observed that:

> . . .one [such factor] was the opportunity given the participants to immediately implement with the classes they taught during the summer--the instruction, suggestions and ideas given in the seminar sessions. That is, since each teacher actually taught regular summer school classes, each was able to gather relevant ideas and materials from the seminar meetings for immediate classroom employment.
>
> . . . Another factor . . . was the appreciable degree of mobility accorded the Consultant and the Specialist. We were able to visit each seminar participant at least twice during the course of the summer.
>
> . . . another factor . . . was the degree of involvement of the participants in our seminar sessions.

The mathematics consultation pair reported on the mini- and maxi-lessons, as part of their evaluation report:

> The participants presented mini-lessons the first four weeks . . . developed and presented demonstration lessons the last four weeks. Our continued emphasis was on the development of a systematic lesson plan which incorporated reading techniques in both introducing vocabulary and directing the reading of a lesson .
>
> Special emphasis was placed upon the introduction of vocabulary in each lesson. It was stressed that new words and symbols should be noted on the chalkboard or screen and then discussed, and defined. The initial period of each seminar was spent on some facet of reading with specific focus on vocabulary and presenting a directed reading lesson. Initial disbelief of the reading inability of these students was dispelled by specific documented examples of difficulty as presented by the team and participants.

While in each subject area reading development was pursued, the specific elements receiving emphasis, of course, varied by the character of the content area. For example, in social science where the sequential element is in a sense built in, emphasis was placed on vocabulary development and the inference process. In mathematics, sequential emphasis and main idea were stressed, while in English, differential attention was directed toward vocabulary development, importance of detail, and the inference process.

A major element in the construction of mini- or maxi-lessons was the use of behavioral objects which tended to bind together the diverse subject areas and differential emphases on reading elements.

OPERATION OF THE PROGRAM: RECRUITMENT PROBLEMS

Each of the five components in the Summertime Right to Read Project was plagued with recruitment problems. Generally, the number of participants at the outset was short of the expectations listed in the proposal and of course below that either anticipated or desired by those planning and directing the various components. For example, the proposal called for "forty-four high school content area teachers," to be trained as Reading Consultants and these teachers, once trained, would provide, together with the Reading Specialist, a team of "Key people who know how to teach the essential developmental reading habits and skills in all curricular areas." Only eighteen teachers were trained as Reading Consultants. They represented twelve schools; one of which was a junior high school. The Reading Specialist group numbered sixteen teachers representing thirteen schools, with one, a junior high school. Inability to reach full complement of trainees in either component has been attributed to the "Lateness of announcement for all high schools to participate."[1] Evidence, however, would indicate that the timing of announcements, insofar as this was the case with one component, was indeed soon enough.[2] This of course might imply that all other factors affecting recruitment, apart from the timing of announcements, operated smoothly. This was not the case. Throughout the short duration of this project all components were also, to a greater or lesser degree, plagued with organizational problems, i.e., problems related to the coordination of the programs' many elements. Although this will be noted in greater detail below in the presentation and discussion of questionnaire responses, the following list extracted from the Director's report provides sufficient examples of the lack of coordination of activities:

> Lack of adequate time for thorough organization and communication,
> Difficulty in delivery of materials,
> Difficulty in receiving prompt payment,
> Difficulty in having appropriate materials and supplies when needed,
> Lateness in notification of assignments, meetings, etc.,
> Lack of adequate orientation for personnel before programs began, and
> Difficulty in having adequate supply of needed standardized tests available.

The difficulty in recruiting students is documented in a series of memos which record the changes in the criteria used for admission of students together with urgent requests for action in filling quotas in the Seven and Ten component.

> The initial announcement was made in a memo issued on May 7, 1970 to school principals. As noted above, this memo summarized the purpose of the program and listed the criteria for student participation: "Tuition-free classes will be offered to present 6A and 9A pupils who are retarded in reading, two years or more below grade level on recent pupil score reports of the ITBS"

---

[1]Delores Minor, "Final Report: Summertime Right to Read Program," Memo, August 7, 1970.

[2]An announcement outlining the Seven and Ten component was issued as a memo to all principals of schools with a sixth or a ninth grade enrolment on May 7, 1970.

A memo dated May 8th requested teachers interested in summer school teaching to complete an application section of the memo and return it to the Language Education Department by May 18th.

On May 13th a follow-up memo was issued to establish the number of 6A and 9A students expected to attend the Seven and Ten Classes. A listing of school sites for the Seven and Ten component was contained in a memo dated May 15th. A memo requesting summer school principals to set aside, "one or two rooms for the summer school reading improvement classes in your summer school building," was sent on May 19th.

By the end of May, it apparently became clear that registration was proceeding at a slow pace. To help stimulate more registration, an "Urgent" memo was issued on June 1st including the following revision:

> Any student, one or more years retarded in reading on recent score reports of the Iowa Tests of Basic Skills, entering grades 7B-7A, 8B-8A, 9B-9A, and 10B (only) in September, 1970, may attend a tuition free class.

An undetermined number of teachers who had indicated an interest in the summer school program were notified that their application had been accepted but because of the, "problem of obtaining anticipated student enrolment figures, "assignment would be forthcoming. This information was contained in a memo issued June 2nd.

Two days later, other teachers were informed that their applications could not be accepted because of insufficient registrations; however, they were asked if they wished to be kept on the list, pending an increase in student number; or if they were interested in participating as substitutes during the summer program.

Notifications of the summer school assignments were made in memos dated June 10th. The program was to begin on June 15th with the enroling of students at the local summer school.

During the early weeks of the program's operation efforts to increase the size of student enrolment were continued.

According to the director's final report, student enrolment in the Seven and Ten component, reached 3,465. This was far in excess of the 500 entering seventh grade and 500 entering tenth grade students anticipated in the proposal. Of course, the revision of the reading proficiency criteria and the admission of students from other grade levels, as well as the policy of not restricting participation solely to students attending Title I schools, account for the difference in size.

However, from an evaluation perspective the number of students attending the Seven and Ten component is progressively reduced when test data are taken into account. From a total enrolment figure of 3,465, information on test performance--either pretest, posttest or both--was received for 2,148 students or 61 per cent of the total enrolment from project schools. By limiting the analysis to students with both pre- and posttest scores who were also enroled for at least six weeks and absent no more than ten days, the total thus derived was 1,440 or 41 per cent of the enrolment figure. Of this group, a minority (419) was students attending Title I schools and the majority (1,021 or 71% was students attending non-Title I schools. Although the grades represented by this reduced group of 1,440 ranged from as low as 5A to as high as 12B, the tendency was for a concentration of entering seventh grade students (657) and to a much lesser degree, o entering tenth grade students (150). (Similarly, there was a reduction in the number of cases, from the sum recorded in the Director's report, when test data were examined in the Games and Books component.)

Eventually, a rather large number of students participated in both the Seven and Ten and the Games and Books components and benefits were most probably gained by these students. Because of the largeness of sample size coupled with limited clerical assistance, a check on the initial slippage in numbers of students between the 3,465 reported enrolment in the Seven and Ten component and an accounting for 2,148 cases for which there was information on test scores was precluded. It was felt that more would be gained in allocating clerical time to checking the posted test scores from the Seven and Ten test sheets (pretest) and machine scoring posttests.[1] The difference between the 2148 cases registered in the computer and the 1,440 cases for which useable test data were available, can be attributed mainly to the restrictions imposed out of a consideration to control for continued exposure to the program--in terms of length of enrolment and attendance. Thus one-third of the cases where test information was available was discarded because a comparison between pre- and posttest scores would not be valid. Additionally, if the 673 cases, where a check on the accuracy of tabulated pretest scores was precluded because answer sheets were not available, are considered to be of somewhat doubtful validity, the size of the sample is further reduced to 797. And while this latter sample of cases provided a basis for an assessment of the changes in student performance on standardized tests, quite obviously a broad measure of the effectiveness of the program is not possible.

As mentioned above, this same problem obtained in the Games and Books component i.e., a decrease in the number of cases available for statistical analysis. Although a total enrolment of 1,299 students was recorded and an average attendance of 1,100 was also listed, only 311 cases could be used in the comparison of pre- and posttest scores. Of this group, approximately, half were students regularly attending Title I schools.

[1]Plus rescoring the Games and Books test booklets.

Thus, in both of these components the difference in numbers between enrolment and complete test scores can be attributed largely to late student participation, high absentee rates and/or actual, if not official, withdrawal from the respective program.[1]

EFFECTIVENESS OF TWO COMPONENTS

The effectiveness of the Summertime Right to Read Program may be observed in a comparison of pre- and posttest scores as displayed in two sets of tables below for two components, respectively: Games and Books and Seven and Ten.

Games and Books

In the Games and Books component two different test batteries were employed. The Stanford Diagnostic Reading Test was administered at the outset for the purpose of establishing a profile for each student to serve as a basis for developing individualized programs of reading. The selection of Stanford Reading Achievement tests for posttesting resulted from a variety of reasons: a decision to obtain a measure of reading achievement; an almost last minute search for the availability of testing instruments of sufficient number to administer to the students still enrolled in the program; and the need for an instrument which would require much less time for administration than, for example, a diagnostic reading test and, which would at the same time be both comprehensive in scope and could be used for comparison purposes vis-a-vis the pretest diagnostic instrument. Test score data for the Games and Books component are presented in Tables 1 and 2, aggregated by test level, grade of students, and differentiated by Title I school attendance (Table 1) and non-Title I school attendance (Table 2). All cases were excluded where any of the subtest scores, name of school, or grade of student was not included. Thirty-four additional cases were excluded because posttest protocols were not returned. In all the cases represented in Tables 1 and 2 the test protocols were rescored.[2]

---

[1] Information bearing on staff withdrawal was available from the Reading Improvement component. At the end of July, twenty-five teachers were listed as dropouts in a report issued by the director of this component. A follow-up on these, by the director, established that out of the eleven responding, four were participating in other summer programs, three were attending university, one was writing a book, still another was out because of illness and two said they withdrew because the workshop was not what they felt they wanted.

[2] Data for students attending parochial schools were not included in these tables. Diagnostic subtest raw scores and product moment correlation coefficients among these scores at each grade level were computed and, although not included in this report, are available.

In comparing for the difference between the pretest mean scores and the posttest[2] mean scores, the grade equivalent or conversion scores[1] should be used.

Because of small numbers per grade level, only two comparisons in Table 1, and three in Table 2 were possible without too great a risk for interpreting error.

---

[1]Grade conversion scores were determined from the computed raw score means.

[2]These should be read, as for example in Table 1, column one (Test level A, third grade) under pretest, Reading Comprehension, Grade Conversion score equals 22: two years and two months level. In other words, third grade students registered a pretest (mean) score of two years and two months in reading comprehension and on the posttest reading achievement subtests achieved a (mean) score on word meaning of between three years and one month and three years and two months; on the posttest paragraph meaning subtest, their (mean) score was two years and six months.

TABLE 1

MEANS AND STANDARD DEVIATIONS (RAW SCORE) AND GRADE CONVERSIONS OF RAW SCORE MEANS OF PRE- AND POSTTEST SCORES ON VARIOUS STANFORD READING TESTS FOR STUDENTS REGULARLY ATTENDING TITLE I SCHOOLS WHO PARTICIPATED IN THE GAMES AND BOOKS COMPONENT, THE SUMMERTIME RIGHT TO READ PROJECT, 1970 (N = 159)

		TEST LEVEL A[a]				TEST LEVEL B[b]		
PRETEST	GRADE:	THIRD (N=4	FOURTH (N=46)	FIFTH (N=75)	SIXTH (N=12)	SEVENTH (N=10)	EIGHTH (N=8)	NINTH (N=4)
Reading Comp.	M	20.25	25.21	31.77	34.50	26.40	38.50	30.00
	SD	8.26	9.30	8.57	5.66	7.48	12.04	13.29
Grade Conver. Score	M	22	23	26-27	28-29	41-42	57-58	45
POSTTEST								
Word Meaning Raw Score	M	8.75	12.00	15.52	14.75			
	SD	5.43	6.48	6.68	3.46			
Grade Conver. Score	M	31-32	36	39-41	38-39			
Paragraph Meaning Raw Score	M	13.00	18.34	23.34	23.66	16.40	27.25	15.50
	SD	8.28	7.71	9.25	10.06	7.94	12.88	8.42
Grade Conver. Score	M	26	31-32	38-39	38-39	48-50	68-70	46-48

[a]Pretest: Stanford Diagnostic Reading Test, Level I (for the middle of Grade 2 to the middle of Grade 4).
Posttest: Stanford Achievement Test, Intermediate I, Reading Tests (for Grade 4 to the middle of Grade 5).

[b]Pretest: Stanford Diagnostic Reading Test, Level II (for the middle of Grade 4 to the middle of Grade 8).
Posttest: Stanford Achievement Test, Advanced, Paragraph Meaning Test (for Grades 7,8, and 9).

TABLE 2

MEANS AND STANDARD DEVIATIONS (RAW SCORE) AND GRADE CONVERSIONS OF RAW SCORE MEANS OF PRE- AND POSTTEST SCORES ON VARIOUS STANFORD READING TESTS FOR STUDENTS REGULARLY ATTENDING NON-TITLE I SCHOOLS WHO PARTICIPATED IN THE GAMES AND BOOKS COMPONENT, THE SUMMERTIME RIGHT TO READ PROJECT, 1970 (N=152)

		TEST LEVEL A[a]				TEST LEVEL B[b]			
PRETEST	GRADE:	THIRD	FOURTH	FIFTH	SIXTH	SIXTH	SEVENTH	EIGHTH	NINTH
Reading Comp.		(N=9)	(N=32)	(N=36)	(N=32)	(N=7)	(N=13)	(N=16)	(N=7)
	M	23.22	25.56	33.83	34.93	32.28	30.61	35.43	42.57
	SD	9.84	9.48	6.75	7.46	8.11	9.44	7.99	4.15
Grade Conver. Score	M	22-23	23	28	28-29	48-50	45-46	52-53	64-67
POSTTEST									
Word Meaning									
Raw Score	M	11.00	13.18	14.97	16.56				
	SD	5.40	9.08	6.90	5.87				
Grade Conver. Score	M	35	37-38	38-39	41-42				
Paragraph Meaning	M	10.77	17.28	22.27	26.09	16.14	16.30	19.68	23.71
Raw Score	SD	6.33	6.07	8.84	8.76	2.91	8.29	4.93	8.82
Grade Conver. Score	M	23-24	30-31	37-38	41-42	48-50	48-50		62-64

[a] Pre- and Posttest: see note in Table I

[b] Pre- and Posttest: see note in Table I

In each of five grade groups the gains in mean scores are impressive: fourth and fifth grades (Table 1, Test Level A) and fourth, fifth and sixth (Table 2, Test Level A). For roughly two months of concentrated reading improvement effort, reading score improved one academic year. Of some interest is the fact that in Table 2 (Level A), the pretest means for the fourth, fifth, and sixth grades were all below the third grade level (reading comprehension) while on both posttest subtests (word meaning and paragraph meaning) means ranged from third grade to fourth grade level.[1] Viewed from the perspective of reading retardation, students at the sixth grade were approximately three years in arrears at the time the pretest was administered; two months later, their retardation in reading ability had decreased to two years.

Seven and Ten

Gains in reading ability, i.e., reading comprehension and vocabulary for the Seven and Ten component are presented in Tables 3 through 6. Test score data from this component were separated by Title I or non-Title I school attendance (schools the students normally attend) and whether tests protocols were rechecked or not. (In other words, checked is used to designate the comparison made between tabulated pretest scores with machine scored results printed on the answer sheets.) Furthermore, data displayed in each table were grouped by student grade. In all cases, the scores displayed are in grade equivalent or conversion form.[2] Of the gains displayed for the 7B and 10B students in Tables 3 and 4, the most impressive are those for the 10B students. On both subtests, these students increased one academic year in reading comprehension and one year and six months in vocabulary. While gains were not as marked among the 7B students in both tables, there was a mean net gain of from two to five months. It is of some interest to note that the dispersion around the mean (as measured by the standard deviation) was much more spread out for 10B students on both pretest subtests (e.g., Table 3, reading comprehension, SD=2.08), than was the case for 7B students (e.g., Table 3 reading comprehension, SD=1.42). Assuming that this is not an artifact related to the characteristics of the test instrument per se, this then would indicate much more variability, i.e., the manifestation of a wide range in levels of reading proficiency among upper grade students in reading abilities than that found at a lower level. Thus there is a greater need at the upper level for more individualized instruction. At this level, roughly two-thirds of the 10B students (Table 3) ranged from 4 years, 2 months to 8 years, 3 months in reading comprehension, as compared to a range of from 2 years, 5 months to 5 years, 3 months for two-thirds of the 7B students.

---

[1]It should be noted that the pretest instrument (Stanford Diagnostic Reading Test) has a low ceiling (grade equivalent score of 5.1) which tends to depress pretest mean scores.

[2]Thus, in Table 3 posttest gain on reading comprehension (mean) score (.39) should be read point three nine months gain or approximately four months gain.

TABLE 3

GATES-MACGINITIE[1] SUB-TESTS GRADE CONVERSION MEANS AND STANDARD DEVIATIONS OF PRETEST SCORES AND POSTTEST GAINS: MEANS OF BRL BOOKS COMPLETED FOR STUDENTS REGULARLY ATTENDING TITLE I[2] SCHOOLS WHO PARTICIPATED IN THE SEVEN AND TEN COMPONENT, THE SUMMERTIME RIGHT TO READ PROJECT, 1970, WHO COMPLETED BOTH PRE-[3] AND POSTTESTS (N=609)

		7B (N=70)	7A (N=19)	8B (N=18)	9B (N=7)	9A (N=11)	10B (N=38)	10A (N=6)	11B (N=9)	12B (N=10)
Reading Comp. Pretest	M	3.96	4.01	5.07	9.12	6.86	6.29	5.61	7.38	6.42
	SD	1.42	1.08	2.11	1.63	2.34	2.08	1.59	3.40	2.39
Posttest Gain	M	.39	.17	.30	1.11	.44	1.12	.50	1.27	1.28
	SD	1.00	.57	1.21	1.61	1.84	2.13	1.21	1.84	1.98
Vocabulary Pretest	M	4.39	4.49	5.43	8.22	6.34	6.44	6.08	6.86	6.98
	SD	1.23	1.18	1.88	2.31	2.63	2.13	2.13	3.58	2.22
Posttest Gain	M	.60	- .02	.02	1.34	.45	1.66	2.33	1.52	1.86
	SD	1.41	.37	1.64	3.68	1.94	2.29	1.70	1.87	2.46
BRL		(N=19)	(N=5)	(N=2)	(N=0)	(N=3)	(N=28)	(N=3)	(N=9)	(N=8)
N. Books Completed	M	3.15	5.00	2.50		4.00	3.25	2.00	3.00	2.62

[1]Senior high level students were tested on the Survey E; Others, on the Survey D level; Pretest (1M); Posttest (2M). Grade Score Conversions are used above.

[2]All students who were enrolled for five weeks or less and were absent more than ten days were excluded from the analysis.

[3]Tabulations of pretest scores were checked for accuracy from machine scored answer sheets.

TABLE 4

GATES-MACGINITIE[1] SUB-TESTS GRADE CONVERSION MEAN AND STANDARD DEVIATION OF PRETEST SCORES AND POSTTEST GAINS: MEAN OF BRL BOOKS COMPLETED FOR STUDENTS REGULARLY ATTENDING NON-TITLE I[2] SCHOOLS WHO PARTICIPATED IN THE SEVEN AND TEN COMPONENT, THE SUMMERTIME RIGHT TO READ PROJECT, 1970, WHO COMPLETED BOTH PRE-[3] AND POSTTESTS (N=609)

Reading Comprehension		6B (N=33)	6A (N=14)	7B (N=292)	7A (N=46)	8B (N=55)	8A (N=35)	9B (N=39)	9A (N=25)	10B (N=60)	10A (N=10)
Pretest	M	2.93	4.22	3.86	4.75	5.69	5.45	6.52	5.98	7.25	4.54
	SD	.83	1.22	1.36	2.01	2.30	1.86	1.96	2.17	2.35	2.35
(Posttest) Gain	M	.43	- .13	.67	.88	1.16	1.34	.95	1.07	1.05	1.09
	SD	.66	1.12	1.31	1.69	1.68	1.90	2.52	2.01	1.82	2.18
Vocabulary Pretest	M	3.08	4.22	4.12	4.76	6.14	6.40	7.01	6.80	6.57	5.25
	SD	.91	.84	1.51	1.98	2.10	2.32	2.13	1.81	2.30	2.29
(Posttest) Gain	M	.46	- .04	.72	.65	.75	1.26	1.45	.70	1.62	.95
	SD	.98	.59	1.44	1.83	2.06	2.22	1.69	1.74	1.53	1.75
Number BRL Books Completed		(N=4)	(N=13)	(N=121)	(N=15)	(N=23)	(N=8)	(N=7)	(N=16)	(N=21)	(N=3)
	M	2.25	1.76	3.19	3.06	2.65	5.50	7.00	4.43	3.42	6.00

[1]Senior high level students were tested on the Survey E; Others, on the Survey D level; Pretest (1M); Posttest (2M). Grade Score Conversions are used above.

[2]All students who were enrolled for five weeks or less and were absent more than ten days were excluded from the analysis.

[3]Tabulations of pretest scores were checked for accuracy from machine scored answer sheets.

TABLE 5

GATES-MACGINITIE[1] SUB-TESTS GRADE CONVERSION MEAN AND STANDARD DEVIATION OF PRETEST SCORES AND POSTTEST GAINS; MEAN OF BRL BOOKS COMPLETED FOR STUDENTS REGULARLY ATTENDING TITLE I[2] SCHOOLS WHO PARTICIPATED IN THE SEVEN AND TEN COMPONENT, THE SUMMERTIME RIGHT TO READ PROJECT, 1970 WHO COMPLETED BOTH PRE[3] AND POSTTESTS (N=231)

Reading Comprehension		6B (N=11)	6A (N=9)	7B (N=160)	7A (N=9)	8B (N=18)	9B (N=16)	10B (N=8)
Pretest	M	3.60	3.75	3.91	4.11	6.27	5.93	5.85
	SD	1.41	.94	1.09	1.93	2.03	3.41	2.45
(Posttest) Gain	M	.49	.84	.83	.26	1.07	-.11	.51
	SD	.70	1.54	1.40	2.36	1.67	1.80	1.19
Vocabulary Pretest	M	4.38	4.38	4.22	4.84	6.26	5.81	5.53
	SD	2.22	1.69	1.29	2.20	1.28	2.59	2.23
(Posttest) Gain	M	.47	.54	.91	- .56	1.58	1.45	1.05
	SD	1.14	1.49	1.34	1.06	1.75	1.22	2.71
Number BRL Books Completed	M	(N=8) 4.00	(N=0)	(N=97) 5.83	(N=6) 4.33	(N=6) 6.66	(N=6) 5.66	(N=2) 4.50

[1]Senior high level students were tested on the Survey E; Others, on the Survey D level: Pretest (1M); Posttest (2M), Grade Score Conversions are used above.

[2]All students who were enrolled for five weeks or less and were absent more than ten days were excluded from the analysis.

[3]Because answer sheets were not available, pretest scores could not be checked for accuracy.

TABLE 6

GATES-MACGINITIE[1] SUB-TESTS GRADE CONVERSION MEAN AND STANDARD DEVIATION OF PRETEST SCORES AND POSTTEST GAINS; MEAN OF BRL BOOKS COMPLETED FOR STUDENTS REGULARLY ATTENDING NON-TITLE I[2] SCHOOLS WHO PARTICIPATED IN THE SEVEN AND TEN COMPONENT, THE SUMMERTIME RIGHT TO READ PROJECT, 1970, WHO COMPLETED BOTH PRE[3] AND POSTTESTS (N=412)

Reading Comprehension		5A (N=9)	6B (N=5)	6A (N=17)	7B (N=135)	7A (N=28)	8B (N=52)	8A (N=46)	9B (N=55)	9A (N=21)	10B (N=44)
Pretest	M	3.17	3.68	4.26	4.68	4.73	5.18	5.55	6.84	6.68	7.05
	SD	1.28	1.33	1.58	1.84	1.94	2.04	1.40	2.20	2.67	2.37
(Posttest)	M	1.34	.62	1.01	1.50	1.52	2.06	1.32	.82	.45	.50
Gain	SD	1.51	.80	.74	2.21	2.26	2.47	1.51	1.78	2.20	1.64
Vocabulary											
Pretest	M	3.70	4.40	4.72	4.97	5.55	5.30	5.66	6.26	6.85	7.03
	SD	1.15	1.53	1.54	1.43	2.07	1.89	1.78	2.05	2.51	2.29
(Posttest)	M	.67	.08	.17	1.51	.77	1.37	.93	.94	1.01	1.45
Gain	SD	1.22	.91	.50	2.51	1.50	2.15	1.68	1.87	2.36	1.69
Number		(N=0)	(N=4)	(N=0)	(N=79)	(N=13)	(N=17)	(N=15)	(N=17)	(N=6)	(N=7)
BRL Books Completed	M		3.00		3.06	2.92	4.76	4.60	5.35	3.00	2.14

[1]Senior high level students were tested on the Survey E; Others, on the Survey D level: Pretest (1M); Posttest (2M). Grade Score Conversions are used above.

[2]All students who were enrolled for five weeks or less and were absent more than ten days were excluded from the anlysis.

[3]Because answer sheets were not available, pretest scores could not be checked for accuracy.

It may be observed in Tables 5 and 6, with due caution to a high error probability in the displayed scores, because lacking answer sheets, the tabulations of pre-test scores could not be checked for accuracy, that for the 7B students the net increase is beyond a half-year on both subtests in Table 5, and beyond a full school year in Table 6. For 10B students,[1] the net increase in reading comprehension is about 3 months and over one year in vocabulary in Table 6.

Thus on the basis of these comparisons, both components were effective since rather good gains in reading performance were registered.[2]

Before considering the responses on questionnaires completed by the participants, the results from pre- and posttest administered to the small group of students at the Kettering High School-EDL sub-component are presented in Table 7. The majority of the students, for which information of grade level was available for about half, were in the ninth grade.

TABLE 7

GATES-MACGINITIE[3] SUB-TESTS GRADE CONVERSION MEAN OF PRETEST SCORES AND POSTTEST GAINS FOR STUDENTS (TITLE I) ENROLLED IN THE EDL SUB-COMPONENT AT THE KETTERING HIGH SCHOOL, SEVEN AND TEN COMPONENT, (N=66)

Class Hour	Reading Comprehension (N)	Pretest	(N)	(Posttest) Gain	Vocabulary (N)	Pretest	(N)	(Posttest) Gain
First	(22)	4.48	(22)	1.82	(22)	5.47	(22)	.67
Second	(20)	4.86	(20)	.77	(20)	5.31	(18)	.82
Third	(23)	5.22	(22)	1.31	(11)	6.46	(11)	1.09
All Groups	(65)	4.86	(64)	1.32	(53)	5.61	(51)	.80

[1]The N in Table 5 for 10B students is small

[2]In addition data on mean number of BRL books completed applied to even fewer students, the mean of three is an accurate completion total for both 7B and 10B students in Tables 3 and 4. (There was no check on accuracy of the figures provided from each component site.) In addition, while no systematic data on the Games and Books token economy operation were available, according to the Director's report, the students earned 66,124 tokens.

[3]Survey E, Pretest (1M); Posttest (2M). Apparently the EDL approach was as successful as the BRL approach in raising reading performance levels of the students--at the Kettering High School. Overall the net mean gain in reading comprehension was more than one academic year, and in vocabulary skills, the net mean gain was half of an academic year. (These results are based on test score information provided by the sub-component staff.)

EVALUATION OF COMPONENT ELEMENTS: QUESTIONNAIRE RESPONSES OF PARTICIPANTS

A questionnaire was prepared and administered to the participants of each component in the Summertime Right to Read program during the last week of operation. In the main the focus of the items included in the instrument was on establishing the participants' evaluation of their respective components, their recommendations for similar future projects, and their proposed utilization, during the re ular school program of new skills, approaches, and material gained as a result of their participation. The discussion to follow will present the major finding in summary form.[1]

Table 8 displays the numbers of respondents completing questionnaires by project component. Taking in account the fact that the questionnaires will be administer- on the last two days of the program's operation--and these days were crowded with termination activities including an "in-house" evaluation form--the number of questionnaires completed was high. Thus, all those participating in the Reading Specialists component completed questionnaires; as did two-thirds in the Reading Consultants component; 43 out of 54 among the Reading Improvement teachers although the latter figure may be slightly inflated; 45 of 47 professionals and 33 out of 59 student tutors in the Games and Books component (and here again, the latter figure may be also inflated) and 68 out of 91 in the Seven and Ten component. Although the three teachers comprising the Kettering High School-EDL sub-component completed questionnaires, their responses were not included in the Tables.[2] In addition there were five or six questionnaires which, while most items were completed, were excluded from the analysis since no project component was identified and none could be deduced from the content of the responses.

TABLE 8

NUMBER OF PARTICIPANTS COMPLETING QUESTIONNAIRE BY PROJECT COMPONENT

Project Component	Number
Reading Specialists	17
Reading Consultants	12
Reading Improvement	43
Games and Books	78
(Professional)	(45)
(Student tutors)	(33)
Seven and Ten	68
Totals	218

[1]A sum total of 34 tables were prepared and are available from the Evaluation Department. These cover the majority of questionnaire items.

[2]This was because the responses of this teacher trio reflect a decidedly different frame of reference from all others in the even and en component. Suffice it to say, that the three were attracted to the program because of the EDL experiment and have become strong advocates for expansion into the regular school program.

Reasons for Participation (Multiple Responses)

Among the Reading Specialists, 41% indicated that they participated in this program because of an opportunity to develop skills and competence as a reading professional; 24% said that they were motivated from a desire to develop skills in teaching reading in the context of specific subject areas; and an equal percentage indicated a concern for reading difficulties among their students.

Equal proportions of Reading Consultants (42%) expressed a desire to develop general skills in the teaching of reading, and to develop teaching of reading skills as would apply to specific subject areas.

This latter reason was also mentioned by 29%, and the former reason by 19% of the Reading Improvement participants.

Economic considerations were most important for the Games and Books student tutors since almost two-thirds mentioned the need for a summer job as a reason for their participation. One-fourth also said they liked working with children. Among the Games and Books professionals, about one-fourth were involved because their participation was credited as a student-teaching assignment. One-fourth were attracted to this component because of the proported emphasis on experimentation, new materials, and the focus on student motivation.

Approximately one-fourth of the Seven and Ten respondents said that the project provided both summer employment and a chance to teach. Seventeen per cent viewed the program as an opportunity to help develop reading skills in students.

Sources Participants First Learned of the Program (Multiple Response)

Approximately two-thirds of the Reading Specialists, and one-third of the Reading Consultants said the principal or assistant principal was the agent from whom they first learned of the program. About one-third of the Reading Specialists and roughly 60% of the Reading Consultants identified a subject area department head.

On the other hand, Reading Improvement participants mentioned a circular or letter (23%), the principal or assistant p4incipal (21%), and the summer school principal (19%).

Games and Books professionals identified a wide variety of sources with about one-third stating that because their participation was part of a student-teaching assignment they were informed about the program in this context. Approximately one-fourth mentioned an administrator who was instrumental in developing the total program at the proposal stage. Forty per cent of the student tutors listed friends and others, and one-fourth mentioned their school counselor.

Seven and Ten participants reported a circular or letter (35%), or department head (19%).

Main Strengths of Each Component (Multiple Responses)

Among the Reading Specialists, between one-third and two-fifths identified the following characteristics as main strengths of the component:

Many guest speakers who were both knowledgeable and experienced presented a variety of perspectives

Exposure to a number of methods for teaching reading and remediation

Preparation of a materials kit

Observation of on-site teaching

Approximately one-fourth mentioned:

Exposure to a large variety of reading instructional materials

Opportunity of some participants to present demonstration lessons

Presence of participants who were trained and experienced as reading teachers was a benefit to others

High motivation and positive attitudes toward component goals of the participants

By contrast, the Reading Consultants were somewhat less generous in their enumeration of main component strengths. Almost one-half cited the presentations by guest speakers. Over one-third pointed to the lesson demonstrations given by the participants and the same proportion noted the exchange of ideas among the participants.

While among the Reading Improvement participants a large variety of answers were given: the response proportion to any one category of answers was no greater than one-third. The variety of approaches to teaching reading presented for each of the three major curriculum areas was viewed by one-third as a major strength. A little less than one-third indicated that the reading and subject area specialists were both competent and stimulating, while one-fifth praised the advice and criticism received from the specialists who observed their teaching in regular summer school classes. An equal proportion noted the practicality of the demonstration lessons. Eighteen per cent (respectively) mentioned:

The new teaching ideas and methods for reinforcement
The meaningful exchange of ideas among participants
The abundance and quality of written material made available

Games and books professionals emphasized the unique elements of this component. About one-third noted the enthusiasm and motivation shown by the pupils, one-fourth pointed to the use of immediate rewards andreinforcement, and approximately 20 per cent (respectively) regarded each of the following as major strengths:

The use of games to teach reading and motivate learning
The emphasis on making reading an enjoyable experience
The use of contingency contracts
The individualization of instruction
The use of prizes to motivate learning, encourage attendance, and attract children to the program.

Among the student tutors the use of prizes to motivate learning was identified by 39%, the use of games to teach reading (28%), and the emphasis on specific skills development (17%) were viewed as major strengths. It should be noted that the percentage of student tutors answering this and subsequent questions markedly declined. Out of a total of thirty-three student tutors completing questionnaires, as few as ten answered many of the items on the questicnnaire.

Seven and Ten participants focused on the smallness of the class size (26%) and the quality and variety by grade level of materials (25%). One-fifth respectively, emphasized these program strengths by pointing to other material in series, kits, or paperback singles; the structuring of classes so that each child could experience success; and the use of programmed materials that provided immediate feedback. About one-fifth mentioned the cooperative spirit among staff members.

Weaknesses in Each Component (Multiple Responses)

The two most frequently mentioned weaknesses in the comments of the Reading Specialists relate to the lack of opportunities to gain practical experience in the application of reading techniques with children who have reading problems (69%), and limited opportunities to test, diagnose, and create a remedial reading plan for the same type of pupil (25%). One-fifth noted the mixed levels of professional competence among the participants as a component weakness.

The focus of the responses to this question by the Reading Consultants was upon lack of organization in this component (36%), lack of or superficiality of instruction (27%), incompetent, inefficient adminisration (18%), lack of a sense of direction (18%). Besides, almost half mentioned that there was very little participation by teachers and a tendency to overestimate teacher abilities; about one-fifth said that there was a lack of access to, involvement of, or opportunity to observe professionals.

One-fourth, respectively, of the Reading Improvement participants underscored various process inadequacies such as absenteeism among group members, infrequent opportunities to get to know other participants, and lack of in-depth consultation with teacher-participants because of time. Another one-fourth pointed to weaknesses related to the inability of the specialists to make more than one classroom visit to observe each of the participants.

Approximately one-half of the Games and Books professionals noted the late arrival of supplies, and another one-fifth mentioned that there apparently was a shortage of supplies and equipment, such as one SRA kit for two classes and not enough girls' prizes. Almost half of the professionals indicated that pre-service training was either lacking or what training and preparation did take place was inadequate. Much along the same perspective were the comments to the effect that organization was either weak, poor, or non-existent (29%). One-fourth of the professionals saw the student tutors as constituting a weakness of this component, that is, the tutors either failed to understand their obligations, they were initially poorly screened, or their work was of poor quality. On the other hand, the tutors viewed insufficient supplies and equipment (27%), organizational failings (23%), late arrival of supplies (18%), and lack of variety in the games used coupled with diminished interest in or over-dependency on working for points (18%) as major weaknesses. (Two-thirds of the student tutors answered this question.)

Insufficient supplies and equipment was mentioned by roughly one-fifth of the Seven and Ten participants. However, two-fifths noted that the material used was either too easy or not relevant. Other weaknesses given--of which there were twenty categories--fell in a frequency range of 13 to 2 per cent.

Materials Not Available Which Would Be An Important Addition in Future Programs
(Multiple Responses)

Textbooks covering the teaching of reading and testing materials were suggested by about one-third, respectively, of the Reading Specialists. (In connection with including testing materials, a testing tutorial program covering administration, diagnosis, and remediation was also mentioned, although this is not in any proper sense a "material".) One-fifth included workbooks and manuals and an equal proportion specified the need for more secondary school study guides.

Approximately 30 per cent of the Reading Consultants said that they could not adequately make any suggestions since they were not sufficiently familiar enough either with the field or with the kinds of material available. The remaining suggestions (all with a response frequency of 14%) were essentially for various types of listings or textbook guides.

Among the Reading Improvement participants no one category of items was mentioned by more than 16 per cent of those responding. However, those items receiving the highest responses were for audio-visual hard and software.

Laminating machines (24%), commercially prepared or just more games (21%), and audio-visual equipment (tape recorder, 18%; record player, 18%) were noted by the Games and Books professionals. However, many items were suggested, and these ranging from English books, word charts to ruled paper and brads. This, perhaps, indicates a lack of many materials, supplies, and equipment. Only one-third of the student tutors completing questionnaires answered this question. Of those who did, one-fourth had nothing to suggest, one-fourth mentioned more mature prizes for the older pupils and provided examples. (Eight per cent recommended a free lunch for staff members.)

A wide ranging assortment of materials were suggested by the Seven and Ten participants. About one-fifth suggested a phonics textbook, workbooks, flash cards and charts, and about one-sixth indicated the need for paperbacks of wider reading levels, more Black literature with higher vocabulary content, and books for circulation.

Most Helpful Services and Procedures--Most Beneficial Parts of Component (Multiple Responses)

The Reading Specialists noted that the most beneficial parts of the component were the presentations of a Language Department Supervisor (53%), an administrator for the Psychological Testing Department (41%) and two reading demonstrations by specialists (35% and 29%, respectively). Twenty-nine per cent mentioned a visitation to an elementary school. About one-fourth noted the demonstration of EDL materials combined with an on-site inspection of EDL laboratories. One-fifth mentioned each of the following: a visit to the Marygrove College Reading Clinic, a visit to Wayne State University, a demonstration of BRL materials, teacher demonstrations by experienced participants, and field trips to a number of schools. In addition, many other benefits (of low frequencies) were given.

With the exception of one low frequency response (14 per cent mentioned teacher demonstrations), the benefits noted by the Reading Consultants were all in the form of presentations.

As in the case of the Reading Specialists, the Reading Improvement participants mentioned many benefits but only two received high frequencies: demonstration lessons (27%) and teaching vocabulary and vocabulary building (24%).

Games and Books professionals focused upon the services provided by the coordinators (41%), the consultants (38%), and the assistance gained by having student teachers (41%). About one-third felt the seminars were beneficial, and one-fifth mentioned the work of the Reading Center Managers. The student-tutors identified the games (33%) and the emphasis on language (25%). Again less than one-third of the tutors answered this question. Only ten per cent of the professionals cited the work of the tutors as having any benefit to the program.

The workshops and seminars were listed by about one-third of the Seven and Ten participants as most beneficial. One-fifth mentioned the initial workshop and the same proportion pointed to the services of the supervisors as most helpful. Other items were noted, but each was of low frequency.

Elements Suggested for Future Programs (Multiple Responses)

The suggestions for future programs offered by Reading Specialists largely reflect the component weaknesses noted above. The suggestions made were that opportunities be provided for participants to practice reading techniques and approaches by teaching summer school classes (44%), pupils who have reading problems be included in the program so that the Reading Specialists could develop their skills in testing, diagnosis, and remediation while aiding such

pupils (44%), demonstration lessons be used (19%), and that a textbook giving an overview of the field in addition to other material be incorporated into the instructional-demonstration phase. Also suggested was the use of a well equipped audio-visual room for the seminar meetings (19%).

The Reading Consultants focused their attention on the core of the component: 44 per cent suggested that in future programs, the training be more in-depth or intensive and be guided by instructors with practical experience. One-third proposed that materials be in sufficient amounts to facilitate experimentation, but also that the materials have relevance. One-fifth suggested greater exposure through observation type visitations.

While a number of suggestions were provided by the Reading Improvement participants, the highest response frequency (16%) was attached to the proposals for more lesson demonstrations by persons other than the component participants, and the incorporation of teaching-of-reading techniques.

Games and Books professionals suggested pre-program planning and training--anywhere from one week to a month prior to program operation (20%) and seminars which would stress reading, diagnosis, and remediation techniques, albeit in more depth (17%). Other suggestions were of very low response frequency. Among the student tutors, (one-third responding), two-fifths suggested that more time be allocated per subject covered, and one-fifth said there should be many things--more of everything.

Seven and Ten participants made numerous suggestions with one-fifth noting the need for various types of workshops and seminars all providing in-service training.

Programatic Aspects Participants Will Incorporate in Their Own Teaching
(Multiple Responses)

Half of the Reading Specialists indicated that they would make extensive use of the various approaches and techniques presented. Among those mentioned were the teaching of reading skills, the marked increase in the utilization of reading techniques, and the adoptation of a reading-skills approach to the teaching of literature. Over two-fifths said they would group students according to their reading need. About one-fifth proposed to use tests for diagnostic as well as an evaluative technique. Approximately one-third, respectively, said that they would improve, rewrite, or restructure their lesson plans to conform to a reading perspective; develop and encourage the use of study guides in all content areas; allocate more time for the diagnosis of pupil reading problems; and make use of newly acquired material including reference material. One-fifth indicated a desire to undertake in-service training with teachers or work closely with the English Department staff.

Among Reading Consultants, half expected to use a variety of tests for diagnostic purposes, half expressed a desire to use a variety of tactics for vocabulary building including an emphasis on dictionary drill, and about one-fifth proposed to compile and use study guides.

The Reading Improvement participants provided many examples of proposed future implementation, but the majority of the examples were of low frequency response. However, two-fifths proposed to stress vocabulary development by incorporating various vocabulary building methods, and one-fifth anticipated using the reading materials they were introduced to during the course of the summer.

Almost three-fourths of the Games and Books professionals indicated they would use games as a direct approach to motivating students, as reinforcement, or as a technique to create a fun-like atmosphere with regard to learning. The remaining responses were of low frequency. (This question did not apply to student-tutors.)

Thirty per cent of the Seven and Ten participants proposed incorporating various phonics techniques in their teaching during the following school year. Of particular interest is the fact that only eleven per cent specifically mentioned using BRL materials in their regular assignments.

Program Appraisal (Multiple Responses)

As a means of gaining some expression, from the participants, of overall component evaluation, the participants were asked to circle one or more of a series of evaluative statements which they felt approximated their own overall appraisal. Table 9 presents the percentages of participants by component who circled their agreement per statement.[1]

The picture that emerges from the magnitude of the responses to the four statements of appraisal per component, is one of differential evaluation. Most positive attitudes were among the Reading Specialists; none circled the two first 'negative' items, only six per cent suggested the need for extensive changes if the component were to be repeated, and virtually all were in agreement regarding continuance. Also high in approval was the response pattern of the Reading Improvement participants. Few agreed with the first two items, and while about one-sixth indicated a need for extensive changes prior to any repetition, approximately three-fourths approved of future reimplementation. The pattern of evaluation among the Seven and Ten group was similar to that of the Reading Improvement participants on the first two items, a few more indicated the need for extensive changes, one-third; and not quite as high a proportion were in favor of the continuation of the component, two-thirds. Games and Books professionals were not negatively disposed to this component; while about half favored continuation, two-thirds indicated a need for extensive changes.

[1]Although not included in the Table 9, the responses of the EDL trio were unanimous in suggesting that this component be continued as part of the regular school program (one participant circled all options), and in agreement that the component be continued in whatever time unit is feasible in the future.

TABLE 9

PERCENTAGES OF PARTICIPANTS WHO CIRCLED THEIR AGREEMENT PER EVALUATION STATEMENT BY COMPONENT (N=212)[1]

Evaluation Statement	Component					
				Games and Books		
	Reading Specialist	Reading Consultant	Reading Improvement	Professionals	Student Tutors	Seven and Ten
The program-component, while possibly having some merit for others, had little to offer in terms of what I sought.	0	17	5	2	16	2
Although I did profit, to some extent, from my participation, I don't believe this program-component--in its present form--should be continued in the future.	0	17	2	2	16	2
I agree with the goals of the program, and I also agree that there is a definite need for such a program, but before it is repeated at some future date, extensive changes should be made in its various parts.	6	7	16	69	48	33
I would suggest that this program-component be continued in whatever time unit is feasible in the future. There is certainly much to be gained by all those participating.	94	25	77	45	32	64
N =	(17)	(12)	(43)	(42)	(31)	(67)

[1]A fifth statement used in the questionnaire was not included because it was indirectly related to the evaluation of the program per This omission, of course, means that the sum of the percentages, per component, may fall far short of 100--as in the case of the Reading Consultants, notwithstanding the fact that this question was also a multiple response item.

RECOMMENDATIONS

The substance of specific recommendations for the improvement in the structure, procedure, and operation of each of the separate Summertime Right to Read components may be gained by reviewing the questionnaire responses of the participants as organized and presented in summary tabulations in the immediate section above. The following recommendations, however, should be viewed as having application to the total program and thus are more general in character.

Projects such as Summertime Right to Read should be carefully prepared at least six to nine months prior to operation. This would of necessity require the assignment of a project director, at this early date, with full-time responsibility to make necessary plans and arrangements. Adequate advance time would allow for 1) more efficient methods of recruiting participants--both students and professionals, 2) the adaptation and implementation of screening procedures in the selection of key personnel, 3) adequate supplies to be on hand prior to operation, 4) a review of objectives and ample opportunity to make revisions and adjustments in plans and objectives, 5) development of a detailed evaluation plan including the scheduling, selection and stocking of tests plus a plan for correcting with a fast turn-around of answer sheets, 6) pilot testing of materials on a very limited scale, and 7) pre-operation workshops, meetings, and seminars.

It is also suggested that specific contingency plans for transfer of whole components or units thereof into the regular school program be developed with school administrators so that transfer can in fact be achieved--and these plans should be developed prior to the program's operation.

As a final note, it should be emphasized that the Summertime Right to Read program has indeed sufficient promise to be continued in the near future.

DS:dc