DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 070 527 PS 006 224

AUTHOR Smith, Merrill L.
TITLE ESEA - Title III: Pre-School Language Development. K-3 Developmental Language-Reading Learning Centers. Final Project Evaluation Report, 1971-72.
INSTITUTION Baugo Community Schools, Elkhart, Ind.
PUB DATE Jul 72
NOTE 48p.; R.R. #3

EDRS PRICE MF-$0.65 HC-$3.29
DESCRIPTORS *Decision Making; Inservice Education; *Language Development; Management; *Preschool Children; *Primary Grades; Program Content; *Program Evaluation

ABSTRACT

Having identified reading and language deficiencies among a community and primary-age pupils (ages 4-9), a program was written which would remit those deficiencies over a three-year period. This objective will be effected by dealing with four population groups: pupils, teachers and aides, management, and parents. The pre-school component serves 50 four-and five-year old students (75% from the target population and 25% from model homes) who typically function poorly in the primary instructional setting resulting from deficiencies in general language development, perceptual-conceptual development, and perceptual-motor development. The program attempts to acquaint the child with early learning performance rather than remediate failure later in the school setting. The K-3 program serves 130 kindergarten, first, second, and third grade students. Two sites utilize a multi-media, small-group tutorial, diagnostic/prescriptive format to alleviate deficiencies in language and reading. The in-service component serves each population as an assist in keeping people informed about the project. The management component is primarily involved in determining the program, both offering direction for and causing implementation of the program, writing role descriptions and strengthening same as need arises. This report is an evaluation concerned with finding immediately-relevant answers for decision making. (CK)

E S E A - T I T L E III

P R E - S C H O O L L A N G U A G E D E V E L O P M E N T

K-3 DEVELOPMENTAL LANGUAGE-READING LEARNING CENTERS

FINAL PROJECT EVALUATION REPORT
1971-72

USOE-ASSIGNED PROJECT NUMBER 6968
BAUGO COMMUNITY SCHOOLS
R. R. #3
Elkhart, Indiana

Prepared and submitted by:
Merrill L. Smith, Ed.S.
On-Site Evaluator

July 1972

THE PROJECT PERSONNEL

Dr. Raymond L. Patheree
SUPERINTENDENT OF SCHOOLS

MANAGEMENT

Mr. Gerald Heindselman -- Project Director
Mr. Randolph Wicker -- Centers Manager

EVALUATION

Mr. Merrill Smith -- On-Site Evaluator
Dr. Clinton Chase -- Technical Assistance
Indiana University

EDUCATIONAL PROGRAM AUDIT

Dr. Gary Mohrenweiser -- Auditor
Educational Management Services, Inc.
Minneapolis, Minnesota

LEARNING DIRECTORS

Mrs. JoAnn Barnes, Pre-School
Mrs. Jeannette Martin, Holben R-L Center
Mrs. Betty Warner, Jimtown R-L Center

INSTRUCTIONAL AIDES

Mrs. Lois Breden
Mrs. Charlotte Haggard
Mrs. Lila Jean
Mrs. Elizabeth Klein
Mrs. Carol Luse
Mrs. Sandra Strickland

Mrs. Letha Ressler, School Home Coordinator

Mr. Robert Purdie, Community Council Chairman
Beverly Greenawalt, Secretary

*PROJECT OVERVIEW

Having identified reading and language deficiencies among our community and primary-age pupils (ages 4-9), a program was written which would remit those deficiencies over a three-year period. This objective will be effected by dealing with four population groups: pupils, teachers and aides, management and parents. These populations comprise four project components: Pre-School, K-3, In-Service, and management.

A. Pre-School Component

This component serves 50 four-and five-year old students (75% from the target population and 25% from model homes) who typically function poorly in the primary instructional setting resulting from deficiencies in general language development (expressive and receptive), perceptual-conceptual development, and perceptual-motor development. The program attempts to acquaint the child with early learning performance rather than remediate failure later in the school setting.

These 50 children are divided into two instructional settings, A.M. and P.M. The pupils are bussed to and from a rented church facility for instruction. The Pre-School is staffed with one Learning Director, two Instructional Aides, one half-time Home-School Coordinator, in addition to efforts and advisements as offered by a speech therapist, a school nurse and volunteer parents. The instruction mirrors a needs assessment, small-group format. Behavioral objectives specify activities, conditions, and levels of achievement for the learners. Learning grids track the students through needs areas. Program objectives provide guidelines for the total component.

B. K-3 Component

The K-3 program serves 130 kindergarten, first, second, and third grade students. Two sites utilize a multi-media, small-group tutorial, diagnostic/prescriptive format to alleviate deficiencies in language and reading.

Each site is staffed with a Learning Director and two Instructional Aides. The overall organization of the two centers is the effort of the Centers Manager.

Instruction is based upon a needs assessment of each student as he is diagnosed in language and reading.

Students are scheduled daily into the centers for 30 minutes of intensified, success-oriented instruction. Instructional activities are based on the teach-test-reteach triad as they are initiated by behavioral objectives. These learner activities are determined by the Learning Director as she determines instructional needs and strategies and coordinates the efforts of the two instructional aides. Assisting the staff are skill banks that cover word attack skills, inferential and literal comprehension as well as language development. These skills are filed in a sequential taxonomized skill bank.

Pre-tests determine area weaknesses. Diagnostic tests determine specific weaknesses within an area. As specific concepts are introduced, pursued and cultivated, assessments are made to determine directionality for the teacher, aide, and learner.

C. In-service Component

The In-service component serves each population (teachers, aides, parents and management) as an assist:

a) in keeping people informed about the project and its component rationale and objectives.

b) in orienting aides and teachers relative to total project.

c) in training aides to function in their roles as instructional aides.

d) in training aides and teachers in the use of special programs (Distar, Alpha I, Systems 80, etc.)

e) in effecting parent seminars and "coffee clutches".

f) in on-going curriculum development and designing effective instructional strategies for implementing project objectives.

g) in opening communication between project personnel and homeroom teachers.

h) in the development of a taxonomy of skills, and the development of a guide of behavioral objectives in specific skills areas based on a hierarchy of skills.

i) in acquiring specialists relative to early childhood development for parent and instructor groups.

D. Management Component

The management component is the core of the total project. Operation and organization radiate from this component to the other components of the total project. This component is staffed by a Project Director and Centers Manager. Other personnel, although remaining independent of management operation and organization, are an integral part of the management component. One full-time on-site evaluator provides the evaluation design and the analysis technique and instrumentation for the 31 performance objectives that govern the project. The evaluator's efforts are supplemented by technical assistance as offered and contracted through Indiana University's research department formally called the Bureau of Educational Studies and Testing (BEST). A project auditor provides directions relative to the total project and specifically to the governing objectives. A parent council assists the total project in offering survey assistance, population needs information, directional advisement and consultation. A projects officer housed in Washington, D.C. provides directionality to the management team.

Line and staff charts show the flow of responsibility of the total project personnel. Those personnel indicated on the flow charts have role descriptions as specified in the project manual of operation. Personnel indirectly involved in management not having role descriptions are under contracted services; this does not include the U.S. Office Project's Director.

Management is primarily involved in determining program, both offering direction for and causing implementation of program to occur, writing role descriptions and strengthening same as need arises, evaluating key personnel and offering constructive criticism as a follow-up to evaluation, working harmoniously with project teachers and aides, building principals and homeroom teachers and aides to effect

a continuum of communication relevant and vital to project and non-project educational goals, make intelligent decisions as directions are offered by Project's Officer, Evaluator, Auditor, Community Council, Supt. of Schools, teachers and aides; keep an appropriate and accurate accounting system of budgeting (proposed, estimated, and supplementary); and making other management changes and adjustments as necessary to keep the project in pursuit of the objectives.

*reproduced in part from Project Handbook, pp. 1-4.

ABOUT THIS REPORT

Researchers are concerned with the discovery and building of principles. They seek to develop rules, to understand causes of things and the forces that interact in the learning process. Although sharing these concerns, evaluation is primarily concerned with collecting information in order to improve management decisions about the worth of the program. This evaluation is concerned with finding immediately-relevant answers for decision making, thus sacrificing the tools of manipulation and control for the practicality of the immediate situation. This is central to the report which follows.

A detailed descriptive report has been written for each of the 31 objective summarizations which follow. The reader should refer to these reports if a more comprehensive study of each of the governing objectives is desired.

GENERAL CONCLUSIONS

The results of the present evaluation clearly indicate that an intervention program can significantly compensate for patterns of delayed development in four-year-old, Pre-School children. The results of this evaluation indicate that a cognitively-oriented preschool curriculum is a stimulating and motivating adventure, much more so than other such programs based on learning through play. The results of this program clearly indicate that besides pupil behavior changes, there are other educational outcomes which are important, such as changes in parental attitude, the professional staff and community values. And, while many educators have been successful in avoiding the precision-based, performance objective format, the results of this evaluation indicate that such a philosophy carries particular appeal in the education of young children.

Furthermore, the results of this evaluation provide considerable evidence to support and enhance programs incorporating a carefully planned relationship between specific deficit and remedial measure--the diagnostic prescriptive process to learning.

I. PRE-SCHOOL COMPONENT

For eight months Baugo Community Schools intervened into the lives of 50 four-year-old children, many of whom, as suggested by federal guidelines, possess deficient developmental experiences. Efforts were extended by both management and the instructional staff to challenge the needs of children through oral language skills, basic concepts, visual-motor skills and affective development.

Test Instruments and Techniques

Kephart Preschool Language Scale*--The PLS, yielding three sets of data, one verbal, auditory and language score, was administered pre and post to 25 randomly-selected students. PLS scores were obtained in the following three areas:

1. Auditory Comprehension (AC)-tasks to determine whether a child can receive auditory information, and can indicate this reception by a meaningful, non-verbal response.
2. Verbal Ability (VA)-tasks to determine whether a child can verbalize adequately, as measured by his responses to a series of graded tasks.
3. Language Age (LA)-a derived score obtained by summating the AC and VA and dividing by two. The LA offers one an estimate of an individual's general language abilities.

The structured portion of the Pre-School day incorporated close manipulation of the learning situation so as to elicit correct responses and provide reinforcement through success and this test was a measure of the success of this particular strategy. Following are the pre and post mean comparisons in years and months:

Pre	Post	Growth (months)
AC 4-8	AC 6-2	AC 18
VA 4-5	VA 5-8	VA 15
LA 4-5	LA 5-9	LA 16
*CA 4-6	CA 5-2	CA 8

*Chronological Age

*Zimmerman, Irla Lee, Kephart Preschool Language Scale, The Slow Learner Series, Charles E. Merrill Publishing Co. Columbus, Ohio, 1969.

Each of the 25 students grew the expected six months in general language abilities. The girls performed generally higher than the boys, especially in verbal ability. There was evidence of slightly more growth in students whose pre-test language quotients were 100 or above as opposed to those pupils whose language quotients were below 100. Sixteen months mean growth were reported for the sample group. (See Appendix item I.A and I.B)

*An Evaluation Scale for Four-and Five-Year-Old Children--The Scale, whose development was primarily an action research project of the nursery school and kindergarten teachers of the University Schools was administered in April to a 60%, randomly-selected sample of Pre-School students. On the five-point scale, three is taken as the mid-point which apportions the scale into "positive self-concept" and "negative self-concept". Seven of the 30 children sampled received a mean rating less than 3, suggesting that these students had not yet exhibited the behavior usually identified with a positive self-concept. The observers had no direct measure of "self-concept" but drew inferences about an individual's self-concept from the behavioral descriptions enumerated on the Evaluation Scale. Seventy-seven percent of the students sampled received a mean rating of 3.5 to 5.0. Within the limitations of the Evaluation scale, by intervening into the lives of fifty 4 and 5 year-old children, the program appears to have affected positive self-concepts in a majority of children.

Perceptual-Motor Survey (LEA)--Twelve perceptual-motor skills, along with many other ancillary items, were recorded on a grid-type log form. All students were indicated on the grid with their progress being tracked and coded through needs areas. Subsequently, the evaluator was able to sample skills identified with the larger body of 1) visual training, including eye movement or focusing, form perception, eidetic thinking and eye-hand coordination; 2) auditory perception skills including language

*Annie L. Butler, School of Education, Indiana University, 1965.

sounds, rote-learned sequence, and meaning differentiation; 3) tactile discrimination and, 4) kinesthetic perception. Results of the performance grid and evaluator sampling indicate that 80% of the students have attained success with each skill listed on the perceptual-motor grid.

Pre-School Attendance--Project pupils were expected to exhibit a 94% attendance figure, excluding major illness. A major illness will involve any illness of five consecutive days or more. Any illness of from 1-4 days following within three days of a previous major illness is considered major. The Pre-School pupils demonstrated a 94.7 attendance figure for the first project year.

Parent-Tutor Scale--During the year parents were afforded the opportunity to develop their skills in working with their children in a one-to-one sitting by way of non-conventional forms of "take homes" or homework. The non-conventional take-home materials consisted of games and activities of a perceptual, conceptual and language development nature designed for use with parent and child. The materials were constructed by the School-Home Coordinator, the Pre-School staff, and parent volunteers.

The Parent-Tutor Scale and accompanying semantic differential were administered pre and post in the fall and spring. Twenty-seven parents answered in the fall. Of the 27, 22 parents responded to the instruments in the spring.

The Parent-Tutor Scale was designed to measure the amount of time spent, the level of difficulty, and interest in the take-home learning assignments. This was accomplished by asking the parents to respond to six questionnaire items.

To measure whether the parents were actually helping their children in these tasks, the parents were asked to identify the correct response BY THE CHILD to four of the learning assignments.

1. When asked about the clarity of the instructions accompanying the tasks, all of the parents said that the instructions were either very clear or generally clear

with only a few instructions being difficult to understand. This finding was true for both the fall and spring administrations.

2. When asked whether they enjoyed working with their children, all of the parents responded that it was either fun or mostly interesting. This finding was for both fall and spring.

3. When asked how many times each week were spent on the assignments, over half spent more than twice a week with their children. Slight change was evidenced during fall and spring.

4. When asked how much time was spent on each task, it usually was reported that more than 30 minutes were spent. There was no difference between fall and spring.

5. When asked whether the children cared about working the assignments, a clear majority of the parents reported that their children enjoyed working the assignments.

6. When asked whether the children found the assignments difficult, the parents reported that the tasks were very easy with few difficulties.

The results of the Parent-Tutor Scale show that the parents are becoming more involved in the take-home learning assignments. In general the attitudes of both the parents and the children are favorable.

The semantic differential was designed to measure the attitudes of the parents toward both the teacher-learning situation and toward the concepts (content) taught in the take-home learning assignments. Four stimulus items were presented and the parents were asked to rate bi-polar descriptions for each item. The 15 descriptors included five evaluative, five potency, and five activity orientation descriptors which were scaled 1 to 5 (See Appendix item I.C).

There was complete data on 22 pairs to in both fall and spring administrations. An analysis of variance was performed employing a repeated measures model.

1. Changes in parental attitude were in the same direction.

2. The same stimulus was generally liked by all parents.

3. Stimuli disliked in the fall were liked in the spring.

4. Some items were more strongly liked than others on E. P. and A.

From the ANOVA table it was indicated that there was a difference between the overall fall and spring ratings. If a lower score can be interpreted as being more

positive, then the spring ratings were in general more positive than those of the fall. Following are the mean total-scale scores for the eight stimulus items. The lower the mean score value the greater the positive evaluation of the item, the greater the item's potency and the more goal-oriented is the item:

LEARNING

	E	P	A	
Fall	7.09	13.91	11.14	10.71
Spring	6.32	13.18	10.95	10.15
	6.70	13.55	11.05	10.43

NUMBER

	E	P	A	
Fall	9.73	14.23	13.09	12.35
Spring	7.64	13.41	11.41	10.82
	8.68	13.82	12.25	11.58

SIZE

	E	P	A	
Fall	11.59	15.00	13.45	13.35
Spring	3.45	14.14	11.64	11.41
	10.02	14.57	12.55	12.30

FAILURE

	E	P	A	
Fall	13.41	14.05	13.91	13.79
Spring	15.36	15.68	15.27	15.44
	14.39	14.86	14.59	14.61

COLOR

	E	P	A	
Fall	8.00	15.41	12.36	11.92
Spring	6.73	14.68	12.14	11.18
	7.36	15.05	12.25	11.55

TEACHING

	E	P	A	
Fall	7.18	14.05	10.77	10.67
Spring	6.32	12.59	10.05	9.65
	6.75	13.32	10.41	10.16

SHAPE

	E	P	A	
Fall	8.91	14.18	13.77	12.29
Spring	8.05	13.77	12.23	11.35
	8.48	13.98	13.00	11.82

CHILDREN

	E	P	A	
Fall	7.45	15.05	11.00	11.17
Spring	7.68	14.64	10.23	10.35
	7.57	14.84	10.61	11.01

OVERALL

	E	P	A	
Fall	9.17	14.48	12.44	12.03
Spring	8.32	14.01	11.74	11.26
	8.74	14.25	12.09	11.69

All spring ratings were more positive than the fall ratings with the exception of the concept of failure. The learner take-home materials did not appear to have effected a 20% change as indicated by parent response and as required by program

objectives. Following is a listing by rank order of the eight stimulus items by the three scales.

EVALUATION

Fall	Spring	Overall
Learning	Learning	Learning
Teaching	Teaching	Teaching
Children	Color	Color
Color	Number	Children
Shape	Children	Shape
Number	Shape	Number
Size	Size	Size
Failure	Failure	Failure

POTENCY

Fall	Spring	Overall
Learning	Teaching	Teaching
Failure	Learning	Learning
Teaching	Number	Number
Shape	Shape	Shape
Number	Size	Size
Size	Children	Children
Children	Color	Failure
Color	Failure	Color

ACTIVITY

Fall	Spring	Overall
Teaching	Teaching	Teaching
Children	Children	Children
Learning	Learning	Learning
Color	Number	Number
Number	Size	Color
Size	Color	Size
Shape	Shape	Shape
Failure	Failure	Failure

The Coffee Clutch--One important aspect of the project was the encouragement of parents to involve themselves in program activities at the Pre-School and within the community. The neighborhood coffee gathering or "coffee clutch", organized and scheduled by the School-Home Coordinator, was an effort to disseminate information about the project (purpose, rationale, present status, etc.) to the parents whose children were participating in the Pre-School. Meetings were effected in the morning, afternoon and evening so that those parents who worked or had younger children to care for could attend. The parents appeared to appreciate the face-to-face, "school-to-parent" format which the "coffee clutch" offered. Thirty-seven of the 50 Pre-School families attended a neighborhood coffee gathering.

Parent Opinion Survey--Parents were surveyed pre and post concerning their attitudes toward the Pre-School program. The questionnaire was designed to elicit parent responses in two broad areas: 1) how the program affected the child, and 2) how

the program affected the parent. All parents who responded (41) indicated a favorable attitude toward the Pre-School program. The parents suggested social growth, speech development, and kindergarten readiness as the most important benefits derived by their children. The parent's conception of the Pre-School's most outstanding features included individual attention, staff expertise and social development. Few program weaknesses were noted other than referring to the fact that all four-year-olds within the Baugo community could not participate in the Pre-School.

Verbal Interaction Checklist--Pre-School students participating in the Distar Language/Reading program were assessed pre and post using a Verbal Interaction Checklist. The 14-item scale was sectioned into initiating items, response items and spontaneous interaction items. The instrument required the rater to observe each student for two minutes noting one of the fourteen behaviors every three seconds. Results of the observations indicated that there was very little verbal interaction among the Distar student and his peers and very little change in communication over the year.

1. The greatest increase, collectively, occurred in the students' responding behaviors, with initiating behavior and spontaneous interactive behavior following in that order.

2. The interaction category evidencing the greatest increase was "giving or offering help, advice, demonstration/explanation."

3. The tendency for interactive behavior to be spontaneous evidenced little increase during the year.

Although minimal, an increase in verbal interaction between students did occur, thus fulfilling the objective as indicated in the evaluation design. (See Appendix item IV)

Rules-Conformity Checklist--Early in September, the Pre-School Learning Director submitted a list of collectively-defined social order rules which they expected their students to adhere to 90% of the time. The students were observed pre and post and

their adherence to the established rules was noted. On the basis of these observations, it was determined that the students were complying to the social-order rules 90% of the time. (A different form of the Rules-Conformity Checklist was administered pre and post at both K-3 Centers with like results).

II. K-3 READING-LEARNING CENTERS COMPONENT

One hundred thirty-one students from grades Kindergarten through three who attended the Title III Reading-Learning Centers were tested pre and post to ascertain the degree to which 1) respective program objectives had been attained and, 2) the intervention process had affected both individual and group growth in reading. Specifically, management had delineated three sets of objectives:

Kindergarten: 80% of all Kindergarten learners (attending the Center) will show at least "C" level achievement on the Metropolitan Readiness Test in May.

Grade One: 80% of grade one students (attending the Center) . . . . showing a "C" or below readiness level upon entering first grade will show at least a mean 1.6 grade placement in reading and language on the Metropolitan Primary I Achievement test administered in May.

Grade Two and Three: 80% of students from grades two and three (attending the Center) will exhibit at least a five months growth in both vocabulary and comprehension on the Metropolitan Reading Achievement Tests administered in May.

Results:

1. All 19 kindergarten students attending the R-L Centers obtained at least a "C" letter rating on the Metropolitan Readiness Test administered in May. Fifteen of the students attained "B" level status or higher.

2. All but one of the 36 first grade students attending the R-L Centers attained 1.6 grade level status in Word Knowledge, Word Discrimination and Reading upon posttesting (97% attainment as opposed to the 80% expectancy level). Mean grade-level achievement for the first-grade students was 2.0 at posttesting.

3. Thirty-four of the 46 second grade students serviced by the R-L Centers grew the five months required by the program objective (74%). This figure is below the expected level of 80%, although the mean growth for the second grade was 11 months. When applying the Standard Error of Measurement to each student's subtest

raw score results indicate 80% attainment of 1.6 grade level status.

4. Fourteen of the 30 third graders attending the R-L Centers grew the required 5 months as indicated by the governing program objective, although mean ~~grade place-~~ growth ment for these thirty students was six months. (See Appendix, Section II).

R-L Center Attendance--R-L Center students were also expected to demonstrate a 94% attendance level at the completion of the project. Major illnesses were not included in the tabulation of R-L Center attendance.

Holben		Jimtown	
Total number enrolled (Sept.-May)	77	Total number enrolled (Feb.-May)	67
Total days enrollment	8395	Total days enrollment	4040
Total student absences	471	Total student absences	314
Total days in attendance	7924	Total days in attendance	3726
Total percent of attendance	94.4%	Total percent of attendance	92.2%

K-3 Parent Seminars--ALL parents of students involved in the two R-L Centers were expected to participate in scheduled seminars with school personnel. All parents were asked to take part in ONE THIRD of the scheduled sessions. One parent seminar was held at each of the two Reading-Learning Centers. Both seminars were conducted late in the year, the time and number of which (1 at each center) left parents little opportunity to attend or choose alternate meeting dates. Since the objective indicated that parents must attend at least one-third of the scheduled seminars, a minimum of three meetings had to be held for this objective to be fulfilled. Approximately 22 (30%) parents attended each of the two sessions. This figure is considerably below the level of attainment required by the program objective.

Learner's Independence Rating Scale--K-3 level students participating within the K-3, R-L Centers, after being given full opportunity for prescriptive instruction by the learning director and instructional aides, are expected to have assumed some degree of personal learning responsibility. Regular homeroom teachers completed, pre and post, a behavioral observation form noting the frequency of occurrence of 8 behavioral descriptions. Comparative results are as follows:

Mean ratings of Learners Independence Rating Scale

Full Scale Total 24

Fall Mean 16.5

Spring Mean 16.5

	mean	s.d.
Kindergarten	16.52	9.46
Grade 1	15.88	2.48
Grade 2	13.63	6.25
Grade	18.78	3.48

The Learners Independence Ratings show the second grade receiving the lowest ratings, the third grade the highest. The large standard deviation for the kindergarten shows a wise range of ratings from low to high for this group. Overall, there appears to have been very little change in personal learning responsibility during the year.

III. MANAGEMENT COMPONENT

Project management is expected to demonstrate its leadership in the program by coordinating the efforts of all project personnel, by working with the program's auditor and evaluator, by filling staff positions, directing in-service training, purchasing and examining current materials, and by making intelligent and effective use of final decision-making authority. (The term "management" refers to the Project Director and Centers Manager).

Instruments and/or Techniques

Management Rating Scale--This scale generally covered those characteristics which are considered representative of effective administrative ability, among which are: sincere interest, flexibility, enthusiasm, consistency, careful deliberation, etc. Results of the scale, which was completed by all project personnel, indicate that management was strongly supported by some raters and clearly not supported by others. This accounts for the relatively large standard deviation noted below. An individual item analysis was warranted to turn up the areas of satisfaction and dissatisfaction.

Total possible score	126
Mean	88.18
Standard Deviation	29.41

The large standard deviation (29.41) indicates that the raters' attitudes, opinions etc., are widely dispersed around the central core of thought (the mean) and that there appears to be minimal "middle-of-the-road" attitudes. Inspection of the scales show that the raters were either supportive or non-supportive of management personnel. The mean itself (88.18) would appear to indicate that there is little unanimity in extremely positive or extremely negative attitudes regarding the management team.

Management Timelines--Inherent in any accountability model is the establishment of timelines or detailed schedules of dates upon which various project events are to occur. Both management and evaluation established timelines early in the project.

Report dates, visitation dates, materials development, committee meetings, and mailing deadlines were all delineated in the management timeline and disseminated to project personnel. Inspection of the Management Installation and Operation Timeline indicated that 80% of all management activities and responsibilities were effected within the limits imposed by the activity schedule and required by the governing program objective. Inspection of the Evaluation Timeline indicated that 80% of said activities had not been effected as scheduled. Instrument administration and data collection dates were closely adhered to; the analysis and reporting of the data often occurred later than the date indicated on the activity schedule.

Management-Evaluation Quality Control Log--Evaluation's responsibility to the project and to management in particular is to measure, analyze, and report on the "condition" of each of the thirty-one governing objectives so that redirection can occur if and when it is needed. Ten recommendations are on record, and each has effected action on the part of the management team. Recommendations include selecting students by random sample; the exclusion of two objectives from the program; adding to existing test batteries at the Pre-School; clarification of roles and responsibilities. The management-evaluation relationship has been satisfactory in light of 1) a basically sound evaluation design; 2) a complete understanding of one-another's responsibility in the project, and 3) mutual concerns in the education of young children.

Management Support Personnel--Project management has enhanced the overall effectiveness of the Title III program by incorporating support group personnel into program functions.

A. Dr. David Pankake, Superintendent of the Elkhart Community Schools, Elkhart, Indiana, and professor of Educational Administration at Indiana University, provided consultant services in relating program components to needs assessment, objectives, budget and evaluation. Dr. Pankake also assisted in the

August pre-service workshop in the area of contingency contracting.

B. Dr. Robert Seitz, Director of Special Education at Ball State University assisted project personnel to refine and objectively state performance objectives in the area of language and speech development in four and five-year old children; provided counsel and general assistance in developing goals for dealing with functionally retarded, disadvantaged children ages four and five, and offered suggestions as to the instructional materials useful to the Pre-School workshop participants.

C. Dr. Richard Benjamin, Director of Evaluation and Research for the Lansing, Michigan Public Schools and consultant for the Institute for the Development of Educational Auditing of Arlington, Virginia, provided valuable counsel and technical assistance with project writing and direction on budgeting.

D. Dr. Clinton Chase, chairman of the Department of Educational Psychology and Director of the Bureau of Educational Studies and Testing, Indiana University, has given consultation and instrumentation to the evaluator.

E. Tom Surface, Distar instructor, Ullery School, Elkhart, Indiana, offered one week's Distar instructional training to several teacher aides during the summer pre-service workshop. One additional day of in-service training was provided the aides at the Ullery School location.

F. Mr. Jack Sanders, Director of Project Image, Ullery School, Elkhart, Indiana, assisted in Distar demonstrations and video taping of the trainees during the pre-service workshop.

Pre-service Workshop--Management provided a two-week workshop, prior to the program's beginning, in August of 1971. Workshop participants included the entire Title III staff and management support personnel. Items for study included project purpose and rationale, learning theory, contingency contracting, phonics and language development, building routine, and line-and-staff relationships. Each content

area, as well as the total workshop, was assessed and evaluated by the evaluator. Additional in-service training was provided for both instructional aides and teachers hired during the school year.

Released-time In-service--Management provided released time for project personnel to visit other relevant projects within the community or area.

1. Distar instructors - February 1, Tom Surface and the Ullery School personnel assisted in additional refinement of techniques in both Distar Reading and Language.
2. K-3 Staff and Centers Manager - November 3 visitation to Project SCIPS, Indianapolis, Indiana.
3. Pre-School Staff, Project Director, Evaluator - A February 29 visitation to the Preschool Centers, Gary, Indiana.
4. Management - Visitation to PROJECT IMAGE, Elkhart, Indiana.
5. Centers Manager, R-L Centers Staff - Trip to IRA Convention, Kokomo, Indiana.

Management-Community Council Questionnaire--Community Council members were questioned pre and post to 1) assess the degree to which management had involved itself in council activities and, 2) to elicit some introspection, some self-evaluation, from the Community Council members concerning their organization. The summated rating scale employed a set of attitude items to which the council members responded with degrees of agreement or disagreement (intensity). Obviously, the scale was used to allow for intensity of attitude expression. Subjects can merely agree or they can agree strongly. The derived mean score of 4.3 indicates that the respondents agreed with the attitude items listed on the questionnaire, but not strongly. Although little variability exists, the intensity of the respondent's attitudes can be assessed by the mean score's proximity to the scale numeral 5. Community Council members listed numerous satisfactions and dissatisfactions concerning their organization. Dissatisfactions: a weakness in dissemination; too much repetition in council meetings; lack of interest in some members of the council.

Dissemination--Project managers, through data compiled by project staff, the evaluator, Community Council, Advisory Committee, principals and related homeroom teachers, were expected to develop communication skills with relevant audiences both inside and outside the project area. Management has been very effective in developing communication skills with relevant audiences within the community as evidenced by the information disseminated:

a. PRE-SCHOOL LEARNING DIRECTOR, PROJECT DIRECTOR and EVALUATOR: November presentation of project rationale and Pre-School component to the Baugo Lions Club (oral presentation and slides).

b. CENTERS MANAGER: Mr. Randolph Wicker, on December 8, delivered a formal presentation of the philosophy, organization and materials, equipment and special techniques of Baugo's Title III Project to the Northeastern Indiana Elementary Principal's Study Council.

c. CENTERS MANAGER, HOLBEN R-L CENTER LEARNING DIRECTOR, PROJECT DIRECTOR: January presentation of K-3 component to the Baugo Lions Club (oral and slides).

d. SCHOOL-HOME COORDINATOR: Mrs. Ressler made a presentation, in January, regarding project rationale and learner take-home materials to a class of kindergarten and preschool education students at Goshen College, Goshen, Ind.

e. EVALUATOR: Mr. Smith, in January, made a formal presentation regarding project status to the Community Council and interested members of the community.

f. PRE-SCHOOL LEARNING DIRECTOR: Presented the Pre-School program to the Women's Society of Jamestown Methodist Church - slides and oral presentation.

g. CENTERS MANAGER, PRE-SCHOOL LEARNING DIRECTOR, HOLBEN R-L CENTER DIRECTOR: Presentation of Baugo Title III Project on WISH Channel 8 TV, Indianapolis, Indiana.

h. Eight Title III articles have appeared in the Elkhart Truth (4 required).

i. Three Title III articles have appeared in the South Bend Tribune (0 required).

j. Five articles have appeared in The Informer (5 required).

k. A number of professionally-printed pamphlets entitled EXEMPLARY EDUCATION FOR BAUGO CHILDREN, showing pictures and describing rationale, are available for dissemination.

Copies of all printed dissemination materials are available from both the Project Director and Evaluator. It is this writer's judgment that management has not only fulfilled its responsibility in disseminating project rationale and status to relevant audiences, but has surpassed the minimum requirements.

IV. TEACHER AND TEACHER-AIDE COMPONENT

Three Learning Directors, six Instructional Aides, and one School-Home Coordinator were evaluated pre and post during the project year.

School-Home Coordinator--Provided instructional guidance and materials designed and correlated to pupil's instruction within the center's setting, the School-Home Coordinator will make visitations into the homes of parents and assist the parents in being able to instruct their children. It was determined early in the year that three visitations would be made to the homes of those children evidencing special language needs (50% of Pre-School population), and that one visit would be made to the remainder or balance of the Pre-School population. As visitations were being made, a brief description of each home visitation, regardless of number, was made on each of the 50 individual forms.

Initial visitations to each of the 50 homes were completed by early December. The nature of the first-round visitations, as evidenced by careful inspection of the logs, consisted of completing Personal History Forms and establishing rapport with the parents. The environmental and physical condition of the home was noted at this time. Second and third visits consisted mainly of providing assistance to the parents in completing several forms required by the evaluator, and individual instruction using the learner take-home materials. The Home-School Coordinator visited the homes of 31 parents more than once, among which are included the three required visitations made to the homes of students who were identified as having special language needs. Since pupil attendance was the responsibility of the School-Home Coordinator, many home visitations were made to retrieve children who had missed the bus, to deliver children to babysitters, and to generally assist both parents and children with their personal welfare problems.

During the first project year (specifically between August 1971 and April 1972), the School-Home Coordinator made a total of 148 home visitations. The evaluator interviewed by telephone 14 randomly-selected parents, all of whom responded affirm-

atively to the following queries: 1) Were the visits to your home by the School-Home Coordinator worthwhile and informative? 2) Would you, as a parent, recommend this service for the parents in next year's project? 3) What were the topics of discussion during the visitation? 4) How many times did the School-Home Coordinator visit your home? Several of the parents interviewed indicated they would welcome more frequent visitations by the School-Home Coordinator.

Instructional Evaluation Rating Scale--The two R-L Center Learning Directors were evaluated using the above-mentioned scale, a 40-item, 1-10 rating scale. The total scale consists of items categorized to yield item scores and mean scores in five quasi-independent areas: Expository items, diagnostic-prescriptive process items, general items, and Title III-related items. Both Learning Directors were expected to obtain a mean rating of 7 on the post-evaluation.

Instructional Evaluation Rating Scale

Full Scale Total	400
Mean Full-Scale Score	343
Mean Rating (1-10)	8.5
Expository item mean	8.4
Diagnostic-Prescriptive item mean	9.0
General item mean	8.1
Title III-item mean	8.6

Instructional Aides

Physiological Needs--Instructional Aides were evaluated pre and post on their abilities to attend to the physiological needs of children. The utility of this objective was much more apparent at the Pre-School, although it was assessed at both of the K-3 Centers as well. Through evaluator-observation it was apparent that instructional aides at both centers and the Pre-School were attending fully to the physiological needs of children. The only change in the post-evaluation appeared to be

less-frequent assistance at the Pre-School level which can most likely be attributed to increased student maturity and independence in self-help skills. The evaluator rated the attendance to physiological needs as a frequent occurrence of all the instructional aides at each level excluding those items which are only seasonally applicable.

Prescription Activity Fulfillment Scale--In demonstrating their instructional responsibilities, the instructional aides (K-3) were to engage the learner in activities in pursuit of the fulfillment of the learning prescriptions and objectives. Using the LEA Prescription Activity Fulfillment Scale, the evaluator rated each of the four R-L Center instructional aides. Aides were expected to demonstrate a mean rating of 7 on the April assessment.

Total Scale Score	150 (15 items x 10-point scale)
Aides' mean score	137.7
Mean Aide rating	8.78

All four instructional aides achieved a mean rating of at least seven on the April evaluation.

Aides' Skills Evaluation Scale--The Aides' Skills Evaluation, a Likert Scale and Semantic Differential, yielded ratings similar to those noted previously.

The Likert Scale contained general items which described aide efficiency, delivery, presentation and ability to relate to children. The total possible score of 75 was closely approximated with the six instructional aides receiving a mean rating of 70.18 with a standard deviation of 2.92. The total scale mean indicates an approximate mean individual rating of 4.7 on the scale of a possible 5.

The Semantic Differential offered evaluation over four specific concepts: enthusiasm, poise with children, team effort, and instructional helper. (Highest score possible=42)

	mean	s.d.
Enthusiasm	34.83	2.67
Poise with children	37.58	2.29
Team effort	37.25	2.74
Instructional helper	39.08	2.48

In general the raters marked the aides very high. Ratings were slightly lower for enthusiasm, higher for instructional helper. Raters appear to be generally pleased with the work of the aides.

Distar-Instructor Evaluation--Two instructional aides, one at the Pre-School and one at the Holben R-L Center, served as Distar instructors. The instructors were observed and evaluated by both the evaluator and/or the centers manager and project director using the Distar Skills Evaluation Scale. Items on the scale were classified into Management, Expository, and General Skills. Both instructors received mean ratings of at least 7 on the final evaluation as required by the program objectives. Mean scores for the respective categories were as follows: Management, 8.2; Expository, 8.0; General, 8.0.

Center Influence Scale--The Reading-Learning Center is one means for making instruction more effective for both the pupil and the regular classroom teacher. Realizing the potential of the Learning Director's experiences, regular classroom teachers were encouraged from the start to utilize these experiences to modify their existing instructional procedures by seeking counsel and sharing successful instructional strategies. The efficiency of these efforts was appraised by the evaluator through a classroom visitation record and a R-L Center Influence Rating Scale.

The homeroom teachers appear to believe that the center has only a moderate effect on the homeroom. Some of the homeroom teachers, in fact, felt little impact of the center.

Total possible score	70
Mean	46.87
S.D.	10.9

It is the evaluator's judgment that the potential and utility of the R-L Centers are far from being realized by the regular class teachers and that this area alone should present as much of a challenge as any one particular objective.

LEA Objective Criteria Analysis--Unless goals are clearly fixed in the minds of both learner and instructor, neither will be able to assess the degree to which they have been successful in their achievement of course objectives. With this notion clearly in mind, the project director and centers manager observed their respective learning centers on a monthly basis noting the degree to which the following objective criteria had been incorporated into the instructional setting: A) the conditions for learning performance; B) the learning outcome; C) the desired level of achievement. Considerable improvement was noted on nearly every monthly report. On the final observation record, both raters indicated that sufficient evidence existed to assert the following:

Teachers are....(in varying degrees of complexity)

1. classifying instructional objectives by fitting them into various classes of behavior.

2. identifying various subtasks inherent in the learning process.

3. planning their procedures around their objectives.

4. informing students beforehand so that they can better direct their attention.

5. showing evidence that factors or elements identified as conditions in the objective are evident in instruction.

6. stating levels of performance which are both obtainable and realistic.

7. making provisions for those students who did not achieve the minimum level of performance.

8. identifying concepts upon which post-instructional learner performance was low.

9. determining the adequacy of instruction based on results of student performance assessment.

10. making provisions for both intermediate and terminal performance.

11. displaying consistency in determining conditions in both the written objective and performance assessment.

12. avoiding trivia in the instructional setting.

The transition to accountability in instruction has been deliberate in regard to numerous adjustments which must be made by both teacher and student. Observers agree that it may take another year to realize full maximization of this instructional concept.

Graduate Coursework--As a result of the innovative procedures evident in Baugo's Title III project, 40% of all teachers, K-3, are to attain Master Degree status by September of 1974. The September 1971 survey indicated that one-half of these teachers had six hours of graduate credit or less completed. All teachers (except those who are exempt under Bulletin 94 and 192) are currently enrolled in degree-seeking graduate coursework.

A P P E N D I X

I.A. Comparative summarizations of Pre-test and Post-test Data.

	Pre-test			Post-test		
No.	AC	VA	LA	AC	VA	LA
1	6-0	6-0	6-0	7-9	6-3	7-0
2	6-3	5-10½	6-0	7-9	8-0	7-9
3	5-4½	6-6	5-9	7-6	6-1½	6-8
4	6-7½	5-1½	5-8	7-6	6-0	6-6
5	5-7½	5-6	5-6	7-6	5-10½	6-7
6	5-1½	5-10½	5-5	7-9	5-7½	6-7
7	5-4½	5-4½	5-4½	6-1½	5-10½	6-0
8	5-1½	4-4½	4-8	7-0	6-9	6-9
9	5-4½	4-1½	4-8	5-7½	6-0	5-8
10	5-4½	4-4½	4-8	6-6	5-10½	6-2
11	5-3½	4-0	4-6	6-0	6-1½	6-1
12	5-0	4-1½	4-6	5-10½	6-3	6-1
13	4-4½	4-6	4-4	5-10½	5-3	5-6
14	4-9	4-0	4-4	6-1½	5-6	5-8
15	2-9	2-7½	2-7	4-6	3-7½	4-1
16	4-6	4-1½	4-3	5-2	5-3	5-2
17	4-7½	4-1½	4-2	5-10½	5-7½	5-8
18	4-6	3-10½	4-2	5-4½	5-3	5-3
19	4-10½	3-3	4-1	5-9	6-3	6-0
20	4-0	4-0	4-0	5-4½	6-3	5-8
21	4-4½	3-6	3-9	6-0	5-3	5-6
22	3-9	3-10½	3-8	5-3	5-7½	5-4
23*	6-0	5-10½	5-9	7-6	7-3	7-4
24	2-10½	3-6	3-2	4-10½	5-2	5-0
25	2-10½	2-9	2-9	5-6	3-10½	4-7

*sample replacements

I.B. Total months growth for Auditory Comprehension, Verbal Ability, and Language Ability.

Student No.	AC	VA	LA
1	21	3**	12
2	18	25.5	21
3	25.5	4.5	11
4	10.5	10.5	10
5	22.5	4.5	13
6	31.5	3	14
7	9	6	8.5
8	22.5	28.5	25
9	3	22.5	12
10	13.5	18	18
11	8.5	25.5	19
12	10.5	25.5	19
13	18	9	14
14	16.5	18	16
15*	21	12	18
16	8	13.5	11
17	15	18	18
18	10.5	16.5	13
19	10.5	36***	23
20	16.5	27	20
21	19.5	21	21
22	18	21	20
23*	18	16.5	19
24	24	20	22
25	31.5	13.5	22

**lower range score
***upper range score

I.C. Descriptor Pairs, Scales, Scoring Scheme for Parent-Tutor Scale

DESCRIPTOR			SCALE
excitable	1----5	calm	Activity Orientation
constrained	1----5	free	Potency
cold	5----1	hot	Activity Orientation
shallow	5----1	deep	Potency
wise	1----5	foolish	Evaluative
bad	5----1	good	Evaluative
ugly	5----1	beautiful	Evaluative
important	1----5	unimportant	Evaluative
soft	5----1	hard	Potency
moving	1----5	still	Activity Orientation
meaningful	1----5	meaningless	Evaluative
difficult	1----5	easy	Activity Orientation
aimless	5----1	motivated	Activity Orientation
weak	5----1	strong	Potency
masculine	1----5	feminine	Potency

L.D. Analysis of Variance: Repeated Measures - Parent-Tutor Scale

SOURCE	df	MS	F
Subjects (S)	21	62.72	--
Administration (T)	1	120.02	4.94
Stimulus (I)	7	253.84	15.56
Scale (F)	2	2705.92	85.75
ST	21	24.28	--
SI	147	16.34	--
TI	7	38.06	3.30
SF	42	31.56	--
TF	2	3.23	<1
IF	14	66.36	11.10
STI	147	11.52	--
STF	42	8.93	--
SIF	294	5.98	--
TIF	14	4.14	<1
STIF	294	4.77	--

II.A. Holben R-L Center Grade one pre-test and post-test comparisons

Student No.	Pre-test Readiness Level	Post-test Grade Placement Word Knowledge	Word Discrim.	Reading
1	C	2.9	3.6	2.5
2	C	2.7	2.8	2.2
3	NA	1.6	1.6	1.7
4	C	2.0	1.8	2.0
5	C	1.9	2.5	2.5
6	C	1.9	2.2	1.6
7	C	2.4	2.8	2.5
8	C	1.9	2.6	1.9
9	NA	1.7	1.9	1.8
10	C	2.4	2.5	1.7
11	NA	1.9	2.8	1.8
12	B	2.7	2.8	2.0
13	NA	2.0	2.6	2.7
14	D	2.0	2.6	1.7
15	D	1.8	2.5	1.8
16	C	1.9	1.9	1.7
17	NA	2.7	3.6	1.7
18	C	2.4	3.1	2.9
19	C	1.9	1.8	1.6
20	NA	3.2	3.1	2.8
21	C	1.7	1.8	1.7

Jimtown R-L Center Grade one pre-test and post-test comparisons (based on three months instruction).

Student No.	Pre-test Word Know.	Word Discrim.	Reading	Post-test Word Know.	Word Discrim.	Reading
1	1.7	1.8	1.7	2.9	3.1	2.5
2	1.0-	1.3	1.2	1.6	1.4	1.5
3	1.6	1.6	1.6	1.9	2.2	1.7
4	1.6	1.9	1.7	1.8	2.8	2.5
5	2.0	2.0	1.9	2.9	3.0	2.6
6	1.3	1.4	1.3	1.7	1.6	1.8
7	1.8	2.0	1.7	2.0	2.6	1.9
8	1.9	2.1	1.6	2.7	2.5	2.7
9	1.7	1.9	1.5	1.9	2.8	1.6
10	1.9	2.2	1.6	2.7	3.0	3.4
11	1.7	1.8	1.5	1.7	3.1	1.9
12	1.7	2.4	1.8	2.4	2.5	2.2
13	1.5	1.4	1.7	1.9	1.6	2.0
14	1.5	1.4	1.6	1.9	1.8	1.9
15	1.7	2.0	1.4	2.4	2.6	2.2

II.B. Holben R-L Center Grade two pre-test and post-test comparisons

Student No.	Pre-test			Post-test		
	Word Know.	Word Discrim.	Reading	Word Know.	Word Discrim.	Reading
1	2.1	2.4	1.7	3.2	3.0	3.7
2	1.7	1.3	1.1	2.2	2.7	2.1
3	1.8	2.7	1.6	3.3	3.4	3.4
4	2.2	2.9	2.3	2.8	3.2	3.7
5	1.8	1.8	1.7	2.5	3.2	2.3
6	2.3	2.3	1.7	2.7	4.3	3.2
7	2.3	2.6	2.0	3.7	2.9	3.1
8	2.7	2.5	2.4	4.6	4.3	4.9+
9	1.9	1.6	1.7	2.6	2.6	3.0
10	1.9	2.4	2.2	2.9	3.2	3.3
11	1.2	1.9	1.7	2.7	3.4	2.2
12	1.7	1.7	2.0	3.0	3.9	2.4
13	1.8	1.6	1.6	4.2	3.4	4.0
14	1.5	1.8	1.6	2.7	2.8	3.2
15	2.4	2.2	2.1	2.1	3.0	4.4
16	1.9	2.4	1.9	2.7	3.2	3.3
17	1.9	2.4	1.7	2.7	3.9	3.3
18	1.7	1.3	1.6	2.8	4.3	2.6
19	1.9	1.7	2.0	2.1	2.3	2.2
20	2.0	1.9	1.5	2.7	3.6	2.6
21	1.2	2.2	1.6	2.2	3.4	1.9
22	1.7	1.6	1.7	2.0	2.6	2.0
23	1.9	2.3	2.0	2.9	3.2	3.5
24	1.7	1.5	1.1	3.0	3.9	3.3
25	1.8	2.2	2.0	2.2	3.0	3.7
26	2.2	1.9	1.3	3.7	3.6	2.6
27	2.1	2.5	1.9	2.9	3.0	4.0

Jimtown R-L Center Grade two pre-test and post-test comparisons (based on three months instruction).

Student No.	Pre-test			Post-test		
	Word Know.	Word Discrim.	Reading	Word Know.	Word Discrim.	Reading
1	1.9	2.1	2.3	2.3	2.8	2.0
2	2.6	3.4	2.6	2.9	4.3	3.3
3	2.1	1.9	2.0	1.9	2.4	1.7
4	2.8	2.6	3.1	2.9	3.9	4.0
5	1.7	2.1	2.1	2.3	2.2	1.8
6	2.0	2.1	2.0	2.7	3.4	2.7
7	2.9	2.9	3.2	3.3	4.6	3.8
8	1.8	2.2	2.1	2.0	2.4	1.6
9	3.2	4.6	2.3	2.9	3.6	3.1
10	2.9	3.2	3.0	3.7	3.2	3.8
11	2.5	2.8	2.2	2.5	2.6	1.9
12	1.9	1.8	1.8	2.1	1.9	2.0
13	1.9	2.3	2.0	2.1	2.7	1.8
14	1.8	1.6	2.0	2.2	2.9	2.2
15	1.7	2.6	1.8	2.6	3.2	2.3
16	2.5	4.3	2.5	2.3	2.9	2.2
17	2.1	2.2	2.2	2.2	2.2	1.9
18	2.0	2.4	2.0	2.7	2.5	2.6
19	2.0	2.6	2.3	2.7	3.0	2.6

II.C.Holben R-L Center Grade three pre-test and post-test comparisons

Student No.	Pre-test		Post-Test	
	Word Know.	Reading	Word Know.	Reading
1	3.1	3.4	4.1	4.2
2	2.7	2.6	3.3	3.?
3	2.8	2.6	2.9	2.5
4	2.7	2.2	3.6	2.4
5	3.0	3.1	5.7	5.7
6	2.9	2.3	2.7	2.7
7	2.6	2.5	5.7	4.0
8	2.6	2.7	3.1	2.2
9	2.2	2.6	3.4	3.6
10	1.7	2.4	3.?	3.3

Jimtown R-L Center Grade three pre-test and post-test comparisons (based on three months of instruction).

Student No.	Pre-test		Post-test	
	Word Know.	Reading	Word Know.	Reading
1	2.6	3.0	3.4	2.7
2	4.3	4.0	3.8	4.3
3	3.8	4.5	4.7	4.4
4	2.8	3.0	2.7	3.4
5	3.2	3.5	3.1	3.5
6	3.4	2.2	3.7	3.6
7	2.3	3.0	2.3	2.3
8	3.4	3.0	3.3	4.0
9	2.3	3.1	2.6	3.1
10	2.8	3.5	1.9	2.6
11	2.5	2.3	2.0	2.4
12	3.4	2.6	2.7	2.4
13	3.5	3.0	3.7	3.9
14	2.4	3.0	1.8	2.2
15	2.7	3.0	3.1	3.0
16	2.7	2.3	2.2	3.4
17	3.2	2.5	3.?	3.6
18	3.0	3.2	4.1	4.3
19	3.1	2.8	4.5	3.6
20	3.1	3.4	3.6	4.0

II.D. Grade Two individual pupil growth in Word Knowledge, Word Discrimination, and Reading (in months).

Pupil No.	Holben			Jimtown		
	Word Know.	Word Disc.	Reading	Word Know.	Word Disc.	Reading
1	13	8	24	6	7	-3
2	7	16	12	3	11	9
3	19	9	22	-4	7	-5
4	6	5	16	1	15	11
5	9	18	8	2	1	-5
6	4	24	19	7	15	7
7	16	3	13	6	21	6
8	23	22	29+	4	2	-7
9	10	12	17	-5	-12	10
10	13	10	13	10	0	8
11	17	19	7	0	-2	-5
12	17	26	4	4	1	4
13	18	22	30	4	4	-4
14	14	12	20	6	15	2
15	-3	10	27	11	8	7
16	10	10	19	-2	-18	-3
17	10	17	20	1	0	-5
18	13	36	12	7	1	6
19	4	8	2	7	6	3
20	7	22	13			
21	12	14	3			
22	5	12	5			
23	12	11	17			
24	17	28	26			
25	6	10	19			
26	17	21	15			
27	8	7	27			

Grade Two Mean Months of Growth

Holben			Jimtown		
Word Know.	Word Disc.	Reading	Word Know.	Word Disc.	Reading
11.3	15.3	15.7	3.9	4.3	1.9

II.E. Grade Three individual pupil growth in Word Knowledge and Reading.

Pupil No.	Holben		Jimtown	
	Word Know.	Reading	Word Know.	Reading
1	12	10	10	-5
2	13	14	-7	3
3	1	-1	11	-1
4	11	2	-1	4
5	31	30	-1	0
6	-2	-1	3	16
7	37	19	5	-4
8	7	-5	4	12
9	14	12	3	0
10	25	11	-11	-11
11			5	1
12			-9	-2
13			2	9
14			9	-10
15			6	0
16			-5	13
17			6	13
18			13	13
19			16	10
20			3	6
Mean	14.9	9.1	6.1	6.7

Pre-test and post-test grade level mean comparisons.

	Holben Center						Jimtown Center					
	Word Know.		Word Disc.		Reading		Word Know.		Word Disc.		Reading	
GRADE	Pre	Post	Pre	Post	Pre	Post	Pre	Post	Pre	Post	Pre	Post
2	2.1	2.8	1.9	3.2	1.7	3.0	2.1	2.5	2.5	2.9	2.2	2.4
3	2.5	3.8	N.A.	N.A.	2.6	3.4	3.0	2.7	N.A.	N.A.	3.1	3.3

Total Project Students pre-test and post-test mean comparisons in Reading, Word Knowledge, Word Discrimination.

	Pre-test	Post-test	Growth
READING			
Grade One: (N=36)	NA	2.0	NA
Grade Two: (N=46)	1.9	2.8	11
Grade Three: (N=30)	2.9	3.3	6
WORD KNOWLEDGE			
Grade Two	2.1	2.6	5
Grade Three	2.8	3.3	7
WORD DISCRIMINATION			
Grade Two	2.2	3.1	11

III Verbal Interaction Log Summary

Categories		A			B			C			D			E			F		
		I	R	S	I	R	S	I	R	S	I	R	S	I	R	S	I	R	S
1. Pre	#	0	0	0	1	0	0	2	0	0	1	0	0	2	0	0	0	0	0
	%	0	0	0	.01	0	0	.02	0	0	.01	0	0	.02	0	0	0	0	0
Post	#	1	1	0	5	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	2	0	0	0	0	0
	%	.01	.01	0	.04	0	0	0	0	0	.01	0	0	.02	0	0	0	0	0
2. Pre	#	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
	%	0	0	0	0	0	0	.01	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Post	#																		
	%																		
3. Pre	#	2	0	0	0	0	0	5	0	0	3	0	0	5	0	0	0	0	0
	%	.02	0	0	0	0	0	.04	0	0	.02	0	0	.04	0	0	0	0	0
Post	#	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	5	0	0	0	0	0
	%	.01	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	.04	0	0	0	0	0
4. Pre	#	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	0	0	3	0	1	1	2	0	0	0	0
	%	0	0	0	0	0	0	.02	0	0	.02	0	.01	.01	.02	0	0	0	0
Post	#	2	0	0	3	0	0	3	0	0	2	0	0	3	0	0	0	0	0
	%	.02	0	0	.02	0	0	.02	0	0	.02	0	0	.02	0	0	0	0	0
5. Pre	#	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
	%	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Post	#																		
	%																		
6. Pre	#	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	4	4	1	0	0	0
	%	.01	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	.01	0	0	.03	.03	.01	0	0	0
Post	#	4	10	1	1	5	0	0	2	0	0	1	0	2	0	0	0	1	0
	%	.03	.08	.01	.01	.04	0	0	.02	0	0	.01	0	.02	0	0	0	.01	0
7. Pre	#	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	0	2	2	0	0	0	0
	%	.01	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	.01	.01	0	.02	.02	0	0	0	0
Post	#	8	0	0	1	1	0	0	2	0	2	1	0	8	0	0	1	0	0
	%	.06	0	0	.01	.01	0	0	.02	0	.02	.01	0	.06	0	0	.01	0	0
8. Pre	#	1	0	0	0	1	0	0	1	0	1	2	0	0	0	0	0	1	0
	%	.01	0	0	0	.01	0	0	.01	0	.01	.02	0	0	0	0	0	.01	0
Post	#	0	1	0	0	1	0	0	2	0	0	1	0	1	2	0	0	0	0
	%	0	.01	0	0	.01	0	0	.02	0	0	.01	0	.01	.02	0	0	0	0
9. Pre	#	1	1	3	1	0	0	1	2	1	2	4	1	4	0	2	0	0	0
	%	.01	.01	0	.01	0	0	.01	.02	.01	.02	.03	.01	.03	0	.02	0	0	0
Post	#	2	1	0	3	0	2	0	1	0	0	0	0	1	5	0	0	0	0
	%	.02	.01	0	.02	0	.02	0	.01	0	0	0	0	.01	.04	0	0	0	0
10. Pre	#	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	1	2	0	0	3	5	0	0	0
	%	0	0	0	0	0	.01	0	0	0	.01	.02	0	0	.02	.04	0	0	0
Post	#	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	3	0	0	1	0	6	5	0	0	2	0
	%	0	0	0	0	.01	0	0	.02	0	0	.01	0	.05	.04	0	0	.02	0

Categories		A			B			C			D			E			F		
		I	R	S	I	R	S	I	R	S	I	R	S	I	R	S	I	R	S
11. Pre	#	0	11	0	0	5	0	2	12	0	0	9	0	0	7	0	0	8	0
	%	0	.09	0	0	.04	0	.02	.10	0	0	.07	0	0	.06	0	0	.07	0
Post	#	0	14	0	0	24	0	0	13	0	0	5	0	0	14	0	0	28	0
	%	0	.11	0	0	.20	0	0	.11	0	0	.04	0	0	.11	0	0	.23	0
12. Pre	#	52	0	0	106	0	0	86	0	0	83	0	0	64	0	0	85	0	0
	%	.43	0	0	.88	0	0	.72	0	0	.67	0	0	.53	0	0	.71	0	0
Post	#	49	0	0	74	0	0	68	0	0	42	0	0	60	0	0	15	0	0
	%	.40	0	0	.61	0	0	.56	0	0	.35	0	0	.48	0	0	.13	0	0
13. Pre	#	10	37	0	0	5	0	1	4	0	2	6	0	7	6	0	7	19	0
	%	.08	.31	0	0	.04	0	.01	.03	0	.02	.05	0	.06	.05	0	.06	.16	0
Post	#	1	28	0	0	1	0	0	30	0	14	50	0	0	11	0	0	73	0
	%	.01	.23	0	0	.01	0	0	.25	0	.12	.42	0	0	.09	0	0	.61	0
		120 Total Responses			120 Total Responses			120 Total Responses			124 Total Responses			121 Total Responses			120 Total Responses		

Categories		G			H			I			J			K			L		
		I	R	S	I	R	S	I	R	S	I	R	S	I	R	S	I	R	S
1. Pre	#	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
	%	0	0	0	0	0	0	.01	.01	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Post	#	1	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0
	%	.01	0	0	.01	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	.01	0	0	0	0	0
2. Pre	#	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
	%	.01	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Post	#	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
	%	.03	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
3. Pre	#	1	0	0	1	0	0	1	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	3	1	0
	%	.01	0	0	.01	0	0	.01	0	0	.01	0	0	0	0	0	.02	.01	0
Post	#	1	0	0	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0
	%	.01	0	0	.03	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	.01	0	0
4. Pre	#	7	0	0	7	0	0	7	0	0	5	1	0	3	0	0	1	0	0
	%	.09	0	0	.06	0	0	.06	0	0	.04	.01	0	.03	0	0	.01	0	0
Post	#	2	0	0	4	0	0	4	0	0	6	0	2	6	0	1	4	1	0
	%	.03	0	0	.05	0	0	.05	0	0	.05	0	.02	.05	0	.01	.03	.01	0
5. Pre	#																		
	%																		
Post	#	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
	%	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	.01	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
6. Pre	#	0	1	0	0	1	0	0	1	0	2	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0
	%	0	.01	0	0	.01	0	0	.01	0	.02	0	0	.01	0	0	0	0	0
Post	#	3	3	0	0	6	0	0	5	0	0	2	0	0	2	0	0	2	0
	%	.04	.04	0	0	.08	0	0	.06	0	0	.02	0	0	.02	0	0	.02	0

Categories		G			H			I			J			K			L		
		I	R	S	I	R	S	I	R	S	I	R	S	I	R	S	I	R	S
7. Pre	#	0	5	0	3	0	0	3	1	0	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
	%	0	.06	0	.03	0	0	.02	.01	0	.02	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Post	#	4	0	0	3	0	0	1	0	0	2	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0
	%	.05	0	0	.04	0	0	.01	0	0	.02	0	0	.01	0	0	0	0	0
8. Pre	#	0	0	0	1	3	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	0
	%	0	0	0	.01	.03	0	0	.01	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	.01	.01	0
Post	#	0	4	0	2	6	0	0	4	0	0	1	2	2	2	0	0	2	0
	%	0	.05	0	.03	.08	0	0	.05	0	0	.01	.02	.02	.02	0	0	.02	0
9. Pre	#	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	5	4	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
	%	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	.04	.03	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Post	#	0	0	2	0	0	1	0	0	1	0	1	1	0	1	0	2	5	0
	%	0	0	.01	0	0	.01	0	0	.01	0	.01	.01	0	.01	0	.02	.04	0
10. Pre	#	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0
	%	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	.02	0	0	0	.01	0	0	0	0	0	0
Post	#	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	0	0	5	0	0	4	0
	%	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	.02	0	0	.04	0	0	.03	0
11. Pre	#	0	2	0	0	10	0	0	12	0	0	13	0	2	13	0	0	3	0
	%	0	.03	0	0	.08	0	0	.10	0	0	.11	0	.02	.11	0	0	.02	0
Post	#	0	15	0	0	15	0	0	14	0	0	5	0	0	11	0	0	28	0
	%	0	.19	0	0	.19	0	0	.16	0	0	.04	0	0	.09	0	0	.23	0
12. Pre	#	62	0	0	92	0	0	84	0	0	83	0	0	77	0	0	110	0	0
	%	.78	0	0	.77	0	0	.70	0	0	.69	0	0	.64	0	0	.91	0	0
Post	#	37	0	0	33	0	0	51	0	0	53	0	0	61	0	0	71	0	0
	%	.46	0	0	.41	0	0	.64	0	0	.44	.0	0	.52	0	0	.59	0	0
13. Pre	#	0	1	0	0	2	0	0	1	0	2	6	0	0	24	0	0	1	0
	%	0	.01	0	0	.02	0	0	.01	0	.02	.05	0	0	.20	0	0	.01	0
Post	#	0	6	0	0	7	0	0	6	0	4	37	1	0	25	0	0	0	0
	%	0	.08	0	0	.09	0	0	.08	0	.03	.31	.01	0	.21	0	0	0	0
		80 Total Responses			120 Total Responses			121 Total Responses			120 Total Responses			120 Total Responses			121 Total Responses		

Categories		M			N			O			P			Q			R		
		I	R	S	I	R	S	I	R	S	I	R	S	I	R	S	I	R	S
1. Pre	#	0	0	0	1	0	0				0	0	0	0	0	0	2	0	0
	%	0	0	0	.01	0	0				0	0	0	0	0	0	.02	0	0
Post	#	1	0	0	0	0	0				2	0	0	1	0	0	3	0	0
	%	.01	0	0	0	0	0				.02	0	0	.01	0	0	.03	0	0
2. Pre	#	1	0	0	1	0	0				0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0
	%	.01	0	0	.01	0	0				0	0	0	.01	0	0	0	0	0
Post	#	1	0	0	0	0	0				0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0
	%	.01	0	0	0	0	0				0	0	.01	0	0	0	0	0	0

Categories		M			N			O			P			Q			R		
		I	R	S	I	R	S	I	R	S	I	R	S	I	R	S	I	R	S
3. Pre	#	2	0	0	0	0	0				0	0	0	0	0	0	3	2	0
	%	.02	0	0	0	0	0				0	0	0	0	0	0	.04	.02	0
Post	#	0	0	0	0	0	0				3	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0
	%	0	0	0	0	0	0				.03	0	0	0	0	0	.01	0	0
4. Pre	#	3	1	0	1	0	0				7	0	0	4	0	0	3	0	0
	%	.03	.02	0	.01	0	0				.08	0	0	.05	0	0	.04	0	0
Post	#	3	0	2	3	0	1				4	0	0	5	0	0	6	0	0
	%	.03	0	.02	.04	0	.01				.04	0	0	.06	0	0	.06	0	0
5. Pre	#																		
	%																		
Post	#	0	0	0	0	0	0				0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1
	%	0	0	0	0	0	0				0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	.01
6. Pre	#	1	3	0	0	4	0				1	3	0	0	2	0	0	6	0
	%	.01	.03	0	0	.06	0				.01	.04	0	0	.03	0	0	.07	0
Post	#	2	3	2	0	3	1				3	5	0	2	6	0	2	9	0
	%	.02	.03	.02	0	.04	.01				.03	.06	0	.02	.07	0	.02	.10	0
7. Pre	#	0	0	0	6	0	0				11	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
	%	0	0	0	.09	0	0				.13	.01	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Post	#	13	3	1	6	4	0				2	6	0	12	1	0	6	0	0
	%	.11	.02	.01	.08	.05	0				.02	.07	0	.15	.01	0	.06	0	0
8. Pre	#	0	0	0	0	0	0				0	3	0	0	4	0	1	2	0
	%	0	0	0	0	0	0				0	.04	0	0	.05	0	.01	.02	0
Post	#	0	2	0	3	3	0				0	4	0	0	2	0	0	6	0
	%	0	.02	0	.04	.04	0				0	.05	0	0	.02	0	0	.06	0
9. Pre	#	0	1	2	2	5	1				0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	0
	%	0	.01	.02	.03	.07	.01				0	0	0	0	0	0	0	.02	0
Post	#	2	6	3	0	1	0				1	0	1	2	0	0	1	0	0
	%	.02	.05	.03	0	.01	0				.01	0	.01	.02	0	0	.01	0	0
10. Pre	#	0	0	0	0	2	0				0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
	%	0	0	0	0	.03	0				0	.01	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Post	#	0	2	0	0	1	0				0	1	0	0	1	0	0	2	0
	%	0	.02	0	0	.01	0				0	.01	0	0	.01	0	0	.02	0
11. Pre	#	0	6	0	0	12	0				0	18	0	0	6	0	0	10	0
	%	0	.05	0	0	.18	0				0	.22	0	0	.08	0	0	.12	0
Post	#	1	27	0	0	23	0				0	15	0	0	11	0	0	22	0
	%	.01	.22	0	0	.29	0				0	.18	0	0	.14	0	0	.24	0
12. Pre	#	92	0	0	31	0	0				34	0	0	63	0	0	44	0	0
	%	.77	0	0	.46	0	0				.41	0	0	.79	0	0	.54	0	0
Post	#	43	0	0	27	0	0				28	0	0	19	0	0	21	0	0
	%	.35	0	0	.34	0	0				.34	0	0	.25	0	0	.23	0	0
13. Pre	#	3	5	0	0	1	0				0	4	0	0	0	0	0	6	0
	%	.03	.04	0	0	.01	0				0	.05	0	0	0	0	0	.07	0
Post	#	0	5	0	0	3	0				0	6	0	0	14	0	1	9	0
	%	0	.04	0	0	.04	0				0	.07	0	0	.18	0	.01	.10	0
		120 Total Responses			67 Total Responses						83 Total Responses			80 Total Responses			81 Total Responses		

Categories		S			T			Totals Σ% (Sum of percentages across subjects)			Differences Σ% post	Σ% pre	
		I	R	S	I	R	S	I	R	S	I	R	S
10. Pre	#	0	1	0	0	0	0						
	%	0	.01	0	0	0	0	.01	.11	.06			
Post	#	0	3	0	0	1	0				+04	+19	+06
	%	0	.03	0	0	.01	0	.65	.30	0			
11. Pre	#	0	0	0	10	9	0						
	%	0	0	0	.08	.08	0	.12	1.61	0			
Post	#	0	11	0	0	22	0				+11	+1.42	0
	%	0	.09	0	0	.18	0	.01	3.03	0			
12. Pre	#	95	0	0	56	0	0						
	%	.79	0	0	.47	0	0	12.66	0	0			
Post	#	64	0	0	50	0	0				4.62	0	0
	%	.53	0	0	.41	0	0	8.04	0	0			
13. Pre	#	2	13	0	5	18	0						
	%	.02	.11	0	.04	.15	0	.06	1.37	0			
Post	#	4	8	0	1	13	0				+15	+1.61	+01
	%	.03	.07	0	.01	.11	0	.19	2.98	.01			
		120 Total Responses			120 Total Responses								

IV Visitors to the Baugo Title III Project

Indiana University South Bend

Ball State University

Indiana State University

Goshen College

Manchester College

Riverview Elementary School (Elkhart)

Ullery Developmental Center (Elkhart)

Daly Elementary School (Elkhart)

Rice Elementary School (Elkhart)

Cleveland Elementary School (Elkhart)

Bristol Elementary School (Elkhart)

Woodland Elementary School (Elkhart)

Principals (Elkhart)

Psychometrists (Elkhart)

Reading Consultants (Elkhart)

Concord Community Schools

Wa-Nee Community Schools

Indiana Department of Public Instruction Title III Evaluation Team

Lagrange Community Schools

Middlebury Community Schools