DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 095 228 UD 014 486

TITLE	ESEA Title I, Child Parent Centers, 1972-73. Final Evaluation Report.
INSTITUTION	Institute for the Development of Educational Auditing, Arlington, Va.
SPONS AGENCY	Chicago Board of Education, Ill. Dept. of Government Funded Programs.
PUB DATE	Mar 74
NOTE	55p.
AVAILABLE FROM	IBEX, Inc., 1121 Arlington Boulevard, Suite 57, Arlington, Va. 22209 (Price not quoted)
EDRS PRICE	MF-$0.75 HC-$3.15 PLUS POSTAGE
DESCRIPTORS	*Early Childhood Education; Elementary Education; Health Programs; Kindergarten; Learning Activities; *Parent Participation; Preschool Programs; Primary Grades; *Program Evaluation; Reading Programs; Reading Readiness; *Urban Education
IDENTIFIERS	Elementary Secondary Education Act Title I; ESEA Title I; *Illinois

ABSTRACT

The Child Parent Education Centers, funded through Title I of the Elementary Secondary Education Act of 1965, are administered by the Chicago Board of Education in areas characterized by a high density of low-income families. Approximately 2100 children, ages three through nine, are enrolled in the 11 centers which offer up to six years of education including two years of preschool education, kindergarten, and primary grades one, two, and three. The Child Parent Education Centers have the purpose of building, in early childhood, a strong foundation for cognitive and affective growth. The centers develop factors contributing to this foundation with programs using multiple techniques and approaches including: (1) direct parent involvement in the center program and in activites designed to meet parent needs; (2) elimination of factors, such as social and health problems, that may interfere with successful learning experiences; (3) use of learning materials which incorporate a specific learning approach; (4) structuring readiness and reading programs so the frequent feedback is available; and (5) directed experiences that contribute to skill development. Participants in the two year preschool program are selected from three and four year old children residing in the individual attendance areas. (Author/JM)

ESEA TITLE I

CHILD PARENT CENTERS

1972 - 73

FINAL EVALUATION REPORT

DEPARTMENT OF GOVERNMENT FUNDED PROGRAMS

BOARD OF EDUCATION

CITY OF CHICAGO

PREPARED BY
IBEX, INCORPORATED

(formerly The Institute For Development of Educational Auditing)

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

The authors express their appreciation to Dr. Siegfried Mueller, Research Coordinator, Mrs. Laura Crane, Coordinator Data Analysis, Miss Muriel Clarkston, Assistant Title I Evaluation Coordinator and Mrs. Jeanelle Jennings, Early Childhood Program Evaluator of the Division of Research and Evaluation, along with staff of the Department of System Analysis and Data Processing, who have provided numerous suggestions and considerable support throughout the evaluation activities.

Special appreciation is extended to the Child Parent Center principals and staffs, who not only assisted in the design of this evaluation, but also handled much of the data collection. The principals are listed below with their respective centers designated:

PRINCIPAL	CPEC
Mr. Wayne Hoffman	Cole Miller
Dr. Marjorie S. Lerner(Mrs.)	Donoghue
Mrs. Doris G. Barnes	Ferguson
Mrs. Debora Gordon	Hansberry-Dickens
Mr. Raymond Gerlik	Mason
Mrs. Betsy T. Clayton	Olive
Mr. Roland P. Hinton	Scott
Mrs. Elouise C. Cantrell	Truth
Mr. Ernest C. Billups	Wheatley

The authors wish to acknowledge the assistance of Mr. King Nelson, President of IDEA, for his suggestions relative to data and file management; Dr. Hugh Peck, Senior Consultant of IDEA, for his assistance in instrument development; Mr. Steve Davis, for his assistance in managing the project; Ms. Greta Carl for her assistance in preparing the program description; and Ms. Susan Fell for her assistance in conducting principal interviews and classroom observations.

Jack Stenner
Vice President

INSTITUTE FOR DEVELOPMENT OF
EDUCATIONAL AUDITING

BOARD OF EDUCATION
CITY OF CHICAGO

John D. Carey, President
Mrs. Carey B. Preston, Vice President
Alvin J. Boutte
Mrs. David Cerda
Edgar G. Epps
Bernard S. Friedman
Mrs. Louis A. Malis
Thomas J. Nayder
Mrs. William Rohter
Gerald L. Sbarboro
Mrs. W. Lydon Wild

James F. Redmond
General Superintendent of Schools

Manford Byrd, Jr.
Deputy Superintendent of Schools

James G. Moffat
Assistant Superintendent
Department Government Funded Programs

Frederick A. Schuster
Administrator, Research and Evaluation
Government Funded Programs

March 1974

TABLE OF CONTENTS

I. EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

The Child Parent Centers program represents a documented strategy for the education of disadvantaged children. The program combines a complex of innovative strategies and philosophies which are unparalleled nationally and which have interacted to produce an exciting and refreshingly successful Title I program. This report marks the completion of the seventh year of this program.

For the third straight year, (as monitored by the longitudinal evaluation design) the CPC students at the second and third grades are achieving at or above national norms in reading and mathematics. As noted in last year's Final Evaluation Report, the most striking characteristic of the achievement pattern is stability over time. The typical (median) Child Parent Center student is likely to be at national norms by the end of kindergarten and will likely remain there through first, second and third grade. On the Chicago Criterion Referenced Reading Test, the CPC students are above the 73%tile on both mechanics and comprehension at both the second and third grades.

Between the ages of five and twelve the self concept begins to crystallize. During this period (termed the latency period by many authors), the child matures considerably in both the physical, cognitive and affective areas. He confronts his environment with an increasingly stable set of feelings, attitudes and behaviors which are based, to a large extent on his self concept which is, likewise, stabilizing. As the child becomes older he becomes more sure of what he likes and dislikes, who he

likes and dislikes, what he enjoys doing and what he dislikes doing, how he sees his future and what he will be doing in this future. He begins to plan and his aspirations and hopes tend to be consistent with the way he values himself, which, in turn, is dictated in large part by how he perceives others value him.

The Self Concepts of CPC students were measured using the nationally normed Self Observation Scales (SOS). The CPC kindergarten group is significantly higher than the national Title I sample, especially in the area of Social Maturity. However, results at the other grades do not support the conclusion that CPC students are more socially mature. A multiple regression analysis was run with the TOBE language score as the criterion (dependent variable) and the four SOS scores as predictor (independent) variables. The multiple correlation (r=.56) was highly significant and indicates that self concept accounts for about 31% of the variance in CPC language test scores. This finding is consistent with the Final Evaluation of the Three Highly Structured Reading Activities which shows a strong relationship between the way children feel about themselves and their academic achievement level. The Self Security and Social Maturity scores show the highest correlation with language achievement with correlations of .53 and .47 respectively. The Social Maturity and Self Security Scales are also the scales on which disadvantaged children show the lowest scores when compared to their more advantaged peers nationally.

There are four specific processes that differentiate the Child Parent Center program from other Title I programs. All of the Centers are very consistent in the implementation of these processes and each of the processes have been empirically validated as contributors to the success of the CPC program. A rather extensive effort was launched in 1973 to identify other strategies or processes that distinguish the CPC program from other programs and also to determine whether differences existed across the Centers. Although there are some differences between the Centers on such variables as teacher attitudes these differences are minimal and do not appear related to student achievement. Thus, through the process of exclusion, as well as, revalidation, four characteristics, (1) early intervention, (2) structured language/ basic skills orientation, (3) parent involvement and (4) program continuity, which were identified last year seem to be even more important and exhaustive as explanations for the CPC program's success. With two years of validation behind these characteristics, it seems reasonable to suggest that they be included, in some form, in all Title I programs. The consistent replication of the success shown by the CPC program argues for the generalizability as well as the power of these characteristics. The above four components are obviously interrelated and no one component is necessary and sufficient. Language development cannot be adequately influenced if intervention begins after about age 3½, and early intervention without structured systematic language instruction yields less than desirable results (e.g., see Head Start Evaluations). Parent involvement has both primary influence on children's achievement and secondary vertical impact in that

younger children seem to be better achievers than their older siblings if their mothers have been involved in the Child Parent Center program. Program continuity seems to be the component that welds the other components into a successful strategy. These four components interact as a system with the absence of one component being sufficient to render the system inoperative (unsuccessful) yet with all four components operating smoothly, the benefits can be tremendous.

A consistent picture emerges from an examination of the test results for CPC third grade graduates. Both the fourth and fifth grade cohorts are .3 to .35 standard deviations or 4 to 6 months below national norms. The city wide scores are significantly below CPC graduates and Title I students are significantly below the city wide averages. The rate of growth for CPC graduates prior to entering the regular school program was one month growth for each month of instruction (national norm) but upon graduation and entry into the regular school program, the growth rate has slipped to 7 to 8 months growth for each year's instruction rather than the year for year rate during their CPC tenure. It is interesting to compare the regular school CPC graduates with the fourth grade cohort (N=39) who were graduated as a group to one classroom. Perhaps the continued peer pressure and high level of teacher expectation contributed to sustaining the month for month growth exhibited by the intact fourth grade cohort. However, this explanation is pure speculation and additional study is presently underway.

The evidence for ability level on the part of CPC students and the evidence for sustained achievement near national norms after graduating from the CPC program may be some of the strongest evidence yet uncovered for the position that schools can make a dramatic impact on young disadvantaged children's cognitive development. Furthermore, this change in ability level and achievement is sufficient to enable the previously educationally disadvantaged student to continue a growth rate superior to the typical city wide student, although somewhat off the national norm. The available evidence suggests that if the CPC graduates are placed in a highly motivating environment with peer pressure for achievement, it may be possible to sustain the month for month rate of growth and avoid the slight decline in growth rate shown by CPC graduates in the regular school program.

II. IMPLICATIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

The major question facing education is whether the gap in achievement evident between high and low SES children is alterable within the limits of our present knowledge. The conclusion of this three year evaluation must be that the achievement gap between disadvantaged children and their more advantaged counterparts, and more specifically the gap between the socioeconomically disadvantaged Black American and the middle class White American is most decidedly alterable and may, in fact, for all intents and purposes, be erasable.

The following implications and recommendations are suggested by the evaluation results:

1. In light of the consistent success of the CPC program over seven years, serious consideration should be given toward expansion of this activity, or at a minimum, incorporation of the successful processes into other ongoing Title I programs.

2. Consider the possibility of continuing CPC graduates in regular school classrooms containing at least 50% other CPC graduates. A finding might be that non-CPC graduates would benefit from the exposure to the high achieving CPC group.

3. Emphasis on the parent involvement component of the program should be continued with parents of pre-school enrollee's with increased parent education activities, i.e., teaching parents to teach their children.

4. Evaluate CPC students' achievement level on some tasks of cognitive orientation.

5. Continue the follow-up study on Child Parent Center graduates.

6. Compare achievement across all Early Childhood Programs funded by Title I.

III. PROGRAM DESCRIPTION*

The Child Parent Education Centers, funded through ESEA Title I, are administered by the Chicago Board of Education in areas characterized by a high density of low-income families. Approximately 2,100 children, ages 3 through 9, are enrolled in the eleven centers which offer up to six years of education including two years of preschool education, kindergarten, and primary grades 1, 2, and 3.

The Child Parent Education Centers have the purpose of building, in early childhood, a strong foundation for cognitive and affective growth. Factors contributing to this foundation include maturation, health, cultural background, social experiences, emotional development, home and community experiences, language ability, and informal reading experiences. The centers develop these factors with programs using multiple techniques and approaches including:

- Direct parent involvement in the center program and in activities designed to meet parent needs.
- Elimination of factors, such as social and health problems, that may interfere with successful learning experiences.
- Use of learning materials which incorporate a specific learning approach.
- Structuring readiness and reading programs so that frequent feedback is available.
- Directed experiences that contribute to skill development.

* For a more comprehensive description of the CPC program, see the 1972-73 Child-Parent Centers, ESEA Title I Activity.

Participants in the two year preschool program, offered by all centers, are selected from three and four year old children residing in the individual attendance areas. The parent program at each center is an integral part of the Child Parent Education Center concept and at the time of registration, parents of enrollees agree to actively participate.

Operating during the regular school year and during a summer session, centers open new classes as students advance if the space and enrollment allow. The decision concerning which grade levels a center will serve is made at the individual center by staff and the advisory council with the approval of the district superintendent. At the end of the 1972 fiscal year, the four centers opened in 1967 (Cole, Dickens, Hansberry, and Olive) include students through the third grade; Miller and Wheatley include students through the first grade; Ferguson, Donoghue, and Mason include students through kindergarten; and Scott and Truth centers have students at the two preschool years.

The physical arrangements of the Child Parent Education Centers take three basic forms. Seven centers operate with mobile classroom clusters; Ferguson, Donoghue, and Scott operate with prefabricated modular units called demountables; Sojourner Truth, erected by the Public Building Commission, is located in a permanent installation called a schome (school-home) which has movable interior walls. All centers have an area reserved for parents, as well as one for administrative purposes.

Staff, both full and part-time, include classroom teachers; teacher aides; parent (home economics) teachers; adjustment teachers; teacher-nurses; social workers; health aides; school-community representatives; licensed practical nurses; assistant principal ; head teachers; speech therapists; clerks; and custodians. Sojourner Truth also has a team leader and a librarian to assist with the open school plan and team teaching methods. Class sizes are approximately 15 in the preschool and kindergarten and 22 in the primary grades.

Department of Curriculum consultants, other Board of Education personnel, resource persons from educational institutions, and representatives of publishing companies conduct inservice for teachers and teacher aides. Topics covered include the philosophy of early childhood education, child development and the utilization of new materials and publications in the areas of preschool and primary education.

The instructional program at each of the centers is unique, tailored to the community which it serves, and designed to meet the specific needs of its own pupils. Approaches and materials are selected or developed by the local staff working cooperatively with the parent advisory council. Some of the centers have chosen tightly structured linguistic programs; others have chosen language experience programs which allow more pupil independence. All aim at developing greater pupil facility in the use of language so that pupils become more successful readers. To further this aim and to strengthen pupil self-identity, all programs also emphasize the use of rewards and praise for pupils upon the successful completion of learning tasks.

The use of audiovisual equipment and culturally oriented materials at appropriate levels is standard in all centers. In addition, at the Hansberry Center, a lending library of toys, manipulatives, and records is available to parents to help them develop their children's cognitive abilities. The Sojourner Truth Center, because of the flexible nature of its physical arrangement, employs differentiated staffing and team teaching.

Supporting the instructional program at all centers is a nutrition and health program. The practical nurse, the teacher-nurse, speech therapist and the teacher-social worker all participate to a degree in the early identification of pupil health problems, in helping parents to learn to recognize problems which may need medical attention, and in arranging referral and follow-up services for pupils and their parents.

The staff assistant provides, in cooperation with principals and other school personnel, for ongoing inservice programs of educational methods and materials in the areas of early childhood development and reading. The staff assistant provides assistance to staff in the centers in the development and implementation of educational programs involving both parents and children. She assists in the writing of proposals, preparation of written reports and preparation of budgets. The staff assistant also provides administrative assistance in the expediting of requisitions for supplies, educational materials, equipment and services within budget allocation and monitor expenditures.

Pupils have access to library materials procured under ESEA Title II. Food services, breakfast, and/or lunch, are provided under the Federal Lunchroom Subsidy Program.

The total environment has many aspects contributing to the cognitive and affective growth of children, and parent-child interaction is one of the most important. Parental involvement is a major feature which distinguishes the CPC program from other early childhood programs such as Head Start and Follow Through. Another feature of the CPC program is the emphasis on early enrollment and program continuity, i.e., beginning at age three and continuing through third grade. Thus, continuity of learning and skill reinforcement are provided during the critical early childhood years when cognitive development is at its maximum.

The parent program is a major factor contributing to the success of the Child Parent Centers. Parents are required to spend at least one half day at the center per week. Children benefit by knowing that their parents are near; parents benefit by participating in events and activities planned by and for them with the help of the home economics teacher assigned specifically to work with them.

Recently, parents of prospective pupils, members of school advisory councils and community organizations, and local school personnel have participated in the site selection, planning and implementation of new centers. Operational Child Parent centers have local advisory councils which meet once a month to act on matters pertinent to the centers' operation.

Some parents serve regularly in the classroom; others create material for the classroom; still others meet in a small group with a teacher to learn how to instruct their own children at home. Typical involvements include GED classes, Spanish-English classes, Child Development classes, family management, nutrition and consumer education.

Each center has an adjustment teacher, a school-community representative, a licensed practical nurse, a home economist for parents, the services of a teacher-nurse, speech therapist and a teacher-social worker, all of whom work closely with the parents. Staff members also visit the families in their homes.

Programs and activities, along with the instructional program, are planned to meet the requirements of the individual communities. All centers work toward achieving the goals of the Child Parent Centers through the use of these varied activities, programs and methods.

Each Child Parent Center has initiated aspects of its program which are unique. This philosophy of planned variation has resulted in innovations of which the following list is representative.

- Varied summer school programs
- Individual teachers select reading programs
- Bilingual component for Spanish speaking students
- Camping trip to Springfield
- Staff instruction for parents to continue school programs at home

- Annual trip sponsored by parents for four-year-old students
- Mental health assistance for students
- Multi-age grouping
- Home instruction program
- Strong parent-community involvement
- Staff accountability
- Full-time teacher aides
- Male teacher for three-year-old students
- Campus setting
- Spanish program for kindergarten
- Executive Board of Parent Council serves as classroom aides
- Educational Planning Board
- Landscaping designed by parents
- Individualized student programs
- Preschool curriculum development by staff

IV. EVALUATION DESIGN SUMMARY*

A close examination of the expanding literature on educational evaluation indicates the need and desirability of educational evaluation to a critical appraisal of the tools and methodologies available. This shift in discussion has paralleled the realization that evaluation can be an aid to rational thought and action within the decision making process.

Evaluation includes the specification of an information need and the collecting, analyzing, and reporting of information to alleviate that need. Most information needs are generated by individuals in decisionmaking capacities. In the Child Parent Center Program this includes teachers, principals, ESEA program staff, superintendents, board members, the community, and the Office of the Superintendent of Public Instruction, State of Illinois, among others. Each of these groups of individuals makes decisions at different levels and, thus, requires information in different formats and at different times.

The conceptual approach used in planning and implementing this evaluation is based on the Information Based Evaluation Model (IBE)**. Information based evaluation recognizes the importance of program objectives, but only to the extent to which

*This evaluation design summary has been excerpted from the Evaluation Design Document submitted in draft form on February 21, 1972. Much of the information in this section was developed by Center principals, ESEA Evaluation Staff, and IDEA staff during an evaluation design conference held in February, 1973.

**An Overview of Information Based Evaluation: A Design Procedure. A. Jackson Stenner, IDEA Corp., Arlington, Virginia 22209.

feedback on the objectives is considered important to information users. The overriding consideration is the type of questions about which relevant individuals desire answers. Priorities are established in both the information domain category (e.g., student cognitive growth) and the information users category (e.g., ESEA Project Staff) and the evaluation resources are expended to meet these identified priorities. An additional check on the adequacy of evaluation information is the extent to which the information leads to action. If no relationship exists between information and action, then the adequacy and/or quality of the evaluation effort is in doubt. The IBE approach emphasizes the fact that an evaluation must be dynamic if it is to be responsive. Program objectives rarely change during the project year; thus, the objectives based evaluation is static and methodical in responding to the information requirements. Information based evaluation accepts the fact that information needs are fluid, and new questions are posed throughout the program cycle.

Program Objectives

The objectives for the Child Parent Center program, as they appear in the project proposal (Fiscal 1973), are as follows:

- Given a standardized test of reading readiness, at least 90 percent of the kindergarten pupils will indicate readiness to read.
- Given a standardized test of reading achievement, a minimum of 50 percent of the pupils at Primary 1, 2, and 3 will achieve a median stanine score higher than the city-wide stanine.
- Given an attitude rating inventory on a pre and post-test basis, the pupil will demonstrate improvement in self-concept by indicating more positive responses on the post-test than on the pre-test.

- Given the results of a child's medical and dental examinations and referral procedures, the parents, with the aid of the center, will seek corrective steps to alleviate those conditions that caused absenteeism, and thereby, a ten percent decrease in absenteeism will result.

- Given the proposed organized parents' program, 75 percent of the parents will give a minimum of two days to a month (four half days) service to the center and 80 percent of the parents will attend a minimum of one meeting a month.

In addition to these project objectives, each Child Parent Center has specific objectives unique to their situation; however, this evaluation, for the most part, will focus on the above listed project objectives. Specific center objectives are the focus of ongoing evaluation at the local centers.

Population Selection Procedures

The following criteria were utilized to establish Title I eligible elementary school attendance areas:

1. The percentage of concentration of children from low income families is 35 percent or above; or if,

2. The percentage of concentration is above the district-wide percentage of 25.4 and the number of children from low-income families in the attendance areas is 150 or more; or if,

3. The percentage of concentration is 15% or above and the number of children from low-income families in the attendance area is above 385. This is higher than the average number of children from low-income families for the current school year. The average number of low-income children per school attendance area is 317.

Within these eligible elementary school attendance areas, eleven Child Parent Centers have been established. Following are the eleven centers with the corresponding level of poverty:

CENTER	AREA	DISTRICT	PERCENT OF POVERTY
Donaghue	B	11	56.0
Hansberry	C	8	56.0
Olive	B	10	54.1
Scott	A	14	52.1
Miller	C	8	50.3
Sojourner Truth	C	7	50.2
Wheatley	A	18	48.1
Ferguson	C	7	47.0
Mason	B	10	45.6
Dickens	C	8	38.5
Cole	C	8	30.9

Evaluation Questions

The following are the evaluation questions to be answered during the course of this project. These questions were arrived at through consultation with project staff and represent the types of information needed by project management.

1. What are the academic and demographic characteristics of project students? Are these characteristics similar to non-participating peers within each attendance area?

2. What are the academic, demographic and attitudinal characteristics of project teachers?

3. What are the characteristics of families living in the community served by the project?

4. What are the unique characteristics of the eleven centers?

5. What are the staff attitudes toward the inservice program?

6. Is the instructional program being implemented according to design within each center?

7. Are there differences between centers in teacher attitudes toward the teaching-learning process?

8. To what extent was it necessary to alter the project from that originally proposed?

9. Were the materials, supplies and other forms of support delivered in a timely and adequate fashion?

10. Were the major project milestones accomplished on time?

11. Was the evaluation implementation according to schedule?

12. What percent of the kindergarten pupils demonstrate a readiness to read? (Criterion 90%)

13. What percent of the primary 1, 2, and 3 pupils achieve a median stanine score higher than the citywide median stanine on the appropriate form and level of the CAT? (Criterion 50%)

14. What percent of all project pupils have demonstrated an improved self concept as demonstrated by more positive responses on the attitude inventory?

15. What percent decrease (or increase) has been realized over last year's attendance data? (Criterion 10% decrease)

16. What percent of the project parents have given two days' service to the project? (Criterion 75%)

17. What percent of the project parents have attended one meeting per month of the project? (Criterion 80%)

18. Were differential results obtained from different centers in the project?

19. Which types of students gain most from the centers and which types gain least?

20. Is there a relationship between self concept and academic success?

21. Is there a relationship between teacher characteristics (attitude, schooling) and student success?

22. How does the child-parent center program compare with the regular public school program?

23. How does the child-parent center program compare with similar programs nationally?

24. What profiles of process dimensions are characteristic of a successful learning situation?

25. Are certain process dimension profiles successful at some grade levels and less successful at others?

26. What differences exist between learning environments?

27. Are certain process dimension profiles more successful producing some outcomes e.g., reading and math than in producing other outcomes e.g., self-concept and creativity?

28. How much of the difference between classrooms on the criterion scores can be attributed to process dimension profiles?

Instrumentation

The instrumentation for this project was first discussed at a meeting (2-9-72) involving Center principals, IDEA and ESEA Research and Evaluation staff. A second meeting (10-31-72) involving Chicago Research and Evaluation Staff and IDEA was held to discuss revisions to the instrumentation battery. All instruments were reviewed by Center principals and staff. Following is a list of the evaluation instrumentation with a brief description accompanying each instrument. An instrumentation catalog containing each instrument used in evaluating the CPC program is available as an addendum to the Evaluation Design Document (November 1972).

INSTRUMENTATION SUMMARY

1. TESTS OF BASIC EXPERIENCES (TOBE) - is a series of standardized group administered tests for young children. Five tests are available at each of two levels. Level K is designed for children in the preschool or Kindergarten age group, and Level L is designed for both Kindergarten and first grade children. The five subtests include: General Concepts, Mathematics and Language, Science and Social Studies.

2. CALIFORNIA ACHIEVEMENT TEST (CAT-70) - is a group administered standardized test. The battery contains tests in three basic skills areas: Reading, Mathematics and Language. This instrument will be administered to CPC second and third graders.

3. TEACHER ASSESSMENT INVENTORY - was developed by the Chicago ESEA Research and Evaluation staff in the Fall of 1971. The instrument was developed to assess attitude change in Title I students. Presently the instrument is being validated and interpretive scores should be available by January, 1973.

4. SELF OBSERVATION SCALES (Primary Level) - is a direct self report measure (group administered) in which the child answers "yes" or "no" to a series of questions measuring five factors of the child's self concept: Self Security, School Affiliation, Social Maturity, Self Acceptance and Achievement Motivation. The instrument has been recently validated by the Institute on a sample of 30,000 students nationally and represents a reliable and valid measure of a child's attitudes about himself.

5. TEACHER BELIEFS SURVEY (TBS) - is a direct self report measure which taps dimensions of the teacher's attitudes toward the teaching and learning process. The instrument includes 72 statements to which the teacher indicates his/her degree of agreement.

6. TEACHER SITUATIONAL RESPONSE - is a direct self report measure designed to assess the way the teacher would respond in a series of hypothetical situations. The instrument includes 60 situations with four alternative actions of which the teacher selects the response which is most characteristic of the way he/she would respond.

7. INSTRUCTIONAL STRATEGIES LOG - is a self report instrument which involves the teacher recording the activity in his/her classroom over a one-week period. The teacher records what has happened in the classroom rather than what was planned to happen. Part two of the instrument calls for some statements on the instructional materials used in the classroom and the approach used to introduce the materials.

8. CLASSROOM OBSERVATION SCHEDULE - is an observation instrument to be administered by an Institute staff member. The instrument involves observing the classroom activities and responding to a series of questions.

9. TEACHER SELF EVALUATION REPORT - is an instrument completed by the teacher which indicates the teacher's perceived weaknesses and strengths.

10. TIME UTILIZATION INVENTORY - is a short instrument which asks the teacher to indicate the amount of time he/she allocates to certain instructional and non-instructional activities.

11. TEACHER AND PARAPROFESSIONAL FILE - is an instrument developed to collect certain demographic information on classroom staff.

12. TEACHER OPINIONNAIRE - is a direct self report inventory designed to illicit teachers' and paraprofessionals' attitudes toward the CPC program in general and toward specific aspects of the program in particular (e.g., inservice).

13. CPC GRADUATE TRACKING AND RETRIEVAL FORMAT - is an instrument developed to collect identification information on all CPC graduates, thus allowing them to be located and their performance monitored.

14. PRINCIPAL ACTIVITY LOG - is completed by the principal for a one-week period. The instrument records principal activities throughout a five-day week.

15. SUPPORT TEAM ACTIVITY LOG - is completed by the support team members for a one-week period. Like the principal activity log above, the instrument records activities over a five-day week.

16. PRINCIPAL INTERVIEW FORM - is completed by an Institute staff member during an interview with Center principals. The instrument is designed to ascertain the extent to which the 72-73 school year was implemented smoothly.

17. STUDENT FILE - is completed by each classroom teacher for his/her students. Information includes years in the program, siblings in the program, etc.

V. EVALUATION RESULTS

This chapter is organized around eight major information domains or evaluation areas of interest. These domains are (1) Summary of the 1971-72 Final Report, (2) Standardized Achievement Test Scores, (3) Criterion Referenced Reading Achievement, (4) Self Concept Development, (5) Components of Success, (6) CPC Graduate Study and (7) Attendance. An eighth area, 1973-74 Evaluation Plan , although not a domain is considered at the end of the chapter.

Summary of the 1971-72 Final Evaluation Report

The 1971-72 Final Evaluation Report marked the culmination of the first year of the longitudinal evaluation design for the Child Parent Center activity. The results of the first year's efforts are summarized below.

- Eighty-two percent (82%) of the Child Parent Center Kindergarten population are "ready" for first grade and forty-seven percent (47%) of the group are in the High Normal or Superior groups. Overall, the readiness scores for the CPC population are considerably above the national average. The typical (median) CPC kindergarten student is functioning at about the 60th percentile nationally.
- The reading and math achievement test scores, like the readiness scores, are at or above national norms in almost every case. Several characteristics of these achievement test scores follow:
    - The growth pattern is stable from kindergarten through third grade.
    - The 71-72 achievement test data marks the third year in which almost identical results have been achieved.

- The 71-72 third grade scores have an almost identical distribution to last year's third grade scores.

- With few exceptions, the achievement test data is consistent across centers.

- The most striking difference between the CPC achievement scores and the typical Title I scores is the nature of the growth pattern. The CPC student is consistently at or near grade level from grade one through grade four and is projected to continue at a similar rate through grade six. The typical Title I student nationally presents a growth pattern suggestive of the "cumulative deficit" phenomena, i.e., the longer he is in school, the farther behind he becomes. Note that the gap between the CPC student and his national Title I counterpart is quite small (5 months) at the end of grade one, but by grade four the difference is more than one year, and by grade six the difference approaches two full years.

- The most important vertical impact finding is that younger brothers and sisters of CPC students come more ready for school than their older siblings. Sixty-six pairs of students were studied in 1972 to determine how younger siblings compare with their older brothers and sisters in reading achievement. The findings can be summarized as follows:

  - The younger sibling group is performing at the 65th percentile nationally and older sibling group is achieving at the 48th percentile.

  - The younger siblings outperform their older siblings in 77% of the cases.

  - Younger siblings fare better if they are two or more years behind their older siblings than if they are only one year behind.

- A small group of four-year graduates was located at the Chicago State West Center Branch of the Charles Evans Hughes School. Although these students did not receive a full six-year program, their reading scores provide an important indication of the stability of the cognitive gains demonstrated by CPC graduates. The CPC graduates continue to progress one month for each month of school in accordance with national norms, while their Head Start counterparts evidence a cumulative deficit through grade three. Projecting these scores through grade six will place the CPC graduate more than two full grade levels ahead of his peer in the national Head Start population.

- Four characteristics stand out as the most salient aspects of the CPC program. Two of these characteristics, early intervention and parent involvement, have been empirically validated as significant contributors; the other two, program continuity and structured basic skills orientation, have been identified through less rigorous procedures.

- Early intervention is consistently related to success within the CPC program. Those students not receiving CPC preschool experiences achieve less than students receiving preschool. Likewise, number of years enrolled in the CPC program is highly related to third grade achievement scores. Intervention at age three is very close to a necessary, yet not sufficient condition for success in the CPC program.

- Parent involvement accounts for approximately 20% of the variance in pupil achievement and is the only significant characteristic in the discriminant analysis study. The relationship between parent involvement and student achievement gains is consistent with the findings of the 1969-70 Planned Variation Head Start Evaluation Study. The Head Start study showed a consistent significant relationship between the degree of parent involvement (contact with classroom) and the subsequent student growth; however, this may reflect the quality of parent interest and parent-child interaction as much as it reflects the direct effects of the parents' participation in the program.

- Program continuity distinguishes the CPC program from the most common alternatives such as Head Start, Home Start and Follow Through. The CPC program offers the child a consistent approach, philosophy, facility and staff for six years. This continuity is provided at a time in the student's maturational process when structure and consistent human relationships are important. The CPC curriculum provides a six-year continuous progress program and the student is not shuttled between one preschool curriculum and another kindergarten curriculum and yet another primary grade's curriculum. The need for consistency and continuity is so apparent that it seems simplistic to claim it as a distinguishing characteristic and yet, program continuity is violated at least three times before most Title I children reach third grade.

- The CPC program from preschool through grade three emphasizes language and basic skills.

- There is abounding support for the notion that the preschool years are the critical pivotal point in the child's growth. During these years, the child's language, motivation and emotional development progress at a speed unparalleled in the maturational process. For the disadvantaged child, there are distinct deficiencies which become more pronounced and pervasive as the child develops. As amazing as it may seem, age five may be too late for successful intervention.

- The Child Parent Center experience over the past six years provides evidence that a successful compensatory education alternative may be available; however, the alternative is not consistent with traditional views of the role of education. It requires some profound alterations in the relationship between parents and the schools, between the schools and the child, and between the schools and the community. It would necessitate massive inservice education in altering the perceptions, attitudes and expectations of a large number of educators and laymen.

Standardized Achievement Test Scores

The analysis of student outcomes by its very nature lends itself to comparisons, e.g., student achievement across centers and across grades. The most important caution that must be emphasized is, therefore, the broad area of data interpretation. The tables and figures that follow present a variety of information on student related characteristics; however, it is imperative that the reader observe two things about these tables:

1. Differences in the number of students across grades and centers and,

2. The amount of missing data.

Some differences that appear to be significant in a statistical sense may not be meaningful or useful in a practical or decisionmaking sense. All interpretations and conclusions have been generated with these limitations in mind. Because of the small and varying sample sizes the majority of the results will be presented by grade across all centers rather than by comparing centers within a particular grade.

The readiness test used in the 1971-72 evaluation was the Metropolitan Readiness Test. This year the Test of Basic Experiences (TOBE) was used at the kindergarten level. Table 1 presents the TOBE scores in language and math.

Table 1 TOBE National Percentiles for CPC Kindergarten Children in Language and Mathematics (N=263)

TOBE Language	TOBE Math
50%tile	43%tile

The comparability between the TOBE and the Metropolitan must be seriously questioned. The TOBE does not compare favorably with the Metropolitan in terms of norming and technical excellence nor does it yield as comprehensive a set of subtests. Given these limitations it is quite difficult to make any comparisons between this year's TOBE scores and last year's Metropolitan scores. However, tentatively, it appears that the language scores are at about the same level as last year's and that the mathematics scores are down from last year. At least another year's data with the TOBE will be necessary to substantiate this finding. Programmatically, center principals may wish to check with their teaching

staffs to determine whether the teachers have noted a slight decrease in kindergarten math achievement.

Tables 2 and 3 present the California Achievement Test (CAT) results for grades two and three. The achievement test scores for grade one were not available at time of publication of this report.

Table 2 CAT (Pre-Post) National Percentiles for Second Graders in Reading and Math (N= 91)

	Pre	Post
CAT Vocabulary	49	58
CAT Comprehension	45	52
CAT Math Problem Solving	52	53

Table 3 CAT (Pre-Post) National Percentiles for Third Graders in Reading and Math (N= 52)

	Pre	Post
CAT Vocabulary	55	61
CAT Comprehension	59	61
CAT Math Problem Solving	42	59

For the third straight year, (as monitored by the longitudinal evaluation design) the CPC students at the second and third grades are achieving at or above national norms in reading and mathematics. As noted in last year's Final Evaluation Report, the most striking characteristic of the achievement pattern is stability over time. The typical (median) Child Parent Center student is likely to be at national norms by the end of kindergarten and will likely remain there through first, second and third grade.

The CPC Graduate

An overwhelming majority of the preschool studies show that upon school entrance disadvantaged children with preschool experience are superior to disadvantaged children without preschool experience; however, this superiority diminishes and in most cases disappears over the primary grades. For disadvantaged children, school achievement declines relative to national norms (or local norms for that matter), as the number of years in school increase. Likewise, intervention efforts at each succeeding year become less and less successful. Almost without exception compensatory early childhood education programs have shown an inability to sustain initial cognitive gains.

The 1969 National Head Start Evaluation states:

> . . . the scores of Head Start children on cognitive measures fall consistently below the national norms on standardized tests. While the former Head Start enrollees approach the national level on school readiness (measured by the MRT at first grade), their relative standing is considerably less favorable for the tests of language development and scholastic achievement. On the SAT they trail about six-tenths of a year at the second grade and close to a full year at grade three.

In 1972, a small group of five year graduates (this group began the program at four rather than three years of age) which had been moved as a group into another special program were located and tested at the end of their fourth grade year. Table 4

presents pre and post test reading achievement scores for this group of graduates.

Table 4 CPC (Five Year) Graduates Reading Scores (ITBS)

N	Mean Pre-Test Beginning Fourth Grade	Mean Post-Test Ending Fourth Grade	National Norm	Gain
39	3.7	4.7	4.9	1.0

In 1973, a fifth grade group (N=52) and a fourth grade group (N=69) were tested in the city-wide testing program. Both of these groups were five year graduates and the students were scattered throughout several schools (little attempt was made to maintain the groups when they were graduated into the regular school program). Table 5 presents the results for the fourth and fifth grade cohorts; city-wide results are not available at this time for both grade levels.

Table 5 Grade Equivalent Achievement Test Scores (ITBS) for CPC Graduates and National Norming Sample.

	National Norm Fifth Grade	CPC Graduates Fifth Grade N=69	National Norm Fourth Grade	CPC Graduates Fourth Grade N=52
Vocabulary	5.7	4.9	4.7	4.3
Reading	5.7	5.3	4.7	4.0
Spelling	5.7	6.2		
Capitalization	5.7	4.9		
Punctuation	5.7	5.6		
Language Usage	5.7	4.7		
Total Language	5.7	5.3		
Map Reading	5.7	4.9		
Reading Graphs	5.7	4.9		
References	5.7	5.5		
Total Work Skills	5.7	5.1		
Arithmetic Concepts	5.7	5.2	4.7	4.4
Arithmetic Problems	5.7	5.3	4.7	4.5
Total Arithmetic	5.7	5.3	4.7	4.5
Total Composite	5.7	5.2		

A consistent picture emerges from an examination of Table 6. CPC graduates in both the fourth and fifth grade cohorts are .3 to .35 σ's or 4 to 6 months off national norms. The city wide scores are significantly below CPC graduates and Title I students are significantly below the city wide averages. The rate of growth for CPC graduates prior to entering the regular school program was one month growth for each month of instruction (national norm), but upon graduation and entry into the regular school program the growth rate has slipped to 7 to 8 months' growth for each year's instruction rather than the year for year rate during their CPC tenure. It is interesting to compare the regular school CPC graduates with the fourth grade cohort (N=39) that graduated as a group into one school. Perhaps the continued peer pressure and high level of teacher expectation contributed to sustaining the month for month growth exhibited by the intact fourth grade cohort. However, this explanation is pure speculation and additional study is presently underway.

Criterion Referenced Reading Achievement

In early 1973 the Division of Research and Evaluation, Government Funded Programs, completed the development of the Criterion Referenced Record (CRT) in Mechanics of Reading and Reading Comprehension. The Mechanics Record (60 items) is administered to second through sixth graders and includes ten parts: (1) Recognition of letters, (2) Recognition of sounds, (3) Matching a small letter with its capital, (4) Recognition of consonant digraphs and trigraphs, (5) Recognition of dipthongs, (6) Recognition of words by their beginning sound, (7) Recognition of words by their ending sound, (8) Recognition of spoken words, (9) Recognition of words that rhyme, and (10) Word perception.

The Reading Comprehension Record (48 items) includes six sections: (1) Picture vocabulary, (2) Recognition of the meaning of a word, (3) Understanding a factual sentence, (4) Weaving ideas together in a short passage to draw proper conclusions, (5) Making correct inferences from a picture, and (6) Drawing proper conclusions and making accurate inferences from short passages. Second graders take twenty comprehension items, third and fourth graders take thirty items and fifth and sixth graders take forty-eight items.

In the Spring of 1973 the Criterion Referenced Record in Mechanics and Reading Comprehension was administered to approximately 18,000 Title I students throughout Chicago.

Using an item tape, IDEA completed a comprehensive series of item analyses and developed a set of grade norms for both mechanics and comprehension. The norms are presented in the form of percentiles, e.g., a score of fifty (50) in the following tables means that half the Title I students in Chicago did worse than the group average and half did better. Table 6 presents the Criterion Referenced Record Scores for CPC second and third graders.

Table 6 Criterion Referenced Reading Scores (Title I percentiles) for Grades Two and Three

	Grade Two N=29	Grade Three N=80
Mechanics	77%tile	73%tile
Comprehension	82%tile	77%tile

Here again we get an opportunity to compare CPC students with their Title I counterparts in other programs. As Table 6 indicates the CPC students are considerably above the Title I norm (50%tile) in both mechanics and comprehension at both second and third grades. These Criterion Referenced Scores are consistent with the previously cited standardized test scores and the two combined serve to illustrate the superior achievement of the CPC student in contrast to the "typical" Chicago Title I student.

SELF CONCEPT DEVELOPMENT

Between the ages of five and twelve the self concept begins to crystalize. During this period (termed the latency period by many authors), the child matures considerably in both the physical, cognitive and affective areas. He confronts his environment with an increasingly stable set of feelings, attitudes and behaviors which are based, to a large extent, on his self concept which is, likewise, stabilizing. As the child becomes older he becomes more sure of what he likes and dislikes, who he likes and dislikes, what he enjoys doing and what he dislikes doing, how he sees his future and what he will be doing in this future. He begins to plan and his aspirations and hopes tend to be consistent with the way he values himself, which, in turn, is dictated in large part by how he perceives others value him.

Although the early school years are characterized by a crystalization of self, the child also begins to differentiate. The self concept of the five year old is a relatively simple construct. The five year old views most things as a dichotomy: people are good or bad, food is good or bad, places are happy or sad places to be, other children are friendly or mean. As the six year old enters first grade new demands are placed on him. He is expected to interact with unfamiliar children and authority figures and, to a great extent, his well being is determined by how successfully he negotiates these new demands. It is these early school years that have a truly

profound impact on the child's self concept development. Never before has he been consistently, objectively and sometimes coldly, judged by peers and adults. He is unable to separate himself from his actions so that reprimands and criticism often become viewed as direct threats to self. With this background information we now turn to the correlates of a positive and negative self concept, respectively.

The Positive Self Concept*

Children (ages 5-8) with positive self concepts are, first of all, confident about their ability to meet everyday problems and demands. They are confident about their relationships with other people and take pleasure in mutual interdependence, in needing others and in being needed. Autonomy and independence are beginning to take shape. Children with strong self concepts view themselves as desirable and valuable contributors to the well being of those around them. They see themselves as deserving of attention and love and feel they are capable of reciprocating. They compare themselves favorably with their peers and feel that authority figures are supportive and interested in them as individuals.

* The profiles for a "positive" and "negative" self concept are drawn from the results of the national validation and norming of the Self Observation Scales.

Children with positive self concepts tend to be comparatively independent and reliable. These qualities may stem from their feelings of sufficiency and adequacy in new and challenging situations. They are relatively free from anxiety, nervousness, excessive worry, tiredness and loneliness. They report being happy with the way they look and would not change their appearance if they could.

Children with a positive view of themselves enjoy interacting with their peers and see themselves as on a par with their peers in most situations, while occasionally professing superiority in certain areas. They recognize the social consequences of certain "asocial" actions and see the benefits of give-and-take in social interactions. These children are able to admit that they make mistakes and that they sometimes hurt other people, but they apparently do not view these admissions as major threats to self.

Behaviorally, these children are seldom designated as problem children. They usually appear comparatively calm, keep their hands to themselves and, although they are frequently competitive, they express aggression when external considerations warrant aggressive behavior. They express dissatisfaction with their own poor performances but relatively seldom make self deprecating remarks. They react positively to constructive criticism, can accept praise well, and derive obvious pleasure from a job well done.

Scholastically, children with positive self concepts tend to be above expectation in reading and mathematics. They tend to attain higher scores on standardized achievement tests than would be predicted from ability tests. These children are positive toward school and view it as a happy, worthwhile place to be.

The Negative Self Concept

Children with poor self concepts are insecure and pessimistic about their ability to meet everyday problems and demands and they are unsure about their relationships with others. They often tend to be either overly dependent and withdrawn or overly aggressive with apparently minimal overt needs for social interaction and, in each case, growth toward autonomy appears stunted and retarded. These children view themselves as undesirable and, through their often inappropriate behavior (which is, although inappropriate, usually quite consistent with the way the children feel about themselves), they are regularly reinforced in these feelings.* They report not being needed by significant others and do not feel that others care about them as individuals. They compare themselves unfavorably with their peers and frequently report being inferior to their peers in age-appropriate activities. Authority figures represent a threat to children with poor self concepts.

---

* Modifying the truism from the financial world that "the rich get richer and the poor get poorer" we can say that children with strong self concepts get positive reinforcement and, thus, get stronger, while those with weak self concepts get negatively reinforced and thus get weaker.

These children are threatened in social interactions and prefer to play with younger children. They report a desire to dominate in peer oriented activities, i.e., always wanting to be first or always wanting to be the leader, and yet, would prefer to play alone if given a choice. They tend to be quitters and are satisfied with poor performance (again, poor performance is consistent with the way these children view themselves). These children find it difficult to admit to even common mistakes and are quite insensitive to other people's feelings.

Behaviorally, these children are frequently labeled as problem children. The acting out, aggressive, verbally disruptive child has a markedly lower self concept than does the "healthy" child. Likewise, the insecure, withdrawn, quiet child also has a low self concept, but his inadequacies are manifested differently from the aggressive child. These children respond negatively to criticism and, surprisingly, they often respond inappropriately or even negatively to praise because positive feelings are inconsistent with the way these children feel about themselves.

Scholastically, children with poor self concepts tend to be below average in reading and mathematics. They tend to obtain lower scores on standardized achievement tests than would be predicted from ability tests. These children are negative toward school and view it as an unhappy place to be.

The Self Observation Scales (SOS) is a direct, self report, group administered instrument comprised of forty-five items at the primary level (K-3) and sixty items at the intermediate level (4-6). The SOS primary level (used in this evaluation) measures five dimensions of children's affective behavior:

SUBSCALE I - SELF ACCEPTANCE

Children with high scores view themselves positively and attribute to themselves the qualities of happiness, importance, and general competence. These children see themselves as important to other people including authority figures and their peers. Children with low scores view themselves as inadequate, unsuccessful, and undesirable. They do not see themselves as happy, and they view themselves as relatively unimportant to authority figures and their peers. Three items highly descriptive of this subscale are: (1) Do you feel good about yourself most of the time? (2) Do people listen to you? (3) Are you a happy person?

SUBSCALE II - SOCIAL MATURITY

Children with high scores view their relationships and interactions with other people (especially peers) positively. They view themselves as independent, persistent, and sensitive to other people's needs and feelings. Children with low scores view themselves as quitters and loners. They see themselves as wanting to dominate in peer situations yet would prefer to be alone if they had a choice. Low scores reflect an uncertainty

in social interactions. Three items highly descriptive of this subscale are: (1) Do you always have to be boss? (2) Can you do your work only if someone helps you? (3) Do you give up easily?

SUBSCALE III - SCHOOL AFFILIATION

Children with high scores view school as a positive influence in their lives. They enjoy going to school, and they enjoy the activities associated with school. Children with low scores view school as an unhappy place to be. They do not enjoy most school related activities and are negative about the importance of school to their lives. Three items highly descriptive of this subscale are: (1) Do you like school? (2) Is school a happy place for you to be? (3) Do you like arithmetic problems at school?

SUBSCALE IV - SELF SECURITY

Children with high scores report a low level of anxiety and a high level of emotional stability. These children view themselves as in harmony with significant people around them, and they are confident about new experiences and their ability to perform adequately. Low scoring children report being anxious, depressed, and unsure of themselves. New experiences tend to be anxiety provoking stemming from an uncertainty about their ability to perform. Three items highly descriptive of this subscale are: (1) Do you make mistakes most of the time you try to do things? (2) Do you forget most of what you learn? (3) Do you get tired a lot?

SUBSCALE V - ACHIEVEMENT MOTIVATION

This subscale measures aspects of affective behavior that distinguish over-achieving children (relative to measured ability) from under-achieving children. Children with high scores tend to possess certain attributes characteristic of over-achieving children, while children with low scores possess certain attributes characteristic of under-achieving children. Several items highly descriptive of this subscale are: (1) Do you make mistakes most of the time you try to do things? (2) Do you give up easily? (3) Are you pretty good at everything?

The scales at both the primary and intermediate levels have been developed factor analytically and have been normed and validated on a sample of approximately 30,000 children nationally.

Table 7 gives the national percentile means for the students in the Child Parent Center activity. Because of the extremely small sample sizes and the fact that only one center contributes all the first and third graders no attempt will be made to interpret these findings. The only grade that has a somewhat reasonable sample is the kindergarten group and some interpretation will be tentatively offered for this group.

Table 7 Self Observation Scale Scores for CPC Students in Grades K-3

	Self Security	School Affiliation	Social Maturity	Self Acceptance
Grade K(N=74)	42%tile	48%tile	44%tile	46%tile
Grade 1(N=22)	50%tile	53%tile	34%tile	34%tile
Grade 2(N=42)	25%tile	42%tile	17%tile	44%tile
Grade 3(N=15)	48%tile	70%tile	24%tile	50%tile

The CPC kindergarten group is significantly higher than the national Title I sample, especially in the area of Social Maturity. However, results at the other grades do not support the conclusion that CPC students are more socially mature. A multiple regression analysis was run with the TOBE language score as the criterion (dependent variable) and the four SOS scores as predictor (independent) variables. The multiple correlation (r=.56) was highly significant and indicates that self concept accounts for about 31% of the variance in CPC language test scores. This finding is consistent with the Final Evaluation of the Three Highly Structured Reading Activities which shows a strong relationship between the way children feel about themselves and their

academic achievement level. The Self Security and Social Maturity scores show the highest correlation with language achievement with simple r's of .53 and .47 respectively. The Social Maturity and Self Security Scales are also the scales on which disadvantaged children show the lowest scores when compared to their more advantaged peers nationally. Again, it must be emphasized that the above findings are tentative and that any conclusions must await the second year's results on the SOS.

Components of Success

There is a tendency in educational evaluation to identify the most salient characteristics of a program and to then attribute the program's success or failure to these characteristics. A relationship between processes and outcomes is assumed usually without any attempt at empirically verifying the relationship. There are four specific processes that differentiate the Child Parent Center program from other Title I programs. All of the Centers are very consistent in the implementation of these processes and at least two of the processes have been empirically validated as contributors to the success of the CPC program. A rather extensive effort was launched in 1973 to identify other strategies or processes that distinguish the CPC program from other programs and also to determine whether differences existed across the Centers. Although there are some differences between the Centers on such variables as teacher attitudes these differences are minimal and do not appear related to student achievement.

Thus, through the process of exclusion, as well as, revalidation the four characteristics (components of success) that were identified last year seem to be even more important and exhaustive as explanations for the CPC program's success. With two years of validation behind these characteristics it seems reasonable to suggest that they be included, in some form, in all Title I programs. The consistent replication of the success shown by the CPC program argues for the generalizability as well as the power of these characteristics.

Maturation plays an important role in preparing children for school; however, maturation cannot be treated independently of the experiences that the child has prior to coming to school. Maturation and experience interact and although most children mature physically in a similar fashion, their early experiences to a large extent dictate how they will mature cognitively and affectively. One tool that is essential for cognitive and affective growth in the young child is language facility. Through language (words) the child is able to describe, manipulate and explain what he senses externally and what he feels internally. Language is a facilitating vehicle for all abstract thought and subjective experience. We will have more to say about language development but suffice it to say that the important years in the development of language are from two-five years. This is a period in which the formal education process has no influence and yet it may be the most crucial period in children's cognitive development. The importance of language development and thus the early years is

compounded for disadvantaged children because of the relative lack of certain socio-cultural experiences. Thus, the case for early intervention in educating the disadvantaged child. Early intervention, per se, is not a panacea nor is it sufficient; rather, it is important because it affords the educational program an opportunity to impact the child's language development.

The second component of success is a curriculum and philosophy committed to early structured language and basic skills development. More than just facilitating thought, language regulates the processes of abstraction, generalization, comparison and isolation and then in turn governs the expressions of the products of these processes. Thus, language enables a four year old to formalize the differences between a cat and a dog (process of comparison) and then to verbalize the differences. The best evidence available suggests that language development in the disadvantaged child must proceed in a structured systematic manner. The effectiveness of a structured basic skills orientation has been highlighted in a summary of the 1970-71 Follow Through Evaluation:

> Follow Through's effects on achievement were largest in magnitude and most consistent in structured academic approaches -- those approaches emphasizing the teaching of academic information through sequentially structured activities and frequent extrinsic reinforcement.

The Third Component of Success is parent involvement. Again, the positive benefits of parent involvement are felt most dramatically during the early years (3-5). This year's evaluation has validated the relationship between parent involve-

ment and academic achievement which was uncovered in last year's evaluation.

The Fourth Component of Success is program continuity. There is an abundance of evidence that suggests that if early intervention, language/basic skills orientation and parent involvement are all part of a program and program continuity is absent, the program may not meet expectations. Program continuity means that the child is exposed to a consistent programmatic approach, facility, philosophy and staff for six years. These six years represent a period of the child's life that cannot be excelled at any other age in terms of cognitive and affective growth, even adolescence cannot compete with the profound growth that takes place between the ages of three and nine.

These four components are obviously interrelated and no one component is necessary and sufficient. Language development cannot be adequately influenced if intervention begins after about age 3½, and early intervention without structured systematic language instruction yields less than desirable results (e.g., see Head Start Evaluations). Parent involvement has both primary influence on children's achievement and secondary vertical impact in that younger children seem to be better achievers than their older siblings if their mothers have been involved in the Child Parent Center program. Program continuity seems to be the component that welds the other components into a successful strategy. These four components interact as a system with the absence of one component being sufficient to render the system inoperative(unsuccessful) yet with all four components operating

smoothly, the benefits can be tremendous.

If we accept the success of the Child Parent Center Program and if we at least partially accept the four components as explanations for the success of the program we face some difficult questions. We can no longer say that the education of the disadvantaged child, to a level commensurate with his more advantaged counterpart, cannot be accomplished.

Attendance

Last year's Final Evaluation Report for the CPC program cited two possible explanations for the higher attendance rates in the CPC activity compared to those found in other Title I activities. First, consistent parent involvement is associated with high student attendance and second, the comprehensive health and nutrition component of the CPC program may be minimizing absences due to health and health related problems. Table 8 presents the attendance for the CPC students.

Table 8 Days in Attendance for CPC Students

Grade	% Attendance
K	93
1	94
2	93
3	95

The attendance rates for CPC students run between four and six percentage points higher than the citywide average. The attendance figures for this year closely parallel those of last year.

Eighth Year Evaluation

Several evaluation strat s have been applied in this evaluation that show promise o: providing programmatically relevant information. It is important that the longitudinal evaluation design be continued and that subsequent years' evaluations attempt to replicate and expand the findings reported in this report. In particular, the following evaluation activities should be considered for the 1973-74 evaluation.

- Continue the follow-up study on Child Parent Center graduates.
- Relate the profile analysis to the findings of the cross lagged panel analysis.
- Check the stability of Self Concept over a one-year period.
- Look in depth at parent involvement and the dimensions that contribute to achievement.
- Check the development of CPC students on some of Piaget's cognitive tasks.