DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 063 591   CS 000 021

AUTHOR   Dunkeld, Colin G.
TITLE   The Portland Project: An In-Service Training Program
                in the Teaching of Reading.
INSTITUTION   Oregon State Univ., Portland.; Portland Public
                Schools, Oreg.
SPONS AGENCY   Office of Education (DHEW), Washington, D.C.
PUB DATE   May 72
GRANT   OEG-0-70-4043(725)
NOTE   85p.; Paper presented at Annual Convention of
                International Reading Assn. (17th, Detroit, May
                10-13, 1972)

EDRS PRICE   MF-$0.65 HC-$3.29
DESCRIPTORS   *College School Cooperation; Disadvantaged Schools;
                Disadvantaged Youth; Elementary Education; *Inservice
                Programs; *Inservice Teacher Education; Language
                Arts; Parent Participation; *Reading Instruction;
                Released Time; Teacher Aides
IDENTIFIERS   *Portland Project

ABSTRACT
        The Portland Project, an inservice training program
in the teaching of reading for teachers, parents, principals, and
teacher aides, was a federally-funded joint effort of Portland State
University and the Portland, Oregon, Public Schools. It provided for
one day of released time per week for teachers of grades one through
four in four disadvantaged public schools. University classroom
presentations, workshop activities, and independent assignments were
combined with on-site school demonstrations and supervision. All
participants attended a two-week training session during August 1970.
Teachers subsequently made significant progress in achieving 51 of 68
knowledge objectives and in achieving 6 of 11 classroom performance
objectives. Parents made significant gains in attaining 12 of 13
knowledge objectives, while aides made significant progress in
realizing 4 of 4 such objectives. However, sample measures of
reading, writing and oral language performances of the children whose
teachers and auxiliary personnel participated in the project revealed
no significant gains nor losses. (Appendices include sample forms and
various questionnaires utilized during the project.) (Author/RD)

ED 063591

THE PORTLAND PROJECT

An In-Service Training Program in the Teaching of Reading

Colin G. Dunkeld
Portland State University

presented at

Implementing Innovative Products and Practice
Pre Convention Institute
Seventeenth Annual Convention
International Reading Association
Detroit, Michigan
May 9th and 10th, 1972

CS 000 021

1

THE PORTLAND PROJECT

William A. Jenkins	Director
Colin G. Dunkeld	Associate Director
Marian Zollinger	Supervisor
Margaret Jones	Supervisor
Jean Bolos	Supervisor
Richard McMenemy	Parents' Program
Richard Gilkey	Media Specialist
Gene Ashback	Principal
James Bow	Principal
Isaac White	Principal
Leigh Wilcox	Principal
Mark Green	Evaluation Specialist
Joan Goforth	Evaluation Specialist
Steven Nelson	Evaluation Specialist
Marilyn Tanke	Graduate Assistant
Sharon Darcy	Secretary

The Portland Project: First Year

TABLE OF CONTENTS

The Portland Project: First Year

LIST OF TABLES

THE PORTLAND PROJECT: FIRST YEAR

I Summary

The Portland Project was an in-service tra ning program in the teaching
of reading. It was planned and conducted jointly by Portland State
University and Portland Public Schools, funded by the U.S. Office of
Education, and evaluated by the Northwest Regional Educational Laboratory.

The rationale for the program was that:

1. An in-service program should provide sufficient time for
   participants to assimilate the information provided by the
   program, select, practice, and develop new skills, or improve
   existing skills. It should not be a burden added to already
   busy teachers, tacked on to the end of a full day.

2. An in-service program should be comprehensive in scope encompassing
   as many personnel concerned with teaching as possible. It is
   well established that principals need to be actively supportive
   of in-service programs (Aaron et al,1965). The value of teaching
   aides is also becoming recognized (Emmerling, 1966). It is becoming
   increasingly evident too that the active cooperation of parents
   exerts a considerable influence upon children's achievement (Smith,
   1963 and 1968, Della Piana, 1968). Therefore, teachers, their
   teaching aides, principals, and parents should be included in
   the program.

3. An in-service program should provide information to meet teachers'
   immediate needs. Frequent references in professional literature
   to teachers' overdependence upon the philosophy and method of
   a single basal text (Austin et al, 1963 and Spache and Spache,
   1970) suggest a lack of information and a lack of confidence on the

part of many teachers for the construction of sound, eclectic programs. Furthmore, none of the currently devised approaches demonstrates clear superiority over any other (Bond and Dykstra, 1967). Therefore, an in-service program should provide information about the different emphases, different goals, and successful components of many approaches.

4. An in-s_.vice program should provide for <u>transfer and application</u> of what is learned to the classroom. Therefore, on-site demonstration, supervision, and feedback should be an integral part of the program.

Part cipants in the program were the principals, the teachers of grades one through four, the teachers' aides, and a group of parent volunteers from four low-achieving, disadvantaged public elementary schools selected by the Portland Public Schools of the basis of need.

The objectives of the program were:

1. To increase teachers' knowledge of techniques and materials for the teaching of reading and language.

2. To train teachers to diagnose children's specific needs in reading and language and to construct and implement programs for their classrooms based upon those needs.

3. To train teachers' aides in the use of a variety of materials for the teaching of reading to enable them to increase their usefulness to the classroom teachers.

4. To train a group of parent vol..eers in the use of a variety of materials for the teaching of reading to enable them to work with teachers in the classrooms and to assist their own children in learning to read at home.

The first year began with a two week summer session in August 1970 and continued throughout the 1970-71 school year. Aides and principals attended the summer session only Teachers and parents attended both the summer and the year long programs. Throughout the year the teachers were released from their classrooms one day a week to attend classes and workshops at the university while paid, qualified, substitute teachers took their places in the classrooms.

The training activities consisted of lectures, workshop tasks, independent assignments, and regular supervision, demonstration, and assistance in classrooms. The teachers received a stipend for the summer session and earned 22 quarter hours of college credit for the summer and school year. The parents were paid $1.60 per hour up to a maximum of four hours per week.

Changes in knowledge and performance were assessed by means of locally constructed tests, questionnaires, and observational schedules. Teachers made significant gains in 51 out of 68 specific objectives concerning knowledge of techniques and materials in the teaching of reading and language. They made significant gains in 6 out of 11 specific objectives concerning their classroom performance. Parents made significant gains in 12 out of 13 specific knowledge objectives, and aides made significant gains in 4 out of 4 specific knowledge objectives. No direct measures of aides' or parents' classroom performances were taken. Teachers received an average of just over one hour's assistance from a parent per week at a cost of less than five minutes of teacher's time.

Parents and teachers perceived the program as a whole and the majority of the instructional and supervisory activities to have been of interest and

value. Sample measures of children's reading and their performances in
oral and written language in project schools and comparison schools were
taken at points in the program. They suggest neither significant gains
nor losses and are insufficient to be used for an evaluation of program
activities.

The combination of university lecture-discussion-workshop activities
and on-site classroom demonstration and supervision was effective in
increasing teachers' knowledge and in changing certain teaching practices.
Children's achievements in reading and language tests were probably
not significantly affected during the program. Implications for future
in-service programs were noted. Long term effects on the development and
maintenance of teaching skills and on reading achievement within the schools
were not assessed.

II The Context of the Program

Portland is a city with a population of 380,000. It has 96 elementary
schools and spent an estimated average of $750.05 per elementary school
pupil in 1970-71. According to federal guidelines for assessing deprivation,
the level of deprivation per school area averages 16%. The need for programs
to improve the teaching of reading in low-achieving schools with an above
average percentage of deprivation is well known. Portland Public Schools
were therefore asked to identify four such schools in need of assistance with
the teaching of reading.

Meetings were held in which an outline of the scope and purposes of the
program was presented and discussed with the teachers and principals.

The four schools expressed a willingness to participate.

The level of deprivation in each of the four schools exceeds 20%.
The schools are located in widely separate parts of the city and are in
transient neighborhoods experiencing a steady turnover of pupils each
year. The extent of the turnover is shown in Table 1.

Table 1

Student Turnover in Program Schools

	Begin	In	Out	End
School 1				
1969-70	489	699 (210)	222	477
1970-71	462	580 (118)	173	407
School 2				
1969-70	297	400 (103)	129	271
1970-71	279	355 (76)	106	249
School 3				
1969-70	680	869 (189)	179	691
1970-71	592	801 (209)	170	631
School 4				
1969-70	655	764 (109)	135	629
1970-71	664	805 (141)	139	666

Begin = enrollment at beginning of year, September 30.

In =   beginning enrollment plus students transferring in.

Out =   students transferring out.

End =   enrollment at end of year, June

Three of the schools are predominantly white; one is predominantly black.
In one of the white schools, 23% of the children are black; in another 11%
are oriental. Details are presented in Table 2.

Table 2

Racial Composition of Program Schools

	White	Black	Oriental	Spanish American	American Indian
School 1	82.1%	3.4%	11.1%	2.3%	1.1%
School 2	72.2%	22.9%	0.8%	1.6%	2.5%
School 3	41.4%	58.4%	0.2%	0.0%	0.0%
School 4	94.5%	0.9%	0.9%	3.2%	0.5%

III The Program

A. Scope, Objectives and Assumptions

The program was limited to persons conerned with the teaching of reading
in grades one through four of the four elementary schools. It included
the 4 principals, 36 teachers, 19 teachers' aides, and 21 parents.
The racial composition of the program participants is shown in Table 3.

Table 3

Racial Composition of Program Participants

	Total	White	Black	Oriental
Principals	4	3	1	0
Teachers	36	33	2	1
Teachers' Aides	18	14	4	0
Parents	21	20	1	0

Three teachers possessed masters degrees. The teachers had taken a mean
of 2.2 methods courses in the teaching of reading and language within
the past ten years and a mean of 2.0 methods courses more than ten years
prior to the program. Within the past ten years three teachers had taken
four or more methods courses, nine had taken one course, and four had
taken no courses. One teacher was in her first year of teaching, six
were in their second year, and eight had taught for more than twenty
years. The teachers had a mean of 9.8 years of teaching experience. Eleven
teachers failed to meet regular graduate admissions requirements and
were granted special status to participate and recieve credit in the program.

Educational qualifications of the aides ranged from fourteen who had high
school diplomas but had less than two years of college to three who
held bachelor's degrees. Their experience ranged from one who was in her
first year to one who was in her fifteenth. Excluding the most experienced,
who was atypical, the median experience for the group was 1.8 years as
a teacher's aide.

Of the twenty-one parents, two did not have high school diplomas, thirteen
had attended college at some time but for less than two years, and one had
a bachelor's degree. None had worked as aides or had given any kind of
instructional assistance in a school.

The objectives of the program were:
  1. To increase teacher's knowledge of techniques and materials
     for teaching reading.
  2. To train teachers to diagnose children's specific needs in
     reading and language, and to construct and implement programs

for their classrooms based upon those needs.

3. To train teacher's aides in the use of a variety of materials
   for the teaching of reading to enable them to increase
   their usefulness to the classroom teachers.

4. To train a group of parent volunteers to work with teachers
   in the classrooms and to assist their own children in learning
   to read at home.

The general objectives in turn were analyzed and rewritten as numerous
specific behavioral, performance, and process objectives. Topics for
which specific objectives were written are listed in the section reporting
the evaluation of program activities. (pp. 27-30).

The program had certain biases and operated on certain assumptions regarding
training and supervision. The biases were that a successful reading
program -

1. Maintains a very close relationship between a child's own
   spoken language and the materials used for the teaching of
   reading.

2. Depends upon children's development in all of the language
   arts, especially listening and speaking.

3. Fully recognizes individual rates and patterns of development
   in all of the language subskills.

Training was conceived of as more than the training in the construction
of activities or training in the appropriate use of certain teaching
materials. It was viewed as a process by which a teacher gains independence -

1. In assessing children's stages of development in all aspects of
   language.

2. In designing, presenting, and organizing activities to match those stages.

The assumptions were that -

1. A program of instruction would increase teachers' knowledge of
   techniques and materials.

2. A program of classroom demonstration and supervision would assist
   teachers in organizing their classrooms and applying their
   increased knowledge.

3. A training program for teachers' aides and parents would assist
   the teachers in their task of teaching children to read.

B. Personnel

The staff was drawn jointly from the university and the public schools. A
reading specialist was added to the university staff as associate director
of the program. The duties of staff members and the percentage of their
time devoted to the program were as follows:

Director:	Write proposal and program guidelines, establish policy, obtain staff, contract for evaluation, compile budget, instruct and supervise.	20% (U)
Associate Director:	Instruct, coordinate instructional and evaluational activities, supervise, handle day to day administration.	67% (U)
3 Supervisors:	Supervise, demonstrate, assist program participants individually, instruct, conduct workshop activities.	100% (U)
		100% (S)
		50% (U)

Instructor for Parents' Program:	Instruct, direct the parents' activities.	25% (S)
Media-Specialist:	Instruct, conduct workshop activities, obtain specialized materials.	25% (S)
Administrative Assistant:	Clerical	100% (U)
Secretary:	Communications and records	50% (U)
2 Graduate Assistants:	Assist program staff, carry out directed evaluation activities.	33% (U)
		33% (U)

(U) = indicates university personnel. (S) = indicates public schools personnel.

In addition, an evaluation team was employed under a separate contract.

The instructor for the parents' program was a reading specialist in the public schools. One of the three supervisors had formerly been supervisor of language arts instruction in the public schools; the other two had been primary grade teachers and language arts consultants.

C. Procedures

1. Organizational Details

The period of time covered by this report is the summer of 1970 and the 1970-71 school year; this is the first year of a two-year program. Instruction and workshop activities took place at Portland State University. On-site demonstration and supervision took place in the schools.

a. <u>Planning and Provision for Review</u>

Many opportunities were provided for joint planning and
review of the effectiveness of program procedures. Before
the program began all staff members, teachers, and principals
were asked to contribute suggestions and make known their
requests for program content. One principal, two teachers and
four staff members submitted suggestions. These suggestions
were circulated amongst the program participants and staff members
for comments. Following this, the staff met to plan instructional
and workshop activities.

A teachers' feedback committee was formed to meet as it desired and
make known its suggestions for program content and procedures.
Supervisors drew upon their experiences in the classrooms and
asked teachers directly to make requests for program content.
A member of the evaluation team regularly monitored sample
training activities and provided immediate written feedback
to the program staff. Pre-tests of all lecture-discussion topics
were given at the beginning of each quarter and used diagnostically
to increase the relevance of training activities. Additionally,
an ad hoc meeting of the program staff was called early in the
school year at the request of the school principals.

In practice, though many opportunities for participation in program
planning were made available, and though each had some effect,
by far the bulk of the program planning was done by instructional
staff members. The program participants made only minor suggestions
from time to time regarding content and procedures.

b. **In-Service Training for Staff**

A short in-service training program was conducted for
members of the supervisory staff by a specialist in supervision.
Five two-hour sessions were held in which supervisory techniques
were presented, practiced, and discussed, and a supervision model
examined. The model consisted of an observer in the classroom
providing feedback and discussion to increase teachers' awareness
of their performances, and of alternatives. In addition, members
of the program staff attended the International Reading
Association Annual Meeting and the National Council of Teachers
of English Conference on Language Arts in the Elementary Schools
to make comparisons and obtain suggestions from similar programs.
The director and assistant director attended joint planning
session discussions, and progress reports, from four sister
EPDA programs.

2. Program Activities

a. Teachers

i.   Introduction

Each quarter the program activities were developed around
a central theme. The themes were:

Summer: Basic Techniques in Teaching Reading

Fall: Language Activities and the Teaching of Reading

Winter: Diagnostic Teaching of Reading

Spring: Children's Literature and the Teaching of Reading

During each quarter the teachers were provided with lists of
behavioral objectives concerning items of teacher knowledge.

Decisions were made not to present lists of behavioral
objectives concerning classroom performance because
specific performances of a teacher should be evaluated
against that teacher's classroom organizational plan, and
against that teacher's prior performance. Goals for
teacher's performances were set individually by program
supervisors. It was not expected that all teachers would
employ identical observable techniques.

The training activities were of four kinds:
1. Lecture-discussion sessions
2. Training tasks carried out at the workshop sessions
3. Specific independent assignments in the teachers'
   own time
4. On-site classroom supervision, demonstration, and
   assistance

A typical day's schedule for the teachers during each of
the ten days of the summer session and each of the released
time days once each week throughout the year consisted of
a 90-minute lecture-discussion session followed by a
90 minute workshop each morning and a 90 minute media workshop
followed by individual conferences and independent study each
afternoon.

The school principals occupied the dual role of program
participants and staff discussion leaders in the summer
program.

ii.   The Lecture Discussions

The lecture discussions consisted of presentations by members
of the program staff or guest lecturers on topics related
to the major theme. For example, a series of lectures
examined and evaluated different systems for teaching word-
recognition. Another topic was the construction and use
of experience charts and the integration of language-
experience techniques with graded basal reading programs.
Another topic was the reading aloud or telling of children's
stories by the teacher.

Lecture-discussions were supplemented by the use of
overhead transparencies and chalkboard examples and
summaries.

iii. Workshop Activities

Workshop activities consisted of guided participation in
specific tasks, for example the practice writing and
discussion of the uses and limitations of behavioral objectives,
the construction of audio tapes for language teaching,
participation in creative dramatics and choral reading
activities, practice administration and interpretation of
diagnostic reading tests, and the preparation of questioning
strategies for specific stories. A complete listing of
lecture-discussion topics, workshop training tasks, and
specific independent assignments is given in Appendix A.

iv.   Supervision

Supervision was carried out by all members of the
project staff, primarily by one half-time and two full-time
staff members who were in the schools daily. They
demonstrated new materials with whole classes and small
groups of children, assisted with lesson preparation, worked
with children with special needs, discussed and planned
solutions to classroom management problems, obtained
materials for teachers, made suggestions for independent
activities, and assisted teachers in analyzing aspects
of their performance and planning alternative teaching
strategies.

The full time supervisors expressed their discomfort with
the passivity of a purely observational-feedback-discussion
role. Their point of view was that they could influence
teacher behavior more successfully and more permanently
by being willing to teach beside the teachers and participate
actively in the events of the class and the school.

They considered it essential that supervisors were
perceived as valuable sources of help and not as unwelcome,
critical intruders. Supervisors arrived early in the morning
and stayed late in order to meet informally with teachers
and plan convenient times to visit classrooms and
assist teachers. By participating in classrooms, they
experienced directly the problems teachers faced. Planning

between teachers and supervisors became joint efforts
with common purposes in mind. One member of the project
staff maintained an observational-feedback-discussion role,
but was able to make little more than one visit to each
room in that role throughout the year.

v.   Equipment and Materials

Textbooks were purchased and placed on reserve in the
university reference library for teachers to use. Program
staff prepared mimeographed supplements to accompany key
lectures. Staff and participants collaborated in the
production of booklets on "Independent Activities and Games
to Teach Reading", and "Ways of Sharing Children's Books".
Diagnostic reading tests, auditory discrimination tests,
and readiness tests, were purchased for training activities.
Sets of published instructional materials, texts, and
sample collections of children's books were purchased for
the use of supervisory staff in classrooms and to introduce
program participants to materials and methods unfamiliar
to them. The media specialist regularly obtained and made
available to program schools new texts and audio-visual materials
for the teaching of reading and the language arts.

b. Teacher's Aides

The entire program for the teachers' aides was confined to the
mornings of the ten-day summer session. Aides attended all of
the general lecture-discussion sessions and participated in a
workshop program of their own under the direction of one staff

member. Aides at all times were addressed as teachers. The
program invited aides to display initiative in the classroom in
discussing and planning learning activities with teachers.

Workshop activities consisted of discussions of aide-pupil and
aide-teacher relationships, informal case studies of
problem situations, and specific activities for teaching reading
to individuals and small groups of children. Sample topics were:
Listening to a Child Read, Reading Aloud to Children, Constructing
and Using an Experience Chart, and Helping Children to Complete
a Workbook Exercise. The aides produced a booklet, "Here's
an Idea", a compilation of activities for teaching reading and
language.

c. The Parents' Program

The parents attended all of the general lecture-discussion sessions
with the teachers throughout the ten-day summer session and
throughout most of the year. In addition they attended a special
90 minute workshop session of their own, conducted by the
director of the parents' program. They gave voluntary assistance
in classrooms throughout the year.

The workshop sessions consisted of a careful examination of
materials for the teaching of reading and question and answer
sessions about the use of those materials with individuals and small
groups of children. General principles of counselling and of

tutoring were discussed. Group and individual visits were made
to a school library and to public libraries. Specific suggestions
were presented and discussed for parents to help their children
learn to read at home.

d. Budget

The program was funded by the U.S. Office of Education. The
total budget amounted to $188,000.

Broad budget categories were as follows: Staff Salaries - $89,600.,
Evaluation Sub-contract - $14,100., Various Stipends and Program
Support Costs, including the costs of providing substitute
teachers - $69,500., Materials and Supplies - $6,700., Travel
costs - $8,100.

Applying programmed budgeting techniques, the costs break down
into the following categories: Parents' Summer Program - $3,100.,
Teachers' Summer Program - $22,200., Year-long Parents' Program -
$12,800., Year-long Teachers' Program - $149,900. Within the
teachers' program, cost breakdowns were: Administration - $26,300.,
Instruction - $38,000., Supervision - $24,500., Evaluation -
$18,600., and Program Support Costs - $42,500.

The cost of the program per participant was: Summer Program -
cost per parent, $281.; cost per teacher, $616. Year-long
program - cost per parent, $674.; cost per teacher, $4,164.

No cost figures appear for the aides' program. The aides were
paid by the school district and the aides' program was run in

conjunction with the summer program for teachers with no extra
staff assignments being required.

A summary of major budget categories translated into estimated
program costs is presented in Table 4.

Table 4

Estimated Program Costs

Budgeted Categories / Item	Cost	Summer Program Parents	Summer Program Teachers	Year-Long Program Parents	Teachers Admin.	Teachers Instruct.	Teachers Superv.	Teachers Eval.	Teachers Support
Salaries									
Admin., instr. Superv. clerical consultant	66,600. 8,700. 2,500.	1,000.	9.700.	5,000	14,800	23,200	18,000	6,100	-
%benefits	11,800	200.	1,700	900	1,900	3,500	2.700	900	-
TOTAL	89,600.	1,200	11,400.	5,900.	16,700	26,700	20,700	7,000	.
Evaluation contract	14,100	200	1,800	500	-	-	-	11,600	-
Various Stipends									
Parents	6,000	1,000	-	5,000	-	-	-	-	-
Teachers	6,300	-	6,300	-	-	-	-	-	-
Substitute teachers	40,100	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	40,100
Required fees	3,100	-	700	-	-	-	-	-	2,400
Admin. Overhead	14,000	600	1,400	1,000	2,800	5,000	3,200	-	-
TOTAL	69,500	1,600	8,400	6,000	2,800	5,000	3,200	-	42,500
Materials									
instruct.	3,400	-	400	200	-	2,800	-	-	-
admin.	3,3..	100	200	200	2,800	-	-	-	-
TOTAL	6,?00	100	600	400	2,800	2,800	-	-	-
Travel	8,100	-	-	-	4,000	3,500	600	-	-
TOTAL	188,000.	3,100	22,200	12,800	26,300	38,000	24,500	18,600	42,500
							$149,900		
of Program Participants		17	36	19			36		
Cost Per Participant		$237.1	$616.	$674.			$4,164.		

IV Evaluation

A. Objectives

   1. Overall Objectives

      It must be borne in mind that the Portland Project was not
concieved as a research project. It was a training program
with a clear-cut responsibility for evaluating its
effectiveness in terms of its goals but not subject to the
constraints and rigorous control of the variables associated
with a research project. To have attempted to do so would
have limited the scope and flexibility and distorted the reality
of the training activities, or would have required an
inappropriately large proportion of effort and resources
being channelled .into measurement. Accordingly, the following
plan for evaluation was designed.

      Four kinds of evaluation were anticipated:

      a. Gains in knowledge by teachers, teachers' aides, and parents.

      b. Changes in selected items of teachers' classroom performance.

      c. Long term, though not necessarily short term, gains in
children's achievement in reading and language.

      d. Participant's perceptions of the value of various
program activities.

   2. Objectives Evaluated

      a. Knowledge. Evaluations were made of 68 specific objectives
of teachers' knowledge, 4 specific objectives of aide's
knowledge, and 15 specific objectives of parents' knowledge.

Evaluations were made by means of pre and post paper and
pencil tests administered each quarter. In addition,
selected items from the teachers' tests were pre and post
tested with a group of teachers from two comparison schools.

b. Performance. Evaluations were made of 11 specific objectives
of teachers' classroom performance by means of pre and post
observations and interview schedules administered to teachers
in the project schools and the comparison schools. Additionally,
evaluations were made of 13 workshop tasks and independent
training assignments given to teachers in the project schools.
Information was also collected from teachers periodically
about three kinds of assistance received from parents.

c. Children's achievement. The aim and justification of any
in-service program is the eventual gain in children's
achievements and attitudes in the classroom. The program
staff were therefore interested in this facet of evaluation
but expressed many reservations about possible interpretation
that might be put upon the data. In the first place,
many variables were undoubtedly operating that were not
under the control of the program, notably, for example a recent
change in basal readers and changes in the organization of
the reading program within project schools. Secondly, a
Hawthorne effect, while desireable if it occurred, would
certainly mask the effects of specific program activities.

Thirdly, the transient nature of the school populations
again complicated the collection and interpretation of
data. And fourthly, the replacement of teachers by
substitute teachers might be hypothesized to offset
any anticipated gains resulting from improved teaching if
the training activities proved to be effective.

In view of the limited interpretation possible without
the employment of a complex evaluation design, plans were
made to collect only two kinds of data about children's
achievement in reading and language. Plans were made
to draw upon data from the regular testing program of the
public schools in order to make comparisons between past
and current achievement in project schools, and between
project schools and two approximately similar comparison
schools. Additionally, plans were made to collect pre and
post samples of oral and written language from a small
random sample of children in project and comparison schools.

d. Participants' perceptions of the value of various program
activities were assessed by means of questionnaires administered
periodically during the program and after the completion of
the first year.

B. Choosing Participants

The program participants were the principals, teachers of grades one
through four, the teachers' aides, and a group of parent
volunteers from four low-achieving disadvantaged city

elementary schools identified by the public schools for participation
in the program.

Two other schools in somewhat similar disadvantaged areas, but
not schools deemed to be in need of assistance with their reading
programs, were selected by Portland Public Schools for certain
selected comparisons to be made. The principal of one of
those schools stated that the teaching of reading had been given
the highest priority in his school for several years, that a reading
coordinator was employed to this end, and that all teachers regarded
themselves as reading teachers.

Of the 36 teachers who completed the program, 35 were present from
the beginning, 1 took the place of another who was transferred
between the summer and full sessions. No other teachers withdrew.

21 parents participated in the program. Eleven began at the
commencement of the program, 10 others joined the program at
different times during its first three months. Two withdrew
during the year. One aide withdrew during the summer session.

C. Measuring Changes

The objectives concerning changes in the teachers', parents',
and aides' knowledge were assessed by means of paper and
pencil tests. Changes in teachers' classroom performances were
assessed by observational and interview schedules used by
trained observers. Teachers' performances on specific independent
assignments and workshop tasks were evaluated by examining written

reports and written answers to test situations. Parents'
performances were assessed by means of critical incidents
and sample logs of parent activities submitted by teachers.
In all cases performance criteria were specified by
program staff. Data collection and analysis were carried out
by trained members of the evaluation team. Children's
reading achievement in the spring of their third grade year
was assessed by the McMenemy Silent Reading Test, the only
reading test administered routinely in grades one through
four throughout Portland Public Schools. Children's
oral and written language development was assessed by
obtaining oral and written language samples in response to
picture stimulae and by analyzing the samples for number of
words, number of communication units, number of mazes, number
of subordinate constructions, average length of communication
units, average number of words in mazes, and average number of
words in subordinate constructions.

A pre and post teacher attitude and practices survey questionnaire
was administered by members of the project staff and scored
and interpreted by the Learning Institute of North Carolina,
the agency responsible for the coordinated evaluation of five
sister EPDA programs.

The evaluation schedule is summarized in Table 5. Sample observation
schedules are presented in Appendix B.

Table 5

Evaluation Schedule

Objective Evaluated	Instrument Used	Pre-Test	Post-Test
1. Knowledge			
a. Teacher's Knowledge	Paper and Pencil Test	Beginning of each quarter	End of each quarter
b. Aide's Knowledge	Paper and Pencil Test	Beginning of Summer Session	End of Summer Session
c. Parent's Knowledge	Paper and Pencil Test	Beginning of each quarter	End of each quarter
2. Performance			
a. Teacher's Classroom Performance	Observation Schedule and Interview	December,1970	April, 1971
b. Teacher's Independent Assignments	List of Criteria for Each Task	None	3 in Summer 2 in Fall 3 in Winter 5 in Spring
c. Parent's Performances	Sample Logs Kept by Teachers	None	December,1970 February - April, 1971
3. Children's Achievements	a. McMenemy Silent Reading Test	None	Spring, 1970
	b. Samples of Oral and Written Language	December,1970	May, 1971
4. Participants' Perceptions of Program Activities			
a. Parents' and Teachers' Evaluation of the Program	a. Teachers' Questionnaire	None	August, 1970 January, 1971 September, 1971
	b. Parents' Questionnaire	None	September, 1971
b. Teachers' Attitudes and Practices	Questionnaire	October, 1970	May, 1971

30

D. Analysis of the Data
    1. Knowledge
        a. Teachers' Knowledge
        The following summaries are based upon <u>The Final Report Evaluation</u>

        prepared by the Northwest Regional Educational Laboratory,

        Portland, Oregon, June 11, 1971.

        In general, the performance criteria set by the program staff for

        knowledge and performance items were arbitrarily high.

        Though performance criteria were frequently not met, significant

        changes ($p > .05$, one-tailed) were recorded in 51 out of 68 knowledge

        items and 6 out of 11 specific performance items.

        Topics in which teachers' knowledge improved significantly were:

        1. The sequence and elements of a conventional reading lesson. (S)

        2. The distinguishing characteristics of basal reader, phonic,

            linguistic, and language experience approaches to the teaching

            of reading. (N)

        3. The effectiveness of various methods for teaching word-

            recognition.

        4. Useful phonic generalizations.

        5. Definitions of phonic and linguistic terms. (S)

        6. Definitions of terms describing spoken language.

        7. A syllabus for teaching speaking in an elementary school.

        8. Factors which interfere with listening.

        9. Ways of using a tape recorder for oral reading.

        10. Stories for reading aloud.

        11. Relationships between silent and oral reading.

12. Difficulties encountered in teaching choral speaking.

13. Steps in the preparation of passages for choral speaking. (S)

14. Methods of casting in choral speaking.

15. Criteria for selecting a story for creative dramatics.

16. Defining characteristics of creative dramatics.

17. Materials for stimulating creative writing.

18. Sustaining independent writing.

19. Purposes and sample activities of three kinds of writing lessons. (S)

20. Activities in the early stages of written composition.

21. Sources of words for teaching spelling. (N)

22. Poetry books for the elementary school.

23. Technical terms in poetry. (N)

24. A system for teaching standard English to children speaking non-standard English.

25. Terms for the measurement of units of language. (S)

26. Ways to increase the objectivity of evaluation of written composition.

27. Specific purposes of readiness activities. (S)

28. Classifying questions according to thinking activities. (S)

29. Constructing questions to match thinking abilities.

30. Anticipated ranges of reading achievement.

31. Criticisms of grouping practices for reading instruction.

32. Ways of improving grouping practices. (S)

33. Prescribing instruction for specific word-recognition difficulties. (N)

34. Identifying subskills of reading comprehension. (S)

35. Prescribing instruction in comprehension difficulties.

36. Materials for teaching reading comprehension. (S)

37. Readability formulas.

38. Factors which influence the difficulty of a reading passage.

39. Cloze procedure for assessing passage difficulty.

40. Selecting reading passages to match children's levels of development.

41. Interpreting an informal reading inventory. (S)

42. Computing a reading expectancy.

43. Guidelines for establishing a classroom library.

44. Classroom library management practices.

45. Sustaining interest in literature.

46. Children's preferences in literature.

47. Children's responses to specific stories.

48. Ways of sharing independent reading experiences.

49. Reasons for sharing independent reading experiences.

50. Constructing a weekly schedule according to specifications.

51. Units of spoken language.

Topics in which teachers' knowledge did not improve significantly were:

1. Generalizations governing syllable division.

2. Preparing a passage for reading comprehension.

* 3. The purposes and steps in constructing an experience chart.

4. Reasons for teaching speaking.

5. Characteristics of a teacher which encourage children to speak.

6. Activities which promote good listening habits.

7. Activities for oral reading.

8. Recommended time proportions for oral reading.

9. Guidelines for oral reading.

10. Criteria for choosing a selection for choral speaking.

11. A sequence of activities for creative dramatics.

12. Requirements for a classroom writing center.

* 13. Increasing children's interest in poems.

14. Characteristics of reading readiness.

15. Ways of assessing readiness for reading. (N)

16. Identifying and classifying children's word recognition
     difficulties.

* 17. Categories of books for a classroom library.

* indicates topics in which a high performance on the pretest left little
opportunity or necessity for gains to be made. The pre tests
otherwise indicated that at the beginning of each quarter, before topics
were presented and discussed, teachers as a group did not respond well to
questions which were primarily directed towards their understanding of
day to day basic teaching competencies.

(S) and (N) indicate those topics in which the performances of teachers
in project schools and comparison schools were compared. (S) indicates
topics in which scores earned by teachers in project schools were
significantly ($p > .05$) higher than scores earned by teachers in
comparison schools. (N) indicates topics in which scores earned by
teachers in project schools did not differ significantly from scores
earned by teachers in comparison schools.

An examination of the topics in which gains were made and a
consideration of the training activities used shows the following:

1. Teachers made significant gains in 29 topics out of a total
   of 42 developed by lecture discussion alone.

2. Teachers made significant gains in 8 topics out of a total
   of 10 developed by lecture discussion supplemented by
   workshop activities.

3. Teachers made significant gains in 6 topics out of a total
   of 6 developed by lecture discussion supplemented by workshop
   practice and an independent assignment.

4. Teachers made significant gains in 5 topics out of 5 developed
   by lecture discussion supplemented by specific independent
   assignments.

5. Teachers made significant gains in 3 topics out of a total of
   4 developed by specific independent assignments alone.

6. Teachers did not make significant gains in one topic inadvertently
   omitted from program activities.

Several factors should be borne in mind:

1. Specific independent assignments and workshop tasks were
   made directly relevant to classroom teaching, e.g., prepare
   questions for use with a story you are using, administer a
   Wepman Auditory Discrimination Test to a child whose auditory
   discrimination is in question, etc.

2. Lecture-discussions were presented with full use of audio-visual
   aids, chalkboard, and mimeographed supplementary materials.

3. Written lists of behavioral objectives were presented to the teachers.

4. Supervisors were available to assist teachers with all of the activities of the program.

Under these conditions significant gains took place in 51 out of 68 items of knowledge. Lecture-discussion alone, although effective, was the least effective method. Lecture-discussion supplemented by a specific independent assignment was the most effective.

Pre and post tests of seventeen of the tests of teacher knowledge were administered to teachers in the comparison schools. Pre test differences were not significant. On all seventeen tests, teachers in project schools earned higher post-test scores than teachers in comparison schools. In five of those tests the scores were not statistically significant. In the other twelve tests the scores were significantly different ($p >$ .05).

b. Aides' Knowledge

Aides made significant gains in all four items of knowledge that were assessed. The four items were:

1. Specific tasks in which an aide can assist a teacher.
2. Knowledge of the use of specific instructional materials for reading and language.
3. Tutoring techniques for use with an individual child.
4. Acceptable ways of working with an uncooperative child.

c. Parents' Knowledge

Parents made significant gains in 12 out of 13 specific items of knowledge of the teaching of reading and language.

These items were:

1. Ways in which a parent can help a teacher.

2. Ways of increasing parents' participation in reading with their own children.

3. Knowledge of basic terms of reading instruction.

4. Knowledge of basic terms of remedial reading instruction.

5. Recognition of true and false statements about reading instruction.

6. Methods of remediation.

7. Materials for teaching reading available in Portland Public Schools.

8. Methods and materials for beginning readers.

9. Principles of motivation.

10. Specific remedial practices for deficiencies in consonant sounds, short vowel sounds, long vowel sounds, word patterns and blending of letters.

11. Use of the library.

12. Ways of increasing children's interest in books.

The one item in which they did not show a significant improvement was: Ways of increasing a child's vocabulary, background, and experiences with or without a library.

2. Performance
   a. Teachers' Classroom Performance

   According to observational and interview schedules obtained during visits to classrooms by trained observers, teachers made significant gains ($p > .05$) in 6 out of 11 aspects of teaching performances observed.

Those in which gains were noted were:

1. Planning a week's work in reading and language using
    a variety of appropriate materials and classroom organizational
    patterns.

2. Holding individual conferences with students about reading. (N)

3. Obtaining and making use of students' suggestions for the
    content and scheduling of reading and language activities. (S)

4. Making specific suggestions for students' independent work. (N)

5. Making use of a systematic plan when teaching reading to small
    groups. (S)

6. Establishing classroom libraries, following suggestions for
    improving their appearance, and implementing practices encouraging
    their use.

Those in which significant gains ($p > .05$) were not noted were:

1. Obtaining information about children's progress by
    standardized and informal tests. (N)

* 2. Selecting materials for instructional use and for independent
    study according to level of difficulty, interest to the child,
    and literary content. (N)

3. Guidance of students in the choice of independent activities. (N)

* 4. Using a variety of questions in discussing a reading selection. (N)

5. Using a purposeful sequence of questions in discussing a reading
    activity.

* indicates that performances in the pre-observations were high leaving
little opportunity or necessity for gain.

(S) and (N) indicate performances in which comparisons were made

between teachers in project schools and teachers in comparison schools.

(S) indicates that significant difference between teachers in project schools and teachers in comparison schools were noted in favor of teachers in project schools.

(N) indicates differences between teachers in project schools and teachers in comparison schools were not significant.

b. Teachers' Specific Assignments

More than 80% of the teachers carried out the following specific independent assignments satisfactorily according to predetermined criteria for each.

1. A comparison of materials representing two contrasting approaches to the teaching of reading.

2. A description and critique of the word-recognition program of the basal reading materials selected for use at the teacher's grade level.

3. A schedule for the reading and language arts activities for the first week.

4. A log and critique of independent reading about the teaching of reading and language.

5. Objectives for a sequence of language activities. Design, implementation, and modification of those activities.

6. Computation of reading expectancies for two children.

7. Location of materials for independent use by students designed to teach a specific reading skill.

8. Construction of questions about reading passages for use with a class to accomplish appropriately stated objectives.

9. Computation of the readability of two selected children's
   library books.

10. Establishment of a classroom library according to program
    guidelines and management practices.

11. Collection of information by means of an informal reading
    inventory technique concerning children's word recognition
    and comprehension in books chosen for independent reading.

12. Preparation of stories from chidren's literature for reading
    aloud.

Additionally, all of the teachers administered and interpreted each of
the following tests:

1. Wepman Auditory Discrimination Test

2. Durrell Learning Rate Test

3. Harris or Mills Learning Methods Test

4. Two Informal Reading Inventories

5. Dolch or Fry List of Basic Words

6. Roswell-Chall Diagnostic Reading Test

Six weeks after administering and interpreting the above tests, teachers
were given a paper and pencil test on the purposes of the tests.
Twenty teachers were able to state the purposes of each test satisfactorily,
11 teachers expressed only a partial understanding of the purposes of the
tests, and 5 teachers were either incorrect or expressed almost no
understanding of the purposes of the tests.

c. Parents' Performance

An analysis of sample logs of parents' activities prepared by teachers
shows that parents provided five categories of assistance to teachers.

Those categories were:

I.   Total Class Instruction

      e.g. Reading Stories

           Assisting in the direction of a class play

           Assisting on field trips

II.   Individual and Small Group Instruction

      e.g. Assisting children with assigned work

           Hearing children read

III. Preparation for class

      e.g. Preparation of Art materials

           Preparation of tests materials

IV.   Post Instructional Aid

      e.g. Test correction

           Bulletin Board display

V.   Non-instructional Aid

      e.g. Help with class party

While individual teachers made different use of parents' services,
74% of parents' time was spent in instructional assistance,
categories I and II, and 26% of parents' time was spent in support
services, categories III, IV and V.

In a typical week, teachers reported that they invested an average
of 4.4 minutes of time in explaining to parents what needed to be
done, in return for which they received an average of 73 minutes
of assistance.

3. Children's Achievements

Samples of oral and written language were obtained from a random
sample of children at each grade level of grades one through
four of the four project schools and the two comparison schools.
Graduate assistants were trained to elicit and to analyze the
language samples according to specified procedures, substantially
those described by Loban (1963). Large colored pictures showing
children in action in a variety of familiar daily life activities
were presented as stimulae. Two pictures were selected for use
at each grade level. Pre tests were given in December and post tests
were given in May. Picture A was used for the pre test with half
of the sample, and picture B was used as the pre test for the other
half. Children were then given the opposite pictures for the post
test. Specific questions, instructions, and a controlled number of
prompts and time intervals were used.

Oral language samples were tape-recorded and transcribed for later
analysis. Analysis was made of the following items: Oral sample:
Total number of words, number of communication units, number of
mazes, total number of words in communication units, total number of
words in mazes, number of subordinate constructions, average length
of communication units.

Written sample: Total number of words, total number of communication
units, average length of communication units, number of subordinate
constructions.

The following information is taken from the report on oral and
written language prepared by the Northwest Regional Laboratory,
October, 1971.

Each examiner, after training, analyzed three test sample
transcripts of oral and written language. An estimate of
inter-rater reliability was computed for each of the eleven
sub-tasks by means of Kendall's Coefficient of Concordance, W,
(Edwards, 1962 pp. 252-255).

Coefficients of Concordance, W's, were significant ($p > .05$) for
six of the eleven sub-tasks. Results are reported in Table 6.

Table 6

Inter-Rater Reliability on Oral and Written Language Samples

(Kendall's Coefficient of Concordance for 4 Judges' Ratings Over 11 Tasks (N=3))

Task	Kendall's W_c	F (df=2,5)
1. Total Number of Words	.98	147.00 *
2. Number of Communication Units	.59	4.32
3. Number of Mazes	.65	5.57
4. Total Number of Words in Communication Units	.42	2.17
5. Total Number of Words in Mazes	.79	11.29*
6. Number of Subordinate Constructions	.04	.13
7. Average Length of Communication Units	.87	20.08
8. Total Number of Words	.98	147.00*
9. Number of Communication Units	.87	20.08*
10. Average Length of Communication Units	.42	147.00*
11. Number of Subordinate Constructions	.73	20.08*
		8.11*

*significant, p.> .05.

The results of the oral and written language measures at each grade level are presented in tables 7 through 10.

Table 7

..surements of Oral and Written Language: Grade One

Oral Sample

		Project Schools		Comparison Schools	
		Pre test	Post test	Pre test	Post test
1.	Total number of words	48.11	40.94	27.60	64.93
2.	Number of C-Units	4.72	4.50	3.20	6.64
3.	Number of Mazes	1.83	.94	1.29	1.80
4.	Total number of words in C-Units	43.39	38.22	24.64	53.79
5.	Total number of words in mazes	4.27	2.20	3.71	6.36
6.	Number of subordinate constructions	.17	.22	.20	.73
7.	Average length of C-Units	8.38	7.79	7.40	7.54

Written Sample

		Pre test	Post test	Pre test	Post test
1.	Total number of words	7.84	9.28	8.67	12.00
2.	Number of C-units	.27	.81	.33	1.20
3.	Average length of C-units	.68	2.40	2.47	3.40
4.	Number of subordinate constructions	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00

Table 3

Measurements of Oral and Written Language: Grade Two

Oral Sample

	Project Schools		Comparison Schools	
	Pre Test	Post Test	Pre Test	Post Test
1. Total number of words	66.65	81.29	33.00	52.50
2. Number of C-units	6.77	7.58	3.63	6.38
3. Number of mazes	2.71	3.88	.63	2.50
4. Number of words in C-units	60.65	69.35	30.63	46.50
5. Number of words in mazes	5.82	11.94	2.38	6.25
6. Number of Subordinate constructions	.29	1.18	0.00	0.00
7. Average length of C-units	8.76	9.21	7.35	7.30

Written Sample

	Pre Test	Post Test	Pre Test	Post Test
1. Total number of words	13.89	20.73	12.33	24.50
2. Number of C-units	1.56	2.06	.75	3.00
3. Average length of C-Units	4.21	5.85	4.38	7.80
4. Number of subordinate constructions	.17	.22	.00	.17

Table 9

Measurements of Oral and Written Language: Grade Three

Ora! Sample

	Project Schools		Comparison Schools	
	Pre test	Post test	Pre test	Post test
1. Total number of words	108.78	67.00	47.90	79.90
2. Number of C-units	10.56	7.00	4.80	7.30
3. Number of mazes	3.33	2.00	1.70	3.00
4. Total number of words in C-units	99.00	55.44	43.30	63.50
5. Total number of words in mazes	9.78	4.89	4.50	16.30
6. Number of subordinate constructions	.67	.22	.50	.70
7. Average length of C-units	8.37	8.94	8.77	7.80

Written Sample

	Project Schools		Comparison Schools	
1. Number of words	22.07	28.14	34.07	41.71
2. Number of C-units	2.14	3.07	3.64	5.00
3. Average length of C-units	7.74	7.83	8.06	8.44
4. Number of subordinate constructions	.07	.29	.43	.57

Table 10

Measurements of Oral and Written Language: Grade Four

Oral Sample

		Project Schools		Comparison Schools	
		Pre test	Post test	Pre test	Post test
1.	Total number of words	99.96	80.71	113.69	120.38
2.	Number of C-units	10.58	8.83	12.19	13.69
3.	Number of mazes	3.22	2.65	3.19	3.75
4.	Total number of words in C-Units	90.63	73.04	104.94	110.94
5.	Total number of words in mazes	10.04	7.74	8.75	9.38
* 6.	Number of subordinate constructions	1.75	1.38	1.88	1.25
* 7.	Average length of C-units	8.61	8.55	8.96	8.18

Written Sample

1.	Number of words	47.44	47.44	50.94	54.06
2.	Number of C-units	5.12	5.08	5.69	6.00
3.	Average length of C-units	8.46	7.90	9.59	9.93
4.	Number of subordinate constructions	.68	.84	.81	.38

Inferences from the data are extremely limited because the
comparability of the groups is not known, the timing of
the pre-test came after many of the training activities had
been used in the project schools, and many more variables
than those under the control of the project were operating
in both project and comparison schools. However, the
following statements can be made:

In the oral language samples in grades one through four,
the comparison schools began lower and made greater gains
over the period between pre and post tests. Project
schools, on final standing showed slight, though not
significant ($p >$ .05) superiority on only one measure
of language development, average length of communication
units.

In the written sample, comparison schools began higher and
made the greatest gains over the period between pre and
post tests. Only in grades two and four in the number
of subordinate constructions did the project schools show
slight superiority.

Measurements of children's reading achievement in project and
comparison schools were obtained from the public schools
annual testing program. Only very limited data were available.
The following information is abstracted from the Northwest
Regional Laboratory's final report, Appendix C.

No clearcut indication of the program's effectiveness can be
inferred from the data available.   Data were available from only
two of the project schools and the two comparison schools from the
third grade classroomsonly, at the end of the first year.   There is
no way of knowing the initial standing of the children or the
comparability of the populations.   The data available are presented
in Table 11.

Table 11

Reading Achievement Test* Results for Project and Comparison Schools

School		N	Mean	SD
Project -	School 1	31	25.87	6.93
	School 2	63	21.48	7.85
Comparison	School 3	69	24.91	7.95
	School 4	69	25.17	8.12

* McMenemy Reading Test - Spring 1971

Data for the project schools were combined and compared to the data from
the combined comparison schools.   A t-test for independent groups showed
that the reading achievement of the comparison schools was
significantly superior (p > .05) to that of project schools.

4. Participants' Perceptions of Program Activities.
    a. Parents and Teachers' Evaluation of the Program.

Questionnaires requesting participants' evaluation of program

activities were distributed during and after the program's

first year.   At mid-year teachers and parents were asked to rate

the effectiveness of the presentations and the usefulness of each

of the lecture-discussion and workshop activities. Mean ratings

on a seven point scale from 1, low to 7, high were obtained and are

presented in Table 12.

Table 12

Participants' Ratings of Program Activities

Parents

Lecture-Discussions		Workshop Sessions	
Presentation	Usefulness	Presentation	Usefulness
5.4	3.8	6.0	5.9

Teachers

Lecture-Discussions		Workshop Sessions	
Presentation	Usefulness	Presentation	Usefulness
5.0	5.1	5.2	4.9

At the end of the year, the topics reported by teachers to be
of the greatest value were:

1. Elements of a Reading Lesson
2. Teaching Word-Recognition
3. Comparisons of Approaches to Teaching Reading
4. Relationship Between Reading and Creative Writing
5. Informal Reading Inventory
6. Teacher-made and Published Diagnostic Tests
7. Questioning Strategies
8. Reading Stories to Children
9. Using Literature Packets
10. Establishing and Managing Classroom Libraries

Teachers were asked to rate the value of assignments on
a five point scale from 1,of little value to 5, very valuable. The
lowest mean value reported was 2.9 (report on sequences of
lessons); the highest mean value reported was 4.1 (establish a
classroom library). The overall mean for all assignments was 3.5.

Teachers reported that supervisors assisted primarily by teaching
small groups, by supplying teaching suggestions and materials,
by observing and by working with individual children. Twenty two
teachers gave ratings of excellent to the supervisory activities.
3 teachers reported occasions when supervisory activities were
inconvenient.

Free responses indicated that the policy of help being offered
at teacher's convenience rather than being forced upon teachers
or offered according to a schedule was considerably valued.
Teachers reported greater confidence and imp oved technique
in many specific classroom situations in which they were
individually assisted by supervisors but which recieved no
formal observation or evaluation.

Twenty three teachers had the same substitute teacher each week,
nine had the same substitute most weeks. Twenty nine teachers
still found it necessary to prepare a full day's work for the
substitute on most occasions. Two teachers rated their
substitutes as poor, three rated them as fair, thirteen rated
them as good, and fourteen rated them outstanding. Seventeen
teachers reported that the use of substitute teachers caused
no problems, three reported that substitutes had difficulties
controlling the class, and six reported some difficulties in
preparing suitable lessons for the substitutes to teach. Six
teachers reported that their classes had not accomplished as
much as in previous years and three reported poorer quality work
from the classes compared with previous years.

In general, wherever the school made an effort to obtain the same
substitute each week, to acquaint that substitute with what was
expected of him, the teachers reported that their substitutes
performed very well.

All of the teachers except one indicated that they studied for the
post-tests each quarter. Twenty of them found the study relevant
to their work in the classroom, eight did not, and six were undecided.
All but one of the teachers found the statements of behavioral
objectives to be useful.

Summaries of free responses indicated that teachers were generally in
favor of program activities continuing in the same format, that
lecture-discussion sessions were useful but too long, test-emphasis
was too great, and that more time should be given to working with
teachers individually in the classrooms.

Questionnaires were sent by mail to nineteen parents three months
after the program ended. Fourteen replies were received. Eight
parents indicated that they gave between one and two hours time to
the school each week, six indicated that they gave more than two
hours. Helping individual children with reading and language was
by far the most frequently reported form of assistance. All fourteen
parents reported that in their opinion the school valued their
help. In answer to the question, "Were you asked at any time to
do anything you could not do?", all fourteen replied, no. Twelve
reported that the program had shown them definite ways in which
to help a teacher in school; one reported that she had tutored
previously and had learned nothing new. One felt that she should
be told exactly what to do when helping a certain child and that
decisions should not be left to her. Thirteen parents expressed
a willingness and the likelihood of continuing to help in some way.

Twelve reported that they had learned how to help their own
children. All fourteen reported that they had gained a better
understanding of the schools' reading programs. Four reported
giving out of school help to other parents and children.

In general, the parents valued their own workshop sessions very
highly, but found the general lecture-discussions to be too
often unrelated to their immediate needs and therefore less
valuable. Many indicated a desire to know more specifically at
the beginning of the program what was expected of them. Almost
all indicated that exchange of information on the specific problems
they were encountering was one of the most valuable activities.
Almost all also indicated a strong desire for some supervision
and individual evaluation of their work.

b. Teachers' Attitudes and Practices

A Teacher Attitudes and Practice Survey Questionnaire was designed
by Specialized Educational Consultant Services, Incorporated,
North Carolina, and administered in October, four months after
the commencement of the program and in May, at the close of the
first year. No measures were taken before the program commenced.
The survey contained three scales: 1) attitudes towards general
school practices; 2) frequency of use of various teaching techniques·
3) attitudes toward parent involvement and non-standard dialects.
Differences between the October and May surveys were found not
to be statistically significant. Attitudes towards general school

practices, frequency of use of recommended teaching methods, and attitudes towards parent involvement and non-standard dialects appear to have remained stable throughout the period between the surveys. Data are given in Table 13.

Table 13

Raw Score Means of Teacher Attitude and Practices Survey

	October Survey	May Survey
Scale 1	184.00	180.96
Scale 2	177.54	182.04
Scale 3	126.32	128.54

E. Multiplier Effect

In addition to its work within the four program schools, the progr ·
has also had effects upon the broader community. The e·tent of
such effects is extremely difficult to assess. No one can mea~·re
for example the effect of the program upon improving university
and public school relations. However, evidence of two major
effects is available.

1. Within the university, over twenty sets of instructional
    handouts ranging from simple informative leaflets to complex
    training sequences have been made available to and used in methods
    courses within the School of Education.

2. Requests have been made to the university for EPDA Program staff
    members to assist voluntarily in other in-service training
    programs, and to act as consultants to other schools. They have
    assisted in the following ways:

    a) Conducted two training sessions of a local workshop for
        teacher aides

    b) Spoken to two school P.T.A. meetings

    c) Made a presentation at the Annual Conference of I.R.A.

    d) Conducted two workshops and given three lectures to local
        professional groups, I.R.A., and N.C.T.E.

    e) Presented lecture-discussion sessions to two class sessions
        of university methods courses.

    Three other requests for intensive in-service courses were received and
    had to be deferred until the program was complete.

F. Findings

The Portland Project provided one day per week of released time
to teachers of grades one through four of four low achieving,
disadvantaged, public elementary schools. It included principals,
teachers, teacher aides, and a group of parents within the scope
of its program. It combined university classroom presentation
workshop activities, and independent assignments with on site
demonstration and supervision. Specifically it showed that
teachers', aides', and parents' knowledge of techniques of teaching
reading could be substantially increased; that improvements in
certain features of teachers' classroom performance could be brought
about; and that parents could assist teachers in many ways,
perceive themselves as valued assistants, and be perceived as such
by teachers.

It further demonstrated that personnel from a large public school
system, an urban university, and a regional educational laboratory
can work together harmoniously and effectively as an in-service training
and evaluation team.

The following conclusions can be drawn in relation to the objectives
of the program:

1. The program brought about significant improvements in
    teachers' knowledge of materials and techniques for teaching
    reading.

2. Teachers demonstrated competence in the use of several
    major diagnostic techniques. The program also brought

about significant improvements in certain aspects

of teaching performance of the group as a whole, notably

in planning each week's work to include a variety of

appropriate materials and classroom organizational patterns,

in involving children in planning classroom activities,

in holding individual conferences with children, in

planning independent work activities for children, in

making use of a systematic plan when teaching reading to

small groups of children, and in establishing and

maintaining classroom libraries.

3. A ten-morning summer workshop in basic techniques in teaching

reading increased teacher aides' techniques

for teaching reading and ways of working with children. It

enabled them to assist more effectively in their

classrooms.

4. Parents trained in basic techniques of teaching reading and

the use of materials were able to assist teachers with

individuals and small groups in their classrooms.

The following observations may also be made:

1. Teachers in four low-achieving schools initially did

not perform well on tests of knowledge of everyday materials

and techniques for teaching reading and language.

2. Throughout the year the esprit de corps of program
    participants and their attitudes towards implementing
    program suggestions remained uniformly high. This is
    probably attributable to the sufficient amounts of time
    provided, the practical emphasis of the training activities,
    and the balance of off-site and on-site training
    activities.

3. Public school supervisory staff and university staff members
    played complementary roles, extended each others experiences,
    and benefitted by collaborating for a common purpose.

4. Though adequate measures were not available, it appears
    unlikely that children made significant gains or losses
    in reading or language achievements during the period in
    which teachers were released from school one day a week
    to receive training.

5. Teachers of grades one through four were released from
    school one day a week, and substitute teachers took their
    places without major disruptions of school functioning
    and without adverse effects upon children's achievement.

It was apparent to the program staff from teachers' performances on
pre-tests and from informal comments made as rapport was established between

program participants and staff, that many teachers teach daily in their

classrooms with limited knowledge of the range of alternative

teaching techniques and materials available to them, and at times with

insufficient confidence and information to ask questions, show initiative

in program changes, set appropriate goals, or seek out new ways of

achieving their goals. For many teachers, systematic in-service

training appears to be a necessity if they are to increase the effectiveness,

the scope, and the interest of their classroom programs.

Staff members from both the university and the public school system

with experience of other in-service programs attribute many of the successes

of the Portland Project to these factors:

1. The released time which gave the teachers the time and opportunity

   they needed to examine their goals and explore teaching

   alternatives, and gave the program staff the opportunity to

   require teachers to perform certain training tasks.

2. The objectivity, perspective, and expertise provided by the university

   staff, which gave direction to and extended the experience of the

   public school staff.

3. The sufficiency of the time allowed to classroom supervisors

   which allowed them to make frequent visits to program classrooms

   and work closely and intensively with the teachers.

A major failing which did not become apparent until the end of the

program was the insufficient insistence by program staff upon the

practice and mastery of discrete teaching skills by the program

participants. For example, such skills as the giving of directions to

a class, the teaching of a sound-symbol relationship, and the pacing

of a discussion, were all discussed and understood and were used by teachers in classrooms. The program did not provide sufficient opportunities for the mastery of those skills in practice situations for those teachers who needed them.

One of the major problems of an eclectic program appears to be that in the hands of some teachers, at least at a certain stage in their development, it tends to become a piecemeal program rather than an integrated, diagnostically based program. Perhaps detailed case studies of the development of diagnostic teaching techniques by individual teachers are needed to throw light upon this problem and suggest appropriate training measures.

The problem of evaluating diagnostic teaching is extremely complex and was encountered but not solved during this project. The use of a single observational schedule implies an expectation of one kind of teaching performance for all teachers. While appropriate for use with some teachers at certain stages of development, it is bound to be inappropriate for use with other highly imaginative and effective teachers. One solution appears to be individual evaluations of teaching performance by sophisticated observers aware of individual goals. This solution occurred to the program staff too late to be put to use in the Portland Project.

V Recommendations

The Portland Project was innovative rather than exemplary. Because of
its exploratory nature, the need for cooperation with other projects
in distant parts of the country, and the need for a comprehensive
evaluation of its activities, its operating budget was large, far
larger than would be needed by a school district to replicate its
most successful features with a similar population. Furthermore,
inadequacies in the training model and its evaluation design appeared
before the program was complete. Perhaps though, as much can be
learned from the project's shortcomings, as from its successes. With
these points in mind the following recommendations are made concerning
in-service programs in the teaching of reading.

1. An in-service training program is well advised to provide
    generous time allowances for the participants to assimilate
    new information and engage in training tasks.

2. Leadership and the planning and staffing of program activities
    is more likely to be innovative, objective, and comprehensive
    when it is a responsibility shared between knowledgeable persons
    from within the public school system and specialists from the
    university.

3. Leadership is the responsibility of the program staff. Though it
    is desirable to include program participants in the planning,
    they may not be in a position to do so until they have experienced
    many of the training activities and grasped the possible scope of

the program.

4. It does not appear to be sufficient merely to identify discrete
    teaching skills, discuss them, and observe them in use in
    classrooms. The findings of this program suggest that opporturities
    for practice and mastery of discrete teaching skills before they
    are applied in the classroom are necessary for many teachers.

5. It seems to be advantageous for all staff members to be prepared
    to carry out all staff roles: presentation of information,
    direction of workshop activities, on-site supervision and
    demonstration. This keeps all staff members in touch with the
    problems of application and transfer.

6. Principals, teachers, aides, and parents can all benefit from
    inclusion in the program. All need systematic feedback.

7. A program should include process goals as well as product goals.
    Not all of the activities of a program will result in objective
    measurable changes of behavior occurring with the duration of the
    program.

8. The goals of a program of supervision need to be regarded as
    specific goals for individual teachers and evaluated accordingly,
    not as group goals for all teachers.

9. A program should remain responsive to emerging needs. Not all
    program goals can be anticipated ahead of time.

10. The comparative effectiveness of various styles of classroom
    supervision needs to be investigated.

List of References

Aaron, Ira E., Callaway, B., and Olson A.V. Conducting In-Service
Programs in Reading, Newark, Deleware: International Reading Association,
1965.

Austin, Mary C., Morrison, Coleman,and others, The First R: The
Harvard Report on Reading in the Elementary Schools. New York: Macmillan,
1963.

Bond, Guy L., and Dykstra, Robert. The Cooperative Research Program in
First Grade Reading Instruction. Reading Research Quarterly, Vol. II, no.
4, (Summer, 1967), 5-142.

Della-Piana, G. and Others. "Parents and Reading Achievement." Elementary
English, Vol. 45, February, 1968.

Emmerling, Frank C., and Chavis, Kanawha Z., "Innovations in Education",
'The Teacher Aide'," Educational Leadership, XXIV (November, 1966),
pp. 175-183.

Loban, Walter. The Language of Elementary School Children, Champaign,
Illinois, National Council of Teachers of English, 1963.

Smith, Mildred B. and Brahce, Carl. "When School and Home Focus on
Achievement". Educational Leadership 20 (February,1963),
pp. 314-318.

Smith, Mildred B., "School and Home: Focus on Achievement." In Developing
Programs for the Educationally Disadvantaged. edited by A. Harry
Passow, pp. 87-107, New York, Teachers College Press, Columbia
University, 1968.

Spache, George D. and Spache, Evelyn B., Reading in the Elementary
School. Second Edition, Boston: Allyn and Bacon, 1969.

Appendix A

Topics and Training Activities of the Portland Project

Summer - 1970, Basic Techniques in Teaching Reading

A. Lecture-Discussions

1. The Total Reading Program. Old and new definitions of reading. Short and long-term goals of school reading programs. Developmental, practice, corrective, remedial, and readiness aspects of a reading program.

2. Basal Readers. Comparison between conventional basal readers and recent alternatives. Rationale, limitations, and intended use.

3. A Conventional Reading Lesson. Essential elements of a reading lesson. A reading lesson as a problem-solving activity. Classroom tested suggestions.

4. Word-Recognition Skills. An examination of theory and practice of the most widely recommended techniques for teaching independence in recognizing words.

5. Planning a Week's Reading Instruction. A classroom organizational plan permitting systematic group teaching, individualized independent reading, and regular individualized corrective assistance.

6. The Language Experience Approach. The relationship between reading and children's language. Ways of using children's spontaneous personal language to teach children how to read.

7. Teacher-Made Media. The construction and use of photographs, film strips, film clips, and audio tapes in the teaching of reading.

8. Phonics Approaches. The sound-spelling relationships of English words expressed as phonic generalizations. Cautions, limitations,

and general principles for using this information for teaching.

9. <u>Linguistics Approaches.</u> Recent terms from linguistics. The use of spelling patterns and sentence patterns in the teaching of reading limitations.

10. <u>Teaching Reading Comprehension.</u> Conventional analyses of reading comprehension. Teaching comprehension.

B. <u>Workshop Activities</u>

1. Preview of audio-tapes for teaching listening.

2. Construction of audio-tapes for language and listening activities.

3. Preview of films for use in teaching language arts.

4. Using films to teach language arts.

5. Examination - demonstration of selected reading readiness programs and materials.

C. <u>Specific Independent Assignments</u>

1. Examine materials and compare two different approaches to the teaching of reading.

2. Locate, describe, critique, and where necessary - outline, plans for supplementing the word-recognition program of the materials you intend to use for teaching reading this year.

3. Develop your plans for your first week's teaching of reading and language arts.

4. Keep a log of independent readings and your reactions to them.

Fall 1971

The Relationships Between the Teaching of Reading and the Teaching of Language

A. **Lecture-Discussions**

1. **Listening and Speaking.** Relationships among the language arts classroom
    activities for developing listening and speaking.

2. **Improving Listening and Speaking.** Fluency and precision in speech.
    Activities for improving listening and speaking.

3. **Creative Dramatics.** The use of informal dramatic activities in
    elementary school language arts.

4. **Written Composition.** Stimulating written composition, encouraging
    fluency.

5. **Improving Written Composition.** Activities for sustaining and improving
    children's writing.

6. **Dialect, Usage and Grammar in the Classroom.** Descriptive versus
    prescriptive approaches to language study. Implications for teachers.

7. **Language Development in Young Children.** Summaries of recent investigations
    in children's acquisition of language. Implications for teachers.

8. **Reading Aloud to Children.** Choosing books and reading aloud to children.

9. **Oral Reading and Choral Reading Activities.** Guidelines for oral
    reading. Choosing passages for choral reading. Teaching choral reading.

10. **Poetry in the Elementary Classroom.** Choosing poems for children.
    Activities which encourage children to read and write poems.

11. **Evaluating Children's Development in Listening, Speaking and Writing.**
    Informal and formal ways of assessing children's development.
    Implications for teaching.

B. Workshop Activities

1. Methods and materials for teaching the alphabet.

2. Writing behavioral objectives for reading and language.

3. Activities in creative dramatics - participation.

4. Teaching handwriting - participation and application of diagnostic
   techniques.

5. Constructing and using a classroom writing center.

6. Using catalogs and curriculum guides to obtain materials.

7. Using a tape recorder for oral reading activities.

8. Making audio-tapes for language lessons.

C. Specific Independent Assignments

Select one topic in the language arts. Describe the children's backgrounds
and write objectives for a sequence of lessons or activities over
a period of four or five weeks. Carry out the activities. After
each one, analyze what happened and modify your plans towards meeting
the objectives.

Winter 1970-71

Diagnosing Individual Students Needs In Learning To Read

A. Lecture-Discussions

1. When Should Reading Instruction Begin? A review of studies of early
   readers. Assessing reading readiness.

2. Activities Before a Child Learns to Read. A discussion of pre-reading
   activities and their purposes.

3. Questioning Strategies in the Classroom. Kinds of questions.
    Developing questions for specific purposes.

4. Informal Reading Inventories. The purposes, construction, and
    limitations of informal reading inventories.

5. A Language Program in a Ghetto School. Guest Speaker - Mr. E. Gottlieb.

6. Correcting Selected Word-Recognition Difficulties.

7. Verbal and Non-Verbal Communication.   Guest Speaker - Dr. S. Jones.

8. Teaching Children to Read Textbooks. Guest Speaker - Dr. Margaret Early

9. Classroom Organization. Strengths and weaknesses of various grouping
    and individualized procedures.

10. Correcting Selected Comprehension Difficulties.   ys of identifying
    comprehension problems. Corrective methods and materials.

B. Workshop Activities

    1. Tests of Auditory Discrimination

    2. Tests of Learning Methods and Learning Rate.

    3. Tests of Sight Vocabulary

    4. Teacher-made Diagnostic Reading Tests

    5. Informal Reading Inventory Proficiency Test - Administration,
        Recording, and Interpretation.

    6. Independent Activities for Teaching Reading.

    7. Estimating Reading Potential.

    8. Estimating the Difficulty of Reading Materials.

C. Specific Independent Assignments

    1. Administer and interpret each of the following tests:
        Wepman Auditory Discrimination Test

       Durrell Learning Rate Test

       Harris or Mills Learning Methods Test

       Two Informal Reading Inventories

       Dolch or Fry List of Basic Words

       Roswell Chall Diagnostic Reading Test

2. Compute reading expectancies for two members of your class.

3. Contribute materials for independent activities designed to
   teach specific reading skills.

4. Write questions about reading passages to use with a class to
   accomplish appropriately stated objectives.

5. Compute the readability of two selected children's library books.

<center>Spring 1970-71</center>

<center>Children's Literature and the Teaching of Reading</center>

A. <u>Lecture-Discussions</u>

1. <u>Reading Aloud to Children.</u> Guest Speaker - Dr. Vera Petersen.

2. <u>Sharing Independent Reading.</u> Using various media for interpreting and
   sharing children's books.

3. <u>A Literature Curriculum</u>. Guidelines for literature curriculum.
   Teacher's role in selecting literature.

4. <u>Illustrations in Children's Books</u>. Guest Speaker - Dr. Vera Petersen.

5. <u>Intermediate Literature Packets.</u> Obtaining, preparing and using sets
   of good books.

6. <u>Story Ladies</u>. An active role for parents in a School reading program.

7. Classroom Libraries. Establishing a classroom library. Good Management Practices.

8. Children's Independent Reading. Findings and Problems.

9. Reference Books for Children. Guest Speaker - Dr. Vera Petersen

10. Using Radio and Television to Teach Reading and Literature.

B. Workshop Activities

1. Grade level group discussions of ways of sharing children's books.

2. Grade level group discussions of using children's literature for teaching reading.

3. Discussion of major difficulties teachers face in implementing program suggestions.

4. Visit to a school library.

C. Specific Independent Assignments

1. Establish a classroom library according to program guidelines and management practices.

2. Collect information by means of an informal reading inventory technique about children's performance in word-recognition and comprehension in books they have chosen for independent reading.

3. Prepare stories for reading aloud.

4. Prepare stories from children's literature for use in the reading program.

Appendix B

Observations of Teachers' Classroom Performances

A. 1. How do you organize your class for reading instruction? (If teacher groups children, then ask..) How are children grouped?

2. Observer will record organizational pattern of class during at least two language arts writing or reading lesson periods.

B. The observer will be asked to detect the presence or absence of the following sequence of steps in reading lessons.

*I. 1. Motive (The Content) Was the topic, title, a division of the reading or an illustration in the book discussed before the main reading began?

2. Background (Material Extraneous to Story Content) Was background information relevant to the story content presented or reviewed before the main reading began?

3. Vocabulary Was vocabulary presented visually and meanings discussed before the main reading began?

4. Guidance Did the teacher indicate the amount of reading to be done and the manner in which it was to be done?

  a. Before the main reading began?

  b. Did the teacher indicate an implicit beginning point?

  c. Did the teacher indicate explicitly the amount to be read?

  d. Did the teacher indicate the rate at which the selection was to be read?

5. Purpose Were specific purpose setting questions asked before the main reading began?

*   Items 1-5 may appear in any order.

II. 6. <u>Reading</u> (For Purpose of Discussion)

Did the children read the first passage silently <u>before</u> the discussion took place?

III. 7. <u>Re-reading</u>

    a. Was oral re-reading conducted in response to the specific purpose setting questions?

    b. Did the reading approximate natural speech rather than word-by-word or sing-song before it was accepted by the teacher?

    c. Did the discussion attempt to relate the story content to the children's background?

IV. 8. <u>Skills Practice</u>

    a. Was an assignment given using material other than that in the reading passage?

    b. Were directions about <u>how</u> to do it given clearly?

    c. Were some examples worked out and discussed prior to independent work?

9. <u>Transfer</u> (Material not Regularly in Content)

Were suggestions made for further activities of reading related to the lesson?

The anticipated sequence I-IV may not be completed for observation in one typical reading period.

C. Observers will record the presence or absence of <u>each</u> of the following types of questions:

    i.   Cognitive-Factual
    ii. Convergent
    iii. Divergent
    iv. Evaluative

D. Observers will record the sequence of the above questions.

E. Observer will record systematically samples of the behavior of the children not under the direct supervision of teacher.

F. Observer will look for the presence or absence of the following items and events:

(A.) Bcoks in Classroom Library

    1. Non-Fiction Books

        a. Alphabet Books

        b. Number and Counting Books

        c. Books on Science and Social Studies

            (1) Biographies

            (2) Travel Stories

            (3) True Adventures

            (4) True Animal Stories

            (5) Science Topics

            (6) Social Studies Topics

            (7) Science Reference Books

    2. Fiction Books

        a. Fairy Tales

            (1) Old

            (2) New

        b. Folk Tales

            (1) Old

            (2) New

            (3) American

            (4) Other Lands

        c. Picture Books

        d. Poetry

           (1) Mother Goose

           (2) Nonsense Rhymes

           (3) Old

           (4) New

        e. Animal Stories

        f. Adventure Stories

        g. Sports Stories

        h. Mysteries

        i. Plays and Choral Reading for Children

3. Magazines

    a. Jack and Jill

    b. Highlights

    c. Weekly Reader

    d. Boys Life

    e. Humpty Dumpty

    f. Children's Digest

    g. Junior Natural History

(B). Appearance of the Classroom Library

1. Rug

2. Comfortable chairs (Rocking chairs, chairs different from those of the classroom)

3. Posters about books or reading

4. A book display

5. Book jackets

6. Puppets

(C). Use of the Library

1. Children are using the library

2. A child can point out something new in the library this week.

3. Children assist in the arrangement of books.

4. Records of books read are available.

5. Recommendations about books are made orally or in writing.

6. The teacher helps a child find a book.

7. The teacher helps a child read a book.

Appendix C

Teachers' Log of Parents' Assistance

DATE:_____

NAME:_____

SCHOOL:_____

GRADE YOU TEACH:_____

1. During the past week did you have a parent helping you in the classroom?

___yes ___no

If yes, how many?_____

PLEASE LIST RESPONSES TO THE FOLLOWING QUESTIONS IN THE LOG BELOW

2. What specific tasks did the parent(s) perfor..?

3. How much time did the parent(s) spend on each task?

4. How much time did it cost you to have the parent(s) help on each task?

5. How much time did it save you to have the parent(s) help on each task?

Specific Task	Estimated Total Time for Each Task	Time Cost to You	Time Saved for You

Appendix D

Teachers' Evaluation of First Year Training Activities

(Please do not write names on these sheets, but do please indicate the grade level you teach)

1. <u>Topics</u>

Looking back over last year's topics, please recall as many as you can. Against each rate its value to you as a teacher from 1 (no value) to 5 (very valuable). This refers to all program activities at PSU, general sessions, workshops, guest speakers, etc. Exact titles are not important. Placement in the right quarter is helpful but not important.

TOPICS

RATING

1(no value) - 5 (very valuable)

SUMMER

FALL

WINTER

SPRING

2. <u>Assignments</u>

You were asked to complete many assignments. Against each assignment listed below, please rate its value to you in learning something useful to a classroom teacher.

Assignments

Summer

a. Compare Two Approaches to the Teaching of REading.

b. Describe and Critique the Word-Recognition Program at One Level of S.R.A.

c. Develop a Plan for Your First Week's Teaching.

d. Keep a Log of Summer Readings and Your Reactions to Them.

Fall

a. Report on a Sequence of Lessons, part 1.

b. Report on a Sequence of Lessons, part 2.

Winter

a. Administer and Interpret a Wepman Auditory Discrimination Test.

b. Administer and Interpret a Durrell Learning Rate Test

c. Administer and Interpret a Learning Methods Test

d. Administer and Interpret an Informal Reading Inventory.

e. Administer and Interpret a Roswell Chall Diagnostic Reading Test.

f. Compute Reading Expectancies for Two Children.

g. Submit a Suggestion for an Independent Activity.

Assignments	Rating
	1(no value)-5(very valuable)

h. Write and Use a Sequence of Questions About a Reading Passage.

i. Compute the Readability of Two Library Books.

Spring

a. Establish a Classroom Library.

b. Keep a Log of Books for Children You Have Read.

c. Keep a Log of Books You have Read Aloud to Children.

d. Report on Teaching a Lesson from Sounds of Language.

e. Report on WAys of Having Children Share Books.

f. Report on Using a Literature Packet.

g. Report on a Child's Performance in Independent Reading (I.R.I. Techniques)

ADD COMMENTS IF YOU WISH

3. ## Supervision

a. What did EPDA supervisors do in your classrooms?

b. Please comment on the value of help given by supervisors.

c. Were any of the supervisory activities unnecessary or inconvenient?

_____No   _____ Yes, please explain

comment if you wish

d. In what ways can a supervisor help you most?

4. Substitute Teachers

    a. Did a substitute teacher take your place each week?

       ____Yes ____No

    b. Did you have the same substitute?

       ____Always ____Almost Always ___Occasionally ___Never

    c Did you still have to prepare work all year long?

       ____Yes ____No Comment if you wish.

    d. How would you rate your substitute's performance?

       ____Poor ____Fair ____Good ____Outstanding

    e. Was there anything she did particularly well?

    f. Was there anything that caused you problems or extra work?

    g. Compared with previous years, did you time away from the classroom
       cut down on the amount or quality of work you could accomplish?
       Amount?
       Quality?
       What kinds of work? subject, etc.?

5. Tests

    a. In general, were the test questions relevant to your work in
       the classroom?   ___Yes ___ No

    b. Did you study for the tests? ___Yes ___No

    c. If so, was the time spent on studying -
       ____ Time Wasted ____ Time Well Spent
       Comment if you wish

    d. Were the lists of objectives helpful? ____No ____Yes
       Comment if you wish

6. <u>Textbooks</u>

    a. Did you make use of texts brought to your attention by EPDA?

        Please list:

    b. How helpful was the bibliography?

        ____Very helpful   ____Helpful

        ____Of little help   ____Of no help

7. <u>Materials</u>

    Please list teaching materials that you tried or made use of that were brought to your attention primarily by EPDA. Comment on their value if you wish.

8. <u>Overall Evaluation</u>

    a. In what ways, if any, has the EPDA program made you a more effective teacher?

    b. What do <u>you</u> think the EPDA program stressed?

    c. What suggestions would you make for the coming year?

Appendix E

Questionnaire for Parents

Please do not write your names on this questionnaire.

1. About how much time per week were you able to spend in school helping a teacher?

   A. Before Christmas

Before Christmas	Between Christmas and Spring	After Spring
____None		
____Less than one hour	____	____
____From one to two hours	____	____
____More than two hours	____	____

   B. What kinds of things did you do? Please list.

2. Were you asked at any time to do anything you could not do?

   ___No   ___Yes. If yes, explain.

3. In your opinion, did the school value your help?

   ___Yes   ___No: Comment if you wish

4. Did you feel that the EPDA program showed you definite ways in which you could help a teacher in school?

   ____Yes   ____No: Comment if you wish

5. Are you likely to continue to help in some way?

   ____Yes   ____No: Comment if you wish

6. Did EPDA show you definite ways you could help your own children
    learn to read?

    ____Yes   ____No: Comment if you wish

7. Has EPDA given you a better understanding of your school's reading
    program?

    ____Yes   ____No: Comment if you wish

8. Has EPDA helped you describe and explain your school's reading program
    to other parents?

    ____Yes   ____No: Comment if you wish

9. Have you given any out of school help to other parents or other children?

    ____No   ____Yes: If yes, please describe briefly.

10. What was most valuable to you?

11. What was least valuable to you?

12. Was it a good idea to include parents and teachers in the same sessions
     much of the time?

    ____Yes   ____No: Comment if you wish.

13. What suggestions would you make to improve the program for parents
     next time?