

DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 096 629

CS 001 347

AUTHOR Shirley, Don D.
TITLE Kansas Right-To-Read Project Program Evaluation,
Summer Workshop, 1974.
INSTITUTION Kansas State Dept. of Education, Topeka.
PUB DATE Sep 74
NOTE 8p.
EDRS PRICE MF-\$0.75 HC-\$1.50 PLUS POSTAGE
DESCRIPTORS *Inservice Teacher Education; *Program Development;
Reading; Reading Achievement; Reading Improvement;
*Reading Instruction; Reading Skills; *Summer
Workshops; *Teaching Techniques
IDENTIFIERS Kansas; *Right to Read

ABSTRACT

This paper reports on a Right to Read summer workshop held for selected classroom teachers. The objectives of the workshop were to provide the teachers with new reading related concepts, techniques, and materials so they could return to their own schools and share their knowledge and attitudes with other teachers. A total of 30 teachers participated in the workshop. The workshop was evaluated by the participants through daily session evaluation checklists, a pre-post workshop content survey, and a workshop summary. The overall evaluation score for the workshop was 9.8 on a 10 point score. The responses on the pre-post workshop content survey indicated that the teachers gained knowledge of select aspects of reading techniques and concepts. Comments in the daily and overall evaluations indicated that most teachers felt both a high degree of satisfaction with the workshop and that it had been a valuable part of their professional growth in the teaching of reading skills.
(Author/WR)

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH
EDUCATION & WELFARE
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF
EDUCATION

THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY.

ED 096629

KANSAS RIGHT-TO-READ PROJECT
PROGRAM EVALUATION
SUMMER WORKSHOP - 1974

Report submitted to:

Wesley Pelsue, Reading Education Specialist,
Kansas State Department of Education

Program Evaluation Design and Report by:

Don D. Shirley

September 1974

S 081 347

TABLE OF CONTENTS

I	Introduction	1
II	Program Evaluation Design	1
III	Results	2
	A. Data from Daily Workshop Session Evaluation	2
	B. Data from Workshop Content Survey	2
	Table 1 Participants' Reactions to Workshop Sessions - Summer 1974	3
	C. Overall Workshop Evaluation	4
	Table II Final Workshop Summary Data	5
IV	Conclusions	4

KANSAS STATE RIGHT-TO-READ PROJECT PROGRAM EVALUATION

I INTRODUCTION

The State Right-to-Read plan is designed to bring about measurable improvements in the reading skills and attitudes of children in Kansas. Research has indicated that the classroom teacher is the key to effective reading programs. Consequently, the Kansas plan is teacher oriented in the form of inservice workshops for classroom teachers. Further information on the philosophy and total program is available in the Kansas State Department of Education booklet, Kansas-Right-to-Read Plan.

In brief, the basic plan consists of a series of summer workshops where a selected group of classroom teachers are exposed to reading-related programs, suggestions and materials. These summer workshop participants then return to their own school districts and work with fellow teachers in implementing these newly acquired skills, ideas and programs through local inservice sessions.

II PROGRAM EVALUATION DESIGN

The total evaluation will cover two aspects of the Kansas plan; first, the effects of the summer workshop and secondly, the influences of the workshop participants once they have returned to their respective school district and have established their locally organized inservice programs. This report will present data on the summer workshop only. The final report, which will be available next summer, will present the evaluation of the local inservice programs and the over-all Right-to-Read plan.

A series of surveys and questionnaires were developed to collect data on various aspects of the summer workshop. Most of the forms were designed to gain the workshop participants reactions to the summary program. The participants supplied evaluation data through the following sources:

1. Daily Session Evaluation Checklist - A short form which the participants completed at the end of each major phase of the workshop program.

2. Workshop Content Survey - This was a 12 item survey which asked the participants to respond to specific questions related to content which was covered in the workshop presentations. The participants completed this survey twice; first, on Sunday evening before the first major workshop speaker and then again on Friday after the workshop ended. To develop the

questions on this form, each of the workshop speakers was contacted before the workshop and was asked to supply the evaluator with a short summary of his presentations content.

3. Workshop Summary - Each participant was asked to rate the overall workshop on the 1 to 10 scale and the appropriateness and value of the various sessions. They were also requested to make any comments or recommendations on the total workshop on this form and suggest changes for future workshops.

III RESULTS

A. Data from Daily Workshop Session Evaluation - After each major session of the workshop participants completed a short form assessing their immediate reaction to that session's topic and content. On this form they were asked to rate the value of the session on a 10 point scale, 1 for poor to 10 for outstanding. Other questions were asked dealing with appropriateness of topic, whether topic should be in future workshops and the need for more information of the topic. Table 1 displays a summary of the data from this source.

All of the sessions were rated from good to excellent. Only one of the sessions, Diagnosis of Reading, was rated below 9.0. The participants felt that all the sessions were appropriate and should be repeated in future workshops. The same two areas, "Use of Newspapers" and "Perceptual Aspects of Reading," that ranked highest during last summer's workshops were rated highest again this summer.

B. Data from Workshop Content Survey - This survey was designed to collect information of the participants familiarity with concepts presented in the workshop. The survey was given both before and after the workshop so that it could be determined if a change in their response would take place. Each participant's pre and post workshop surveys were checked individually to determine if their quality and quantity of responses changed.

On the pre-workshop test, 44 per cent of the questions were left unanswered or obviously wrong. Many others were only partially answered or answered with incomplete thoughts. On the post-workshop test, only 5 per cent of the questions were left unanswered or only partially answered. The participants' post-assessment tests showed a higher degree of consistency in their responses. Their answers were more complete, and exhibited a higher degree of understanding of the concepts presented during the workshop. Examples of this in two areas were:

- a. Behavioral Objectives: On the pre-test only 8 of the 30 participants could list the three areas of domains. After the workshop all of the participants gave the correct responses.

TABLE I
PARTICIPANTS' REACTIONS TO WORKSHOP SESSIONS - SUMMER 1974 WORKSHOP

Session - Topic	Average Rating of Session Ratings 1 - Poor 3 - Fair 5-6 - Average 8 - Good 10 - Outstanding	Was the content of this session appropriate to your school's situation?	Should this session be repeated in future work- shop programs?	Would you like more information on this session's topic?
		YES*	YES*	YES*
Monday - Individualized Reading	9.1	100%	100%	73%
Tuesday - Diagnosis of Reading	8.0	97%	97%	70%
Tuesday Evening - Behavioral Objectives	9.3	100%	100%	76%
Wednesday - Perceptual Aspects	9.7	100%	100%	97%
Thursday - Use of Newspapers in Reading	9.9	100%	100%	96%
Friday - Experimental Motivation in Language Arts	9.5	100%	100%	96%
OVER-ALL AVERAGE RATING:	9.2			

* Percentages indicate frequency of response

- b. Visual perception aspects of reading: Out of 60 possible answers on visual perception, on the pretest, only 23 were correctly answered. On the posttest only 8 out of the 60 were wrong.

In general, the post-workshop surveys did indicate that the participants made rather significant gains in the familiarity with the concepts presented during the workshop.

C. Overall Workshop Evaluation - The overall workshop evaluation by the participants indicated that the workshop was very valuable and outstanding. The rating of 9.8 out of a possible 10 was higher than either the 1971 or 1972 workshops.

Table II displays some of the other data summarized from the total workshop evaluation survey. This data indicates that all but one of the participants felt all of the topics were appropriate for classroom teachers. Out of all the topics only reading diagnostic techniques and visual perception techniques were presently being used in over half of the participants schools. Over two-thirds of the participants felt they would have no difficulties in presenting these concepts to other teachers in their buildings. The majority indicated they thought most of the teachers receiving help on the topics presented in the workshop would use these new techniques in their classroom except for the area of typewriters in reading. The problem indicated here was related to the availability of enough typewriters in the elementary schools.

Most said the workshop format and organization was excellent. Six participants did indicate they felt the only problems were related to time; longer breaks, more time off to visit with other participants and not to report on Sunday.

In planning for future workshops they recommended several areas and speakers: (number of participants making suggestion in parenthesis)

- a. Opportunity to hear from other teachers on how they have used the various techniques (13)
- b. Visual perception (5)
- c. Individualized Instruction (5)
- d. Sister Sybillina (22)
- e. Gene Schultz (14)
- f. Hope Shackelford (10)

IV CONCLUSIONS

The participants, as in past summer workshops, again indicated that this workshop would be rated as one of the best experience they have had in their educational career. The pre-post test on workshop content showed a significant gain in their knowledge of the workshop topics and techniques. The summary evaluation indicated that in most cases they were presented with new techniques which they felt they could put into practice one they were back in the classroom and help other teachers use also.

TABLE II

Final Workshop Summary Data

	I. Is the information appropriate to your school's situation?		II. Is most of this information presently being used in your school?		III. Do you anticipate having difficulty in presenting this information to other staff members in your school?		IV. Do you feel most of the teachers who get this information from you will use it in their classroom teaching?	
	YES	NO	YES	NO	YES	NO	YES	NO
Individualized Reading (Brown)	97	3	37	63	29	71	68	32
Reading Diagnosis (Watson)	97	3	59	41	18	82	76	24
Title III Project (Schulze) (Typewriter Use)	97	3	3	97	32	68	20	80
Newspapers (Shackelford)	97	3	24	76	10	90	53	37
Perceptual Aspects of a Reading Disability	27	3	54	46	15	85	82	18
Behavioral Objectives (Pelsue)	97	3	31	69	27	73	59	41

The workshop members enthusiasm towards the workshop experiences can best be expressed by four of their comments:

"This has been the most worthwhile week I've had in a long time - stimulating, instructive, and fun! "

"This workshop has been a great experience for us. It has not only given me many new ideas, but it has refreshed my enthusiasm for teaching. Also, I had the opportunity to meet other teachers and great people who really care about children! "

"It's been a great experience - Nothing succeeds like success and this has been a real success as far as I am concerned.

"This answered many questions for me. I'm very anxious to apply this to my classroom in an All-out effort to have children learn how and enjoy it. Thank you very much."