DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 061 377 UD 012 203

AUTHOR Fox, David J.; And Others
TITLE Decentralized Open Enrollment: Services to Children in Receiving Elementary, Intermediate and Junior High Schools. Evaluation of a New York City ESEA Title I Program, 1969-70.
INSTITUTION Center for Urban Education, New York, N.Y.
REPORT NO P-A126
PUB DATE Aug 70
NOTE 168p.

EDRS PRICE MF-$0.65 HC-$6.58
DESCRIPTORS Academic Achievement; Academic Standards; Admission Criteria; Community Control; *Decentralization; *Decentralized School Design; Educational Innovation; Educationally Disadvantaged; Educational Objectives; Educational Opportunities; Educational Planning; Elementary Education; Elementary Grades; *Elementary Schools; *Junior High Schools; Middle Schools; *Open Enrollment; Organizational Change
IDENTIFIERS New York City

ABSTRACT

This evaluation of the decentralized Open Enrollment programs conducted in the New York City public schools during the 1969-70 school year, with funds provided by Title I of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act, covers programs developed and implemented at the school district level. It was contracted by the Bureau of Research of the central Board of Education, but the programs under study were all developed and implemented at the school district level. Included are the following sections dealing with: (1) summary of programs proposed; (2) objectives of the program; (3) research and evaluation plan for discerning the perceptions of the program of District Title I coordinators, principals and teachers, and mothers and children; (4) the observational visits; and, (5) conclusions and recommendations. An appendix contains a list of research instruments used in this study. (Author/SB)

PROJECT NO. 03-70

DECENTRALIZED OPEN ENROLLMENT: SERVICES TO CHILDREN IN RECEIVING ELEMENTARY, INTERMEDIATE AND JUNIOR HIGH SCHOOLS

David J. Fox
Lucy Greenberg
Lisa Harbatkin

Evaluation of a New York City
ESEA Title I Program
1969-1970

August 1970

The Center for Urban Education

Center for Urban Education
Educational Research Committee
ESEA Title I Program Evaluation

DECENTRALIZED OPEN ENROLLMENT: SERVICES TO CHILDREN IN RECEIVING ELEMENTARY, INTERMEDIATE AND JUNIOR HIGH SCHOOLS

David J. Fox, Lucy Greenberg, Lisa Harbatkin

Evaluation of a New York City school district educational project funded under Title I of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965 (PL 89-10), performed under contract with the Board of Education of the City of New York for the 1969-70 school year.

August 1970

TABLE OF CONTENTS

I

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

INTRODUCTION

This evaluation of the decentralized Open Enrollment programs conducted in the New York City public schools during the 1969-70 school year with funds provided by Title I of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act covers programs developed and implemented at the school district level. Nineteen different districts received funds for programs under the general heading of "Open Enrollment" and the programs had varied interests and emphases, reflecting local conditions and concerns.

OBJECTIVES OF THE DISTRICT PROGRAM

The evaluation design was developed from those items noted in the district proposals under the heading "Objectives." The objectives can be grouped into three areas, 1) those concerned with general or specific aspects of academic improvement, 2) those concerned with the nature of the school's service, including both the provisions of guidance and counseling services, and the modification and/or improvement in staff and the instructional process, and 3) those concerned with some dimension of the social process or the child's personal (non-academic) functioning.

THE EVALUATION PLAN

The Foci of Evaluation

The overall plan for the evaluation had three major foci. The

first was to evaluate the extent to which the program elements, as specified in the several district proposals, were in fact implemented. The other two foci involved only a sample of six districts. The second focus was on "participant reaction," which involved determining the reaction of children, mothers, teachers, principals, and district Title I coordinators. The third focus was on the quality of the "program" as it was implemented within the sample schools.

Instruments

Nine different instruments were used. For the evaluation of program implementation, a questionnaire was sent to the principals of the 240 schools scheduled to be receiving schools asking about their roles in the development of the districts' proposals and the nature of the services provided their schools. Then interviews were held with the Title I coordinators of the six sample districts, using an informal interview guide concentrating on program implementation. Participant reaction was estimated through three brief questionnaires, to teachers, parents, and pupils. Aspects of the quality of the program were estimated through four instruments completed by the educators and parents from the evaluation staff. These were a scale for rating aspects of the physical condition and educational climate of the school building, two separate scales (one for educators, one for parents) for rating aspects of the 175 individual lessons observed, and a sociometric-type form for recording intra-class interactions.

III

FINDINGS

Perceptions of Coordinators, Principals and Teachers

Data obtained from coordinators and principals indicated that the program had generally been implemented as planned. Both coordinators and principals were concerned with the time schedule for the program, believing that an earlier series of budget approval steps would provide for earlier arrival of supplies and materials and more efficient recruitment of staff. Both too saw a need for greater parental involvement. Few principals reported any active role in the preparation of the district proposal, and one in five reported feeling "not at all familiar with it" indicating a need both for better orientation and improved involvement by principals in the generation of these decentralized proposals.

The data provided by principals indicate that staff used to provide services to children for the program typically had been providing similar services to the school population before the school was designated a "receiving school" and principals and teachers both noted the need for additional professional (and paraprofessional) staff.

Perceptions of Mothers and Children, and Children's Achievement in Reading

The small sample of mothers responding were almost unanimously positive in their ratings, expressing satisfaction with the progress of their children. They indicated little activity in or towards the school, corroborating the coordinators' and principals' view of the

need for greater parental involvement. Children too, were more positive than negative in their free response comments. The low return rates for mothers and children limit any more conclusive summary of their statements.

In reading achievement, the pattern within the sample districts varied so widely that an overall conclusion is not considered valid. At one extreme, half of the Open Enrollment children in one district showed normal progress in reading at both the elementary and junior high school level, a normal pattern. At the other extreme were two districts in which few children showed normal progress at either level, and in between were the other sample districts with normal progress patterns at the elementary, but not the junior high school level.

Perceptions of Observers

Where comparable questions were asked, both professional and parent observers provided the same response pattern, and so these data can be summarized together. School building and school climate were rated positively, as was the general climate of classes and the organization and planning of the lessons observed. At both elementary and junior high school levels, the children were considered to be working at appropriate tasks, to be well behaved and interested, with active participation and good understanding and verbal fluency.

Teachers too were rated positively at both levels, and their personal qualities were the most frequent lesson strengths noted by the observers. Weaknesses in the lesson were more often methodological.

The professional observers also observed and rated aspects of special programs in remedial reading, and guidance and four individual programs developed in two of the sample districts. These data were consistently positive particularly the evaluation of the individual district programs.

The final aspect of the observations involved the recording and classification (on a positive-negative continuum) of the interactions seen within each class, considering the role, sex, and ethnic status of the initiator and recipient of the interaction. The interactions observed were predominantly positive, whether involving the teacher, or the children. With one exception, positive interactions were observed between children of all three ethnic groups studied (White, Black, and Spanish-speaking) at both elementary and junior high school levels. Moreover, the majority of negative interactions among pupils were directed towards other children of the same ethnic group, so that there were few negative interactions across groups.

CONCLUSIONS ABOUT EVALUATION FOCI

In terms of the three foci of this evaluation, the data provide a basis for the following conclusions:

1. The program was essentially implemented as proposed, and certainly the legal commitments to expend the funds in pre-specified ways was also met. While there was considerable confusion at the individual school level as to just who and what was supported by program funds, this confusion did not obscure the basic finding that support was provided at the scale envisioned.

2. The participants studied, coordinators, principals, teachers, parents and children, were generally positive in their perceptions of the program.

3. The quality of the separate district programs observed was also rated positively by both professional and parent members of the observation team. Particular praise was given some of the special programs developed in Districts 11 and 22.

CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTION

This is an evaluation of the decentralized Open Enrollment programs conducted in the New York City public schools during the 1969-70 school year with funds provided by Title I of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act. This evaluation was contracted for with the Bureau of Research of the central Board of Education, but the programs under study were all developed and implemented at the school district level. In many cases the districts involved chose the alternative available to them of contracting for district evaluations of the Open Enrollment program as well as district evaluations of their other decentralized programs. As Table II-1 indicates, the 19 different districts which received funds for programs under the general heading of "Open Enrollment" had varied interests and emphases, reflecting local conditions and concerns. Thus, there is no meaningful entity which might be called the Open Enrollment "program," in the sense of characterizing all participating districts and schools. Rather there are some emphases, such as the emphasis on reading or on guidance services, which are common to more than one district. There are also unique emphases such as the one planned by one district to make educational use of the bus ride to and from school.

In addition to the differences between districts the several schools in a district were free to develop their own emphases and program variations. Therefore, we first sampled districts and then sampled schools within the districts. In analyzing the data and in preparing

this report the school and district were the basic units of study. Generalizations about the Open Enrollment programs which can be drawn on a citywide basis are limited to such areas as the extent to which the several projects were implemented as proposed.

BACKGROUND OF THE PROGRAM

The Open Enrollment program began in 1960 as one of the New York City Board of Education's programmatic efforts to better integrate the public schools. Under the original plan minority group parents whose children were attending a school composed primarily of minority group children could apply for transfer to a school populated by white children. If their child was accepted for transfer, he was to be bused from home to school and back; transportation was provided by the Board of Education.

The child's original neighborhood school was designated the "sending school" and the school to which he transferred was designated the "receiving school." In the initial years, the criterion used for designating a sending school was an enrollment of 90 percent or more Black or Puerto Rican children combined; this was based on a survey conducted by the New York City Board of Education on October 31st of the preceding year.

The criteria for a receiving school were that the school be underutilized, have space available for additional children, and that it have an enrollment of 90 percent of "other" children (not Black or Puerto Rican). This percentage has dropped over the years and is now 75 percent "other."

In 1966 the Open Enrollment program was included with those programs funded under Title I of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act; it has been evaluated each year since 1966-67 as were all Title I programs.

In 1968, although admission to the program continued to be handled centrally, Open Enrollment was decentralized so that each district was free to develop its own program for utilizing the funds. Under this program a district was allocated $100 per child received in the districts' schools under the Open Enrollment program. The basic orientation of the program, as noted in the Board of Education's overall program statement, was that ". . .the Title I services will follow those children who participate in an organized plan to further integration and leave their poverty area schools to do so."[1]

Now the program includes two groups of children: those whose parents have applied for transfer (free choice Open Enrollment children), and those children who have been transferred at the instruction of the local District Superintendent and whose transfers were reviewed by the Zoning Section of the Board of Education.

For the academic year 1969-70, in addition to these district designed decentralized programs, there is a centralized program proposing the assignment of 200 additional staff positions to receiving elementary schools. This program, titled "Augmented Instructional Services for Open Enrollment Receiving Schools" will be evaluated separately and so is not within the province of this study.

---

[1] Summary of Proposed Programs 1969-1970, Title I, ESEA, Board of Education, August, 1969, page 65.

CHAPTER II

THE PROGRAMS PROPOSED

The variety of objectives stated in the proposals from the 19 districts are summarized in Table II-1. This table summarizes the "Objectives" sections of each proposal. In developing this summary, the evaluation team had to resolve the confusion which exists in the proposals as to what is included under the standard proposal headings of goals, objectives and procedures. The goals and objectives were also often disparate and redundant. To further compound confusion, there were instances in which a goal or objective was stated or implied in the procedures section of the proposal without being specified in the section devoted to Objectives. We urge the proposal developers, both in central and district offices, to eliminate this confusion in the future.

The summary of objectives used as the basis of this evaluation design was developed from those items listed in the proposal under the heading "Objectives." In the sample districts, the district Title I or Open Enrollment Coordinator was given the opportunity to amend the list prior to our collection of data. None did, so that the in-depth study was oriented to evaluating the objectives as originally stated in the district proposals.

OVERALL DISTRICTS

The objectives have been grouped into three areas: 1) those concerned with general or specific aspects of academic improvement; 2) those

concerned with the provision of guidance and counseling services, and the modification and/or improvement in staff and the instructional process; and 3) those concerned with some dimension of the social process or the child's personal non-academic functioning. In addition, there were some miscellaneous objectives. One proposal listed nine objectives, while four districts had as few as two.

The most consistent concern expressed was with the objectives related to social and personal processes; 16 of the 19 districts had at least one objective in this area. Two of the districts listed all of their objectives in the social and personal areas. This area was defined by 10 districts in terms of improving interrelationships within the triad of school-home-and community. Other consistent emphases were on reducing conflict and/or improving adjustment among children (8 districts) and on fostering integration. Seven districts specifically mentioned integration. Since integration is a goal of the Open Enrollment program, almost by definition, many districts did not state it specifically.

There was also consistent concern with academic improvement, most frequently stated in terms of reading. Fourteen of the 19 proposals made some reference to academic improvement, with ten specifying reading improvement. No other specific academic component was mentioned by more than three districts.

Twelve districts listed at least one objective within the third area, instructional and guidance processes; the provision of guidance services most often noted. Of the remaining objectives, the use or recognition of paraprofessionals were stated in more than three proposals.

TABLE II-1

OPEN ENROLLMENT PROGRAM OBJECTIVES LISTED IN DISTRICT PROPOSALS, BY DISTRICT

OBJECTIVES	DISTRICTS																			No. of Districts
	1	2	6	8	9	10	11	15	18	20	21	22	23	24	25	26	27	28	29	
1. Academic																				
a. General; unspecified improvement; remediation, higher achievement, realizing potential ability		X	X	X	X		X		X		X		X		X			X	X	11
b. Reading improvement; remediation, diagnosis of reading needs	X	X				X		X	X	X		X	X	X	X				X	11
c. Arithmetic/mathematics improvement; remediation		X				X			X											3
d. Language arts achievment						X														1
e. Science learning						X														1
f. Improvement of study skills, work habits						X	X													2
g. Improvement of speech, speaking ability									X											1
h. Instruction in English as a second language														X						1
i. Enriching experiences							X				X		X							3
2. Instructional, Guidance Processes																				
a. Small group instruction				X		X					X									3
b. Improved quality of instruction; innovation in methods									X	X										2
c. Raising teachers' expectations re: minority children										X										1

TABLE II-1 (Continued)

OBJECTIVES	DISTRICTS																			No. of Districts
	1	2	6	8	9	10	11	15	18	20	21	22	23	24	25	26	27	28	29	
2. Instructional, Guidance Processes (Continued)																				
d. Guidance, Counseling				X				X	X			X		X				X		6
e. Use of paraprofessionals			X	X					X			X								4
f. Reduction of drop-outs							X													1
3. Social/Personal Variables																				
a. Foster integration	X	X		X	X				X				X					X		7
b. Increase aspiration level		X	X						X			X			X					5
c. Foster adjustment, conflict reduction						X	X			X	X				X	X	X		X	8
d. Reduce educational disadvantage, isolation	X		X				X				X				X		X	X		7
e. Improve morale, image, confidence	X	X	X				X				X									5
f. Involve parents, community, develop relationship between sending/receiving communities, between school/home	X	X	X	X		X				X	X					X		X	X	10
4. Other																				
a. Provide supervision on buses												X								1
b. Establish criteria for admission													X							1
c. Provide multi-ethnic materials				X																1

CHAPTER III

THE EVALUATION PLAN

OVERVIEW

The overall plan for this evaluation had three major foci. First, we sought to conduct what might be called a "legal commitment evaluation;" that is, an evaluation of the extent to which the program elements, as specified in all the district proposals, were in fact implemented. This was done by developing an instrument called the Principal's Implementation Inventory, for the principals of every school designated in each district proposal as receiving some service, supply, or staff through the district Open Enrollment program. This Inventory was distributed to the entire principal population of both districts and schools.[1]

The other two foci involved a sample of the districts which had active Open Enrollment programs. A sample of six districts was selected through the sampling procedure discussed later in this chapter; and within these districts 16 elementary, eight junior high schools, and four special projects were selected as sites for further study.

The second evaluation focus was to assess "participant reaction;" that is, the reaction of five groups of participants: children, mothers, teachers, principals, and district Title I coordinators. Children and mothers were asked, through the Student's Questionnaire and Mother's

[1] This instrument and return rate are discussed in the Instrument section following.

Questionnaire to give some overall reaction to the program, looking back over their total experience with the program.[1]

Teachers, principals, and district Title I coordinators were asked to comment on specifics of the program as it functioned within their school or district. A Teacher's Questionnaire, informal interviews with the Title I coordinators in the sample districts and the Principal's Implementation Inventory were used to gather this information.

The third focus of this study was on the quality of the program as it was implemented in the sample schools. For this, teams of professional and non-professional observers were sent to visit and observe classes in the sample schools. The observers sought to see the school's normal functioning, with particular emphasis on the Open Enrollment program.[2]

THE SAMPLE OF DISTRICTS AND SCHOOLS

A two step process was developed to select the sample for this evaluation. First districts were selected; then, within these districts, schools were chosen.

The Sample of Districts

The proposals from the 19 districts receiving funds for the decentralized Open Enrollment program were divided into two groups based on whether or not the budget was in excess of $150,000. Nine districts

---

[1] For children in an Open Enrollment program for more than two years, and for the mothers of these children, the Open Enrollment referent cuts across the current decentralized programs and includes the earlier centralized program. This was recognized by evaluation project staff but we preferred the longer view and we did not feel it feasible to ask the children and their mothers to limit their comments to the last year or two.

[2] The reader is reminded that not all schools in each district were committed to implementing the identical program. Therefore, the observers identified their observational sites separately for each school.

submitted proposals budgeted at less than $150,000, and ten districts submitted programs budgeted in excess of $150,000.

From the 19 districts, a total of six (approximately one-third) was decided upon, three from each group. The selection of the six sample districts was made by the evaluation staff who attempted to choose districts which not only had varied emphases in their program statement, but which also had innovative program elements. Thus, we selected a district with many elements to its program; a program with few elements, and a district which planned a multi-media program, one of the newer educational approaches.

Obviously, this procedure was deliberate rather than random, and was used in the belief that given the small size of the strata, and the diversity of the program emphases, random selection methods would have been satisfying a research principle but might have sacrificed the opportunity to place the evaluation efforts in those districts where we might learn things of general interest to all districts planning future programs.

All six sample districts invited to participate agreed to do so, and the initial interview with the district Title I coordinator was completed on schedule. Similarly, the sample of eight junior high schools in these six districts agreed to participate. However, the implementation of the evaluation in the elementary schools was impeded by the reluctance of several elementary school principals in the sample districts to participate. They were loathe to permit their schools to serve as data collection sites because, they said, the evaluating agency was the Center for Urban Education.[1] We were told by ten dif-

[1] As will be discussed in the chapter on the Principal's Implementation Inventory, reluctance to participate for this reason was a citywide phenomenon. It is discussed here in terms of the sample districts only because this section concerns that sample.

ferent principals that they, and their professional association, the Elementary School Principals Association, had taken issue with several educational positions taken or implied in Center publications, (the Urban Review was most often mentioned). Moreover, they considered the Center to be biased against the administrative staff of the public schools. Given this professional disagreement, they did not wish to cooperate with, or be a part of, this evaluation.

Despite strong and consistent support from the Bureau of Educational Research of the Board of Education requesting their participation in this study, in one district no principal of an elementary school would agree. In a second district only one elementary school principal would cooperate. The same reluctance was found in an alternate district selected for the totally non-cooperating district. The final sample of elementary schools thus involves only five of the six districts.

Selecting schools within the districts with small budgets was not a problem, since typically there were no more than one or two participating schools in each district. Within the three larger budget districts where more schools participated, the sample schools were chosen to represent the number of children admitted under the Open Enrollment program. All elementary and junior high schools in the large budget districts were ranked on the basis of the number of children indicated as Open Enrollment children in 16 district proposals. The two sample schools were selected to represent a relatively small and relatively large number of Open Enrollment children. In one district there were so many elementary schools in the district program that a third school representing the district median number of admissions was selected.

In two of the sample districts, a special program, an Evening Guidance Center, was studied.

In summary, nine elementary and eight junior high schools participated, involving five districts at the elementary, and six at the junior high school level.

The Programs In The Sample Districts

The program objectives specified in the proposals of the six sample districts represented good coverage of the list of objectives in Table II-1. All four categories of objectives, including the "other" category, were represented; the objectives stated in the proposals of the six sample districts included at least one reference to 18 of the 24 (75 percent) specific objectives listed. The sample districts' proposals did not include the following objectives: improvement and/or remediation in arithmetic or mathematics; the provision of small group instruction; science learning; speech and speaking ability; English as a second language; and the provision of multi-ethnic materials.

THE OBSERVATIONAL VISITS

This evaluation included both professionals and non-professionals on the observational teams.

The Professional Members of the Teams

The special competencies sought in the professional members of the observation team were determined by the districts' proposals. Each district's major emphasis, as stated in the proposal, was the basis for selecting the professional observers. One professional was designated team leader.

Eleven different professional observers were used. There were five experts in the instructional areas at the elementary and secondary level; four experts in guidance, counseling and psychological services; one expert in social and community services, and a professional in multi-media instruction. Eight of these people were on the faculties of three different colleges, and a ninth was on the staff of a residential treatment center. Eight of them had had previous experience with evaluations of Title I programs.

The Non-Professional Members of the Team

a. Recruitment

It was necessary to recruit parent observers for the 1969-70 Enrollment evaluation. An attempt was made to find out whether other evaluators had used non-professional personnel to evaluate professional functioning. Letters to the Office of Economic Opportunity, the Bureau of Indian Affairs, and to a past president of the United Parents Association yielded no relevant information. It was then decided that the sample schools' Parents Associations would be asked for their help. A letter was sent to 12 sending and receiving school Parents Associations informing them of the nature of our evaluation, the conditions of work, and the one restriction that a candidate could not be an employee of the Board of Education, and asking them to recommend an observer. Only four responses were received. Therefore, an alternate plan was adopted, in which the United Parents Association was asked to refer potential parent observers. This procedure succeeded in recruiting an additional seven parent observers, of whom five actually served.

b. Descriptive Information

The non-professionals were all parents, and most had children in schools in a sending or receiving school in the decentralized Open Enrollment program. Except in one instance when an error occurred, no parent was sent to observe in a school attended by her child.

All of the parent observers were women, and of the nine who served, seven were white and two black. All were at least high school graduates, with two holding Bachelor's degrees and one a Master's. Many had previous work experience, and all (by unanimous agreement of the evaluation staff with whom they met) were interested in, and committed to, public education.

c. Briefing and Supervision

Before any of the parent observers made school visits, they were invited to small group briefing sessions. During these sessions two members of the evaluation staff went over all the instruments to be used, explained the procedures to be followed, and answered any questions the parents had. Once school visits were underway, the evaluation staff was always available for answering additional questions.

The Structure and Scope of the Visits

For the observational school visits, four-member teams were formed consisting of two professionals and two non-professionals. Both parents and professional observers were asked to arrange their class visits so that the parent observer was always accompanied by a professional observer. Individual specialists, for single visits, were scheduled as required by the nature of the district program. Beginning in March and continuing through early June the teams visited

the sample schools at about one to two week intervals.[1] To establish continuity, one team was assigned to each of the sample districts and that team made all of the visits in the district.[2]

The design for this evaluation called for an average of four observational visits in the small budget districts, and six visits in the larger budget districts. The observational team judged whether fewer or more visits were necessary. In practice the anticipated schedule proved reasonable. In both of the smaller budget districts participating, four observational visits were completed. In two of the three larger budget districts, six visits were made; in the third larger budget district only three visits were completed, since the team considered additional visits would serve no useful purpose.

A total of 85.5 observer days were spent in the sample schools on these 23 visits, 40.5 days in elementary schools, 34 days in junior high schools and 11 days in special facilities or programs.

INSTRUMENTS AND DATA GATHERING PROCEDURES

A total of nine instruments was used in this evaluation:

1. Interview Guide for Coordinators
2. Principal's Implementation Inventory
3. Teacher's Questionnaire
4. Basic Individual Lesson Observation Report (ILOR) for Professional Observers
5. Basic Individual Lesson Observation Report for Parent Observers
6. Interaction Pattern Analysis for Professional Observers
7. Building and School-Wide Observations
8. Mother's Questionnaire
9. Student Questionnaire

Copies of all instruments used appear in Appendix B, which provides the content but not the layout of the instruments.

---

[1] Absences reduced teams to fewer than the full complement of four members in six of the 23 visits.

[2] In some instances an observer served on more than one observational team. When this happened the observer made all of the visits scheduled for each of the teams to which he was assigned.

Informal Interview Guide for Title I Coordinators

In December and January, the Title I coordinators of each of the six sample districts were interviewed individually by a member of the evaluation staff, in order to acquire an understanding of the nature of the programs in these districts, and to obtain the coordinators' perceptions of how the district program was being implemented.

Three coordinators relied exclusively upon their own knowledge of the programs in their districts; the other three called upon principals, reading supervisors, guidance counselors, or other consultants, to supplement their own knowledge. In two instances these consultants were invited to be present throughout the interview, and in the third they were available for further discussion after the interview with the coordinator.

These interviews were necessarily unique to each district since the interview focused on the implementation of the district proposal. However, all six coordinators were asked three common questions. First, they were asked if the objectives stated in the program proposal had been amended in any way. Second, they were asked if the program was underway. Finally, they were asked about the receipt of the personnel, materials and supplies specified in the program proposal.

Principal's Implementation Inventory

This instrument was a highly structured questionnaire, intended to serve four purposes: 1) to identify the role each principal played in the development of the district Open Enrollment proposal, and his perception of the most effective timetable for proposal development;

2) to provide a description of the population of the school for both the 1968-69 and the 1969-70 school year in terms of grade register, class size, and specifically of voluntary and mandated Open Enrollment children; 3) to identify the kinds of personnel, equipment and supplies provided to the school under the program, as well as any other or additional personnel, equipment or supplies the principal felt he lacked; and 4) to describe the extent of parental and community involvement with the school.

This inventory was mailed to the principals of 240 elementary and junior high schools listed as Open Enrollment receiving schools in the 19 district proposals. The mailing elicited a flood of complaints and refusals to respond. Principals of schools receiving few, or no, services funded through the Open Enrollment program saw no reason to fill out an extensive questionnaire to report that they received little or no service. We agreed, and suggested to them that a simple note to this effect would suffice. The refusals centered around the "boycott" against the evaluation agency referred to earlier. After several days of discussion, some principals agreed to complete the Inventory.

In early April, a second mailing went out with a cover letter from Dr. Samuel D. McClelland, Director of the Office of Educational Research, enlisting the cooperation of the schools. In order to encourage as high a rate of return as possible, the Evaluation Chairman also sent a letter giving schools the options of either filling out the Inventory as completely as possible, or indicating that they had only fractional services; or sending a letter saying that they were not an Open Enrollment receiving school.

By May 26th, a total of 117 responses of some kind (a 49 percent return) had been received from 18 of the 19 districts. There was no response at all from 124 schools. Of these 117, 81 were completed or partially completed Inventories, 16 were letters or Inventories indicating only fractional services, and 20 were letters indicating that the principal did not consider his school an Open Enrollment receiving school. Of the 81 schools that submitted completed questionnaires, 21 were junior high schools and 60 were elementary schools. Of 16 schools sending reports of fractional services, two were junior high schools and 14 were elementary schools.

Since the returns include schools in 18 of the 19 districts, the data do serve to accomplish the research purposes of the Inventory, although on a sampling rather than the total population basis anticipated.

Teacher's Questionnaire

The Teacher's Questionnaire was a simple one-page instrument consisting of five free-response questions, and an opportunity for additional comments. The five questions were intended to identify those aspects of the district program of which teachers were aware in their school, and their evaluation of the Open Enrollment program as it functioned in their school. Specifically, they were asked to discuss the program's effectiveness, strengths and weaknesses, and to suggest improvements. The questionnaire was to be mailed directly back to the evaluation office.

The Teacher's Questionnaire was placed in the letter boxes of all 639 teachers in each of five elementary schools and five junior high schools which were chosen on the basis of their relatively large

Open Enrollment registers. Despite the brevity of the instrument only 61 were returned. The return rate of 9.5 percent makes the information suggestive at best.

Basic Individual Lesson Observation Report (ILOR): For Professional Observers

This instrument was used by the professional members of each observation team. It was adapted from the ILOR used in several previous evaluations.[1] For this evaluation, the questions centered on five areas: 1) a description of the lesson observed in terms of who taught it, its content and methodology; 2) teacher functioning as reflected in the planning, use of materials, ability to elicit pupil response and participation, classroom climate and atmosphere, and effectiveness of teaching style and method; 3) children's reactions, responses and participation; 4) inter-class interactions; and 5) overall appraisal of the lesson, and specifically its strengths and weaknesses. For those districts which emphasized remedial reading services, additional items were added for the reading specialist on the observational team. These items asked for descriptions and evaluations of the techniques used in the remedial reading groups.

A total of 135 lessons was observed by the professional members of the observation team, 70 at the elementary, and 65 at the junior high school level. In addition, 40 remedial reading lessons were observed, 21 at the elementary level, and 19 at the junior high school level. The 70 elementary level lessons most often observed were: reading 35 (50 percent), mathematics 7 (10 percent), social studies 5 (7 percent), English and language arts 6 (9 percent).

[1] The technical aspects of this instrument are discussed at length in the report of the evaluation of the More Effective Schools Program, The Center for Urban Education, December 1968.

Basic ILOR: For Parent Observers

The parent observers completed a briefer version of the ILOR intended to elicit a description of the lesson (who taught it, the content, the kind of grouping, if any); the children's reactions and responses; and their "vote" as to whether or not they would like their ". . . child to be in this class even if he had to be bused to attend?" Parent members of the team observed 109 lessons.

Interaction Pattern Analysis:
Observation Team

In an effort to obtain some quantitative estimate of the nature of the interactions among children in the classroom, professional and parent observers were asked to indicate on a chart or matrix, the frequency of interactions observed among children, considering sex and ethnic status (White, Black, Spanish speaking, and other).

Interaction patterns were completed for 114 lessons by professional observers at the elementary level, and for 45 at the junior high school level. The patterns were completed by parent observers for 101 lessons: 38 at the elementary, and 63 at the junior high school level.

The original plan was for each observer, professional and parent, to fill out three interaction matrices during each observed lesson. The first of the interaction matrices was to be filled out during a five minute period at the start of a lesson, the second during a five minute period in the middle of a lesson, and the third toward the end of the lesson. If the observer could not handle all the instruments in the course of one lesson, he was free to omit one or more of the interaction matrices.

Building and School-Wide Observations:
Observation Team

Each member of the observational team was also asked to complete a Building and School-Wide Observation form at the end of the observational day. This form was intended to provide the evaluation staff with ratings of the physical characteristics and facilities of the building (i.e., lunchroom, library, science laboratories), and the overall atmosphere of the school.

In all, 33 Building and School-Wide Observation forms were completed by professional members of the observation team in 16 elementary and 17 junior high schools. Parent observers completed 24, in 14 elementary and 10 junior high schools.

Mother's Questionnaire

During prior evaluations of the centralized Open Enrollment program a variety of efforts to elicit responses from parents had not succeeded in producing any substantial response. Since the effort had not been made in the previous year of the decentralized program, it was decided to try again this year.

A brief questionnaire was developed and printed on the back of a 5" x 8" postcard. The questionnaire asked the child's mother to rate her satisfaction with her child's progress, and to describe the extent of her participation in Parents Associations and of her visits to school. In addition, the Mother's Questionnaire for children being bused under the district Open Enrollment program asked whether or not the parent had requested the transfer.[1]

[1]The reader is reminded that the responses to this instrument cut across the two years of decentralized Open Enrollment programs and the preceding years of the centralized program.

The questionnaire was distributed in four elementary schools and five junior high schools, while the Pupil Questionnaires (discussed below) were being administered.[1] In the elementary schools, Form S of the Open Enrollment Mother's Questionnaire was distributed to those children who indicated that they took the school bus to school. All other children were given the alternate Form R for receiving school mothers. Junior high school pupils received an Open Enrollment Mother's Questionnaire if they indicated that they had ridden the school bus in elementary school; if they had not, they received receiving school Mother's Questionnaires. In all, 173 Open Enrollment Mother's Questionnaires and 361 receiving school Mother's Questionnaires were distributed. Of these, 17 questionnaires were received from mothers of children being bused and 80 were received from mothers of children in the receiving schools.

Student Questionnaire

Student opinion was obtained by simply asking children in sample junior high schools to describe their experiences while attending a school in which some children came from other districts.[2]

The questionnaire was distributed to a total of 302 children in three classes in each of five junior high schools, chosen because of relatively high registers of Open Enrollment children. Responses were

[1] One elementary school principal requested that the forms not be distributed and his request was honored.

[2] The reader is reminded that the responses to this instrument also cut across the two years of decentralized Open Enrollment programs and the preceding years of the centralized program.

received from 103 students in five different junior high schools. Of these, 61 were received from resident children and 42 from those who had been bused at some point in their school career, and 167 handed in blank sheets.

CHAPTER IV

FINDINGS: PERCEPTIONS OF DISTRICT TITLE I COORDINATORS, PRINCIPALS, AND TEACHERS

This chapter presents the findings from the interviews with the Title I coordinator of each of the six sample districts, the responses of principals to the Principal's Implementation Inventory, and the responses of the teachers to the Teacher's Questionnaire.

PERCEPTIONS OF TITLE I COORDINATORS

As noted earlier, the six district Title I coordinators were interviewed individually to obtain their perceptions of the implementation of the district program. Since three coordinators asked others (e.g., principals, reading supervisors, guidance counselors) to supplement their own knowledge, this section will differentiate the coordinators' views from the views of these consultants.

Personnel, Materials and Equipment

With one minor exception the coordinators said that they had received the personnel requested; one coordinator said he had received the personnel he requested, but that he had requested fewer than he desired because of limitations on the amount of money available for salaries. He felt that he could use more people, and added that the formula for paying the district for Open Enrollment children was out of date since salaries had increased since the last change in the formula.

In the opinion of the coordinators, the situation in regard to materials and equipment was far less satisfactory. Last year's materials

were still being delivered in some districts. One coordinator thought he had received everything requested in the 1969-70 proposal[1] and that was because he had funds available to commit for early ordering. One coordinator was not sure what had been received. The four others indicated that since formal approval of the program budget had not yet been received, ordering was just getting under way. These four districts were using material and equipment left over from the previous year or on hand in the school, and were planning to replace it when their orders came through.

Parent and Community Involvement

All of the proposals made reference to greater parent and community involvement and five of the six coordinators agreed that parental involvement was important, but nobody was really satisfied with the degree of involvement achieved. The coordinators pointed out that the schools were using a variety of means to ensure parent involvement, including teas, workshops, a parent clinic that provided assistance with health, welfare, housing and other problems, and evening facilities to encourage parents to come to the school and participate in its activities. Guidance counselors held workshops with some parents and in two districts both children and their parents were involved in the corrective reading program. However, even the effort to employ paraprofessionals from the

[1] The reader is reminded that these interviews were conducted in December and January.

sending communities, and in this way bring out-of-district parents into the schools, was not always successful in attracting parents from sending areas. Despite everything, the coordinators felt that parent participation, and in particular participation by sending school parents, was still inadequate.

Problems With Funding

All of the coordinators brought up some aspect of the funding problem. One pointed out that the district proposal was tailored to a budget rather than to its needs. Another, as noted above, made references to the obsolescence of the formula for paying the district for receiving Open Enrollment children. All of the coordinators felt that their inability to order materials and supplies early enough posed a very serious problem: because they had not yet received final program approval they could not send in their orders.

Everybody felt that the sequence and timing of the whole program was much too late and resulted in problems in planning and staffing as well as in ordering materials. One district Title I coordinator said that although they had managed to employ a fine guidance counselor, the timing problem had caused them to lose the opportunity to employ the person who was their first choice.

Recommendations of Coordinators

The six coordinators made a number of recommendations as a result of their experiences with the program. One principal called in by the coordinator suggested that the Center For Urban Education make

its evaluation without any preconceived ideas. He went on to suggest that evaluation should be part of project planning and that representatives of the evaluation team should sit down with district staff to work out the proposals. Another coordinator suggested that funding be for a longer period of time in order to achieve continuity and to make it possible for the district to plan for a two or three year period.

The coordinator who was concerned with the funding formula recommended that funding be based on $150 per Open Enrollment pupil rather than on the present formula of $100. Still another coordinator recommended, as a solution to the materials problem, that each district should receive an advance of five to seven percent of its project money several months before the school year, so supplies can be ordered far enough in advance to be available at the beginning of the year. All coordinators agreed on the necessity for earlier funding in order to have adequate time for planning and recruitment as well as ordering. Dates from January on were mentioned as appropriate starting dates for work on the proposal with final approval no later than June.

PERCEPTIONS OF PRINCIPALS

The perceptions of principals reported here come from the Principal's Implementation Inventory. In addition to the questions about personnel and services that their school received under the district Open Enrollment program, the Principal's Implementation Inventory included questions intended to obtain the principal's

perceptions of his role in the development of the district proposal, and the ideal time schedule for the different stages of proposal development.

In total, 97 Principal's Implementation Inventories were returned, 81 completed and 16 partially completed. These 97 respondents represent 18 of the 19 districts with Open Enrollment programs, and involve 71 elementary and 26 junior high schools. Since the number of respondents for each specific question varied more widely than is usual on a questionnaire, the number responding to each question was used as the base for the computation of percentages, and that referent number will be indicated in the discussion of each question.

The Preparation of the District Proposal

Seventy of the total 97 respondents answered the question asking for a description of their role in developing the district proposal for the Open Enrollment program. Three noted that they had become principal at the beginning of the year, and so could have had no role; 41 wrote in the word "none" in response to this question. Undoubtedly these figures are a minimum estimate of the extent of non-participation by the principals, for if one assumes that all the 27 principals who left this question blank also had no role to report, non-participation rises to 70 percent (68 of 97). The 26 who indicated some role represent ten different districts. There was one district in which participation had been outstanding; of 12 respondents, 11 indicated participation in proposal development. Other than this one district, there was only one other in which more principals indicated participation than the number indicating non-participation.

These 26 principals had primarily been resource people for the proposal in their districts. Eight principals used the identical phrase: "ideas for recycling the program were discussed at a District conference." Six principals reported suggesting specific services to be provided or problems with which the proposal should deal, and two principals provided statistical data needed for the proposal. Six other principals reported a role more concerned with implementation than development, by noting they conducted orientation sessions for teachers and/or parents.

Although not many principals had participated in developing the proposal, most (81 percent) felt that they were familiar with it, either "to some extent" (37 percent) or "completely" (44 percent). One principal in five (19 percent of the 75) who responded to this question reported that he was "not familiar" with the district proposal. It is a serious matter when, by mid-year, one in five principals responsible for implementing some part of a program reports no familiarity with the proposal for that program.

Table IV-1 below summarizes the principals' views about the ideal time cycle for developing Open Enrollment program proposals. The respondents were asked to indicate the "ideal beginning time" for the seven aspects of program development listed, and for the latest final date of funding.

A glance down the two columns at the right side of the table makes clear that few principals felt that beginning work on any of these aspects could properly be delayed beyond the end of the year <u>preceding</u> implementation. The one major exception are those who felt that

TABLE IV-1

PRINCIPALS' PERCEPTION OF IDEAL TIME TO BEGIN

SPECIFIC ASPECTS OF PROPOSAL DEVELOPMENT, IN PERCENTAGES

Activity	Number Responding	Percent Saying Ideal Beginning Time Was: Year Preceding Implementation: Sept./ Oct.	Nov./ Feb.	Mar./ Apr.	May/ June	July/ Aug.	Year of Implementation: Sept./ Oct.	Nov. & Later
A. Planning and Programming	68	10%	30%	34%	25%	1%	0%	0%
B. Ordering Supplies and Equipment	68	8	41	37	13	1	0	0
C. Recruitment of:								
1. Professional Staff	69	6	19	40	33	1	1	0
2. Paraprofessional Staff	63	6	17	39	33	3	2	0
D. Orientation Sessions With:								
1. Teachers	68	10	7	21	49	6	7	0
2. Parents	68	10	8	30	47	1	4	0
3. Paraprofessionals	62	10	6	21	42	8	13	0
E. Latest Final Date for Funding	66	8	33	33	20	1	0	5[a]

[a] Five percent suggested funding could be finalized in the period January to April of the year of implementation.

the "orientation sessions with paraprofessionals" could be begun either during the summer (8 percent), or at the beginning of the year of implementation (13 percent).

Two activities were felt by the principals to require the earliest beginning. Forty percent felt that planning and programming should begin no later than February of the year before implementation, and half (49 percent) believed that supplies and equipment must be ordered by that time. The other activities, including recruiting and orienting staff, and final funding, could be delayed until after February, but between one-third and one-half of the principals believed that even these activities should be begun no later than April of the year preceding implementation.

Staff Supplied by Program

a. Numbers Proposed and Provided

Data on the staff supplied to schools through the district Open Enrollment program were obtained from a summary listing of staff supplied by the Office of State and Federally Assisted Programs (OSFAP) of the Board of Education. In the Principal's Implementation Inventory principals were asked to indicate the total number of teachers and paraprofessionals provided for, and in the same instrument they were asked to indicate the number provided by position, e.g., corrective reading teacher, art teacher, and so on.

The data provided by elementary school principals when asked to indicate the total numbers of teachers and paraprofessionals " . . . paid from Open Enrollment funds," had little relationship to the data provided

when they were asked to indicate, position by position, the number of ". . . special personnel [which] have been assigned to your school to implement the Open Enrollment program."[1] The elementary level principals reported 75 percent more teachers by position than they reported by total; for paraprofessionals the number reported by position was almost twice as great as the total number reported. The junior high school principals' reports were equally unreliable for teachers, but were accurate for paraprofessionals.

Two findings are clear from these data: First, that the elementary school principals responding were not completely certain in their own minds as to who on their staff was paid by Open Enrollment program funds; and second, that at the elementary level principals generally said that they received more teachers and paraprofessionals than the OSFAP list indicated. At the junior high school level, principals generally indicated that they had received fewer teachers and paraprofessionals than indicated.[2] In either case, the data indicate a clear need for improved

[1] In retrospect, the evaluation staff realizes that the subtle difference in wording between the two questions was an error. It opened up the possibility that a school receiving additional staff paid by regular district lines because it was asked to implement the Open Enrollment program, could properly have included these staff in the second question. The numbers of staff involved in this kind of misinterpretation, however, could not account for any significant part of these discrepancies. More likely, the structured listing by position either made the principal aware, or suggested to him, that teachers in certain positions were paid for by Open Enrollment funds.

[2] Both these generalizations are based on the way three of the four possible comparisons come out at each level, i.e., comparing the OSFAP list to the principals' total, and to the by-position data for teachers and paraprofessionals.

communication between the OSFAP and the schools receiving services.

In 16 of the 19 proposals, the number of staff by position was included in the districts' proposals.

There is a reasonably close correspondence among the data for teachers at the junior high school level from all three sources of information (41.2 received, 42.2 proposed by districts, 45.4 by the OSFAP list). However, at the elementary level these principals reported having more teachers paid by Open Enrollment funds (80.9) than the proposals indicated would be provided (54.9), or the OSFAP list noted (60.6). For paraprofessionals, the finding was reversed: at the elementary level principals reported about the same number (101.8) as the district proposals indicated would be provided (110.0); whereas, at the junior high school level, fewer paraprofessionals on staff were indicated by principals (31.8) than was indicated in the proposals (68.0), or on the OSFAP list (61.0).

Examination of the data indicates that the excess of teachers reported by elementary school principals was even more discrepant than the totals suggest, for the district and OSFAP list includes 10.3 and 9.0 teachers respectively provided to schools in which the principal responded that he was not an Open Enrollment receiving school and/or was receiving no services at all. This same phenomenon is apparent at the junior high school level for paraprofessionals, five of whom were reported as going to schools which disclaimed receipt of any services.

The conclusion from these data is that there is confusion between the central staff at the Board of Education, the district staff responsible

for the proposal and district program, and the principals of the schools ultimately receiving services as to what personnel the Open Enrollment program is supporting.

Perhaps more important is the fact that while the data indicate that the funds for staff are being used to support the indicated services, these staff do not seem to fit the model of new additional staff specifically recruited to fill roles within a program. Rather, as noted in the 1968-69 evaluation of the program, these staff continue to fit the model of services already on a school's table of organization before the program. The only new element is that the services are now charged to the account of the budget for this program.

The evaluation staff raises the question of whether this is fulfilling the spirit and intent of this decentralized Title I program, to have "service follow the child." It would seem that almost by definition, the addition to a school of children needing remedial and supplementary services would require additional personnel,[1] as several principals also noted.

b. Satisfaction with Paraprofessional Staff

One specific dimension of staffing was studied. Table IV-2 presents the proportions of principals who indicated their satisfaction with the amount of paraprofessional help available for each of six kinds of duties listed on the questionnaire.

---

[1] The evaluation team sees the wisdom of using experienced staff already in a school to implement these programs where possible. The point raised here is not that specific teachers were already in the schools but that the specific positions were directed to providing the same services.

TABLE IV-2

PERCENTAGE OF PRINCIPALS INDICATING SATISFACTION

WITH EXTENT OF PARAPROFESSIONAL HELP AVAILABLE

BY DUTY OF PARAPROFESSIONAL

		Percent of Principals Selecting Option			
DUTY	N	I have enough	I HAVE SOME, but not enough	I HAVE NONE, but I would like some	I HAVE NONE, and I do not see the need for any for the current program
a. Supervise OE children on buses	68	9%	49%	32%	10%
b. Supervise OE children during lunch	72	6	58	33	3
c. Tutor OE children on a one-to-one basis	71	7	27	65	1
d. Help in instruction of groups of OE children	69	6	31	57	6
e. Help prepare materials for teachers	68	15	38	46	1
f. Make home visits and/or work with parents of OE children	70	4	23	70	3

As is obvious, (and administratively traditional!) few principals felt that they had enough paraprofessional help; only in terms of "help prepare materials for teachers" did more than ten percent of the respondents indicate that they had enough paraprofessionals. Similarly, only once, in terms of "supervise Open Enrollment children on buses" did as many as ten percent of the respondents indicate that while they had no paraprofessional help for this activity, they saw no need for any. For supervision on the bus and at lunch,[1] the modal response was "I have some, but not enough";whereas, for the other activities, one-to-one tutoring, group instruction, help prepare teacher materials, and Open Enrollment parent contacts, the modal response was "I have none, but I would like some." This then is a clear area of expressed need to which those who develop future proposals should give attention.

c. Orientation of Staff and Parents

To a greater extent than in previous evaluations of the Open Enrollment and other Title I programs, the principals reported consistent efforts to orient staff and parents to the program through short-term orientation sessions, workshops, and in-service programs.

Only one principal in three or four[2] reported no orientation

[1]When there was no paraprofessional help for lunchroom supervision, the principals reported supervision by lunchroom aides or teachers. Persons in these two roles were used with equal frequency, and there were no differences in the supervision reported for Open Enrollment or resident children.

[2]The number of respondents to this question varied from 64 to 72.

efforts for parents (31 percent), for paraprofessionals (27 percent), or for teachers (23 percent). Not only did the large majority report some orientation efforts, but two out of five reported "continuing sessions" with teachers (42 percent) and with paraprofessionals (46 percent); one in five principals reported such sessions with parents (21 percent).

Materials and Supplies Provided by the Program

a. Those Provided, and Those Ordered but not Provided.

The Principal's Implementation Inventory included a question intended to serve two purposes. First, it was intended to determine if the materials, equipment and supplies indicated in the districts' proposals were, in fact, provided. Second, it was intended to provide principals with the opportunity to indicate what, if any, materials and equipment had been either ordered and not received as of January, 1970, or not ordered because of late funding.

The low response rate eliminated the possibility of realizing the first purpose, since the district proposals presented total district data on materials and equipment, and did not specify this information for each receiving school. Thus, if some things were not received at all by the responding principals, or were received in smaller quantities than indicated for the district, it is perfectly possible that they were received in the schools of the nonresponding principals. The one piece of relevant data is the finding that of the 32 specific items or categories of items which were to be purchased by at least one district, some of the responding principals indicated receipt of 28 items or categories. Thus, although these data do not provide a basis for a generalization about quantity, they do indicate that the variety of

items to be purchased were actually purchased.

Not one of the 117 responding principals indicated that there were any materials or equipment that he was "unable to order" because of late funding. Thus, while there had been sufficient indication of this problem in previous years to include the question it did not seem to be a problem in 1969-70.

However, late funding still meant that there were orders which had not been received as of January 1970. One principal indicated that he had not yet received an order for 15 of the 32 items listed in the Inventory. Looked at by school, of the 81 principals who completed the Inventory, 12 elementary school principals (in five districts) and four junior high school principals (in two districts) indicated at least one item which had not been received although ordered. Generally, no one item of materials stood out as a problem; only four items, phonographs, cassette-type tape recorders, film strips, and reading games, were noted by more than two different schools.

b. Satisfaction with Reading, Audiovisual, and Science Equipment and Material

Table IV-3 presents the principals' ratings of reading, audio-visual, and science equipment and materials based on five different criteria. The distributions of responses for the three different kinds of materials were essentially the same, so that one can speak generally. The majority view was that they were "generally" or "always" available in sufficient quantities and on time; were "always" appropriate; of "superior" (but not "very superior") quality; "easy to use," (but again, not "very"); that reading materials were "constantly" used, audiovisual equipment "often" used, whereas science and laboratory equipment was

TABLE IV-3

PRINCIPALS' RATING OF
READING, AUDIOVISUAL, AND SCIENCE EQUIPMENT,
MATERIALS AND SUPPLIES, IN PERCENTAGES

Criteria	Rating	Item Rated: Reading Materials	Audio-visual Equipment	Science and Lab. Equipment
		N = 29	N = 28	N = 23
I. AVAILABILITY	1. Always easily available in sufficient quantities and on time	35%	37%	38%
	2. Generally available in sufficient quantities & on time	35	26	38
	3. Obtaining sufficient quantities a problem	17	15	10
	4. Obtaining on time a problem	3	4	4
	5. Obtaining on time & in sufficient quantities both problems	10	18	10
II. APPROPRIATENESS	1. Always appropriate for our needs	56%	61%	59%
	2. Sometimes appropriate for our needs	44	39	35
	3. Seldom appropriate for our needs	-	-	6
	4. Never appropriate for our needs	-	-	-
III. QUALITY	1. Very superior	4%	8%	6%
	2. Superior	63	46	44
	3. Average	33	46	50
	4. Inferior	-	-	-
	5. Very inferior	-	-	-
IV. EASE OF USE	1. Very easy to use	10%	14%	14%
	2. Easy to use	76	75	67
	3. Somewhat difficult to use	10	7	14
	4. Very difficult to use	4	4	5
V. FREQUENCY OF USE	1. Constantly used	50%	25%	25%
	2. Often used	43	57	35
	3. Sometimes used	7	18	30
	4. Seldom used	-	-	10
	5. Never Used	-	-	-

equally likely to be rated as used "constantly," "often," or "sometimes." No principal felt that the materials were ever of "inferior" quality, and only two felt that they were ever "seldom" or "never" appropriate, or used "seldom" or "never."

Between one-quarter and one-third of the principals felt that there were problems in obtaining sufficient quantities of materials early enough for most effective use; a greater proportion reported this for reading and audiovisual materials than for science materials. And between eleven and 19 percent of the respondents felt that the materials were "somewhat" or "very" difficult to use, especially the science and laboratory equipment.

c. Satisfaction with Current Budgetary Provisions for Personnel, Materials and Supplies

Principals were asked whether or not there were additional personnel or additional supplies and materials which were needed by the Open Enrollment program in their school, but which they had not requested because of budgetary considerations. A majority of the 81 principals responding to these questions indicated that budgetary restrictions had left them with additional needs for personnel (86 percent) and for materials and supplies (64 percent).

Within the personnel area, four kinds of needs were identified by at least one respondent in five. The clearest need was expressed for additional paraprofessional help, a need stated by half (49 percent) of the respondents with seven principals specifically noting that they wanted the paraprofessionals to assist on the bus ride to and from school each day. The need for corrective reading teachers, guidance counselors, and corrective mathematics teachers were mentioned by

32, 26 and 19 percent of the responding principals. Otherwise, no one kind of staff person was noted by more than seven percent of the principals.

There was no consensus when asked about the specific supplies or materials needed. At most, 26 percent of the principals noted the need for more audiovisual materials and equipment without specifying any one item or instrument. Similarly vague was the request for additional "remedial" materials made by 14 percent of the respondents; or for additional workbooks or texts in general, noted by 7 percent. No other single item was mentioned by more than three principals.

Community Involvement in the Open Enrollment Program

Principals saw a lot of room for improvement in the extent of parental and community involvement in the activities of their school. They also noted more involvement by the receiving community and its parents than by the sending school community and its parents. In fact, the distribution of responses for the two kinds of communities were almost perfectly reversed. Where 68 percent of the principals saw "little" (55 percent) or "no" (13 percent) participation by the sending school community and parents, a similar proportion, 70 percent, saw "some" (41 percent) or a "great deal" (29 percent) of participation by the receiving school parents and community. To some extent, parent involvement is a school rather than a district phenomenon. This is indicated by the fact that in reference to both sending and receiving communities, there were two districts in which at least one principal indicated "no participation" while another principal indicated a "great deal" of participation.

Principals were also asked for suggestions to improve "school-parent and school-community cooperation." Three kinds of suggestions were made by as many as ten percent of the principals. Sixteen percent suggested providing transportation and/or carfare to ease the travelling between school and sending community; 14 percent suggested the creation of a liaison position to be filled by a family worker to serve as the contact between the school and the sending community parents; and, ten percent suggested conducting activities for the sending community parents in the sending community itself. When asked for suggestions about parental and community participation, 50 of the 54 suggestions made by the principals specified the sending community, although the question asking for suggestions did not.

Principals were also questioned about the extent to which paraprofessionals on their staff came from the sending school community. Of the 77 principals who answered, 65 said that they had paraprofessionals on staff. Of these 65, 12 percent reported that between one-fourth and three-fourths of their paraprofessionals were from the sending community, and 25 percent of the principals reported that more than three-fourths of their paraprofessionals were. The remaining 63 percent reported between none and one-fourth of their paraprofessionals from the sending schools' community.

Problems in Implementation

Asked to indicate any problems ". . . encountered in the implementation of the Open Enrollment program in your school," 58 of the

65 responding principals indicated at least one problem. These 58 principals represent 15 of the 18 districts from which responses were obtained.[1] Five problems were identified by between 14 percent and 31 percent of the respondents. No other single problem was noted by more than one percent of the respondents.

The problem noted most frequently was the effect of insufficient and/or late funding on personnel, materials, or supplies. This problem was noted by 39 percent of the principals, involving 25 schools and eleven separate districts. Some principals expressed it as a general problem, i.e., "we feel that the concept of 'services follow the child' has not been implemented," or "we believe that the major problem is that the Open Enrollment program has not been supplemented by the kinds of services, materials and assistance that you have indicated in your questionnaire. It is our conviction that we do a superior job with our Open Enrollment youngsters. However, the introduction of these items would naturally enhance our efforts." At the extreme is the principal who noted, "It appears that no additional services or materials were allocated for 1969-70 for the students in the program. Whatever is here was here before and the program has been static since 1963."

Next came two problems which were, in a sense, aspects of the same problem: the inability to secure participation of sending school parents in school and parental activities, noted by 32 percent of the respondents, and the difficulty of contacting a sending school parent in the event a child became ill, or some other emergency need for contact arose, mentioned by 20 percent of the principals. In seven

[1] In the three districts in which no principal reported a problem, responses were received from only three schools.

instances the principal mentioned both aspects of the problem in his response. This problem, too, cut across schools and districts; 27 different principals from 11 different districts mentioned one or both aspects.

Problems concerned with the fact that the Open Enrollment children were bused came next in frequency. Fourteen (21 percent) different principals from 10 districts mentioned that this resulted in a long day for the children, lateness, disruptive behavior, and inability to participate in afterschool activities. As one principal said, "Some children from sending community are a distance from school and /it is/ not feasible to provide corrective reading and tutorial work for them because of bus schedules and family needs for children to be home immediately after school." The problem of disruptive behavior on the bus, was also allied to the lack of personnel discussed before. While it was sometimes stated without reference to personnel needed, it was also noted that, "We have often suggested that there be paid supervision on the buses but this has never come to pass."

The last problem noted with any frequency, involved the "inordinate percentage of problems in the Open Enrollment population sent from the sending school." Although mentioned by principals of nine schools, this was not a shared observation in the sense that the other four problems were; all nine principals noting this problem were from schools in three districts in Brooklyn. Several of these nine responses implied that the atypically high proportion of behavior problems occurred because the sending schools wanted it that way, i.e., "severe discipline problems are sent to the receiving school." Others stated it directly, "Guidance

cases and conduct cases were encouraged to apply for the Open Enrollment program in our school. . . ," or, "Sending school violates rules of Open Enrollment program by sending children with guidance services records which they conceal."

It is of interest to note that in the first evaluation of the Open Enrollment program conducted under Title I auspices in 1966,[1] this was a frequent problem raised by receiving school principals in all boroughs. That evaluation staff therefore investigated the school behavioral records of children who entered the program and compared them with a sample[2] in terms of behavior in the sending school. The data from this comparison led to the conclusion that, ". . . considering only those unsatisfactories received in the sending school, both Open Enrollment boys and girls had received fewer than the matched sample children." It may be that this problem should be restudied in those districts in which principals have raised the question.[3]

---

[1] David J. Fox, Free Choice Open Enrollment - Elementary Schools (New York: Center for Urban Education, 1966).

[2] The samples were matched on age, sex, and reading grade as of the time the Open Enrollment child entered the Open Enrollment program.

[3] It was not done in this evaluation because the delay in obtaining responses from principals made the staff aware of this finding too late in the year to effectively raise the possibility of adding this to the official evaluation design. It was the staff's judgement that, given the reluctant cooperation of principals in other phases of this evaluation, it was unlikely that the school records needed for this particular substudy would have been made available without this official addition to the design.

It is also of interest historically, that this 1966 evaluation also cited principals as noting every one of the problems they have raised in 1970, and in much the same order of seriousness. Clearly, there has been limited success in eliminating these problems.

TEACHER PERCEPTIONS

Teachers within the six sample districts whose pupils were given the Pupil Questionnaire were given the opportunity to comment upon the program through the Teacher's Questionnaire. Sixty-one teachers from five elementary and four junior high schools sent the questionnaire back. The reader is reminded that the response rate on the Teacher's Questionnaire was only 9.5 percent, and so the data discussed below are suggestive only.

The Teacher's Questionnaire asked the teacher to indicate the aspects of the Open Enrollment program of which she was aware in her school, to appraise the effectiveness of the program in her class, to indicate the strengths and weaknesses of the program, and to make recommendations for next year.

Aspects Known

At both the elementary and junior high school level, the Open Enrollment program meant "extra staff" to the teachers responding. They mentioned reading teachers, specialists in such areas as music and science, or guidance personnel. Consistent with the dominance of reading among the proposal objectives, at both the elementary and junior high school level, additional positions devoted to instruction in reading were the single most frequent aspect of the program mentioned by teachers.

Other than the additional staff, the teachers referred to special programs instituted in the school or additional materials or supplies

Effectiveness and Strengths of Program

At both the elementary and junior high school levels the teachers who responded appraised the Open Enrollment program in their classes positively. Only five (3,2)[1] of the 54 who responded to this question appraised it negatively, and seven others (5,2) expressed neutral or non-committal appraisals. None of the responses was strongly negative. The other 42 respondents were either positive (13,12), or what we considered strongly positive (7,10).

Asked to specify the strengths of the program, teachers most often referred to integration (7,11) noting "Opportunity for children of different backgrounds to share experiences and learn together," or for ". . . interaction of the children who might otherwise never have contact with either race." And moreover, as one teacher said, "It destroys myths: when a child of any color is hurt he cries, bleeds, is moody, etc. The children notice this, they have more in common than they are different." (Respondent's underlining)

Other strengths noted by the teachers were the individual help provided the Open Enrollment children through the program (3,4), the small classes (2,4), and the atmosphere of the receiving school (3,2). "One major strength is that the children are in a school in which

[1] The first number in the parenthesis refers to the number of elementary school respondents, the second number to the junior high school respondents.

there are few disciplinary problems and social problems. Those around the open enrollee want to learn. The open enrollee 'catches' the spirit, places an added value on education and tries harder."

Weaknesses of the Program

There were three weaknesses which were noted by more than five teachers: the lack of some special personnel needed in the school, such as guidance staff, or corrective teachers in reading and mathematics (5,6); the travel time for the children (5,5); and the difficulty in establishing any teacher-Open Enrollment parent communication (7,4). Despite the relatively few replies and the few schools involved, these three, and the less frequent teacher responses essentially paralleled the range of problems discussed by the principals on the Implementation Inventory. Also interesting was the fact that in two instances teachers who noted the integration aspect of the program as a strength, also noted a different dimension of the racial aspect as a weakness; one noting that "in many subtle ways, the black child is reminded of his being different, and the dominance of the white culture surrounds him. He is not being helped to find his identity and be proud of it (respondent's underline). The other teacher said that the program "isolates the children and points up the racial barrier."

Recommendations and Other Comments

As typically happens with these two questions, the recommendations made by the teachers were the programmatic interpretations of the weaknesses they noted. Thus, they suggested ways of improving teacher-school and Open Enrollment parent interaction (9,6), and recommended holding some PTA meetings in the sending neighborhoods, and home visits

by teachers. They noted that additional staff were needed for the program (9,8), especially for guidance, corrective reading, and mathematics. They also recommended improved admission procedures (6,1), directed towards screening out disruptive children or children for whom the trip is excessively long.

Comparing teacher comments in the previous evaluations of the Open Enrollment program to those received in this one, one notes a greater concern today with the professional aspects of program implementation and a more positive opinion overall.[1] The overall positive tone of the responses of the teachers who did reply is typified by the additional comment written by one who noted, "I feel that the Open Enrollment program challenges the teacher to individualize her program and work in small groups. Thus, she is better able to meet the needs of all the children. I feel further that this is implemented in my school with successful results."

[1] Once again the reader is reminded of the low response rate. It may well be that this finding is a function of the negatively oriented teacher not responding. However, there is no reason to suspect that the positive teacher was more likely to respond.

CHAPTER V

PERCEPTIONS OF MOTHERS AND CHILDREN AND CHILDREN'S ACHIEVEMENT

One phase of the evaluation plan involved obtaining some insight into the perceptions of parents and children involved in the program. As noted in Chapter II, in view of past failures to achieve substantial parental response to mailed questionnaires and interview requests, it was decided to try a different procedure. Children were sent home with a prepaid postcard questionnaire addressed to the child's mother. Since the questionnaire was designed to fit onto a 5" by 8" card, it could be completed in a matter of seconds and then put into a mail box. Nevertheless, the card was returned by only 80 mothers of resident children, a return rate of 22 percent, and by 17 mothers of bused children, a return rate of 10 percent. Given these return rates neither set of data can be considered representative; they are summarized below only because the opinions expressed were sufficiently clear to be of interest.

MOTHERS' PERCEPTIONS

Eighty mothers of resident children responded from schools in five districts. They had a median of two children in the school, although there were as many as eight children. A large majority of the mothers (87 percent) were "satisfied" (57 percent) or "very satisfied" (30 percent) with the progress their child was making[1].

[1]Mothers with more than one child in the school were asked to answer in terms of their oldest child.

Almost all (96 percent) the mothers of resident children said that they do go to school for conferences with their child's teacher, most often during Open School Week, or whenever they were asked to come. They reported going to school less often whenever they had something to discuss.

When asked about their involvement in the school and community, 46 percent considered themselves "active" in the school's Parents Association, usually as a member (42 percent) rather than as an officer (4 percent). In contrast to their involvement in school affairs, only 4 percent of the mothers were currently involved with any community group concerned with education. Those mothers who reported no activity said it was because they worked (13 percent), had young children and therefore no time (6 percent), had no time in general (6 percent), or lacked sufficient English fluency (6 percent) to become involved.

Thus, these receiving school mothers who responded can be characterized as sufficiently involved in education to belong to the Parents Association, but not community education groups. They were generally satisfied with the progress their children were making in school, and felt they were responsive to requests to come to school and to visit the school on Open School Week. A minority of these mothers went to school of their own volition as well. Interestingly enough, the small group of sending school mothers who responded reported similar perceptions and activities, so that this summary paragraph describes their perceptions as well.

CHILDREN'S PERCEPTIONS

In five junior high schools students were asked to describe "their experiences while attending a school in which some children came from out of the district." A total of 135 students answered the question, 42 Open Enrollment and 93 resident children.

In the judgment of the evaluation staff the question did not elicit instructive comments; for example, 32 resident children simply noted that they lived near the school; two others wrote "nothing" as their response; and five Open Enrollment and 12 resident children wrote various neutral comments, or offered suggestions to the powers-that-be on how to better run the school. For example, one resident girl observed "I think that the other kids coming from other districts must be very crowed it[1] so they must build more schools in New York."

Of the remaining 84 comments of a substantive nature, there were 37 by Open Enrollment and 47 by resident children. Since this sample is not large enough to be considered representative of the pupil population of the five schools, the responses summarized below are included only to give some of the flavor of what was said.

At the most general level the responses provide some insight into the overall orientation of the pupils. Both groups of pupils come through as positively oriented; that is, more of the pupils responded positively (24, 27)[2] than negatively (13, 20).

---

[1]Spelling and grammatical constructions are unedited.

[2]The first number presented in the parentheses refers to the Open Enrollment children, the second to the resident children.

Based on the limited sample of respondents the children most often gave their personal evaluation of the school (25, 23); less frequently did they comment on the Open Enrollment program (5,15), or about travelling (7,9).[1]

The most direct insight into their feelings about school is provided by the actual words of the children; the following quotations reflect the positively oriented comments about the schools:

> (An Open Enrollment child), "I think this school is better than the one in my area. You can't learn in the area with kids yelling and careing on. So my mother told me to come to this school. So I did. I like it very much."
>
> (A resident child), "It isn't that long a ride to get here, and most of my friends come here. I like the school and most of the teachers."
>
> (A resident child), "I get into trouble sometimes. My math teacher always gets me mad. But most of the teachers are all very nice. Sometimes even my math teacher."
>
> (An Open Enrollment child), "I come from Flatbush and appreciate the chance to attend . . . . The neighborhood junior high school is unpreferable because it presents an element of physical danger. The travelling from home to school, or vice versa, takes a long time but it's worth it."

The negatively oriented responses are somewhat more difficult to quote because the more colorfully eloquent are also obscenely unprintable. A few selected quotations about the Open Enrollment schools follow:

> (An Open Enrollment child), " I do not like this school!"
>
> (A resident child), "Alot of fights, argu ments, etc."

---

[1]The reader is reminded that at the junior high school level resident children often travel to school too.

(An Open Enrollment child), "Our school is no good of me. I hate it so much I blow it up."

(A resident child), "I don't like it because it does not have field trips or nothing like that."

The comments about the Open Enrollment program itself were also both positive and negative.

(An Open Enrollment child), "Well as you know it feels kind of funny going to a joint that you never seen nobody before. You come in knew and people and teacher look at you like you'll /be/ stupid. Like you have four eyes and all that stuff. It would have been different if mother hadden of said: I don't want you to go to this school /i.e., the home school/ I want you to do this and all that."

(A resident child), "I don't think it's right for them to come here because they should go to the school near them."

(An Open Enrollment child), "I think travelling out of your district coming to school is O.K. Some people travel out of their district because they want to go to better schools. I think this program is very good."

(A resident child), "Well,I've met new friends from Manhattan and Jamaica, witch I would of never met if it had'nt bin for the school."

Of the comments related specifically to travelling, the positive responses concentrated on the broadening aspects of going to different places, and enjoying the trip and friends. On the negative side, Open Enrollment children complained that they had to get up too early, and several resident children commiserated with them.

READING ACHIEVEMENT

Table V-1 summarizes the current status in reading of 158 children and presents some comparative data from the 1967-68 and 1968-69 evaluations of the centralized Open Enrollment program. Currently in all grades the majority of Open Enrollment children are reading below grade level; by grade 7 half of the sample students were two years below grade expectation. However, the current 1969-70 data do reflect progress when compared to the data from two and three years ago. Though the 1969-70 samples are small, it is evident that the current fourth, fifth and sixth grades are doing better than prior fourth, fifth and sixth grade samples. The difference is three months for children in grades four and six and five months for children in grade five.

This improvement is reflected again in the data presented in Table V-2 for the sub-sample of children for whom reading grades were available for both the 1966-67 and 1969-70 years; these indicate that whereas from 1966 to 1967 less than half (43 percent) of Open Enrollment children progressed normally, by 1969-1970 slightly more than half (53 percent) of the children were progressing normally.

An analysis of the data by district indicates that the sample districts varied greatly; in one district, half the elementary and junior high school children within the sub-sample showed normal progress and status. In two other districts, normal progress characterized half or more of the elementary school children, but few children at the junior high school level were progressing normally. In two other districts, there were few children at either school level who showed normal progress.

TABLE V-1

READING LEVEL OF OPEN ENROLLMENT CHILDREN, MARCH 1970,

AND COMPARISON DATA, 1967 and 1968

Grade	Number of Children	Number of Children Reading: At or Above Grade: More than 1 Year Above	At to 1 Year Above		Below Grade: .1 to .4	.5 to .8	.9 to 1.6	1.7 to More		Spring '70	Median Grade Equivalent Scores: Spring '67	Spring '68
4	23	2	8		1	7	5	0		4.2	a	3.9
5	30	5	3		7	3	7	5		5.2	4.7	4.7
6	28	6	3		3	2	2	12		6.3	6.0	6.0
7	21	4	1		0	1	1	14		5.7	a	a
8	38	2	2		5	2	5	22		6.6	a	a
9	18	5	4		1	0	1	7		9.7	a	a
No. Totals:	158	(24	21)	45	(17	15	21	60)	113	-	-	-
Percent	100	(15	12)	28%	(11	10	13	38)	72%			

[a] No comparative data available.

TABLE V-2

STATUS OF OPEN ENROLLMENT CHILDREN IN READING BY GRADE LEVEL

IN MARCH 1969 AND MARCH 1970 COMPARATIVE DATA 1966-1967

Status in Regard to Grade-March 1970	Progress 3/69 to 3/70	Grades[a] 4	5	6	8	9	Totals Across Grade No.	%	Comparative Data on Change 1966-1967 %
Number of children		17	25	19	23	15	99	-	-
1. At grade level or above	Normal or more	3	1	4	0	0	8	8	10
	Less than Normal	3	0	0	1	4	8	8	9
2. Below Grade in '69 at or above in '70	Above Normal	3	6	6	2	4	21	21	15
3. At or above in '69 below in '70	Below Normal	3	2	0	1	0	6	6	10
4. Below in '69 and below in '70	Normal or More	1	7	5	7	3	23	23	18
	Less than Normal	4	9	4	12	4	33	34	37
All status levels	Normal or more	7	14	15	9	7	52	53	43
	Less than Normal	10	11	4	14	8	47	47	57

[a] Grade seven does not appear in Table because no scores were available for 1969.

CHAPTER VI

THE OBSERVATIONAL VISITS

BUILDING AND SCHOOL-WIDE OBSERVATIONS

At the end of the day of observations, both professional and parent observers completed the Building and School-Wide Observation guide designed to record their impressions about the physical condition of the school and other aspects of school organization and functioning.

If the data on Building and School-Wide Observations from professional and parent observers had been collected to establish the comparability between these two kinds of observers, the reliability estimates would be close to perfect. Not only was the overall response pattern identical, but often the proportions of observers giving particular ratings were within a few percentage points of each other. For example, the professionals rated the buildings as clean 100 percent of the time at the elementary level and 94 percent of the time at the junior high school level; the parent observers' ratings were 100 percent and 92 percent. Similarly, the professional observers rated the buildings as attractive 100 percent and 82 percent of the time; these ratings were paralleled by the parent ratings of 100 percent and 83 percent. Both 18 percent of the professional observers and 18 percent of the parent observers rated the science laboratories as "poor." The results presented below summarize the ratings of the professionals, although ratings of parent observers could have been used as well.

There were no consistent differences among districts in any of the aspects rated. The discussion below will present separate data for the nine elementary and eight junior high school levels in parentheses.

Generally, the school buildings were appraised positively by the observers; at the elementary level, at least 88 percent of the ratings of physical characteristics were positive; half or more were extremely positive. In contrast, 31 percent of the ratings of junior high schools were negative, and more often than not the modal rating, while "good," was less than "very good."

Considering the specific criteria, the buildings were almost always rated as "clean," (100 percent, 94 percent) and "attractive" (100 percent, 82 percent). Moreover, in most instances the cleanliness was considered "very good" as was the "attractiveness."

The attractiveness of the classrooms at the elementary level was always well rated; this was not so at the junior high school level, where only approximately 69 percent of the classrooms were considered attractive and one in three was considered "poor."

Lighting conditions were almost always rated as satisfactory in both classrooms and corridors. Most of the schools visited had science rooms and/or science laboratories (82 percent, 92 percent). In those schools with science facilities, 44 percent of those at the elementary level were rated as "satisfactory" and 56 percent were rated as "very well" equipped. Approximately 18 percent of the junior high school science facilities were rated as "poorly equipped," with 36 percent rated as "satisfactorily" and 46 percent rated as "very well" equipped.

Libraries also were rated positively, considered "attractive" in 50 percent of the elementary schools and 44 percent of the junior high schools. There was an "adequate" collection of books (40 percent, 40 percent) available for use.

All nine elementary and seven junior high schools had lunchroom facilities. Observers were asked to visit the lunchrooms while they were in use so that they could indicate the nature of the observed seating arrangements. In 69 percent of the observations at the elementary level, the observers thought the children had been seated by grade or class. In the remaining instances, the observers indicated that seating arrangements had been determined by a teacher or other adult, or by the children themselves.

A final observation involved the demeanor of children in the halls, and, at the junior high school level, during the change of periods. When children were in the halls the observers were to determine why. Usually, they were on an errand (81 percent, 35 percent), or on the way for a drink or to the bathroom (62 percent, 41 percent). At the junior high school level, children were occasionally seen in the halls without permission. At the elementary level the children in the halls were rated as quiet, but at the junior high school level only 64 percent of the observations rated the children quiet and 18 percent of the observations noted fighting. Asked specifically to comment on the change of period at the junior high school level, three out of four times the observations rated it "orderly;" when it was not, excessive noise, or racing through the halls, in addition to the fighting mentioned above were noted.

IN-CLASS OBSERVATIONS OF GENERAL PROGRAMS BY THE PROFESSIONAL OBSERVERS

As noted earlier, 70 lessons were observed at the elementary level and 65 at the junior high school level by the professional members of the observation team.

Descriptive Aspects of the Lessons

In half the visits at the elementary level, the observers could not be sure who the Open Enrollment children were; at the junior high level they were sure in only 32 percent of the classes. When they were certain it was because they felt that all of the racially different children were Open Enrollment children, or because they perceived clear differences in accent, or in dress or other overt appearance of economic status.

In almost every observation (98 percent), the lesson was taught by the regular teacher; in 92 percent of the observations this was the only teacher in the room. In the few instances in which another adult was present, it was a student teacher or a teacher aide (seven lessons, all in one district). The aides were usually working with individual children or with a group of children.

The observers felt that their presence was taken as a reasonable intrusion, for in only 4 percent of the elementary, and 5 percent of the junior high lessons did they report feeling that they saw a lesson which was "not at all typical." Rather, they considered the lessons either "fairly" typical (35 percent, 37 percent)[1] or "completely"

[1] As in previous chapters, the first number in the parenthesis refers to the finding for the elementary school level, the second number to the junior high school level.

typical (61 percent, 58 percent). Not only did the observers feel that the teacher tended to ignore them but in about 80 percent of the observations they felt that the "class appeared not to notice the observer after a few minutes." When the children did notice the observers, they "turned frequently to look at them" (14 percent, 12 percent). In very few instances did the children speak to the observers or try to involve them in activities.

Planning, Organization and Classroom Atmosphere

In most instances the observers saw lessons involving whole class instruction, but at both school levels there were classes in which children were receiving individual instruction (22 percent, 28 percent), and in which classes were divided into smaller groups for purposes of instruction (35 percent, 8 percent). Not only was grouping used four times as frequently on the elementary level, but there were also district differences. At the junior high school level, there was only one district in which classes with individual instruction were more frequent than whole class instruction. At the elementary level, grouping was seen consistently in only one district.

At the elementary level, the observers generally rated the lessons as "organized and planned" (49 percent), and "exceptionally well organized and planned" (26 percent). Only rarely were lessons at this level rated as showing "few," or "no," or "some" signs of planning. In contrast, the lessons observed at the junior high school level were rated as showing "little," "no," or only "some," signs of planning as often (49 percent)

as they were rated as being "planned" or "well planned" (51 percent). The extreme negative rating was given by the observers twice as often at the junior high school level (15 percent) as at the elementary level (8 percent).

Similarly, the observers rated the teachers' expectations for the children as "about right for most of the children" more often at the elementary level (68 percent) than at the junior high level (52 percent). There were level differences too, in the kind of inappropriate expectations the observers felt they saw expressed: at the junior high school level the observers felt that teachers were communicating expectations which were too high as often as expectations which were too low (24 percent each). However, at the elementary level the observers felt that the expectations teachers expressed, or implied, were more often too low (20 percent) than too high (12 percent).

Given a checklist to describe classroom atmosphere, the observers almost always chose options which described the classroom as either "completely" relaxed (43 percent, 37 percent), or, relaxed "for the most part" (48 percent, 51 percent). Similarly, when at a different point in the ILOR they were asked to describe the atmosphere in their own words, the observers almost always (92 percent, 85 percent) used positive descriptions such as "warm," "relaxed," "orderly," or reflecting a "good relationship." In the minority of instances when the classroom atmosphere was described negatively, and this occurred more often at the junior high level,

the children were described as being "restless" or seeming "bored" (4 percent, 10 percent), or the teacher was seen as "authoritarian" or "punitive" (4 percent, 5 percent).

Use of Materials and Classroom Appearance

In almost every class at the elementary level, and in more than three-fourths of the classes at the junior high level, there were materials and displays in the classroom.

Table VI-1 presents the distribution of the observer ratings of materials displayed and used in the lessons. For every one of the five aspects rated, there were differences between the elementary and junior high schools in the extreme ratings. In general, the material aspects used in the elementary lessons tended to be rated as "completely" achieved almost twice as frequently as the junior high lessons.

Considering the separate aspects rated, the elementary school lessons were most frequently "completely" characterized by a clean classroom (60 percent), sufficiency of materials (66 percent), and a fairly good relationship between materials and the skills taught (48 percent). The observers felt that the appropriateness of materials and displays, and the interest and stimulation level of the materials was "achieved for the most part" in 50 percent and 47 percent of the observations. This last aspect and the relationship of material to skills were the most frequently reported areas of weakness.

TABLE VI-1

PROFESSIONAL OBSERVERS RATING OF CLASSROOM AND MATERIALS, BY LEVEL IN PERCENTAGES

	Percent Assigning a Rating Of:					
	Completely Achieved		For Most Part Achieved		Not Achieved	
ASPECT	Elem	JH	Elem	JH	Elem	JH
Cleanliness of Classroom	60%	42%	38%	39%	2%	19%
Appropriateness of materials and displays	44	8	50	64	6	28
Relevance of materials to skills being taught	48	25	34	41	18	34
Sufficiency of materials	66	42	23	30	11	28
Interest and stimulation level of materials	32	14	46	35	22	51

At the junior high school level, the cleanliness of the rooms and the sufficiency of materials were rated as "completely" achieved in 42 percent of the lessons. The same areas of weakness were seen as at the elementary level. The interest/stimulation level, and the relationship of the materials to the skills being taught was seen as negative in 51 percent and 34 percent of the lessons respectively.

Finally, the observers were asked to note the use of "any innovative methods or materials" in the lesson. At both levels, there were few instances where innovative methods or materials were noted. In the instances where they found some innovation (30 percent, 20 percent) they noted the use of certain materials such as films, reading aids, and charts, but did not specify any particular instructional techniques.

Observers' Ratings of Children's Responses

Table VI-2 presents data on the percentage of lessons in which observers reported seeing specific kinds of behavior or reactions by children reflecting their response to the lesson and school.

Generally, looking across all of the categories and items, the distributions for the elementary and junior high school lessons observed were similar. There were seven items which a clear majority of the professional observers (between 55 percent and 90 percent) believed characterized the children in the classes they watched; the children "were well behaved for all or almost all of the period"; understood the "teacher's spoken word"; were working

TABLE VI-2

THE PERCENTAGE OF LESSONS IN WHICH OBSERVERS SAW SPECIFIC KINDS OF BEHAVIOR AND/OR REACTIONS BY CHILDREN

Behavior or Reaction[a]	Percentage of Lessons in Which Indicated Behavior Was Seen By: Professional Observers at: Elem. Level	Professional Observers at: Jr. High Level	Parent Observers at:[b] Elem. Level	Parent Observers at:[b] Jr. High Level
1. Interest Shown:				
a. Sustained for period	77%	59%	69%	63%
b. Sustained for half period	16	24	25	22
c. Sustained for little of period	7	17	6	15
2. Children well-behaved for:				
a. All or almost all period	90	81	81	71
b. About half-period	5	13	15	18
c. Little of period	5	6	4	10
3. Active Participation for:				
a. All or almost all period	71	55	69	61
b. About half period	18	28	25	22
c. Little of period	11	17	6	17
4. Nature of Participation:				
a. Working at tasks appropriate to their ability levels	82	69	c	c
b. Raising hands to teacher questions	25	23	53	46
c. Attentive listening	24	22	49	37
d. Taking obvious interest in individual tasks	15	10	30	9
e. Being actively involved in class discussion	11	15	21	37
f. Being involved in discussion with other children	10	11	21	23
g. Raising hands spontaneously	10	10	42	35
5. Other Reactions:				
a. Displaying adequate understanding of teacher's spoken word	89	87	c	c
b. Appearing comfortable in class	85	83	c	c
c. Displaying good verbal fluency	66	61	c	c
d. Presenting serious discipline problems	1	3	c	c

[a]For categories 1,2, and 3 the observer could choose only one of the three sub-categories and so these three add to 100 percent within each category. For categories 4 and 5 they could check as many sub-categories as they considered appropriate.

[b]The last two columns of the Table are discussed in section C of this Chapter, where the data in Category 4 from professional and parent members of the team are compared.

[c]There were not enough replies to these items by the parent observers to warrant presenting the data.

at tasks appropriate to their ability levels; appeared comfortable in class; showed "sustained interest for all or almost all of the period"; actively participated for "all or almost all" of the lesson; and displayed good verbal fluency.

Other than the behavior patterns mentioned above, no one kind of behavior was ascribed to the children in more than 25 percent of the lessons.

Ratings of Teacher's Performance

Observers rated seven specific aspects of teacher performance, and the overall quality of the lesson. The distribution of the ratings is presented in Table VI-3. At both school levels the overall distribution of ratings was positive, and more consistently positive at the elementary level. For example, at the elementary level a median of 59 percent of the ratings was above average. At the junior high level, a median of 50 percent of the ratings was above average.

Teachers were most consistently rated "effective" or "very effective" in maintaining discipline (84 percent, 67 percent); in their use of the particular teaching method they had chosen (62 percent, 51 percent); and in their ability to encourage children's participation (59 percent, 50 percent).

The observers' overall ratings of the quality of the lesson were generally positive. At each level about half (50 percent, 46 percent) of the ratings were either "excellent" (18 percent at each level), or "very good" (32 percent, 28 percent), with most of the

TABLE VI-3

PROFESSIONAL OBSERVERS' RATING OF TEACHER PERFORMANCE

	Percentage Assigning a Rating Of:											
	Very Effective		Effective		Averagely Effective		Ineffective		Very Ineffective		Total a Percent	
ASPECT	Elem	JH	Elem	JH	Elem	JH	Elem	JH	Elem	JH	Elem	JH
Ability to use teaching method chosen	25%	24%	37%	27%	25%	32%	9%	15%	2%	2%	98	100
Ability to utilize teaching aids and materials	12	12	34	31	33	29	16	14	2	8	97	94
Ability to maintain discipline	49	38	35	28	10	19	0	13	1	2	95	100
Ability to sustain interest of children	28	24	30	30	33	24	6	16	0	6	97	100
Ability to encourage, obtain children's participation	27	25	32	25	27	27	9	17	1	6	96	100
Ability to maintain climate conducive to learning	23	28	33	14	29	32	11	16	2	10	98	100
Skill at "pacing" lesson	25	20	34	24	30	32	5	17	3	5	97	98

[a] Difference between totals and 100% are due to "not relevant" response.

remainder rated as "satisfactory" (24 percent, 22 percent), or "fair" (24 percent, 20 percent). Only a few (1 percent, 12 percent) of the lessons were rated as "poor."

Strengths and Weaknesses Reported by Observers

Observers made a total of 114 (68, 46) comments on the strengths of the lessons seen, and 92 (59, 33) comments on weaknesses.

No one kind of weakness characterized the junior high school lessons. Three or four observers noted such weaknesses as "lack of or poor pupil motivation," the "pace of the lesson," the "lack of individual attention," the "lack of student expression," and "routine, mechanical, uncreative lessons." However, the low frequencies and lack of consensus within the school do not permit any generalizations about the weaknesses of the lessons at the junior high school level.

In contrast, at the elementary level there was consensus. Thirty-three percent of the weaknesses noted can be categorized as involving "routine, mechanical, uncreative lessons." No other kind of weakness was common to more than 15 percent of the lessons; less frequent comments which were the same as those at the junior high school level, referred to "lack of or poor pupil motivation;" "lack of student expression or interaction;" and "lack of variety in visual aids and teaching materials." In general, almost all of the weaknesses at either level could be considered methodological, as only a few observers commented on the personal qualities of the teacher.

On the other hand, the observers' perceptions of strengths, at both the elementary and junior high school level, most often concerned the personal "qualities of the teacher" (30 percent, 33 percent). Other than references to the qualities of the teacher, the observers noted the following strengths: "opportunity /provided/ for individual work," the sound "pacing," the"children's /high/ level of interest," or the "creative use of materials."

IN-CLASS OBSERVATIONS OF GENERAL PROGRAMS BY PARENT OBSERVERS

As noted earlier, the parent members of the observation team visited classes in the company of the professional members of the team, but completed the Parent Observer Form of the ILOR independently. At the elementary level 57 Parent-ILORs were completed; at the junior high school level there were 55. The Parent-ILOR contained a selection of questions from the Basic ILOR (see Appendix B) referring to Descriptive Information; Planning, Organization and Classroom Atmosphere; and Children's Responses. It concluded with a question unique to that form, asking if, on the basis of their observation they would like their child "to be in this class even if he had to be bused in order to attend."

For many of the questions in both the Parent-ILOR and the basic-ILOR, the data reported in the sections mentioned above apply equally well to those obtained from the analyses of the Parent Forms of the ILOR. Like the professional observers, the parents had difficulty in identifying the Open Enrollment children at the junior

high school level (64 percent were not sure they could) but were able to do this more often at the elementary level (60 percent were sure they could). The criteria were the same as those used by the professionals, primarily race or other aspect of appearance. In almost identical proportions they reported infrequent observation of either individualized instruction (24 percent, 23 percent), or grouping (35 percent, 8 percent)[1].

They felt, as the professionals had, that the class appeared "not to notice" them after a few minutes (63 percent[2], 81 percent), except in the one district in which the professionals, too, had noted that at the elementary level the children "turned frequently to look at the observer" (22 percent, 4 percent).

The one point of consistent difference between the observers is evident in Table V-I; response for response, the parents reported seeing certain kinds of pupil behavior at least twice, and as many as four times more often than the professional observers. The professional members of the team seem much less willing to label children's activity as "attentive listening" or "spontaneous raising of hands" than were the parents.

---

[1] For the reader's convenience, the six comparable percents for the professionals were 75 percent, 50 percent; 28 percent, 28 percent; and 35 percent, 8 percent.

[2] The Parent observers felt noticed more often at the elementary level than the professionals thought they had been, for in 82 percent of the lessons the professionals felt the children appeared not to notice them.

As a group the responses of the parent observers indicate some lack of certainty as to whether or not they would be inclined towards busing their child to the school they had just visited. Overall, for schools at the elementary level, 47 percent said they would like the idea, 29 percent would not, and the other 24 percent were not sure. This seems to depend on the district involved to some extent, as indicated by the finding that in two districts all the parent observers said "no" or "not sure," while in the three other districts the "yes" predominated.

For the junior high schools, 36 percent of the parents said "yes," 39 percent said "no," and 25 percent were "not sure" whether they'd send their children to the school.

When asked to state reasons, parents who would consider sending their children mentioned good teachers (six), class interested and involved (six), and good program (three). Reasons why parents would not consider sending their children included: "my child is at a lower level" (two), poor lesson (two), not involved (two), poor discipline (three), too many distractions (three).

OBSERVATIONS OF SPECIAL PROGRAMS BY PROFESSIONAL OBSERVERS

Remedial Reading Activities

Because of the emphasis in the districts' proposals on remedial work in reading, this was one of the areas singled out for further study. Two of the sample districts had a particularly heavy emphasis on remedial work in reading. At least one remedial reading class or

group at the elementary level was observed in four of the six sample districts; at the junior high school level, classes were observed in all six sample districts. In all, observers visited 21 remedial groups at the elementary, and 19 at the junior high school level. The distribution of observations by district reflected the district's emphasis on remedial reading; 17 of the 21 groups observed at the elementary level and 12 of the 19 observed at the junior high school level were in the two districts which emphasized reading. Therefore, special note will be made of any special characteristics in these districts in the discussion below.

a. Facilities, Organization, and Materials

At the elementary level remedial reading instruction most frequently took place in a room "primarily set up for remedial reading" (63 percent), but at the junior high school level the instruction usually took place in an ordinary classroom (63 percent).

The skills taught were phonics or word attack (54 percent at the elementary level, 11 percent at the junior high school level); comprehension and language practice (42 percent, 31 percent); and vocabulary (33 percent, 31 percent). Oral expression, and pronunciation or listening skills were taught less often.

At both school levels, the groups were usually (77 percent, 88 percent) homogeneous in ability, as determined by the observer in consultation with the teacher. Moreover, having first estimated the

ability level of the group, the observers usually considered the instruction "appropriate for all or most" of the children in the group (84 percent, 71 percent). The only instances where observers indicated that the skills were "appropriate for few or none" of the children in the group were in two cases at the junior high school level in the same "heavy emphasis" district.

The observers were asked to note materials and devices used or evident in the classroom where instruction took place. They noted the following: Sullivan Programed Readers (46 percent, 45 percent); workbooks (28 percent, 22 percent); practice readers (22 percent, 22 percent); tradebooks (28 percent, 11 percent); and film materials (22 percent, 4 percent).

Generally, the observers felt that the materials and devices in use during the group were related to the particular skill or ability in which the child was deficient (79 percent, 83 percent). In one heavy emphasis district, materials for all elementary groups were rated as related to what the child needed, but this was so in only half of the junior high level ratings. In the other district, the opposite pattern obtained and it was the materials for the junior high school groups which were always seen as related to the child's needs.

Observers were also given a list of materials and devices, developed from the districts' proposals, and were asked to check those present in the room. Observers consistently found these materials and devices more often at the elementary than at the junior high school level. No material or device was seen in more than half of the junior

high school rooms and, in fact, only skill workbooks (47 percent) and reading laboratories (42 percent) were seen in more than one-quarter of the rooms. In contrast, eight of the 12 items listed were present in at least 38 percent of the elementary level rooms, and five of the eight were present in half or more of them. Those seen most frequently, between 52 and 62 percent, in the elementary level rooms were, in decreasing frequency: skill workbooks, basic readers, trade books, picture cards, and reading games. Less frequently observed, in 38 to 42 percent of the elementary rooms, were basal reader work books, experiential reading materials, and reading laboratories. Relatively infrequent at both levels, observed between 0 and 19 percent of the time, were quick flash devices, pacers, tape recorders, and newspapers.

b. Selection, Methodology and Continuity

Based on information obtained from remedial teachers, the observers reported that the Metropolitan Achievement Test was the criterion used most to select children for the remedial classes (62 percent, 74 percent). Teacher recommendation was the only other criterion mentioned with considerable frequency (52 percent, 32 percent). Teachers also mentioned referrals from the guidance counselor (19 percent, 16 percent), or one of the school administrators (23 percent, 11 percent), and on occasion, at the request of the child (14 percent, 11 percent) or a parent (14 percent, 0 percent). In one of the heavy-emphasis districts only the Metropolitan Achievement Test or teacher recommendations were used, but in the other all of the criteria above were noted except for parent request.

The Metropolitan Achievement Test was the usual basis for deciding if a child could be considered to have completed his remedial work (42 percent, 48 percent); the judgment of the corrective reading teacher (38 percent, 10 percent), or the child's regular classroom teacher (28 percent, 10 percent) were used as a basis less often. The heavy-emphasis district, which selected children on the basis of the Metropolitan Achievement Test or regular teacher referral, based its decision to terminate remedial instruction on the Metropolitan Achievement Test or the judgment of the corrective reading teacher. The other heavy-emphasis district used all three bases.

The corrective reading teachers were asked how remedial reading was worked into the school's regular program. At the junior high school level, this was usually accomplished by programming the remedial instruction into the child's regular schedule (86 percent). Otherwise, the remedial classes were held at specified times and the child had to miss that part of his regular schedule (14 percent). At the elementary level the pattern was reversed: usually classes were held at specified times (59 percent), and less often made part of the child's regular program (41 percent). The corrective reading teachers at the elementary level indicated that when a child was taken from his regular class an attempt was made to avoid his missing academic subjects (35 percent) or non-academic subjects (53 percent). Only 5 percent of junior high school teachers indicated attention to either consideration.

The observers considered that the methods they saw provided a "systematic sequence of skills" for "every, or almost every child" (56 percent, 63 percent). When this was not provided, they considered that a systematic sequence was provided for more than half of the group (32 percent, 26 percent). At the junior high school level, the only instances when the observers considered that systematic sequential instruction was provided for fewer than half of the children was in one of the heavy-emphasis districts.

In most of the lessons observed (72 percent, 68 percent) an opportunity was provided for silent reading before pupils read aloud, exercises in workbooks, or pupils reading and working on comprehension questions.

There were consistent efforts made by the teachers to establish continuity, both through diagnostic procedures (93 percent, 54 percent) and by tying the lesson to regular classwork. Although continuity with regular classwork could not be rated in about half of the lessons, of the eight lessons at each school level in which it could be rated, most (five elementary and six junior high) lessons involved some tie-in effort through conferences between the teachers or by using related or common content.

Guidance Activities

A variety of guidance activities were included in the district programs observed. The activities included group guidance classes, parent workshops conducted by guidance counselors, individual

counseling, and group counseling. Except for individual counseling sessions, the other activities were observed by the guidance members of the observation team who also had conferences with guidance personnel in three districts.

In comparison to basic instruction during a regular school day, or classes devoted to remedial reading, the goals and methods of the guidance counselor are much less structured; the guidance members and the other members of the evaluation team preparing this report agree that most of what they saw in the area of guidance was a function of the interaction of a particular guidance counselor and his particular client audience and thus do not necessarily reflect similar interactions by other counselors interacting with other audiences. Therefore, no numerical summary of these observations has been attempted. Instead the section below presents a summary of the observers' impressions of what they saw.

a. Conferences with Guidance Personnel

Three of the four professional guidance observers assigned to a district held conferences or interviews with one or more of the district's guidance personnel. Two of the three guidance observers reported that guidance counselors were most concerned with such areas as vocational choice, narcotics, and conduct. Problems such as truancy, lateness, and other behavioral problems are considered conduct problems. One guidance counselor felt that the long bus rides, 40 to 75 minutes, as well as frequent disruptions on the bus, adversely affected the children's school performance and psychological

state. This counselor felt that the Open Enrollment program was beneficial only to those children who were among the better students in their home schools. In his opinion, those who were far behind to begin with had not benefited from the program.

Another guidance counselor reported holding a series of evening parent workshops on drugs, sex education, school record cards, but said that mostly receiving school parents attended. He felt that many parents were pressuring children and were overly concerned with grades.

The guidance observer in the third district had an opportunity to talk with the district's social worker, psychologist and guidance counselor. The observer was impressed by the competence of these personnel who were operating a form of psychological clinic; the observer described their activities and roles as "very traditional to their respective professions."

b. Group Counseling and Guidance

One observer visited one group counseling and one group guidance session in two separate districts. In the group guidance class the observer found the children spontaneous and articulate. He felt that they were attentive and interested, even excited because the discussion was related to their needs. However, he felt that because the guidance counselor was unable or unwilling to handle the feelings expressed, the session deteriorated at the end and became a recitation session of good citizenship.

The group counseling session was less successful in the observer's

opinion. The observer felt that the counselor had trouble controlling the group and that as a result, there was no cohesion or direction in the group. Only a few of the boys spoke and there was little interchange observed. The observer felt that the counselor talked too much, and on at least one occasion, squelched the boys' desire to discuss a problem. Moreover, the observer thought that the counselor seemed driven to perform for the observer. The observer's summation of the session was that the time was poorly used that day. Despite the adverse comments, the observer said that the students were stimulated by the discussion and "in terms of the need for guidance and the students' response and willingness to participate, there is little question of the worth of a program like this." In addition, the observer felt that under less strained circumstances, i.e., when not being observed, the group counseling class might be more productive than it was that day.

c. Parent Workshops

Three parent workshops run by guidance counselors were observed in two different districts. One workshop was observed by two professional observers and one parent observer. All three members of the observation team agreed that much in the workshop was cliche. However, the parent observer pointed out that there is often much truth in cliches in regard to daily living. It is interesting to note that all three observers reported that the mothers attending seemed to enjoy the discussion, although one observer reported that the meeting was loosely run and conversational in nature. That

observer felt that the workshop could be considered successful only if its intent was to provide information on a superficial level. Another observer of this same workshop reported that the guidance counselor took a non-directive role, made few comments and did little to lead the parents to a further exploration of their thinking.

A third professional observed two other parents' workshops. In the first one he found the guidance counselor warm and enthusiastic, and able to explain materials for home use to parents so they could understand. However, the counselor did not provide enough opportunity for free exploration of a problem. The second workshop was more open and spontaneous than the first, and most of the parents made at least one contribution to the discussion. The guidance counselor did not impose her opinions on the parents. The observer felt that the counselor was not too sure of herself and was overly dependent on the guide sheet provided by the district office. In one instance the observer felt that an effective job was being done, and in the second instance that the total impact of the session was more positive than negative.

d. Overall Impressions

The guidance members of the observation teams specified some weaknesses in what they saw and heard. They considered the following of most significance: 1) there was little time available for work with groups of carefully selected children, 2) counselors were too busy with high school applications, 3) there was an excessive amount of paper work for the counselor, 4) when parent programs were scheduled

for the middle of the day, working parents and those with small children at home could not participate, and 5) the guidance staff was not aware of the contribution the district Open Enrollment program was making to the funding of their position and/or program.

Three of the professional guidance observers made recommendations for strengthening the guidance program: 1) there should be more teacher-parent involvement in establishing goals, 2) there should be secretarial aid(e) for guidance counselors to free them for more creative work in student relationships, 3) there should be less paperwork, 4) there should be a way to extend the program to the home--perhaps through use of paraprofessionals--to enhance the usefulness of the program, 5) parent (workshop) meetings should be more frequent and better structured, 6) where possible a professional skilled in group therapy or a guidance counselor trained by a therapist should be used in the program.

Other Special Projects or Programs

In the course of the Open Enrollment evaluation, visits were made to four special programs going on in two districts, three in District 11 and one in District 22. Since each of these programs was unique, the members of the observation teams were asked to submit anecdotal records of their observations in addition to completing the applicable instruments.

a. Reading Resource Room, District 11

According to the proposal for District 11, a Reading Resource

Room was to be established at the District Office to provide in depth service to three schools in the District, and to the target population in the Open Enrollment schools. The district proposal notes that:

> In this room there will be model setups of the newer programs, materials and approaches in the teaching of reading, and a production center for the producing of materials for use in classrooms and in connection with special programs such as the School Bus Aides Education Program, the Language Arts and Social Studies Materials Production Program, the Reading Counseling Teams Program, and the Parent Volunteer Reading Helpers Program.
>
> The room will also serve as a reference center and conference room for training teachers and other personnel involved in various aspects of these programs, under the direction of the District Reading Consultant.

The observation team for this program consisted of three professional observers (specialists in elementary education, human and community relations, and multi-media and audiovisual techniques), and two parent observers. The team divided in two, with each subteam spending half a day in the district office looking at the materials and equipment used in the program, and the other half day in a school or schools observing the program in operation. The district reading coordinator and audiovisual coordinator graciously made themselves available as guides and consultants for the day. In general, the observation team was "much impressed by our visit to the District Office and its Audiovisual and Reading Resource Room, and by the many materials and the varied equipment on display and available for loan to schools," although they were disappointed that such materials were not usually present in classrooms, and noted that

they seldom observed utilization of these instructional aids.

One member of the observation team characterized the program as "...a good example of what a decentralized school district can do to further the more responsive use of audiovisual materials in the schools." He felt that the professional and paraprofessional staff members assigned to the program showed great enthusiasm. His further comments follow:

> Although enthusiasm is not effectiveness it is, however, the first step in getting these materials used effectively in the classroom. In this regard, the wise choice of materials and equipment, and the careful training of aides in their use, has released a lot of creative energy on the part of the professional staff. The result is a surprising amount of well made audiovisual teaching materials, and even some well thought out student projects.
>
> The equipment available for use in the schools is well suited to the technical competence of the paraprofessions, teachers, and students who operate it. Each machine is the simplest of its kind available: cassette recorders, Instamatic cameras and Carousel slide projectors, and Thermofax copiers. These machines also provide the most flexible kinds of materials for use in the classroom, with small groups, and in individualized instruction. Certain more sophisticated equipment, however, is reserved for use by the more highly trained personnel in the district office. By placing the simpler equipment in the schools, a high degree of successful production was insured at minimal cost in equipment and materials. And keeping the complicated machinery in the hands of trained professionals permitted district wide distribution of more sophisticated materials while minimizing the investment in costly equipment and making the most efficient use of the time needed for these complicated projects.
>
> The uses to which this equipment was put were quite interesting. The Chairman of the Social Studies department of one school had produced, with the help of the aide assigned to his program, numerous transparencies and a number of slide sets and slide plus sound presentations. These were imaginative and made excellent use of magazine, book and newspaper pictures. These materials were being used to revamp the entire Social Studies curriculum so that "discovery" methods could be made more

central to the learning process.

In the English department it was again the Department Chairman who was directly involved, with the help of an aide, in the production of materials. These materials were not used to change the curriculum, however, but to simplify teaching in areas that are difficult for regular as well as Open Enrollment students. Shakespeare, for instance. There was also a great deal of concentration by the aide on tutoring Open Enrollment students in reading. And this too required the production of audiovisual materials since there seems to be a lack of remedial reading materials for use on the Junior High School level. A large amount of simple reading material had been produced using the thermal copier and the ditto machine, and a tape recorder was used for student self-evaluation and to keep a record of individual progress in reading. Both the aide and the department chairman felt that the tutoring program would never have succeeded without these materials, and they have been able to use these materials as the impetus for some volunteer tutoring by parents.

At the district office a number of other audiovisual projects were also available for inspection. These were somewhat more erratic in quality than those previously seen, but the best of these materials were excellently produced. This work also included several well executed student projects.

The district has supported the materials production program by providing personnel, work space and equipment. Since equipment purchase was not originally eligible for federal funding, such support was an absolute necessity if the program were to be effective from the beginning. The grant has subsequently been amended to include equipment, but the nucleus of equipment purchased by the district has made the program fully operational a year sooner than would have been possible otherwise.

A curious omission in this program is in the area of non-English speaking students. I was told that 2,000 of the 5,000 Open Enrollment students were from Spanish speaking homes, but that none of the aides knew Spanish and no materials were produced specifically for these students. Since the project proposal states that non-English speaking students on the early elementary level are a particular target group this omission is hard to understand, and no explanation was given me.

Generally speaking, this program seems well conceived, organized

and administered. There is a great deal of enthusiasm and hard work, particularly because the teachers and aides seem to feel that the materials have really helped the Open Enrollment students benefit from their transfer to a new district. This was an impression that they had gained informally, by watching the students progress, and through regular test scores. It also seems successful because the professional people involved have been able quickly and easily to produce what they needed and immediately put the material to work. They no longer seemed preoccupied with materials and equipment and the time needed to use them. These obstacles had been minimized or eliminated so that they could concentrate on teaching.

b. Project Re-entry, District 11

The second special project observed in District 11 was Project Re-entry. The district proposal describes it in the following way:

> Project Re-entry is a two-pronged program directed toward the prevention of school dropouts through intensive counseling of the pupils in the program (including home visits and parental involvement) and through small group and individual remedial work in basic school subjects, all conducted at the crucial junior high and intermediate school level.
>
> The Project will serve 200 students selected specifically from the Open Enrollment population which attends the Junior High and Intermediate Schools of District 11.
>
> At the Project Re-entry units, a total of six teachers and two educational assistants will provide educational services in basic tool subjects such as reading and mathematics. Each unit will have a morning session (9-11 a.m.) and an afternoon (2-4 p.m.). Twenty-five students will be taught at each session in each Project unit. They will be taught in small groups and on a one-to-one basis. Both sessions will be held four days a week in each unit for 20 weeks during the school year for a total of 80 sessions.

Project Re-entry was observed on two occasions at two different locations. The first time the guidance observer made his observations alone; on the second occasion, the team consisted of a specialist in education, one in human relations, and a parent observer. The observers were unanimous in their feeling that the program was very

good, that the students were interested and working hard, and that the teaching staff was excellent.

The team was told that the students in Project Re-entry, which was housed in out-of-school buildings, fell into three main categories: children under district suspension, children needing tutorial help in reading and math, and children with behavior problems, including school phobias.

All the observers reported that instruction was on a highly individual level, that the atmosphere was relaxed, and that both students and teachers were involved and hard-working. One observer made such comments as: "This lesson was very impressive," "All working assiduously," "The instructor was excellent - low keyed, soft spoken, in no way threatening to these troubled youngsters," "A steady rhythm of students and teachers committed to learning." Another observer noted: "...a very worthwhile project in the way it has been developed and carried out." Still a third observer felt a language arts lesson in which the students acted out a scenario written by one of the teachers, was done with enthusiasm, laughter, and "a generally cathartic reaction." He reported that the "lesson was done very well indeed, and the students seemed both to enjoy it and gain from it."

The one less than favorable observation was of an attempt on the part of one teacher at group counseling. This, the observer felt, was outside the teacher's field of expertise. However, the observation staff's total impression of Project Re-entry was strongly positive.

c. Evening Guidance Clinic, District 11

The third special program observed in District 11 was the Evening Guidance Clinic. The district proposal describes it in this way:

> The Evening Guidance Clinic Program will function on Monday, Tuesday and Thursday evenings from 7-10 p.m. for 110 sessions at each of two schools which are easily accessible to the parents of those Open Enrollment Children who travel out of their district to schools in outlying areas. The program will be coordinated by the District Guidance Supervisor.
>
> In addition to clinical work for those Open Enrollment families which cannot be serviced during the day, this program will develop and implement orientation and workshop sessions for further involvement of the community in understanding the values of integrated education. Each clinic will provide diagnostic and treatment services for children and families referred by the school...

The observer who visited the Evening Guidance Program was the team's guidance specialist, a member of a college faculty and a clinical psychologist. Unfortunately, this program was observed in its final stages and only one client was present who was receiving remedial reading instruction from a paraprofessional. This made it possible for the observer to speak with the professional people present and to review schedules and several case folders. The following are some of the observer's impressions:

> It appears to be a program which provides a place for limited tutorial services, e.g. reading, and a place for a family service type clinic. This program does not, nor should it, provide ongoing psychotherapy. But the program does provide a therapeutic atmosphere where pupils feel more at home and feel there are responsive adults willing and able to help them. The service also provides individual and/or family counseling and, if necessary, psychological testing. From the records, there appears to be regular attendance by a sizable clientele. The tendency is for a client to be short-

> term (i.e., several sessions). There is communication to the schools but this is difficult due to the fact that the staff is part-time and also committed to their regular full-time positions.
>
> In general I was favorably impressed with the staff and the program. While we would have preferred an observation of the program during a more typical evening, nevertheless, from the records the program seems to provide a setting where pupils can go with personal problems and some academic problems.

d. Reading Laboratory, District 22

The fourth special program observed as part of this year's Open Enrollment evaluation was the Reading Laboratory in District 22. The details of the program are outlined in the district proposal.

> An EDL (Educational Developmental Laboratory) Reading Laboratory will be organized in a room of the building which houses the Office of District 22. Six groups of 15-20 pupils each, selected according to the criteria in "a", from JHS 234 and JHS 240, will be brought to the reading laboratory three times per week by bus. They will receive intensive reading help for periods of one hour each.
>
> The laboratory will be supervised by a corrective reading teacher who will diagnose and assign materials. Three educational assistants will work with the corrective reading teacher by either assisting individual pupils or working with small groups. Emphasis will be on the use of highly motivating teaching machines such as the Controlled Reader, Audex, Tachistoscope, and Jr. Controlled Reader (individual). These will be used to teach word attack skills and comprehension skills. The Audioflashcard Reader will be used to teach phonic skills and also to help the non-English speaking pupils. The machines can be used individually or in groups and the pupils are highly motivated to work with them. There will also be a paperback library to improve the pupils' attitudes toward reading. They will be permitted to keep one out of every three books read in order to stimulate reading.

The observational team consisted of three college faculty members, specialists in elementary education, guidance, and multi-media and audiovisual techniques. In addition to observing the program in operation, the team interviewed the corrective reading

teacher in charge of the laboratory program, the three educational assistants who help in the lab, and three women from the Educational Development Laboratory staff who had dropped in to visit the lab.

The observation team agreed that the atmosphere in the lab was relaxed but business-like, that the interaction between the teachers and the children appeared good, that the children received considerable individual instruction and most of them worked diligently. However, the observers also commented on the impersonal nature of such extended work with machines (each group receives a double period of instruction four days a week), and on the fact that some children get bored.

Two of the observers noted that one of the weaknesses of the program is that children miss many activities and classes in their home schools because of the double period of instruction plus the time spent waiting for the bus to the lab, and the bus ride itself. Absenteeism is consequently high (about 50 percent). This facility must be maintained in a central location because there was not enough money to provide the staff, materials, and machines for each individual school involved. Although the problem has been discussed with all the students, as well as with the administrations of the home schools, no really satisfactory solution has been worked out yet.

Two of the observers also noted that although the program had many strengths such as abundant and sequential materials, a low teacher-pupil ratio, continuous progress by students at their own pace, as well as others previously noted, it also had some major weaknesses. In addition to the mechanical quality of the program,

they noted that there seemed to be little opportunity for discussion and evaluation of reading matter as literature. In fact, one observer pointed out that the students "...do not seem to have become deeply involved in the process of reading as a result of the program. A small library of paperback books is available in the center for use outside of class. The books are specially designed for these students, and the incentive had been amended so that if they read four they can keep a fifth (the proposal called for one in three). But only a minority of the students have borrowed books and very few books have been given away. It is difficult to say, though, whether the books are as attractive to the students as they are intended to be."

Another major problem reported was that "...the 80 student capacity of the center covers only the most severely retarded seventh graders in the Open Enrollment program. Those eighth and ninth grade Open Enrollment students with similar problems are almost completely excluded; moreover, operating the center as an afterschool program for local students, while admittedly only a small gesture in response to local complaints about special treatment for 'outsiders,' doesn't begin to cover those who need help within the district."

The final problem mentioned by the observers was that as of May 19, 1970, "There had been no complete, formal evaluation of this program. Since programmed materials are self-scoring, each student's progress is indicated by the level at which he or she is working, but this is not a reliable indication of how well the programmed skills have carried over into regular classroom work. A mid-year evaluation

of attitude change, in which responses were solicited from each student's teacher, was conducted. This response was generally favorable. A complete evaluation was to be conducted in June using standardized reading scores."

Members of the observation team made a number of recommendations for the program. A breather in the double period seemed to be in order. One observer felt that the addition of one or more non-white assistants should be considered. Closer liaison with the home school was also mentioned. Two of the observers thought that additional centers in the schools that need them would be a great improvement. One of the observers suggested the possibility of installing the center in a mobile van so that the busing could be eliminated and the program put into direct contact with the schools involved; if nothing else, he felt the program should be expanded in its present form so that it can at least reach the eighth and ninth grade Open Enrollment students who are also in need of this kind of help.

CHAPTER VII

IN-CLASS INTERACTIONS

The evaluation team was interested in obtaining some insight into what kinds of interactions take place in class. This was accomplished in two ways. First, the professional observers were asked to indicate in their own words the nature of the five specified interactions. Table VII-1 summarizes the content analysis of their responses. Second, they were asked to indicate on a work-chart the kinds of pupil-to-pupil interactions they observed, considering both the sex and ethnic status of the children. Tables VII-2 through VII-5 present the analyses of these data.

SEATING PATTERNS

The observers were asked to indicate the nature of the seating patterns in the class being observed and to ask the teacher how the children were seated initially. The professional observers considered all of the classes they observed at both the elementary and junior high school levels to have integrated seating patterns. The parent observers generally agreed, but there were a few classes (4, 3) which they felt reflected cluster seating. As to how the children were seated, the levels differed in the way which would be expected. At the elementary level, usually (73 percent) teachers assigned seats, occasionally (9 percent) permitting children some discretion about changing once they were assigned. In only one class in four (27 percent) were elementary level children in the classes observed permitted to choose their own seats.

In contrast, at the junior high school level children chose their own seats in half of the observed classes (50 percent) and were often (19 percent) permitted to change seats in the half of the classes in which the teacher assigned seats.

INTERACTIONS AS DESCRIBED BY OBSERVERS

As the data in Table VII-1 indicate, the free-response descriptions written by the observers were consistently positive for both school levels for all five types of interaction.

The specific content of the observers' descriptions provides some interesting comparisons. Teachers were described as "warm" and "friendly" three times as often as they were as "sarcastic" and "overbearing." Similarly, they were described as "capable" twice as often as they were described as "not capable." For children too, the positive descriptions were far more frequent. For example, the children were described as "respectful towards teachers" seven times more often than they were described as "disrespectful." Similarly, they were described as "engrossed" and in "involved" in their tasks four times as often as they were described as "uninterested."

CHILD-TO-CHILD INTERACTIONS, BY SEX AND ETHNIC STATUS

Positive Interactions

a. Elementary Level

Tables VII-2 and VII-3 present the percentage distribution of interactions in elementary school classes by sex and ethnic status of the children. As a basis for evaluating these data the tables also

TABLE VII-1

FEELING TONE, AND NATURE OF INTERACTIONS NOTED
(BY SCHOOL LEVEL, FREQUENCY IN NUMBER)

Interactors	Feeling Tone of Interactions	School Level Elem.	JHS	Most Frequent Free-Response Descriptions of Interactions[a] Positive Interaction	Elem.	JHS	Negative Interaction	Elem.	JHS
1. Teacher to Children	Positive	67	70	Warm, pleasant, friendly	31	22	unaware	10	14
	Negative	17	26	Interested, respectful	10	15	sarcastic, overbearing	6	13
				Encouraging, supportive	11	14	Impersonal	4	10
							Not stimulating	5	9
2. Children to Teacher	Positive	64	65	Respectful	20	21	Disrespectful	3	3
	Negative	7	10	Attentive, interested	14	18	Inattentive	3	4
				Friendly, at ease, relaxed	13	18			
3. Children to Each Other	Positive	29	35	Friendly	29	35	Little Interaction	9	11
	Negative	0	1						
	Little or None	12	13				No Interaction	3	2
4. Teacher to Job	Positive	66	66	Conscientious, dedicated	26	22	Not capable, inadequate	8	10
	Negative	12	19	Capable, skilled, effective, professional	26	21	Showed poor planning	2	4
				Interested	4	8	Unenthusiastic	2	3
5. Children to Tasks	Positive	39	40	Involved, attentive engrossed	29	27	Uninterested	5	10
	Negative	9	14	Interested	8	8			

[a] Other interactions were noted no more than once.

TABLE VII-2

FREQUENCY OF POSITIVE IN-CLASS INTERACTIONS INITIATED,

BY SEX AND ETHNIC STATUS OF INITIATOR AND RECIPIENT

ELEMENTARY LEVEL

BY OBSERVER, IN PERCENT

				RECIPIENT					
				White		Black		Spanish Speaking	
OBSERVER	INITIATOR		N	Male	Female	Male	Female	Male	Female
Professional	White	Male	99	35%	30%	22%	8%	5%	0%
		Female	100	26	45	9	11	1	8
	Black	Male	66	39	20	18	9	6	8
		Female	63	19	35	13	25	3	5
	Spanish	Male	29	24	10	14	7	31	14
	Speaking	Female	23	9	26	14	17	17	17
Base Line Data on Distribution of Children in Classes Observed			1062	37	37	8	10	4	4
Parent	White	Male	85	44	21	22	9	4	0
		Female	76	26	43	16	7	5	3
	Black	Male	52	42	25	10	5	8	10
		Female	50	24	32	20	14	6	4
	Spanish	Male	27	19	7	19	19	22	14
	Speaking	Female	16	19	19	12	6	19	25
Base Line Data on Distribution of Children in Classes Observed			757	38	33	9	13	4	3

TABLE VII-3

FREQUENCY OF POSITIVE IN-CLASS INTERACTIONS RECEIVED,

BY SEX AND ETHNIC STATUS OF INITIATOR AND RECIPIENT

ELEMENTARY LEVEL

BY OBSERVER, IN PERCENT

				INITIATOR					
				White		Black		Spanish Speaking	
OBSERVER	Recipient		N	Male	Female	Male	Female	Male	Female
Professional	White	Male	108	32%	25%	24%	11%	6%	2%
		Female	119	25	38	11	18	3	5
	Black	Male	58	36	16	21	14	8	5
		Female	47	17	23	13	34	4	9
	Spanish Speaking	Male	24	17	4	17	8	37	17
		Female	24	0	33	20	13	17	17
Base line data on distribution of Children in classes observed			1062	37	37	8	10	4	4
Parent	White	Male	99	37	20	22	12	5	4
		Female	85	21	39	15	19	2	4
	Black	Male	53	36	23	9	19	9	4
		Female	29	28	17	11	24	17	3
	Spanish Speaking	Male	23	13	17	18	13	26	13
		Female	17	--	12	28	12	24	24
Base line data on distribution of Children in classes observed			757	38	33	9	13	4	3

present the number of children in the classes observed by sex and ethnic status. Table VII-2 presents the data in terms of who initiated the interaction, and Table VII-3 presents these same data in terms of the receipient of the interaction. Thus, the first row of data in Table VII-2 indicates that of the 99 interactions initiated by white male students, 35 percent were directed towards other white males, 30 percent to white females, 22 percent to black males, and so on. In contrast the first row of Table VII-3 indicates that of the 108 interactions received by (or directed towards) white males, 32 percent came from other white males, 24 percent from white females, 24 percent from black males, and so on. Tables VII-4 and VII-5 present similar analyses for the junior high school classes observed.

Basically the interactions noted followed the distribution of children in the classes. Using a deviation of 10 percent from the percentage of children available in the class as a criterion, the deviations in both Tables VII-2 and VII-3 indicate that black males tended to avoid interactions with white males or females and with Spanish speaking children, and had more than the expected interactions with other black males. Similarly, black females tended to avoid white males but not white females, and had more than the expected interactions with other black females. Thus, for black children, sex and ethnic status are both needed to explain their pattern of interaction with classmates. In contrast, while the few Spanish speaking children observed also tended to avoid interaction with white males and females, they interacted with both Spanish speaking males and females. For the Spanish speaking children, ethnic status alone may be the basis for interaction with classmates.

TABLE VII-4

FREQUENCY OF POSITIVE IN-CLASS INTERACTIONS INITIATED,

BY SEX AND ETHNIC STATUS OF INITIATOR AND RECIPIENT

JUNIOR HIGH SCHOOL LEVEL

BY OBSERVER, IN PERCENT

				RECIPIENT					
				White		Black		Spanish Speaking	
OBSERVER	INITIATOR		N	Male	Female	Male	Female	Male	Female
Professional	White	Male	86	33%	16%	24%	12%	14%	1%
		Female	82	17	48	10	14	5	6
	Black	Male	79	27	8	29	13	15	8
		Female	70	9	17	17	37	6	14
	Spanish	Male	38	21	5	18	13	37	16
	Speaking	Female	36	8	22	11	14	14	31
Base line data on distribution of Children in classes observed			1108	34	26	13	14	7	6
Parent	White	Male	110	43	13	23	9	11	1
		Female	91	14	43	11	15	4	13
	Black	Male	106	32	9	32	19	7	1
		Female	75	13	27	16	36	4	4
	Spanish	Male	36	36	8	22	8	22	4
	Speaking	Female	32	13	56	9	13	6	3
Base line data on distribution of Children in classes observed			859	36	25	13	15	5	5

TABLE VII-5

FREQUENCY OF POSITIVE IN-CLASS INTERACTIONS RECEIVED,

BY SEX AND ETHNIC STATUS OF INITIATOR AND RECIPIENT

JUNIOR HIGH SCHOOL LEVEL

BY OBSERVER, IN PERCENT

				INITIATOR					
				White		Black		Spanish Speaking	
OBSERVER	RECIPIENT		N	Male	Female	Male	Female	Male	Female
Professional	White	Male	80	35%	17%	26%	8%	10%	4%
		Female	82	18	48	8	14	2	10
	Black	Male	74	28	11	30	16	9	5
		Female	68	14	18	14	38	8	8
	Spanish	Male	51	24	8	24	8	27	9
	Speaking	Female	36	3	14	19	28	6	30
Base line data on distribution of Children in classes observed			1108	34	26	13	14	7	6
Parent	White	Male	122	39	11	28	8	11	3
		Female	104	13	38	10	19	3	17
	Black	Male	92	27	11	37	13	9	3
		Female	78	13	18	26	35	3	5
	Spanish	Male	35	34	9	20	9	23	5
	Speaking	Female	19	5	64	5	16	5	5
Base line data on distribution of Children in classes observed			859	36	25	14	15	5	5

The parent observers reported much the same data as the professionals, including the perceptions of interactions reported in the paragraph above. Thus, of the 17 deviations noted in the data from the professional members of the observation team, the data from parent members reflects 14 of these, and includes only one that the professionals had not noted. The parents recorded that Spanish speaking males initiated 10 percent more interactions with black males than would be expected.

The data also provide a direct behavioral test of one of the principal goals of the original Open Enrollment program, the goal of ethnic interaction. Viewed in this way, the data indicate that the program is successful, for at both the elementary and junior high school levels, there were some positive interactions between every combination of ethnic group except between white males and Spanish speaking females at the elementary level.

b. Junior High School Level

The data for the junior high school level almost completely correspond to those for the elementary level, except that the interaction pattern for the Spanish speaking junior high school students parallels that of the black students. Thus, where at the elementary level, the data indicate that Spanish speaking students interact more with each other, regardless of sex at the junior high school level, Spanish speaking males interact more than would be expected with other Spanish speakmales but not with females. The converse finding holds for the Spanish speaking females.

Negative Interactions

In contrast to the 380 positive interactions noted by professional observers at the elementary level and the 391 noted at the junior high school level, there were only 86 negative interactions noted: 39 at the elementary and 47 at the junior high school level. The distribution of these in terms of initiator and recipient and ethnic status appears in Table VII-6.[1]

At both elementary and junior high school levels the majority of negative interactions initiated by white pupils were directed towards other white pupils. At the elementary level the majority of the few negative interactions by black and Spanish speaking children were also directed toward white children. At the junior high school level, the majority of the negative interactions were directed toward the same ethnic group as the initiator.

CONCLUSION

At both the elementary and junior high school level the data indicate that parent and professional observers saw predominantly positive interactions among the children in the classes they observed. Moreover, the interactions were distributed among children in reasonable approximation to the distribution of children within the classes except for the tendency of males to avoid females and vice versa, and for the minority groups to overselect each other somewhat. Perhaps most important, the

[1] Again, data from parent observers were similar.

TABLE VII-6

DISTRIBUTION OF NEGATIVE INTERACTIONS NOTED

BY PROFESSIONAL OBSERVERS, IN FREQUENCY

	Recipient at Elem. Level				Recipient at J.H.S. Level			
Initiator	N	White	Black	Spanish Speaking	N	White	Black	Spanish Speaking
White	19	12	5	2	13	9	2	2
Black	15	7	5	3	21	4	10	7
Spanish Speaking	5	4	1	0	13	2	4	7

objective fact of integration achieved by placing black and Spanish speaking children in the receiving schools has been followed by positive classroom interactions. With one exception, there was evidence of each ethnic group interacting positively with each other.

CHAPTER VIII

CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

CONCLUSIONS ABOUT EVALUATION FOCI

In terms of the three foci of this evaluation, the data provide a basis for the following conclusions:

1. The program was essentially implemented as proposed, and certainly the legal commitment to expend the funds in pre-specified ways was also met. While there was considerable confusion at the individual school level as to just who and what was supported by program funds, this confusion did not obscure the basic finding that support was provided at the scale envisioned.

2. The participants studied, coordinators, principals, teachers, parents and children, were generally positive in their perceptions of the program.

3. The quality of the separate district programs observed was also rated positively by both professional and parent members of the observation team. Particular praise was given some of the special programs developed in Districts 11 and 22.

SPECIFIC RECOMMENDATIONS

The data obtained in this evaluation lead to several specific recommendations:

1. At the district level, develop or strengthen the communication between the Title I coordinator and the district principals in both the development and implementation of the district proposal. Once established, this interrelationship should continue throughout the year so that each is informed as to the activities of the other. This would make the Title I coordinator a better informed coordinator of the separate school programs and make the principals better informed implementors of the district program.

   Obviously, in all districts someone should be "on top" of all programs, particularly one of the scope and educational and social importance of Open Enrollment.

The evaluation staff recognizes that the district Title I coordinator is not an independent, autonomous position and that his or her responsibilities and freedom of action are affected by the perceptions of this role held by the district superintendent and others. What is suggested here is maximum coordination and monitoring of programs within the district's perception of the coordinator's role and responsibilities.

2. At all levels, there should be more thorough efforts to inform principals and staff of the specific support each school is receiving through the program. We are aware that the Office of State and Federally Supported Programs prepares and distributes lists for just this purpose. Indeed, the 1969-70 lists made available to this staff through their kind cooperation were immensely helpful. But communication does not succeed until and unless the message is received, and the responses of principals and staff indicate that this particular message as to support provided often is not received at the school and classroom level. Awareness of the contribution being made by the Title I effort is critical to achieving continued support for the program, and so this effort to improve communication is worth whatever effort it takes. We suggest that specific lists for each school be prepared and sent directly to the school for the information of the principal; to the staff being supported so that they know the source of support for their position; to all staff about supplies and materials and equipment purchased so that they know the source of the funds which purchased them; to the Parent Association and to community groups so that they know the nature of support being funneled into the school through the program.

   This effort, if successful, would also clear away the confusion revealed in the data from the Principal's Implementation Inventory as to just who and what is supported by the program.

3. We agree with the principals' view that proposal preparation should be essentially completed in the year preceding the program with the possible exception of orientation activities. In this regard we are pleased that as this is written in June 1970, there has already been an orientation meeting at the Bureau of Research of the Board of Education in regard to programs for the 1970-71 academic year. This reflects a sharp moving forward of the entire timetable for proposal development and evaluation design, and is a commendable effort.

4. We suggest that there be some city-wide effort to train staff in the work of proposal development. Specifically the proposals should be internally consistent, with the overall goals translated into specific objectives, stated in terms of behavioral outcomes. These in turn should lead logically into the program components intended to lead to the achievement of each separate objective and thereby the ultimate achievement of the goals. A series of in-service seminars or work groups could help immeasurably in this effort, since proposal writing is a skill which is not taught in any current program for the preparation of educational personnel.

5. We agree with the principals who suggested that evaluators should properly be involved in the early stages of proposal development. This process too has been begun in 1970, and should strengthen the interaction between program and evaluation and thereby improve the integrity of each.

6. We agree with the district Title I coordinator who noted a need for reviewing the current basis of allocating funds to a district of $100 per pupil since it has persisted unchanged despite changes in salary scales and in the costs of all materials and supplies purchased for use in the program.

7. We reinforce the suggestions made by the principals for improving community involvement, particularly by the parents of the children being bused. Moving some programs into the sending school neighborhood, providing bus transportation to and from the receiving school for evening meetings, having a liaison person in the sending school at different times during the day are all possible ways for expediting involvement. These and others should be tried until the best methods are found.

8. In some of the receiving schools in some districts in Brooklyn, there is a need for discussions and/or conferences between principals of sending and receiving schools to clarify the question of criteria used in selecting children for admission to this program. Our data provide no basis for determining if the receiving school principals are correct in believing that children with behavior problems enter the program in inordinately large proportions. But this is certainly a problem which can be resolved through face-to-face discussion.

FINAL CONCLUSION

Looking back over the various aspects of the decentralized Open Enrollment program which were studied in this evaluation, two general conclusions can be drawn by the evaluation staff.

First, the overall feeling and tone of most of the data is clearly, even strongly positive. Both parent and professional observers were impressed with the schools they visited, both in terms of physical facilities, climate and atmosphere, and in terms of the functioning of teachers and the response of children. The sample of mothers who responded, although small, expressed nearly unanimous satisfaction with the education their children were receiving, and the children who responded more often wrote positive than negative descriptions of their experiences. The small sample of respondent teachers too, was positively oriented.

However, this positive data should be qualified by the second conclusion; that in most districts and schools the Open Enrollment "program" is best described as a set of staff positions supported by funds provided under this budget heading. This finding is supported by the data from the Principal's Implementation Inventory where a large majority of the principals indicated no role in the preparation of the district proposal and one in five indicated no awareness of it at all. It is further indicated in teachers' responses that the program involves "staff" or guidance counselors not being aware that their position was supported under the program.

Therefore, we believe that the most important finding is reflected in the strongly positive evaluation of such special programs as the four reviewed in this report in Districts 11 and 22. These efforts

have reached advanced stages of development because of the funds made available under the decentralized Open Enrollment program. As one of our observers noted, about one program, "This is a good example of what a decentralized school district can do...."

Thus, the evaluation staff believes that its primary recommendation is to strongly encourage the separate districts to continue in the initial efforts indicated this year to individualize program development and so capitalize on talent, specialization and interest within individual districts and schools. Efforts like those we have evaluated this year have been impressive.

CHAPTER IX

SUMMARY

INTRODUCTION

This evaluation of the decentralized Open Enrollment programs conducted in the New York City public schools during the 1969-70 school year with funds provided by Title I of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act covers programs developed and implemented at the school district level. Nineteen different districts received funds for programs under the general heading of "Open Enrollment" and the programs had varied interests and emphases, reflecting local conditions and concerns.

OBJECTIVES OF THE DISTRICT PROGRAM

The evaluation design was developed from those items noted in the district proposals under the heading "Objectives." The objectives can be grouped into three areas, 1) those concerned with general or specific aspects of academic improvement, 2) those concerned with the nature of the school's service, including both the provision of guidance and counseling services, and the modification and/or improvement in staff and the instructional process, and 3) those concerned with some dimension of the social process or the child's personal (non-academic) functioning.

The most consistent concern expressed in the proposals was with objectives related to social and personal processes; for 16 of the 19 districts had at least one objective in this area, and two had all of

their objectives here. This concern was most often defined in terms of improving interrelationships within the triad of school-home-and community. Other consistent emphases were on reducing conflict and/or improving adjustment among children and fostering integration.

There was also consistent concern with academic improvement, most often specifically stated in terms of reading. Fourteen of the 19 proposals made some reference to an aspect of academic improvement, with 11 specifying reading improvement. No other specific academic component was mentioned by more than three districts.

Twelve different districts had at least one objective within the third area, instructional and guidance processes; most often noted was the provision of guidance services. Otherwise, only objectives related to the use of or recognition of paraprofessionals were stated in more than three proposals.

THE EVALUATION PLAN

The Foci of Evaluation

The overall plan for the evaluation had three major foci. The first was to evaluate the extent to which the program elements, as specified in the several district proposals, were in fact implemented. This was done by sending a Principal's Implementation Inventory to the principal of every school designated as receiving some service, supply, or staff, through the district Open Enrollment program.

The other two foci involved only a sample of six districts. The second focus was on "participant reaction," which involved determining

the reaction of children, mothers, teachers, principals and district Title I coordinators. The third focus was on the quality of the "program" as it was implemented within the sample schools. This aspect of the evaluation was conducted by sending in teams of professional and parent observers to visit and observe classes in the sample schools. The observers sought to see the school's normal functioning, with particular emphasis on the Open Enrollment program.

The Sample

Six districts were selected from the 19 submitting proposals on the basis of the size of the district budget and the complexity of the district program.

All six districts invited to participate agreed and the interviews with the district Title I coordinator were completed on schedule. Similarly, the entire sample of eight junior high schools within these six districts invited to participate, agreed. However, the implementation of this evaluation at the elementary level was impeded by the reluctance of several elementary school principals in the sample districts to permit their schools to serve as data collection sites because they considered the Center for Urban Education to be biased against the administrative staff of the public schools. Given this professional disagreement, they did not wish to cooperate with, or be a part of, this evaluation.

Despite strong and consistent support of our request from the Bureau of Research at the Board of Education, in one of the original six districts selected for the sample no elementary school principal

would agree and in a second district only one elementary school principal agreed. The same reluctance was found in the alternates selected for the totally non-participating district, and so the sample of elementary schools involves only five of the six districts.

If a sample district had more than one school at the elementary or junior high school level, schools were samples to represent the range in number of children admitted under the Open Enrollment program.

Instruments and Data Gathering Procedures

Nine different instruments were used in this evaluation.

a. Informal Interview Guide for Title I Coordinators

The Title I coordinators of the six sample districts were interviewed in December and January, in order to acquire an understanding of the nature of the programs in these districts, and to obtain the coordinators' perceptions of how the district program was being implemented.

b. Principal's Implementation Inventory

This instrument was a highly structured questionnaire, intended 1) to identify the role each principal played in the development of the district Open Enrollment proposal and his perception of the most effective timetable for proposal development, 2) to provide a description of the population of the school, 3) to identify the kinds of personnel, equipment and supplies provided to the school under the program, and 4) to describe the extent of parental and community involvement.

An inventory was mailed to the principals of 240 schools listed as Open Enrollment receiving schools, but because of the "boycott"

noted above and the reluctance of principals of schools receiving few, or no, services funded through the Open Enrollment program to fill out a questionnaire, returns were slow. After much discussion with "boycotting" principals, a second mailing went out with a cover letter from Dr. Samuel McClelland, Director of the Office of Educational Research, enlisting the cooperation of the schools, and a letter from the Evaluation Chairman giving schools the option of indicating by letter that they had only fractional services, or were not an Open Enrollment receiving school; responses were received from 117 schools.

Since this sample of returns includes schools in 18 of the 19 districts, the data provided do serve to accomplish the research purposes of the Inventory, although on a sampling rather than the population basis desired.

c. Teacher's Questionnaire

This was a simple one page questionnaire intended to elicit teachers' perceptions of the program's effectiveness, strengths, weaknesses and possible improvements.

The teacher questionnaire was placed in the letterboxes of 639 teachers in each of five elementary schools, and five junior high schools chosen on the basis of their relatively high Open Enrollment registers. Only 61 were returned, despite the brevity of the instrument. The return rate of 9.5 percent makes the returns suggestive at best.

d. through g. Observational Instruments

Before discussing the instruments completed by the observation

team, it is appropriate to consider the nature of the visits.

Both professionals and non-professionals were used on the observational teams for this evaluation. The special competences sought in the professional members of the team were determined by the emphases of the sample districts' proposals.

Eleven different professional observers were used, five as experts in the instructional areas at the elementary and secondary level, four in guidance, counseling and psychological services and one each in social and community services and multi-media instruction.

The nine non-professionals on the observation team were all parents and most had children in school in one of the districts included within the decentralized Open Enrollment program. All of the parent observers were women, seven white and two black. All had at least a high school education. Before the parent observers made school visits, they came into the project office for small group briefing sessions, including a review of instruments to be used, and procedures to be followed.

Beginning in March and continuing through early June, the teams visited the sample schools at about one to two week intervals. To establish continuity, each of the sample districts was assigned to one observational team, and that team made all of the visits in the district. A total of 85.5 observer days was spent in the sample schools on 23 visits, 40.5 days in elementary schools, 34 in junior high schools and 11 in special facilities or programs.

The instruments involved were the following:

d. Basic Individual Lesson Observation Report (ILOR)

This instrument, adapted from the ILOR used in several previous evaluations, was the observation guide used by the professional members of each observation team. The questions used in this evaluation focussed on five areas: 1) a description of the lesson observed in terms of who taught it, content, and methodology; 2) teacher functioning as reflected in her planning, use of materials, ability to elicit response and participation, classroom climate and atmosphere, and effectiveness of teaching style and method; 3) children's reaction, response and participation; 4) interclass interactions; and 5) overall appraisal of the lesson, and specifically its strengths and weaknesses.

For those districts which emphasized remedial reading services additional items were added to the Basic ILOR for the reading specialist on the observational team. These items asked for descriptions and evaluations of the techniques used in the remedial reading groups.

A total of 135 lessons was observed by the professional members of the observation team, 70 at the elementary and 65 at the junior high level. In addition, 40 remedial reading lessons were observed, 21 at the elementary and 19 at the junior high school level. The 70 elementary level lessons most often involved reading 35 (50 percent), mathematics seven (10 percent), social studies five (7 percent), or English and language arts six (9 percent).

e. Basic ILOR: For Parent Observers

The parent observers completed a brief version of the ILOR which was intended to elicit from them their description of the lesson (who

taught it, the content, the kind of grouping, if any); their views of children's reactions and responses; and their "vote" as to whether or not they would like their "...child to be in this class even if he ad to be bused to attend?"

One hundred and nine lessons were observed by the parent members of the observation team, with the distribution in terms of content similar to that for the professional observers, since the parent observers accompanied the professional observers.

f. Interaction Pattern Analysis

In an effort to obtain some quantitative estimate of the nature of the interactions between children in the classroom, professional and parent observers were asked to indicate on a cross-tally chart the frequency of interactions observed between children considering the variables of sex and ethnic status (White, Black, Puerto Rican and other).

These patterns were completed for 114 lessons by professional observers: 69 at the elementary and 45 at the junior high school level. The patterns were completed by parent observers for 101 lessons: 38 at the elementary and 63 at the junior high school level.

g. Building and School-Wide Observations

Since some observational data were characteristic of the school rather than the class or lesson, each member of the observational team was also asked to complete a Building and School-Wide Observation form at the end of the observational day. This form was intended to

provide the evaluation staff with ratings of the physical characteristics and facilities of the building (i.e., lunchroom, library, science laboratories), and the overall atmosphere of the school.

In all, 33 Building and School-Wide Observation forms were completed by professional members of the observation team (involving 16 elementary and 17 junior high schools) and 24 were completed by parent observers, 14 elementary and ten junior high schools.

h. Mother's Questionnaire

A questionnaire was developed brief enough to be printed on the back of a 5" x 8" postcard. The questionnaire asked the child's mother to rate her satisfaction with the progress her child was making (the eldest if she had more than one child in the school), and to describe the extent of her participation in Parents Associations and the extent of her visits to school. In addition, the Mother's Questionnaire for children being bussed under the district Open Enrollment program asked whether or not they had requested the transfer.

One hundred seventy three Open Enrollment mother and 361 receiving school mother forms were distributed in four elementary and five junior high schools. Of these, 17 questionnaires were returned by mothers of children being bussed and 80 were returned by mothers of children in the receiving schools.

i. Student Questionnaire

Student opinion was obtained in this evaluation by simply asking children in participating junior high schools to describe their experi-

ences while attending a school in which some children came from other districts.

The questionnaire was distributed to three classes in each of five junior high schools chosen because of relatively high registers of Open Enrollment children.

Substantive responses were received from 103 of the 135 responding students in five different junior high schools out of a potential 302. Of these, 61 were received from resident children and 42 from those who had been bused at some point in their school career, and 167 handed in blank sheets.

FINDINGS: PERCEPTIONS OF COORDINATORS, PRINCIPALS, AND TEACHERS

Perceptions of Title I Coordinators

The six Title I coordinators interviewed indicated they had received the personnel requested, but materials and equipment were still coming in from the 1968-69 school year and some for 1969-70 had not yet been ordered because of late approval of the budget. All six felt that parent involvement with the schools was not satisfactory despite varied efforts to involve them. All six also brought up the question of funding and felt that the sequence and timing was much too late for proper ordering and planning.

The six coordinators recommended that: 1) the Center for Urban Education should try to make its evaluation without any preconceived ideas, 2) representatives of the evaluation team should sit down with

district staff and work out the proposals, 3) funding should be made over a longer period of time, 4) funding should be based on $150 per Open Enrollment pupil rather than on the present $100, and 5) that each district receive an advance of five to seven percent of its program money so supplies can be ordered in advance. All coordinators agreed on the necessity for earlier funding.

Perceptions of Principals

a. The Preparation of the District Proposal

Of the 67 principals who answered the question about their role in developing the district proposal most (41) wrote in the word "none" in response to this question. In 15 of the 19 districts, at least one principal responding either said he had no role or left the item blank.

The 26 principals who indicated some role represent ten different districts. Primarily they had been resource people, often providing "ideas for recycling the program."

Although not many had participated in developing the proposal, four of five principals felt that they were familiar with it. However, the fact that one principal in five reported he was "not at all familiar" with the district proposal is still a serious matter. In other words, by midyear one in five principals responsible for implementing some part of a program reports no familiarity with the proposal for that program.

Few principals felt that beginning work on any aspect of planning for the Open Enrollment program could be delayed beyond the end

of the year preceding implementation, except for orientation sessions with paraprofessionals which could be begun during the summer or at the beginning of the year of implementation.

Planning and programming and ordering supplies and equipment needed the earliest beginning, preferably no later than February of the year before implementation.

b. Staff Supplied by Program

Data provided by elementary school principals on the total numbers of teachers and paraprofessionals "...paid from Open Enrollment funds," had little relationship to the data provided when they were asked position by position to indicate the number of special personnel assigned to their schools. School principals were not certain as to who on their staff was paid by Open Enrollment program funds. At the elementary level they generally said they had received more teachers and paraprofessionals than the proposals indicated, while at the junior high school level they generally said that they had received fewer than indicated.

These data indicate a clear need for improved communication between the Office of State and Federally Assisted programs and the schools receiving services as to the specific staff which are supported by various programs.

More important perhaps is the fact that while the data indicate that the funds for staff are being used to support the indicated services, these staff do not seem to fit the model of new or additional

staff specifically recruited to fill roles within a program. Rather, as noted in the 1968-69 evaluation of the program, these staff continue to fit the model of services already on a school's table of organization before the program. The only new element is that the services are now charged to the budget for this program.

The evaluation staff questions whether this is fulfilling the intent of the decentralized Title I Program to have "services follow the child." It would seem that the addition of children needing remedial and supplementary services would require additional personnel. However, the evaluation team sees the wisdom of using experienced staff already in a school to implement these programs. The point is not that specific teachers were already in the schools but that the specific positions were directed to providing the same services.

c. Other Aspects of the Program Provisions

Principals were also asked about ...other aspects of the program: paraprofessional staff, materials and supplies and the provision for orientation of staff and parents. Generally principals felt that they needed more paraprofessional help, even in those instances when they already had some on staff. Not enough principals completed the question about materials for any more substantial conclusion than that the variety of materials planned seemed to have been purchased, and that some of the problems noted in previous years in late provisions of materials were not serious in 1969-70. Asked specifically about their satisfaction with reading, audiovisual and science materials, principals indicated general satisfaction both with

the availability and quality of materials in all three areas. As to orientation, there were more consistent efforts to orient staff and principals than those reported in previous years, and so this is an area of improvement.

d. Community Involvement

Principals saw a lot of room for improvement in the extent of parental and community involvement in the activities of their schools, and also saw more involvement by the receiving community and its parents, than by the sending school community and its parents. Three kinds of suggestions were made for improving school-parent and school-community cooperation: providing transportation and/or carfare for sending school parents, staffing schools with a family worker to serve as the contact between the school and the sending community parents, and conducting activities for the sending community parents in the sending community itself.

e. Problems in Implementation

Fifty-eight principals identified at least one problem in implementing the program. The problem most often mentioned was that of insufficient and/or late funding, and the resulting insufficiencies of personnel, materials or supplies. Next came the problems connected with sending school parents, either the inability to secure their participation in school and parental activities, or the difficulty of contacting them in the event of illness or emergency. In addition, the principals noted problems concerned with behavior, providing supervision or scheduling limitations concerned with busing.

Teacher Perceptions

The reader is reminded that the response rate on the Teacher Questionnaire of only 9.5 percent makes the data suggestive only.

To the responding teachers, the Open Enrollment program meant "extra staff," usually in reading, less often in music, science or guidance. As a group the teachers were positive about the program as it functioned in their school. They viewed the strengths as integration, smaller classes and the atmosphere of the receiving school. Weaknesses noted involved the lack of special personnel needed, the travel time for the children and the difficulty in establishing any teacher-Open Enrollment parent communication.

FINDINGS: PERCEPTIONS OF MOTHERS AND CHILDREN AND CHILDREN'S ACHIEVEMENT IN READING

Mothers' Perceptions

More than four-fifths of the 80 mothers of resident children were "satisfied" or "very satisfied" with the progress their children were making in school and even larger majorities said that they got to school for conferences with their child's teacher, most often when asked, less often when they had something to discuss.

A bit less than half considered themselves active in the Parents Association of the school, usually as a member, rarely as an officer. Almost none was currently a member of any community group concerned with education.

Children's Perceptions

The substantive responses to the Student Questionnaire are not enough to be considered representative of the population of the five schools involved, but the students' free responses provide some insight into the orientation of these pupils along a positive-negative continuum. Both Open Enrollment and resident pupils come through as positively oriented, although there were some vigorously negative statements made.

Most often pupils gave their personal evaluation of their school. Less often they commented on the Open Enrollment program, or specifically about travelling.

Reading Achievement

In the sample districts and schools, the sample of Open Enrollment children identified through the administration of the Pupil Questionnaire was used as the sample for estimating both the current status of children in reading achievement and the nature of progress from 1969 to 1970.

In all grades the Open Enrollment children were reading below grade level, with a gap of about one-half year in the elementary grades, but of about two years in the junior high school years. Although still showing reading levels below expectation, the 1969-70 data do reflect progress when compared to those from two and three years ago. Although the 1969-70 samples are small, the pattern for all three grades for which comparisons are possible is the same. That pattern is that the Open Enrollment children were reading better in

1969-70 than in previous years. The difference was .3 of an academic year for children in grades 4 and 6, and .5 of an academic year for children in grade 5.

This improvement is reflected again in the data for the sub-sample of children for whom reading grades were available for both years. These data show that whereas in the year from 1966 to 1967 less than half of Open Enrollment children progressed normally, in the 1969-70 academic year slightly more than half did.

An analysis of these change data by district shows that the sample districts varied greatly in the patterns of change. In one district, half the children within the sub-sample showed normal progress and status at both elementary and junior high school levels. In two other districts, normal progress characterized half or more of the children at the elementary level, but characterized few children at the junior high school level. In two other districts there were few children who showed normal progress at either level.

Thus, the district analysis suggests that any overall conclusion would be deceptive, combining as it would two very different patterns, one of gain, one of little gain.

FINDINGS: THE OBSERVATIONAL VISITS

In all aspects parent and professional observers produced nearly identical data and so these are summarized together.

Building and School-Wide Observations

At both school levels, both professional and parent observers

appraised the school buildings positively. The buildings were almost always rated as "clean," "attractive" with attractive classrooms (although at the junior high school level one in three classrooms was considered "poor").

Lighting conditions were almost always rated as satisfactory in both classrooms and halls. Most of the schools visited had science rooms and/or science laboratories which were rated satisfactorily or very well equipped. Libraries, too, were rated positively, considered "attractive" with an "adequate" collection of books available for use in the library and for circulation.

Aspects of the Lessons

a. Planning, Organization and Classroom Atmosphere

In most instances the observers saw lessons involving whole class instruction, but at both levels there were classes in which children were receiving individual instruction and in which classes were divided into groups for purposes of instruction. Grouping was more common on the elementary level, but varied by district as well as level.

At the elementary level, the observers generally felt that the lessons they saw were organized and planned and often "exceptionally well organized and planned." In contrast the lessons observed at the junior high school level were rated as showing "little," "no," or only "some" signs of planning as often as they were rated as being "planned" or "well planned."

Given a check list to describe classroom atmosphere, the observers

nearly always chose options which described it positively and later in the ILOR, in their own words also described it positively.

b. Children's Response

Generally, the distributions of ratings for children's behaviors and reactions to elementary and junior high school lessons were similar. There were seven kinds of behavior which a clear majority of the observers believed characterised the children: well behaved, understood the teacher's spoken word, were working at tasks appropriate to their ability levels, appeared comfortable in class, showed sustained interest, actively participated, and displayed good verbal fluency.

c. Teachers' Performance

At both levels the overall ratings of seven aspects of teacher performance were positive, if consistently more positive at the elementary level. Teachers were most consistently effective in maintaining discipline, use of the teaching method they had chosen and in their ability to encourage children's participation.

d. Lesson Strengths and Weaknesses

Weaknesses noted by observers were generally methodological (i.e., references to routine lessons, lack of individual attention or lack of student expression). In contrast, the strengths were predominantly concerned with the qualities of the teachers.

Observations of Special Programs by Professional Observers

a. Remedial Reading Classes or Groups

The remedial reading classes or groups observed took place in a room primarily set up for this instruction. Skills taught most often were concerned with phonics or word attack, less often with oral expression or listening skills. The groups were usually homogeneous and were receiving instruction the observers considered systematic, sequential and appropriate, with materials and devices also considered appropriate.

Admission and discharge from the groups were usually done on the basis of the Metropolitan Achievement Test, less often on the basis of the judgment of the classroom or Corrective Reading teacher. There was evidence of integration of classroom and corrective instruction, through diagnostic procedures and teacher conferences.

b. Guidance Activities

This section of the report is impossible to summarize since it deals with "one of a kind" situations. Most of the observer comments were positive in tone, and noted the clear professional competence of the counselors observed.

c. Special District Programs

Four special district programs were observed, three in District 11 and one in District 22. Again, these are impossible to summarize, other than to note the extremely positive feeling tone of the comments on all four of these projects.

IN-CLASS INTERACTIONS

An effort was made to obtain some insight into what kinds of interactions take place in class. Free response descriptions given by the professional observers were consistently positive at both levels, for five specified interactions.

Teachers were described as warm and friendly three times as often as sarcastic and overbearing. They were described as capable twice as often as they were described as not capable. For children too, the positive descriptions were far more frequent, even on direct comparisons. For example, the children were described as respectful towards teachers seven times more often than they were described as disrespectful. They were described as engrossed and involved in their tasks four times as often as they were described as uninterested.

In addition to the free response items, the observers were also asked to fill out work-sheets detailing the types of child-to-child interactions taking place among children belonging to the different ethnic and sex groups.

With one exception, there were some positive interactions between children of the three ethnic groups studied at both levels. The frequency of these positive interactions noted on the elementary level followed the distribution of children in the classes. Black males tended to avoid interactions with white males or females and had more than the expected interactions with other black males. Similarly, black females tended to avoid white males but not white females, but they had more than the expected interactions with other black females.

Thus, for black children, the interaction of both variables, sex and ethnic status are needed to explain their pattern. In contrast, while the few Spanish speaking children observed also tended to avoid interaction with white males and females, they had more interaction with both Spanish speaking males and females. Thus, for the Spanish speaking children, ethnic status alone explained the pattern.

As in the other data from the two kinds of observers, in the observation of interaction, the parent observers reported much the same data as the professionals, including the perceptions of interactions reported in the paragraph above.

The data also provide a direct behavioral test of one of the original motivating goals of the original Open Enrollment program, the goal of integration. Viewed in this way the data indicate success, for at both the elementary and junior high school levels, there were some positive interactions between every combination of ethnic group except for white males and Spanish speaking females at the elementary level.

The data for the junior high school level almost completely parallel those for the elementary level, except that the interaction patterns for the Spanish speaking junior high school students completely parallel those for the black students. Thus, where at the elementary level the data indicate that Spanish speaking students interact more with each other, regardless of sex, at the junior high school level Spanish speaking males interact more than expected with other Spanish speaking males but not with females, and the converse finding holds for the Spanish speaking females.

At both elementary and junior high school levels the majority of negative interactions initiated by white pupils were directed towards other white pupils. Similarly, at the junior high school level the majority of the negative interactions by black and Spanish speaking pupils were directed towards other black and Spanish speaking pupils. However, at the elementary level the majority of the few negative interactions by black and Spanish speaking pupils were directed to white pupils.

At both the elementary and junior high school level the data indicate that parent and professional observers saw essentially positive interactions among the children in the classes they observed. Moreover, the interactions were distributed among children in reasonable approximation to the distribution of children within the classes except for the tendency of males to avoid females and vice versa, and for the minority groups to overselect each other somewhat. Perhaps most important, the objective fact of integration achieved by placing black and Spanish speaking children in the receiving schools has been followed by the partial integration of classroom interactions, indicated in the finding that with one exception there was evidence of all ethnic groups interacting with each other.

APPENDIX A

STAFF LIST

David J. Fox, Evaluation Chairman
Professor
Director of Research and Graduate Studies
The School of Education
The City College
The City University of New York

Lucy W. Greenberg, Research Associate

Lisa Harbatkin, Research Assistant

Henriette B. Wolkoff, Administrative Assistant

Miriam Balmuth, Observer
Assistant Professor
Department of Education
Hunter College
The City University of New York

Harold B. Davis, Observer
Associate Professor
School of Education
The City College
The City University of New York

Marilyn Gewirtz, Observer

Marvin H. Gewirtz, Observer

Ruth H. Grossman, Observer
Associate Professor
School of Education
The City College
The City University of New York

Jay M. Kaufman, Observer
Instructor
School of Education
The City College
The City University of New York

Parent Observers
Edith Charlton
Michaella Feld
Gladys Giglevitch
Grace Gouze
Irene Hack
Audrey Johnson
Katherine Nichson
Dorothy Sorge
Beatrice Tomao

Emanuel Lieberman, Observer
Program Director
Boys Harbor

Anita Rich, Observer
Lecturer
Department of Education
Richmond College
The City University of New York

Bernard Schneider, Observer
Assistant Professor
Department of Education
Hunter College
The City University of New York

Alfred Weiss, Observer
Assistant Professor
School of Education
The City College
The City University of New York

Theresa A. Woodruff, Observer
Professor
School of Education
The City College
The City University of New York

APPENDIX B

INSTRUMENTS

EVALUATION OF THE OPEN ENROLLMENT PROGRAM 1969-1970

PRINCIPALS' IMPLEMENTATION INVENTORY

1. School_____ Borough_____ District_____ Date_____
2. Name of person completing form_____
3. Position of person completing form_____
4. Number of years at this school_____
5. Date school was designated an OE receiving school_____
6. How many classrooms do you have in your school?_____
7. How many classes do you have in your school?_____
8. To what extent are you familiar with the content of the district's proposal for the Open Enrollment program?

   a. Completely; b. To some extent; c. Not at all.

9. Please describe the role, if any, that you played in the preparation of the district's OE proposal.
10. What was your average class size just prior to your school's designation as an OE receiving school?
11. What has happened to average class size since your school was designated OE. (Please check the correct response for <u>each</u> grade level which exists in your school.)

Level	Increased Greatly	Increased Slightly	Unchanged	Decreased Slightly	Decreased Greatly
Levels used: PreSchool, Early Elementary, Later Elementary, Secondary.					

12. Please indicate the number of students in the OE program in each grade in your school.

Level	1968-1969 Total Register	1968-1969 Total Open Enroll.	1968-1969 If Known Indicate Open Enrollment: Voluntary	1968-1969 If Known Indicate Open Enrollment: Mandated	1969-1970 Total Register	1969-1970 Total Open Enroll.	1969-1970 If Known Indicate Open Enrollment: Voluntary	1969-1970 If Known Indicate Open Enrollment: Mandated
Levels used: PreSchool, Kindergarten, 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, 8, 9.								

13. Please indicate the number of teachers and paraprofessionals on your staff paid from OE and other than OE sources.

Position	Total Number on Staff	Number Paid from OE Funds	Number Paid From Other than OE Funds	Number Whose Salary Support I Am Not Sure About
Positions used: teachers, paraprofessionals.				

14. There has been considerable concern expressed as to the sufficiency of time between the funding and implementation of the program. For each activity noted below, please indicate your idea of the ideal beginning time.

Activities	The Year Preceding Implementation: Sept./ Oct.	Nov./ Dec.	Jan./ Feb.	March/ April	May/ June	July/ Aug.	The Year of Implementation: Sept./ Oct.	Nov./ Dec.	Jan./ Feb.	March/ April	May/ June	July/ Aug.
Activities used: Orientation sessions with teachers, parents, paraprofessionals; ordering supplies												

Activities used: Orientation sessions with teachers, parents, paraprofessionals; ordering supplies and equipment; planning and programming; recruitment of professional staff, paraprofessional staff; latest date at which funding should be final for 9/71 school year.

15. In your opinion are there additional materials and supplies the OE program in your school needs, but which you did not request because of budgetary limitations? Circle one.

No. Yes, I feel the program needs:_____

16. In your opinion are there additional personnel the OE program in your school needs which you did not request because of budgetary limitations? Circle one.

No. Yes, I feel the program needs:_____

17. To what extent do you have the paraprofessional help you would like for the following duties with OE children?

Duty	I have enough	I have SOME, but not enough	I have NONE, but I would like SOME	I have NONE, and I do not see the need for any for the current program
Duty Areas used: a. Supervise OE children on buses; b. Supervise OE children during lunch; c. Tutor OE children on a one to one basis; d. Help in instruction of groups of OE children; e. Help prepare materials for teachers; f. Make home visits and/or work with parents of OE children; g. Other (Specify).				

18. If you have no paraprofessional help at lunch, who does supervise the lunch period? Circle one for each group of children:

For OE Children: a. Lunch room aides; b. Teachers; c. Nobody; d. Other (Specify)

For Resident Children: a. Lunch room aides; b. Teachers; c. Nobody; d. Other (Specify); e. Resident children do not have lunch in school.

19. How many workshops, in-service courses or orientation sessions have you had for each of the following groups?

Group	Number of Sessions			
	None	1-3 Sessions	4-6 Sessions	Continuing Sessions
Groups used: Teachers, Paraprofessionals, Parents				

20. The following types of personnel are noted in the proposals for the Open Enrollment program. Which of these special personnel have been assigned to your school to implement the OE program?

Type of Personnel	Total Number Requested for 1969-70	By What Date Available & Assigned	Total No. Now on part time staff. Indicate time in 1/5s	Number added in 1969-70	Total No. now on full time staff	Number lost in 1969-70
Types of personnel used:	Corrective reading teacher; corrective math teacher; teacher of English as a Second Language; Corrective speech teacher; computer math teacher; music teacher; art teacher; attendance teacher; laboratory assistant; bilingual teacher; teacher-trainer; reading teacher; guidance teacher; teacher coordinator; human relations coordinator; project coordinator; guidance counselor; psychologist; social worker; consultants; clerk-typist-secretary; educational assistant; school aide; family worker; parent program assistant; others (list below).					

21. What material, equipment or supplies have you received specifically to implement the OE program?

Material, Equipment and Supplies	Number or Amount You Now Have	Number or Amount new since 9/69	No. or Amt. ordered but not Rec'd.	Unable to order/late funding
<u>Material, Equipment and Supplies used</u>				
<u>Audio-visual</u>: Hoffman projector; projection devices; radios; phonographs; earphones; casette type tape recorders; desk viewers; film strips; slides.				
<u>Reading equipment and materials</u>: controlled reader; MacMillan spectrum; Barger mirror techniques; StudyScope; Audex; pacers; tachistoscopic devices; Durell-Murphy phonics kit; SRA reading kits; phonic materials; reading games; paperbacks; reading and picture books; workbooks; intersensory materials; multi-ethnic materials.				

21. (continued)

Material, Equipment and Supplies	Number or Amount You Now Have	Number or Amount new since 9/69	No. or Amt. ordered but not Rec'd.	Unable to order/late funding
Material, Equipment and Supplies used (continued)				
Office and Classroom Supplies: Telephone; typewriter; miscellaneous office supplies; duplicating supplies; miscellaneous classroom supplies; postage.				
Miscellaneous: Carfares; toys; snacks; others (list below).				

22. Please rate the four categories of materials and supplies provided for the OE program by each of the five criteria noted below. Please check the appropriate box.

Rating	Reading Materials	Audio-Visual Equipment	Science and Laboratory Equipment	Other Supplies and Equipment. Specify

Rating: I. Availability--1. Always easily available in sufficient quantities and on time; 2. Generally available in sufficient quantities and on time; 3. Obtaining sufficient quantities a problem; 4. Obtaining on time a problem; 5. Obtaining on time and in sufficient quantities are both problems.

II. Appropriateness--1. Always appropriate for our needs; 2. Sometimes appropriate for our needs; 3. Seldom appropriate for our needs; 4. Never appropriate for our needs.

III. Quality--1. Very superior; 2. Superior; 3. Average; 4. Inferior; 5. Very inferior.

IV. Ease of Use--1. Very difficult to use; 2. Somewhat difficult to use; 3. Easy to use; 4. Very easy to use.

V. Frequency of Use--1. Constantly used; 2. Often used; 3. Sometimes used; 4. Seldom used; 5. Never used.

23. To what extent has the school been able to involve or activate parents and community? Check the appropriate box.

Extent	Sending School Parents and Community	Receiving School Parents and Community
Extent: 1. Great extent; 2. Somewhat; 3. Little; 4. Not at all.		

24. Insufficient parent participation is often mentioned as a problem in the OE program. If you have any suggestions to make for improved school-parent and school-community cooperation please list them below.

25. To what extent is your paraprofessional staff from the sending community? Circle one.

    1. They all are; 2. 3/4 to all are; 3. 1/2 to 3/4 are; 4. 1/4 to 1/2 are; 5. Less than 1/4 are; 6. None is.

26. Does the use of paraprofessionals to supervise the buses make it easier to recruit paraprofessional staff from the sending community? Circle one.

    1. Yes; 2. No.

27. What problems have you encountered in the implementation of the OE program in your school?

28. Additional comments.

B 7

OPEN ENROLLMENT EVALUATION

TEACHER'S QUESTIONNAIRE

School_____ Borough _____ District _____
Name _____ Date _____ Grade _____ Subject_____

Dear Teacher: We are doing the centralized evaluation of the decentralized Open Enrollment program. Your school has been designated an Open Enrollment receiving school. As part of this year's evaluation of the program we would appreciate your observations and feelings regarding the functioning of Open Enrollment in your school.

1. What aspects of the Open Enrollment program as designed by your district for your school are you aware of (i.e., any special programs, teaching positions, etc.)?

2. How effective do you consider the program to be as it functions in your class?

3. What do you consider to be its major strengths?

4. What do you consider to be its major weaknesses?

5. What would your recommendations for next year's Open Enrollment program be in your school?

6. Have you any additional comments to make on the Open Enrollment program in your school?

PLEASE RETURN THIS QUESTIONNAIRE IN THE ATTACHED SELF ADDRESSED ENVELOPE

OPEN ENROLLMENT EVALUATION
STUDENT QUESTIONNAIRE

As you know, some children in this school come here from other districts. In the space below tell us what your experiences have been while attending a school with this program.

OPEN ENROLLMENT MOTHER'S QUESTIONNAIRE--SENDING SCHOOL

Dear Mother:

We are evaluating the Open Enrollment program and would like to have the following information from you. If you have more than one child in the Open Enrollment program please answer the questions in terms of your oldest child in the program. When you have checked your answers please drop this card in the mail. It needs no postage.

1. How many children do you have attending school?

2. Does your child go to an out-of-district school? Please check one.
   a. Yes; b. No.

3. If your child goes to an out-of-district school, did you request that he be transferred, or did his school transfer him? Please check one.
   a. I asked; b. School transferred him; c. I don't know.

4. How satisfied are you with the progress your child is making in school? Please check one.
   a. Very satisfied; b. Satisfied; c. Unsatisfied; d. Very unsatisfied.

5. Are you active in the Parent's Association in any of the schools your children attend? Please check one.
   a. Yes, as an officer; b. Yes, as a member; c. No.

6. If NO, why not?

7. Are you currently a member of any community groups concerned with education? Please check one.
   a. Yes; b. No.

8. If YES, which ones?

9. Do you get to school for conferences with your children's teachers? Check any that apply.
   a. Yes, whenever I am asked; b. Yes, during Open School Week;
   c. Yes, whenever I have something I want to discuss; d. Not at all.

OPEN ENROLLMENT MOTHER'S QUESTIONNAIRE--RECEIVING SCHOOL

Dear Mother:

We are evaluating the Open Enrollment program and would like to have the following information from you. If you have more than one child currently attending school please answer the questions in terms of your oldest child now in school. When you have checked your answers please drop this card in the mail. It needs no postage.

1. How many children do you have attending school?

2. How satisfied are you with the progress your child is making in school? Please check one.
   a. Very satisfied; b. Satisfied; c. Unsatisfied; d. Very unsatisfied.

3. Are you active in the Parent's Association in any of the schools your children attend? Please check one.
   a. Yes, as an officer; b. Yes, as a member; c. No.

4. If NO, why not?

5. Are you currently a member of any community groups concerned with education? Please check one.
   a. Yes; b. No.

6. If YES, which ones?

7. Do you get to school for conferences with your children's teachers? Check any that apply.
   a. Yes, whenever I am asked; b. Yes, during Open School Week; c. Yes, whenever I have something I want to discuss; d. Not at all.

B 10

CENTER FOR URBAN EDUCATION

EVALUATION OF THE OPEN ENROLLMENT PROGRAM

BUILDING AND SCHOOL-WIDE OBSERVATIONS---ADDENDUM

School_____Borough____District_____Observer_____Date_____

Note: To be filled out by each observer only once for each school.

1. Please rate the following factors in terms of school-wide observations and impressions. Check the appropriate column.

Factor	Very Good	Good	Poor

Factors: Cleanliness of building; Attractiveness of building; Attractiveness of classroom; General climate.

2. Did the school program have sufficient flexibility to allow for individual needs? Circle one.

a. YES; b. NO. If NO, please explain.

3. Did the school have a lunchroom? Circle one.

a. YES; b. NO. Please describe the lunch facilities.

4. What were the seating arrangements in the lunchroom? Check all that apply.

Categories: a. Determined by a teacher or other adult; b. Seated by classes; c. OE children largely seated together; d. Ethnic groups well mixed; e. Ethnic groups largely seated together; f. Resident children do not eat lunch in school; g. Other, please describe; h. Children choose their own seats.

5. Were the lighting conditions in the halls and classrooms satisfactory?

Halls: YES; NO. Classrooms: YES; NO.

6. Was there a library in the building? Check all that apply.

Rating scale: a. The library is attractive; b. The collection of books is adequate; c. The library is unattractive; d. The collection of books is inadequate; e. Books are not available for circulation; f. Other comments.

7. Were there science laboratories and/or a science room in the building? Check one.

   Rating scale: a. Very well equipped; b. Satisfactorily equipped; c. Poorly equipped; d. There was none.

8. Were there many children in the halls while classes were in session? Check one.

   a. YES; b. NO.

9. Were they quiet? Check one.

   a. YES; b. NO.

10. What were they doing? Check all that apply.

    Categories: a. Running errands; b. Going to the bathroom or for a drink of water; c. Out of the room without permission; d. Fighting; e. Other, specify.

11. If you were observing in a Junior High School, was the change of period orderly?

    a. YES; b. NO. If NO, please explain.

CENTER FOR URBAN EDUCATION

EVALUATION OF THE OPEN ENROLLMENT PROGRAM

BASIC ILOR

School_____District____Borough____Class_____Subject_____

Class Register_____No. of Children Present_____No. OE Children_____

Length of Class Period_____Length of Observation_____

Observer's Name_____Date_____

Please Note: Joint observations should be reported by each observer individually and without consultation.

If you find a question not applicable to the lesson you are observing, please indicate this on the observation form. If you see something that is not covered by the form, and you feel it is important, please feel free to add it and comment upon it.

1. What subject or topic was being taught?

2. As you looked around the classroom, did you feel you were able to identify the OE children?

   a. YES; b. Not Sure; c. NO. If YES, what criteria did you employ to do so? (e.g., race, reading, etc.)

3. Were any children receiving individual instruction?

   a. YES_____children; b. NO.

4. Was the class divided into groups?

   a. YES; b. NO.

5. If YES, how many children were in each group?

   Group One_____; Group Two_____; Group Three_____; Group Four_____.

6. Was the teacher you observed the regular one for this class and subject?

   a. YES; b. NO. If NO, who was she?

7. Was there a teacher aide in the room?

   a. YES; b. NO.

8. If YES, what was the aide doing during the lesson? Check all that apply.

   Categories: 1. Preparing materials; 2. Monitorial work; 3. Working with small groups; 4. Nothing; 5. Clerical work; 6. Working with individual children; 7. Teaching whole class; 8. Other. What?

9. Would you judge this to be a typical lesson for this class? Check one.

   Rating scale: 1. Completely typical; 2. Fairly typical; 3. Not at all typical. What were the reasons for your judgement?

10. How did the class react to the presence of the observer? Check one.

    Categories: 1. Class appeared not to notice the observer after a few minutes; 2. Children came over to speak to observer; 3. Children turned frequently to look at observer; 4. Children made a point of involving observer in activities; 5. Teacher directed lesson to observer. Have you any additional comments on the children's reactions to the observer's presence?

11. Please give a brief description of the general atmosphere of the classroom and the behavior of the children.

12. What amount of planning and organization was evident in this lesson? Check one.

    Categories: a. Lesson was exceptionally well-organized and well-planned; b. Lesson was organized and showed signs of planning; c. Lesson showed some signs of previous teacher preparation; d. Lesson showed few or no signs of organization or planning.

13. Did you observe the use of any innovative methods or materials in this lesson?

    a. YES; b. NO. If yes, please describe what you saw.

14. How would you describe the teacher's level of expectation for the children?

    Rating scale: a. Too high for most of the children; b. Too high for some of the children; c. About right for most of the children; d. Not high enough for some of the children; e. Not high enough for most of the children.

15. Were there any kinds of materials or displays in the classroom?

a. YES; b. NO. If YES, in what subject areas? Please give a brief description (e.g., bulletin boards, materials that could be handled by the children, etc.).

	Completely	For Most Part	No
16. Materials and displays were appropriate for the levels of most of the children.			
17. There were materials relating to the skills being taught.			
18. There were enough materials for all the children.			
19. Materials were interesting and stimulating.			
20. The classroom was clean.			
21. The atmosphere of the classroom was relaxed.			

---

22. As far as you could see, was there any tie-in of this lesson with the special corrective work provided for the OE children?

a. YES; b. NO; c. NOT SURE; d. NOT RELEVANT. If YES, please describe.

23. In what ways did the children participate in class activities?

Categories: a. Attentive listening; b. Raising hands in response to teacher questions; c. Active in class discussion. d. Spontaneous raising of hands; e. Obvious interest in individual tasks; f. Discussion with other children; g. Other. What?

24. USING PERCENTS, please estimate how many of the children in the class fall into each of the categories listed. Note: The totals for parts A, B, and C should add up to 100%. How many children

PART A: a. Showed sustained interest for all or almost all the period? b. Showed sustained interest for about half the period? c. Showed sustained interest for none or almost none of the period?

PART B: d. Participated actively for all or almost all of the period? e. Participated actively for about half the period? f. Participated actively for none or almost none of the period?

PART C: g. Were well-behaved for all or almost all the period? h. Were well-behaved for about half the period? i. Were well-behaved for none or almost none of the period?

PART D: j. Presented serious discipline problems? k. Raised questions of their own at some point during the class? l. Were working at tasks appropriate to their ability levels? m. Displayed an adequate understanding of the teacher's spoken word? n. Were non-English speaking? o. Displayed good verbal fluency? p. Appeared comfortable in the classroom environment?

Please use the following space to elaborate on your estimates of the children's behavior in regard to the above categories.

25. Using the following code, please rate the effectiveness of the teacher's performance in each of the listed areas of classroom functioning.

Scale: 1. Very effective; 2. Effective; 3. Average effectiveness; 4. Ineffective; 5. Very ineffective.

Categories: a. Ability to use teaching methods she chose to use; b. Ability to utilize teaching aids and materials; c. Maintenance of discipline; d. Ability to sustain the interest of most of the children; e. Ability to encourage and obtain active participation by most of the children; f. Maintaining a classroom climate conducive to learning; g. Skill at "pacing" the lesson.

Have you any further comments on the teacher's performance?

26. Overall rating of the lesson.

Scale: a. Excellent; b. Very good; c. Satisfactory; d. Fair; e. Poor.

27. What was the nature of the intra-class interactions between each of the pairs of actors and/or functions listed below? Please describe briefly in the space provided.

a. Teacher to children; b. Teacher to her job; c. Children to teacher; d. Children to each other; e. Children to their tasks; f. Other. Specify.

28. What were the major strengths of this lesson?

29. What were the major weaknesses?

30. Have you any additional comments to make?

B 16

CENTER FOR URBAN EDUCATION

OPEN ENROLLMENT EVALUATION

INDIVIDUAL LESSON OBSERVATION REPORT

REMEDIAL READING ADDENDUM

School_____ Borough_____ District _____ Sex_____

Observer_____ Date_____ Length of Observation_____

NOTE: Clip this to the Basic ILOR.

1. Is group a homogeneous group?

   a. YES; b. NO.

2. What skills were being taught?

3. Did the skills being taught appear to be appropriate for the individual needs of the children?

   a. Appropriate for all or most; b. appropriate for some; c. appropriate for few or none.

4. What reading instructional materials and/or devices were used or evident for use in this particular classroom? (Explain and describe as fully as possible.)

5. Were the materials and/or devices used specifically related to the particular skill or ability in which the child is deficient?

   a. YES; b. NO. Explain basis for answer.

6. Please check all of the following materials used or displayed in the classroom.

   Categories: a. Basic reader; b. Basal reader workbooks; c. Picture cards; d. Reading games; e. Skill workbooks; f. Trade books; g. Experiential reading; h. Reading laboratories; i. Pacers; j. Quick flash devices; k. Tape recorder; l. newspapers; m. Other.

7. Do the methods provide for the development of a systematic sequence of skills?

   Scale used: a. For every or almost every child; b. For more than half the group; c. About half the group; d. Less than half the group; e. One or two pupils; f. None.

8. To what extent were there opportunities for oral reading?

Number of Children	Number of Opportunities to Read Aloud			
	1	2	3	4 or more

Scale used: All or most; About three-quarters; About half; About one-quarter; Few or none.

9. Were there opportunities during the lesson for individual silent reading?

a. YES; b. NO. Please explain and describe.

10. As far as you could see, was there any tie-in of this lesson with the work the children do in their regular classes?

a. YES; b. NO; c. NOT SURE; d. NOT RELEVANT. If YES, please describe.

11. Was this room primarily set up for remedial reading classes?

a. YES; b. NO; c. Explain your rating.

12. Was there any indication in the room, or in the lesson, of earlier diagnostic procedures?

a. YES; b. NO; c. NOT SURE.

13. Describe any incidents that occurred during the lesson that interfered with teaching and how the teacher handled these incidents.

14. In your opinion what effect will continued participation in this type of remedial group have on the reading achievement of these pupils? (Specify the proportion of the group that you would expect in each category.)

Percent of group in each category

Scale: a. Marked progress; b. Slight progress; c. No change; d. Slightly worse; e. Appreciably worse.

Note: Answers to the following questions should be obtained from the teacher.

15. How were children selected for the program?

Categories: a. Teachers' recommendations; b. Metropolitan Achievement Tests; c. Parent request; d. Guidance counselor referral; e. Child's request; f. Administrative referral; g. Other. What?

16. On what basis are the children considered to have finished the program?

    Categories: a. Judgement of CRT; b. Judgement of regular teacher; c. Metropolitan Achievement Tests; d. Other. What?

17. How is the remedial reading program worked into the school's regular scheduling?

    Categories: a. CRT sends for children as she needs them; b. Classes held at specified times; c. Classes programmed into child's regular schedule; d. Programmed so that children don't miss major subjects; e. Programmed so that children don't miss "fun" subjects (e.g., art, gym, etc.).

CENTER FOR URBAN EDUCATION

EVALUATION OF THE OPEN ENROLLMENT PROGRAM

BASIC ILOR: PARENT OBSERVER FORM

School_____District____Borough_____Class Subject_____Class Register__

No. of Children Present_____No. of Children OE_____Length of Class

Period_____Length of Observation_____Observer's Name____Date_____

Please Note: Joint observation should be reported by each observer individually and without consultation.

If you find a question not applicable to the lesson you are observing, please indicate this on the observation form. If you see something that is not covered by the form, and you feel that it is important, please feel free to add it and comment upon it.

1. What subject or topic was being taught?

2. As you looked around the classroom, did you feel you were able to identify the OE children?

   1. YES; 2. NOT SURE; 3. NO. If YES, what criteria did you employ to do so (e.g., race, reading, etc.).

3. Were any children receiving individual instruction?

   1. YES_____children; 2. NO.

4. Was the class divided into groups?

   1. YES; 2. NO.

5. If YES, how many children were in each group?

   Group one_____; Group two_____; Group three_____; Group four_____.

6. Was there a teacher aide in the room?

   1. YES; 2. NO.

7. If YES, what was the aide doing during the lesson? Check all that apply.

   1. Preparing materials; 2. Monitorial work; 3. Working with small groups; 4. Nothing; 5. Clerical work; 6. Working with individual children; 7. Teaching whole class; 8. Other. What?

8. How did the class react to the presence of the observer?

   1. Class appeared not to notice the observer after a few minutes; 2. Children came over to speak to the observer; 3. Children turned frequently to look at observer; 4. Children made a point of involving observer in activities; 5. Teacher directed lesson to observer. Have you any additional comments on the children's reaction to the observer's presence?

9. Please give a brief description of the general atmosphere of the classroom and the behavior of the children.

10. In what ways did the children participate in class activities?

    1. Attentive listening; 2. Raising hands in response to teacher questions; 3. Active in class discussion; 4. Spontaneous raising of hands; 5. Obvious interests in individual tasks; 6. Discussion with other children; 7. Other. What?

11. Using percents, please estimate how many of the children in the class fall into each of the categories listed below. Note: The totals for Parts A, B and C should add up to 100%. How many children:

    PART A: 1. Showed sustained interest for all or almost all the period? 2. Showed sustained interest for about half the period? 3. Showed sustained interest for none or almost none of the period?

    PART B: 4. Participated actively for all or almost all of the period? 5. Participated actively for about half the period? 6. Participated actively for none or almost none of the period?

    PART C: 7. Were well behaved for all or almost all the period? 8. Were well behaved for about half the period? 9. Were well behaved for none or almost none of the period?

    PART D: 10. Presented serious discipline problems? 11. Raised questions of their own at some point during the class? 12. Were working at tasks appropriate to their ability levels? 13. Displayed an adequate understanding of the teacher's spoken words? 14. Were non-English speaking? 15. Displayed good verbal fluency? 16. Appeared comfortable in the classroom environment?

Please use the following space to elaborate on your estimates of the children's behavior in regard to the above categories.

12. On the basis of your observation would you like your child to be in this class even if he had to be bused in order to attend?

    a. Yes; b. No; c. Not sure.

13. Why?

14. Have you any additional comments?

CENTER FOR URBAN EDUCATION

OPEN ENROLLMENT EVALUATION

ILOR PART II: INTERACTION PATTERNS

School_____ District_____ Borough_____ Class_____

Subject_____Class Register_____No. of Children Present_____

No. of OE_____Length of Class Period_____Length of Observation_

_____Observer's Name_____Date_____

One of the basic purposes of the open enrollment program has been to promote integration between the OE and the resident children. This part of the observation is an attempt to assess, at the classroom level, whether interaction does occur between the two groups and the extent to which they function in a fully integrated manner in the classroom setting.

There are two sections in this part. The first simply asks you to draw a diagram of the seating pattern of the classroom. The second consistes of three matrices which are to be filled out at three different times during your visit to the classroom.

Directions for Seating Chart

The following page is provided for you to diagram the seating arrangement of the classroom. Please draw in the desks and their positions. Then indicate each child's seat by abbreviations which also indicate which racial or ethnic group he belongs to, as well as his sex. Use the following abbreviations:

BB = black boy; WB = white boy; PRB = Puerto Rican boy; OB = "other" boy; BG = black girl; WG = white girl; PRG = Puerto Rican girl; OG = "other" girl.

If you find it impossible to make such a specific breakdown among the children on the basis of observation, make the distinctions simply on the basis of white/non-white and use the following abbreviations:

WB = white boy
WG = white girl
NWB = Non-white boy
NWG = Non-white girl

B 23

INTERACTION CHART

Teacher's Desk

Do the children pick their own seats, or does the teacher seat them?

Directions for Filling Out Matrices

The following three pages are provided for the matrix analyses of classroom interaction. Fill out three different matrices during the time you spend in the classroom. For purposes of filling out the matrices, stop your observations of all other classroom activities for three five-minute periods and concentrate on observing the interactions occurring among the children. These five-minute periods should be as widely spaced as possible; one might be when you come into the room, one during the middle of your visit, and another toward the end. Fill out a different matrix sheet for each observation.

How to fill out the matrix. The abbreviations used are the same as those used in the seating plan. Once again, if you find it too difficult to make a judgment as to specific ethnic or racial background among the children, fill out the simpler matrix with the white/non-white breakdown. Otherwise, fill out the complex one with the white/black/Puerto Rican/"other" breakdown.

The abbreviations running down the left side of the matrix represent the initiators of the observed interactions. The abbreviations running across the top represent the recipients of the observed interactions. In filling out the matrix, you should go down the column of initiators until you find the abbreviation corresponding to the race and sex of the child who initiated the interaction. Then, go across the row until you come to the box under the abbreviation corresponding to the race and sex of the child who is the recipient of the interaction. In other words, you will be describing an "I." For example, if a white girl initiates an interaction with a black girl, you would go down 2 spaces in the initiators column and then over 4 spaces across the row until you come to the box under the abbreviation "BG" and then write a plus sign (+) in the box if the interaction was of a positive nature (i.e., conversational pleasant, friendly) and a minus sign (-) if it was negative (i.e., a fight, a nasty comment,

yelling, etc.). You would then follow the same procedure for all other observed interactions, including those between children of the same race and/or sex.

Please note that you should have only one mark in each box: we do not want a counting job. For example, if there is more than one observed interaction initiated by a white girl to a black girl, you would still have only one mark in the appropriate box. All we want to know is whether any interaction took place--whether there was any interaction at all. We are not seeking its frequency.

INTERACTION OBSERVATION 1. From _____ To _____ Minutes_____

What activity was going on during this observation?

	Recipient							
Initiator	WB	WG	BB	BG	PRB	PRG	OB	OG
WB								
WG								
BB								
BG								
PRB								
PRG								
OB								
OG								

	Recipient			
Initiator	WB	WG	NWB	NWG
WB				
WG				
NWB				
NWG				

There were 3 interaction observations.