DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 104 925                                          TM 004 381

AUTHOR          Goetz, Frank; LaBay, Michael
TITLE           The SWRL Kindergarten Program (An Evaluation).
INSTITUTION     Birmingham Public Schools, Mich.
PUB DATE        Jul 74
NOTE            34p.; Best Copy Available, pages 16, 28, 29, and 30
                may reproduce poorly

EDRS PRICE      MF-$0.76  HC-$1.95 PLUS POSTAGE
DESCRIPTORS     Academic Achievement; Achievement Tests; Concept
                Formation; *Early Childhood Education; *Early
                Reading; *Kindergarten Children; Parent Attitudes;
                Preschool Teachers; *Program Evaluation; Reading
                Achievement; *Reading Programs; Reading Skills;
                Surveys; Teacher Attitudes; Vocabulary Development;
                Word Recognition
IDENTIFIERS     *SWRL Kindergarten Program

ABSTRACT

        The SWRL Kindergarten Program was developed by the
Southwest Regional Laboratory for Educational Research and
Development (SWRL), a federally funded facility located in Inglewood,
California. In Birmingham, interest in the SWRL program was
stimulated and developed during the Fall of 1971. It was felt that
this program would provide the children with an opportunity to be
exposed to an early reading program. The components of the SWRL
Program consisted of the Instructional Concepts Program (ICP) which
was intended to introduce the children to concepts of shape, size,
color, amounts, poisitions, and comparisons. Upon completion of the
ICP, the Beginning Reading Program (BRP) was initiated. The goals of
this program were to teach the children word recognition and the
vocabulary of the program design. Some support systems were also
developed to aid the children in maintaining or improving their
acquired skills. (Author/DEP)

THE SWRL KINDERGARTEN PROGRAM

(AN EVALUATION)

.BIRMINGHAM PUBLIC SCHOOLS
Birmingham, Michigan

July, 1974

Dr. Frank Goetz,
Director of Curriculum

Dr. Michael LaBay
Director of Evaluation

2

THE SWRL KINDERGARTEN PROGRAM

CONTENTS

# THE SWRL KINDERGARTEN PROGRAM

## INTRODUCTION

The SWRL Kindergarten Program was developed by the Southwest Regional Laboratory for Educational Research and Development (SWRL) a federally funded facility located in Inglewood, California. The materials and procedures were developed through carefully sequenced studies and extensive field tryouts involving more than 100,000 children over a period of four years.

Each of the Kindergarten Program components underwent continuous sequential evaluation which resulted in modification of the program on the basis of pupil performance data and teacher reactions. When the program had been refined to the point where it was ready for widespread dissemination, federal funds were made available under Title III of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act.

In Birmingham, interest in the SWRL Kindergarten Program was stimulated and developed during the fall of 1971. It was felt this program held promise to meet a need of many of our children, viz to provide an opportunity for them to be exposed to an early reading program. Initial orientation of Elementary Principals regarding the features of the program was arranged through the office of the Director of Elementary Education. In turn, interest was generated among the Kindergarten Teachers in the district. With the assurance that sufficient support was apparent among teachers and principals, and with the approval of the Board of Education, a federal grant was requested and approved through the Michigan Department of Education.

The principal and a kindergarten teacher in eight of our schools agreed to participate in the program. It was subsequently implemented at Bingham Farms, Bloomfield Village, Evergreen, Franklin, Pembroke, Quarton, Torry and Walnut Lake in September, 1972. We would like to express appreciation to Dr. Velma Ruhly, Principal of Franklin Elementary School, for her help in coordinating this program.

## COMPONENTS OF THE SWRL PROGRAM

### The Instructional Concepts Program

(1)

This component consists of 96 concepts pertaining to colors, sizes, shapes, amounts, positions and comparisons. This component is introduced during the first month of school and runs for about 12 weeks. Successful participation in this sequence enables each child to utilize

---

(1) See Appendix A

the 96 concept terms. These concepts are considered basic to later success
in academic programs. Many Birmingham children enter school with prior
understanding of many of these concepts. This part of the program, there-
fore, may be offered on a partial or complete basis or omitted depending
on the needs of the children in each individual school.

## The Beginning Reading Program

Known originally as the First Year Communication Skills Program, this
component has been renamed the Beginning Reading Program (BRP). The
goals of the program are well defined [2]. At the end of the 30 week
sequence children should be able to:

1. Read the 100 words taught directly in the program.
2. Sound out and read new words composed of word elements
   taught in the program.
3. Demonstrate comprehension of the material read.

Instructional materials include individual story books that the children
may keep and take home, flash cards, games, comprehension sheets, criterion
exercises, and practice exercises. The program is organized into 10 units
each requiring about 3 weeks to complete, assuming an instructional period
of about 25 minutes per day.

## SUPPORT SYSTEMS

### The Tutorial Program

Upper grade pupils, aides or other non-professionals are trained to use
specially prepared materials and procedures to tutor kindergarten pupils.
The Tutorial Program supplements regular classroom instruction by provid-
ing additional practice for those children who have not yet attained
program outcomes.

### The Parent-Assisted Learning Program (PAL)

PAL supplements regular classroom instruction of BRP students through the
cooperation and structured assistance of each child's parents. Parents
are trained to use instructional exercises and learning games that
provide practice in specific reading skills being developed by the
teacher in the classroom.

---

(2) Appendix B

## The Summer Reading Program

A ten week parent-guided summer program following the kindergarten year is optional and is designed to help the children maintain and improve the reading skills acquired in kindergarten.


## TEACHER INSERVICE

Teachers in the program received two half-days of inservice prior to implementation of the program and two shorter sessions during the course of the kindergarten year. This training was provided by the Program Coordinator, Dr. Velma Ruhly who had been given prior inservice.


## PARENT ORIENTATION

In order to gain the support of parents and to enlist their cooperation in participating with their children in the program, an orientation meeting was conducted in most schools. Parents were invited in and given an explanation of what the program was designed to do. Printed materials, designed to provide information about the program, were distributed and discussed.


## PROGRAM PROCEDURES AND EVALUATION ACTIVITIES

Each child enrolled in the program was given an entry survey test. This test was intended to determine the entry level of the children with regard to the goals of the program. With 28 being the highest possible score, school means range from 13.5 to 15.8 with a district mean of 15.1 (see Table I).

The Instructional Concepts Program was introduced in September or October and completed in December or January. An end-of-program ICP Test was given and the results sent to the Regional Lab. Table I shows that out of a possible score of 30 the means ranged from 27.1 to 29.4 with a district mean of 28.0.

About three weeks after the ICP began, children were introduced to the Beginning Reading Program. These two programs ran simultaneously for a few weeks until the ICP was completed. The BRP then continued to the end of the school year. At that time an end-of-program test was given to all students who had completed all or most of the program. These results were also sent to the Regional Lab for analysis[3]. Table I shows results of the four subtests.

The highest possible score on the sight word subtest was 18. The school means ranged from 13.3 to 17.8 with a district mean of 14.7.

---

(3) Appendix C

## TABLE I

### SUMMARY OF EVALUATIVE MEASURES

### SWRL KINDERGARTEN PROGRAM

| SCHOOL | Entry Survey (0--28) Mean | ICP (0--30) Mean | Sight Words (0--18) Mean | Word Element (0--9) Mean | Letter Names (0--6) Mean | Sentences (0--10) Mean |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| SWRL A | 13.5 | 27.1 | 15.0 | 7.7 | 5.7 | 6.0 |
| SWRL B | 13.9 | 28.0 | 16.0 | 8.4 | 5.6 | 8.8 |
| SWRL C | 15.1 | 27.8 | 13.8 | 7.3 | 5.7 | 6.4 |
| SWRL D | 15.3 | 27.4 | 15.8 | 8.0 | 5.7 | 8.1 |
| SWRL E | 15.4 | 29.4 | 16.9 | 8.8 | 5.7 | 9.0 |
| SWRL F | 15.5 | 28.3 | 17.4 | 8.7 | 5.6 | 9.1 |
| SWRL G | 15.7 | 27.9 | 13.3 | 6.2 | 5.8 | 3.8 |
| SWRL H | 15.8 | 27.4 | 17.8 | 8.9 | 5.9 | 9.9 |
| SWRL All Schools | 15.1 | 28.0 | 14.7 | 8.0 | 5.7 | 7.8 |
| Control I | | | 9.1 | 5.4 | 5.2 | .4 |
| Control J | | | 10.4 | 6.2 | 5.7 | .9 |
| Control K | | | 11.1 | 5.1 | 5.0 | 1.3 |
| Control All Schools | | | 10.2 | 5.6 | 5.3 | .9 |

-4-

7

For word elements the highest possible score was 9.0. The means ranged from 6.2 to 8.9 with a district mean of 8.0. The highest possible score for Letter Names was 6.0. School means ranged from 5.6 to 5.9, district mean 5.7. Sentence understanding had a possible high score of 10.0. Means ranged from 3.8 (an isolated low) to 9.9 with a district mean of 7.8

The Beginning Reading Program being the component considered most challenging and with the greatest potential for Birmingham children, the decision was made to compare achievement of SWRL children with children who had not been in the program. A random sample of three non-SWRL schools was selected. The BRP end-of-program test was administered to those three control classes. Table I summarizes these results. There were no significant differences between this control group and the SWRL children on the letter naming subtest. However, on the other three subtests, viz., sight words, word elements and sentence understanding, the SWRL children performed significantly better. The difference in sentence understanding was especially dramatic.

No comparison was attempted with the ICP due to the belief that kindergarten teachers do an effective job of teaching these concepts using other methods.

In addition to test results of children at the end of the first year, it was determined we should have opinions of teachers, principals, and parents of children who participated in the program. Therefore, these groups were surveyed.

## Parent Survey Results [4]

In late May of 1973, an opinionnaire was sent to each of the 217 parents who had children in the program. One hundred forty nine (149) were returned (68.7%). District results may be found in Appendix D. A summary of some of the more important questions should be of interest and helpful in assessing the value of the program.

Ninety-three percent of the parents indicated their children enjoyed participation in the program much or very much; 1.4% indicated their children enjoyed participation very little or not at all. Ninety percent said they believed the objectives of the ICP had been accomplished very well. Combining moderately well with very well the percent was 100%. For the Beginning Reading Program the results were 78.3% and 98.6% respectively whereas 1.4% thought objectives of the program were not being accomplished with their children.

Compared with other kindergarten programs parents were familiar with, 85.6% rated the SWRL Program as superior. Parents indicated the program stimulated and challenged their child (81.9%) whereas 2.7% said they felt the program had unduly pressured their child.

---

(4) Appendix D

-5-

Of the parents who participated in the PAL Program, 81.3% said it was effective. Seventy five percent said they felt their child was very well prepared for the second year of school and 22.9% indicated adequate preparation; only 2.1% felt their child was poorly prepared. Parents said their children were reading other materials at home (79.6%). Almost 97% indicated the program should be continued or expanded, while 3% thought it should be eliminated.

These results suggest quite clearly that parents whose children participated in the program were very favorably impressed and desired that it should be continued.

## Teacher Survey Results[5]

In March the teachers were surveyed to determine if they would want to continue the program for another year. Eight teachers started the program in September and a ninth was added in the spring. Some questions, therefore, had 8 respondents and some 9. Participation in the ICP was satisfying to all the teachers. Seven expressed satisfaction with the BRP, one was dissatisfied and one found it "so-so". All teachers indicated children enjoyed participation in both ICP and BRP.

With regard to the time required to teach the ICP, four thought it was just right and four felt it was excessive. Six teachers felt the instructional time was just right for the BRP, two indicated it was excessive. In terms of being ready for the next school year, four teachers thought their children were better prepared and four thought the preparation was about the same.

Objectives of the ICP were assessed to have been accomplished very well by seven of the eight teachers and moderately well by one. For the BRP, six indicated objectives had been accomplished very well and three moderately well. Seven teachers who used the PAL Program said it was helpful. The four teachers who used the Tutor Program found it to be helpful.

Recordkeeping was considered time-consuming but necessary by 7 of the teachers; one found it unnecessarily time-consuming. Seven of the teachers indicated the SWRL Program did not conflict with their philosophy of kindergarten instruction, two teachers indicated there was some conflict. Seven teachers felt the inservice they received was adequate to very adequate; one felt it was inadequate. Eight teachers expressed a desire to continue to participate in the SWRL Program. One chose not to continue. Six teachers said the program should be continued and expanded; no one suggested it be eliminated.

---

(5) Appendix E

The large majority of teachers who participated in the program were satis-fied with and supportive of the program. They wished to continue in it and they recommended to Curriculum Council that the program be made avail-able to other schools on an optional basis. (See Curriculum Council Minutes April 10, 1973).

## Administrator Survey Results[6]

Principals of the eight schools were surveyed in March at the same time as teachers. Six principals agreed with teachers that the program stimulated and challenged the children, one saw no noticeable difference and one saw undue pressure. Seven said that children enjoyed participating in the program much or very much. Six indicated the objectives of ICP had been accomplished very well and one moderately well. BRP objectives had been accomplished very well according to five principals and two assessed accomplishments as moderately well. Five judged the SWRL Program as superior to other kindergarten programs while one said it was about the same and one appraised it as inferior.

All principals said parents were supportive and that kindergarten teachers were positive. The program was judged not to be in conflict with their philosophy by six of the principals, one saw some conflict. Five suggested the program be continued and four said it should be expanded. No one opted for eliminating the program.

## SWRL CHILDREN ONE YEAR LATER

In order to more completely assess the longer range outcomes of the SWRL Program, a longitudinal study was conducted. Dr. Michael LaBay, Director of Evaluation, assisted with this portion of the study. His report is in-cluded here.

INTRODUCTION

On April 13, 1973 the Department of Curriculum asked that the Department of Evaluation assist them in evaluating the effects of the district's SWRL Read-ing Program on reading achievement.

A description of program components, guidelines, and evaluation methods are on file with the Department of Curriculum. This report is part of a larger evalua-tion effort involving assessments of parents, staff, and student attitudes as well as diagnosis, prescription, and assessment of academic progress using pupil performance objectives.

---

(6)  Appendix F

## PURPOSE OF THE REPORT

This report presents academic test results and analysis in an attempt to determine if SWRL students differ from non-SWRL students in reading achievement at the end of their first year.

## PROCEDURES OF THE STUDY

A random sample of first grade pupils enrolled in the Birmingham Public Schools as of May 1, 1974 was used in the study. Pupils were selected by proportional allocation based upon first grade enrollment within each of the district's elementary schools. An original sample of 50 SWRL and 50 control children were drawn from student lists. Groups of pupils ranged in size from 1 (Westchester) to 9 (Quarton). All schools except Bloomfield Village were included in the project.

The school records of each of the 100 children selected for testing were reviewed to double check building location and to record academic aptitude scores obtained on the Primary Mental Abilities (PMA) Test the previous year.

Of the 100 original pupils selected for study, 44 SWRL and 28 control children had recorded PMA total scores and were available for achievement testing. It is assumed, therefore, that these final pupils were a random sample of all children within the district who were given the PMA in 1972-73 and were enrolled in their respective schools as of May 1, 1974.

One test coordinator administered the entire PACER-I (Book Two) Initial Reading Survey to all study pupils in small groups (less than 4) from May 14 through May 28, 1974. Testing procedures, as defined in the PACER manual, were followed with all the children.

## RESULTS

Mini-Pacer analysis of test scores without controlling for academic aptitude indicated that the SWRL and control pupils attained similar scores on each of the six PACER subtests. Table 1 summarizes these findings.

---

### TABLE I

#### MINI-PACER ANALYSIS RESULTS OF SWRL AND CONTROL MEAN PUPIL ACHIEVEMENT LEVELS (PACER-I)

| Subtest No. | SWRL Subtest Performance | | | | | | SWRL Subtest Performance | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 |
| Pupil Count | 44 | 44 | 44 | 44 | 44 | 44 | 28 | 28 | 28 | 28 | 28 | 28 |
| Mean | 11.98 | 8.00 | 7.61 | 6.98 | 7.57 | 10.07 | 11.93 | 7.86 | 7.75 | 7.18 | 7.46 | 10.54 |
| Std. Devel. | 0.15 | 0.000 | 1.05 | 1.51 | 1.05 | 2.77 | 0.37 | 0.44 | 0.83 | 1.49 | 1.40 | 1.82 |

Subtest Definitions:
1= Sight Vocabulary
2= Initial Consonant Substitution
3= Compound Words
4= Inflected Endings
5= Comprehension, Sentence Completion
6= Comprehension, Main Idea, Sequence and Detail.

---

Considering the proportion of pupils correctly answering all items within subtests, Table II indicates that significantly more SWRL children attained perfect scores in subtest 2 than control. All other subtest breakdowns indicate no significant difference between the two groups.

## TABLE II

### MINI-PACER ANALYSIS RESULTS OF SWRL AND CONTROL CRITERION ATTAINMENT
### (CRITERION SET AT MAXIMUM SCORE)

| SWRL Subtest Performance | | | | | | | SWRL Subtest Performance | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Subtest No. | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 |
| Pupil Count | 44 | 44 | 44 | 44 | 44 | 44 | 28 | 28 | 28 | 28 | 28 | 28 |
| Achieved Criterion | 43 | 44 | 38 | 27 | 36 | 23 | 27 | 25 | 25 | 20 | 23 | 12 |

| Number | Subtest | Comparison between groups using z-test of proportions |
|---|---|---|
| 1 | Sight Vocabulary | No significant difference ($-.05$) |
| 2 | Initial Consonant Substitution | Significant difference |
| 3 | Compound Words | No significant difference |
| 4 | Inflected Endings | No significant difference |
| 5 | Comprehension, sentence comp. | No significant difference |
| 6 | Comprehension, Main Idea, etc. | No significant difference |

When each subtest score was controlled for academic aptitude through covariance analysis (PMA total raw scores used as covariate) results indicated that:

1. The SWRL and the control groups were not significantly different in their PMA scores.
2. The correlation between PMA scores and PACER subtest scores was nonsignificant.
3. The two groups did not differ in achievement on any PACER subtest when academic aptitude controls were enforced.

Tables 3 through 8 summarize the above findings.[7]

## CONCLUSIONS

The information presented in this report indicates that children with one year of previous experience in the SWRL Program at the K level did not achieve at a level significantly higher than children in other programs throughout the district, as measured by the PACER battery.

The two sample groups selected for study were not significantly different in academic aptitude, as measured by the PMA battery.

When each child's aptitude was considered through covariance analysis procedures, the SWRL group again was not significantly different in PACER-measured reading ability.

Assuming that PACER battery adequately measures the ability to read at the end of grade one, the data of this report indicates that the district's SWRL Program did not produce achievement levels above those expected in other district program.

Dr. Michael LaBay
Director of Evaluation

_____

(7) Appendix G

## SUMMARY OF FINDINGS AND CONCLUSIONS

As one reads through this report, there are many minor and a few major conclusions. The more pertinent ones will be listed here. Additional questions asked about the program as it was developed by the Southwest Laboratory are included in Appendix H.

1. In the opinion of the parents, teachers, and adm᠁ ᠁tors, who participated in the project, the objectives of ᠁ ᠁ Instructional Concepts Program and the Beginning Reading Progᵣᵤₘ were accomplished. This opinion is substantiated by end-of-program test results.

2. Children who participated in the program scored significantly better on subtests (a) measuring knowledge of sight words, (b) word elements, (c) sentence meaning than did control children who did not participate. There was no significant difference in achievement of the experimental and control group on subtest (d) naming letters. This latter finding suggests that non-SWRL teachers are teaching letter recognition. This is an outcome of the phonovisual program which is taught in many schools.

3. There was no significant difference in the reading achievement of SWRL and non-SWRL children as determined by the PACER Reading Test administered at the end of grade one. This finding is difficult to explain in view of the substantial difference in achievement found at the end of the kindergarten year. The possibility suggests itself that first grade teachers are not maintaining the reading achievement lead that SWRL pupils evidenced at the end of their kindergarten year. Another possibility, of course, is that the program really does not, in the longer term, make a lasting difference.

4. Parents, teachers, and administrators expressed strong support for the program and wished to see it continued.

## RECOMMENDATIONS

1. The SWRL Kindergarten Program should be continued as an optional program in the district at the kindergarten level.

2. All but very immature kindergarten children in a school where the program is offered should be included in an instructional group and in the program.

3. Use of support systems is recommended. Unhealthy pressure must be carefully avoided.

4. Schools that have the program and plan to continue it are advised to assess their reading program delivery system at the first grade level to determine if there may be ways of maintaining the achievement lead evidenced by SWRL children at the end of their kindergarten year.

Dr. Frank Goetz,
Director of Curriculum

14

APPENDICES

## UNIT 1 – COLORS AND DIRECTION FOLLOWING SKILLS

**INITIAL INSTRUCTION**
1* Red, Blue
2 Yellow, Black
3 White, Brown
4 Green, Purple
5 Orange, Pink
6 Row, Numerals 1 to 5
7 Turn, Page, Mark, Box
**ASSESSMENT**
8 Criterion Exercise – Unit 1
**SECOND INSTRUCTION**
9 Practice Exercise A – Unit 1
10 Practice Exercise B – Unit 1

## UNIT 2 – SIZES

**INITIAL INSTRUCTION**
1 Larger, Smaller, Largest, Smallest
2 Shorter, Longer, Longest
3 Shorter, Taller, Shortest, Tallest
4 Thicker, Thinner
**ASSESSMENT**
5 Criterion Exercise – Unit 2
**SECOND INSTRUCTION**
6 Practice Exercise A – Unit 2
7 Practice Exercise B – Unit 2

## UNIT 3 – AMOUNTS

**INITIAL INSTRUCTION**
1 One, Two, Three, Four
2 Five, Six, Seven
3 Eight, Nine, Ten
4 All, Some, None, No
5 More, Less, Most, Least
**ASSESSMENT**
6 Criterion Exercise – Unit 3
**SECOND INSTRUCTION**
7 Practice Exercise A – Unit 3
8 Practice Exercise B – Unit 3

## UNIT 4 – SHAPES

**INITIAL INSTRUCTION**
1 Circle, Square, Triangle
2 Rectangle, Straight and Curved Lines
**ASSESSMENT**
3 Criterion Exercise – Unit 4
**SECOND INSTRUCTION**
4 Practice Exercise A – Unit 4
5 Practice Exercise B – Unit 4

*lesson number

## UNIT 5 – POSITIONS

**INITIAL INSTRUCTION**
1 Front, Back, Middle
2 Top, Bottom, Side
3 Behind, In Front, Between
4 Beside, Next To, Around
5 Above, Below, Over, Under
6 Inside, Outside
7 Right, Left
8 First, Last, Beginning, End
9 First, Second, Third, Fourth
**ASSESSMENT**
10 Criterion Exercise – Unit 5
**SECOND INSTRUCTION**
11 Practice Exercise A – Unit 5
12 Practice Exercise B – Unit 5

## UNIT 6 – PRE-MATHEMATICS

**INITIAL INSTRUCTION**
1 Equal, Unequal (Amount)
2 Same, Different (Size, Shape, Color, Amount)
3 Not Equal or Not Same
4 Combined Colors and Shapes
5 Combined Colors and Sizes; Shapes and Sizes
6 Combined Shapes and Positions, Sizes and Positions
**ASSESSMENT**
7 Criterion Exercise – Unit 6
**SECOND INSTRUCTION**
8 Practice Exercise A – Unit 6
9 Practice Exercise B – Unit 6

## UNIT 7 – PRE-READING

(If the children have already begun
to read, the lessons in this unit may
not be necessary.)

**INITIAL INSTRUCTION**
1 First, Last (Time)
2 Before, After (Time)
3 Letter, Word
4 Sound, Name
**ASSESSMENT**
5 Criterion Exercise – Unit 7
**SECOND INSTRUCTION**
6 Practice Exercise A – Unit 7
7 Practice Exercise B – Unit 7

BRP    PROGRAM OUTCOMES CHART    APPENDIX    B

Outcome 1:  Words that the children learn to read
Outcome 2:  Beginning and ending word elements that the children learn to identify
Outcome 3:  Word-attack skills that the children learn to apply
Outcome 4:  Letter names, both for capital and lower-case letters, that the children learn to identify when shown the letters

| Unit | No. of Weeks | | Outcome Number | | | | | | | 2 | | | 3 | 4 | | |
| | 25 min. per day | 40 min. per day | 1 Words | | | | | | | Word Elements | | | Word Attack | Letter Names | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 1 | 5 | 3 | 1 me | Sam Mat | see | am | | | s | m | at | | | s a | m i | e t |
| 2 | 3 | 2 | Mit it | Sis sit | meet on | in is | | | it | eet | | | | n | o | h |
| 3 | 3 | 2 | sat Nan | Ann a | this man | and the | | | th | an | n | | | w | f | d |
| 4 | 3 | 2 | mad we mess | that will | at with | Sid fell | | | ad | w | ill f | | | l | r | b |

| Unit | 25 min. per day | 40 min per day | Outcome 1 Words | | | | 2 Word Elements | | | | 3 Word Attack | 4 Letter Names | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 5 | 3 | 2 | fit us run | Nat what | sun feet | them fun | un | r | | | By Unit 5 and thereafter, the children should be | u | c | y |
| 6 | 3 | 2 | Nell Ed she | who let | yes well | did need | ell | et | l | eed | able to sound out and read any one-syllable word | | | |
| 7 | 3 | 2 | net fill | ran sheet | sad shut | no mud | ut | sh | | | composed of word elements taught pre- | p | k | g |
| 8 | 3 | 2 | sand hat rat fat | sell he set if | shell then feel wet | fish nut not | en | h | | | viously in the program. Specific words for word-attack in- | | | |
| 9 | 3 | 2 | fan seed was men | win weed to be | hand met bad | hill hit him | b | | | | struction are listed in the Activities and Materials Guides. | x q | z v | j |
| 10 | 3 | 2 | bat bell ant bed | his but Ben bee | wish has bus Bill | ball said had hid | | | | | | | | |

STATE        MICHIGAN
DISTRICT     SCH DIST OF THE CITY

1972-73 KINDERGARTEN PROGRAM INSTALLATION
QUALITY ASSURANCE DATA
DISTRICT REPORT

——————————SUMMARY OF ALL SCHOOLS——————————

## ENTRY SURVEY MEASURE

|  | 0-4 | 5-10 | 11-16 | 17-22 |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| NUMBER OF PUPILS | 0 | 14 | 158 | 62 |
| MEAN SCORE | | 15.1 | | |

| | EARLIEST | LATEST |
|---|---|---|
| DATE COMPLETED | SE27 | OC 6 |
| DURATION MINIMUM | 1 | |
| IN WEEKS MAXIMUM | 2 | |

## ICP UNIT PACING AND PROFICIENCY

| | UNIT 1 | UNIT 2 | UNIT 3 | UNIT 4 | UNIT 5 | UNIT 6 | UNIT 7 |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| PUPILS | 171 | 171 | 171 | 171 | 171 | 170 | |
| MEAN SCORE | 11.7 | 11.4 | 11.4 | 11.7 | 10.7 | 10.7 | 11.3 |
| EARLY DATE | OC 6 | OC 6 | OC26 | OC26 | DE 1 | DE 1 | |
| LATE DATE | OC13 | OC20 | OC26 | NO 3 | DE10 | JA 9 | |
| DURATION MIN | 1 | 1 | | 1 | 1 | 0 | |
| IN WEEKS MAX | 2 | 2 | 2 | 5 | 3 | 3 | |

## ICP COMPLETE MEASURE

| | 0-6 | 7-14 | 15-22 | 23-30 |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| MIN PACE | 0 | 0 | 7 | 223 |
| MAX PACE | | | | |

28.0    DE18    FE22

MIN PACE   7 UNITS 10 WEEKS
MAX PACE   7 UNITS 15 WEEKS

## BRP UNIT PACING AND PROFICIENCY

| | UNIT 1 | UNIT 2 | UNIT 3 | UNIT 4 | UNIT 5 | UNIT 6 | UNIT 7 | UNIT 8 | UNIT 9 | UNIT 10 |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | | | DATA NOT RECEIVED | | | | | | |

## BRP END-OF-YEAR MEASURE

| SIGHT WORDS | | | | WORD ELEMENTS | | | | LETTER NAMES | | | | SENTENCES | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 0-8 | 9-13 | 14-18 | | 0-3 | 4-6 | 7-9 | | 0-2 | 3-4 | 5-6 | | 0-4 | 5-7 | 8-10 | |
| 10 | 58 | 149 | | 2 | 24 | 161 | | 0 | 4 | 213 | | 26 | 54 | 137 | |
| | 14.7 | | | | 8.0 | | | | 5.7 | | | | 7:8 | | |

——————————SUMMARY OF DISTRICT PARTICIPATION——————————

| SCHOOL NAME | NUMBER OF CLASSES | PROGRAM USE *ICP ONLY | BRP ONLY | BOTH | ENTRY SURVEY R | NR | ICP UNIT REPORT R | NR | ICP UNIT ASSESSMENT R | NR | BRP UNIT REPORT R | NR | BRP UNIT ASSESSMENT R | NR | SCHOOL INFORMATION SHEET R | NR |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| BINGHAM FARMS | 1 | * | 0 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 0 |
| BLOOMFIELD VILLAGE | 1 | * | 0 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 0 |
| EVERGREEN | 1 | * | 0 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 0 |
| FRANKLIN | 1 | * | 0 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 0 |
| PEMBROKE | 1 | * | 0 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 0 |
| QUARTON | 1 | * | 0 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 0 |
| TORRY | 1 | * | 0 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 0 |
| WALNUT | 1 | * | 0 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 0 |
| ALL SCHOOLS | 8 | * | 0 | 8 | 6 | 2 | 8 | 0 | 8 | 0 | 8 | 0 | 8 | 0 | 8 | 0 |

* ICP       * BRP

RETURN OF QA DATA

R = NUMBER RETURNING THE COMPONENT          NR = NUMBER NOT RETURNING THE COMPONENT

R = NUMBER RETURNING THE COMPONENT          NR = NUMBER NOT RETURNING THE COMPONENT

18

STATE      MICHIGAN
DISTRICT   SCH DIST OF THE CITY

1972-73   KINDERGARTEN PROGRAM INSTALLATION
QUALITY ASSURANCE DATA
DISTRICT REPORT

1135

──────── SCHOOL   D ────────

**ENTRY SURVEY MEASURE**

| | 0-4 | 5-10 | 11-16 | 17-22 |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| NUMBER OF PUPILS | 0 | 1 | 23 | 8 |
| MEAN SCORE | | 15.3 | | |
| DATE EARLIEST | | | | |
| COMPLETED LATEST | | | | |
| DURATION MINIMUM | | | | |
| IN WEEKS MAXIMUM | | | | |

**ICP UNIT PACING AND PROFICIENCY**

| | UNIT 1 | UNIT 2 | UNIT 3 | UNIT 4 | UNIT 5 | UNIT 6 | UNIT 7 |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| PUPILS | 32 | 32 | 32 | 32 | 32 | 32 | |
| MEAN SCORE | 11.6 | 11.6 | 11.6 | 10.6 | 10.6 | 11.5 | - |
| EARLY DATE | SE29 | OC10 | OC23 | NO22 | DE 6 | DE15 | |
| LATE DATE | SE29 | OC10 | NO 3 | NO22 | DE 6 | DE15 | |
| DURATION MIN | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 1 | |
| IN WEEKS MAX | 2 | - | 2 | 3 | 2 | 1 | |

ICP COMPLETION MEASURE

| | 0-6 | 7-14 | 15-22 | 23-30 |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| | 0 | 27.4 | 4 | 44 |
| | | JA 3 | | |
| | | JA 3 | | |
| MIN PACE  7  UNITS 12 WEEKS | | | | |
| MAX PACE  7  UNITS 12 WEEKS | | | | |

**BRP UNIT PACING AND PROFICIENCY**

| | UNIT 1 | UNIT 2 | UNIT 3 | UNIT 4 | UNIT 5 | UNIT 6 | UNIT 7 | UNIT 8 | UNIT 9 | UNIT 10 |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| PUPILS | | | | | | | | | | |
| MEAN SCORE | DATA NOT RECEIVED | | | | | | | | | |
| EARLY DATE | | | | | | | | | | |
| LATE DATE | | | | | | | | | | |
| DURATION MIN | | | | | | | | | | |
| IN WEEKS MAX | | | | | | | | | | |

**SIGHT WORDS**

| | 0-8 | 9-13 | 14-18 |
|---|---|---|---|
| | 0 | 7 | 23 |
| | 15.8 | | |

**BRP END-OF-YEAR MEASURE**

| | WORD ELEMENTS | | | | LETTER NAMES | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | 0-3 | 4-6 | 7-9 | | 0-2 | 3-4 | 5-6 | |
| | 0 | 2 | 28 | | 0 | 1 | 29 | |
| | 8.6 | | | | 5.7 | | | |

──────── SCHOOL   F ────────

**ENTRY SURVEY MEASURE**

| | 0-4 | 5-10 | 11-16 | 17-22 |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| NUMBER OF PUPILS | 0 | 2 | 17 | 10 |
| MEAN SCORE | | 15.5 | | |
| DATE EARLIEST | | | | |
| COMPLETED LATEST | | | | |
| DURATION MINIMUM | | | | |
| IN WEEKS MAXIMUM | | | | |

**ICP UNIT PACING AND PROFICIENCY**

| | UNIT 1 | UNIT 2 | UNIT 3 | UNIT 4 | UNIT 5 | UNIT 6 | UNIT 7 |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| PUPILS | 28 | 28 | 28 | 28 | 28 | 28 | 28 |
| MEAN SCORE | 11.7 | 11.1 | 11.4 | 11.7 | 10.8 | 10.7 | 11.1 |
| EARLIEST | SE27 | OC 6 | OC23 | OC30 | NO17 | DE12 | |
| LATEST | SE27 | OC 6 | OC23 | OC30 | NO17 | DE12 | |
| DURATION MINIMUM | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 2 | 2 | |
| IN WEEKS MAXIMUM | 1 | 2 | 2 | 3 | 2 | 2 | |

ICP COMPLETION MEASURE

| | 0-6 | 7-14 | 15-22 | 23-30 |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| | 0 | 0 | 0 | 28 |
| | 28.3 | | | |
| | JA 4 | | | |
| | JA 4 | | | |
| MIN PACE  7  UNITS 11 WEEKS | | | | |
| MAX PACE  7  UNITS 11 WEEKS | | | | |

**BRP UNIT PACING AND PROFICIENCY**

| | UNIT 1 | UNIT 2 | UNIT 3 | UNIT 4 | UNIT 5 | UNIT 6 | UNIT 7 | UNIT 8 | UNIT 9 | UNIT 10 |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| PUPILS | | | | | | | | | | |
| MEAN SCORE | DATA NOT RECEIVED | | | | | | | | | |
| EARLY DATE | | | | | | | | | | |
| LATE DATE | | | | | | | | | | |
| DURATION MIN | | | | | | | | | | |
| IN WEEKS MAX | | | | | | | | | | |

**SIGHT WORDS**

| | 0-8 | 9-13 | 14-18 |
|---|---|---|---|
| | 0 | 0 | 31 |
| | 17.4 | | |

**END-OF-YEAR MEASURE**

| | WORD ELEMENTS | | | | LETTER NAMES | | | | SENTENCES | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | 0-3 | 4-6 | 7-9 | | 0-2 | 3-4 | 5-6 | | 0-4 | 5-7 | 8-10 | |
| | 0 | 0 | 31 | | 0 | 0 | 31 | | 1 | 2 | 28 | |
| | 8.7 | | | | 5.6 | | | | 9.1 | | | |

STATE        MICHIGAN
DISTRICT     SCH DIST OF THE CITY

## 1972-73 KINDERGARTEN PROGRAM INSTALLATION
## QUALITY ASSURANCE DATA
## DISTRICT-REPORT

————SCHOOL   B————

### ENTRY SURVEY MEASURE

| NUMBER OF PUPILS | 0-4 | 5-10 | 11-16 | 17-22 |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| | 0 | 4 | 20 | 6 |
| MEAN SCORE | 13.9 | | | |

| DATE COMPLETED EARLIEST | | | |
| DURATION IN WEEKS | LATEST | MINIMUM | MAXIMUM |

### ICP UNIT PACING AND PROFICIENCY

| PUPILS | UNIT 1 | UNIT 2 | UNIT 3 | UNIT 4 | UNIT 5 | UNIT 6 | UNIT 7 |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | 30 | 30 | 30 | 30 | 30 | 30 | 30 |
| MEAN SCORE | 11.5 | 11.0 | 11.0 | 11.7 | 10.3 | 10.3 | 11.2 |
| EARLY DATE | SE29 | OC10 | OC20 | OC27 | NO21 | DE12 | DE15 |
| LATE DATE | OC10 | OC20 | OC26 | NO27 | DE12 | DE15 | |
| DURATION MIN | 2 | 1 | 1 | 4 | 3 | 0 | 0 |
| IN WEEKS MAX | 2 | 1 | 1 | 4 | 3 | 0 | 0 |

### BRP END-OF-YEAR MEASURE

| PUPILS | SIGHT WORDS | | | | WORD ELEMENTS | | | LETTER NAMES | | | SENTENCES | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | 0-8 | 9-13 | 14-18 | | 0-3 | 4-6 | 7-9 | 0-2 | 3-4 | 5-6 | 0-4 | 5-7 | 8-10 |
| | 0 | 5 | 21 | | 0 | 1 | 25 | 0 | 0 | 26 | 0 | 5 | 21 |
| MEAN SCORE | 16.0 | | | | 8.4 | | | 5.6 | | | 8.8 | | |

### ICP COMPLETION MEASURE

| PUPILS | 0-6 | 7-14 | 15-22 | 23-30 |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| | 0 | 0 | 1 | 27 |
| MEAN SCORE | 28.0 | | | |
| EARLY DATE | JA11 | | | |
| LATE DATE | JA11 | | | |
| DURATION MIN | MIN PACE 7 UNITS | 12 WEEKS | | |
| IN WEEKS MAX | MAX PACE 7 UNITS | 12 WEEKS | | |

————SCHOOL   A————

### ENTRY SURVEY MEASURE

| NUMBER OF PUPILS | 0-4 | 5-10 | 11-16 | 17-22 |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| | 0 | 4 | 16 | 1 |
| MEAN SCORE | 13.5 | | | |

### ICP UNIT PACING AND PROFICIENCY

| PUPILS | UNIT 1 | UNIT 2 | UNIT 3 | UNIT 4 | UNIT 5 | UNIT 6 | UNIT 7 |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | 18 | 18 | 18 | 18 | 18 | 18 | 17 |
| MEAN SCORE | 11.8 | 11.4 | 11.0 | 11.1 | 9.8 | 10.1 | 10.7 |
| EARLY DATE | SE27 | OC 6 | OC20 | OC26 | NO27 | DE18 | JA 9 |
| LATE DATE | SE27 | OC 6 | OC20 | OC26 | NO27 | DE18 | |
| DURATION MIN | 1 | 2 | 1 | 1 | 5 | 3 | |
| IN WEEKS MAX | 1 | 2 | 1 | 1 | 5 | 3 | |

### BRP END-OF-YEAR MEASURE

| PUPILS | SIGHT WORDS | | | WORD ELEMENTS | | | LETTER NAMES | | | SENTENCES | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | 0-8 | 9-13 | 14-18 | 0-3 | 4-6 | 7-9 | 0-2 | 3-4 | 5-6 | 0-4 | 5-7 | 8-10 |
| | 1 | 1 | 11 | 0 | 2 | 11 | 0 | 0 | 13 | 4 | 6 | 3 |
| MEAN SCORE | 15.0 | | | 7.7 | | | 5.7 | | | 6.0 | | |

### ICP COMPLETION MEASURE

| PUPILS | 0-6 | 7-14 | 15-22 | 23-30 |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| | 0 | 0 | 1 | 16 |
| MEAN SCORE | 27.1 | | | |
| EARLY DATE | JA19 | | | |
| LATE DATE | JA19 | | | |
| DURATION MIN | MIN PACE 7 UNITS | 15 WEEKS | | |
| IN WEEKS MAX | MAX PACE 7 UNITS | 15 WEEKS | | |

### BRP UNIT PACING AND PROFICIENCY

| PUPILS | UNIT 1 | UNIT 2 | UNIT 3 | UNIT 4 | UNIT 5 | UNIT 6 | UNIT 7 | UNIT 8 | UNIT 9 | UNIT 10 |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | DATA NOT RECEIVED | | | | | | | | | |

### BRP UNIT PACING AND PROFICIENCY

| PUPILS | UNIT 1 | UNIT 2 | UNIT 3 | UNIT 4 | UNIT 5 | UNIT 6 | UNIT 7 | UNIT 8 | UNIT 9 | UNIT 10 |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | DATA NOT RECEIVED | | | | | | | | | |

# 1972-73 KINDERGARTEN PROGRAM INST ALLATION
## QUALITY ASSURANCE DATA
## DISTRICT REPORT

STATE   MICHIGAN
DISTRICT   SCH DIST OF THE CITY

----- SCHOOL   E -----

### ENTRY SURVEY MEASURE

| NUMBER OF PUPILS | 0-4 | 5-10 | 11-16 | 17-22 |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| | 0 | 1 | 22 | 11 |
| MEAN SCORE | 15.4 | | | |

### ICP UNIT PACING AND PROFICIENCY

| | UNIT 1 | UNIT 2* | UNIT 3 | UNIT 4 | UNIT 5 | UNIT 6 | UNIT 7 |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| PUPILS | 33 | 33 | 33 | 33 | 33 | 33 | 33 |
| MEAN SCORE | 12.0 | 11.6 | 11.4 | 11.6 | 10.6 | 11.1 | 11.5 |
| DATE EARLIEST | SE30 | OC 7 | OC20 | OC27 | NO24 | DE 6 | DE14 |
| COMPLETED LATEST | SE30 | OC 7 | OC20 | OC27 | NO24 | DE14 | DE14 |
| DURATION MINIMUM | 1 | 1 | 2 | 1 | 4 | 2 | 1 |
| IN WEEKS MAXIMUM | 1 | 2 | 2 | 4 | 2 | 2 | 1 |

### ICP COMPLETION MEASURE

| | 0-6 | 7-14 | 15-22 | 23-30 |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| | 0 | 0 | 0 | 32 |
| MIN PACE | 29.4 | | | |
| MAX PACE | FE22 | | | |
| | 7 UNITS 11 WEEKS | | | |
| | 7 UNITS 11 WEEKS | | | |

### BRP UNIT PACING AND PROFICIENCY

| | UNIT 1 | UNIT 2 | UNIT 3 | UNIT 4 | UNIT 5 | UNIT 6 | UNIT 7 | UNIT 8 | UNIT 9 | UNIT 10 |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|

### BRP END-OF-YEAR MEASURE

| SIGHT WORDS | 0-8 | 9-13 | 14-18 |
|---|---|---|---|
| | 4 | 26 | 0 |
| | 8.8 | | |

| WORD ELEMENTS | 0-3 | 4-6 | 7-9 |
|---|---|---|---|
| | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| | .0 | | |

| LETTER NAMES | 0-2 | 3-4 | 5-6 |
|---|---|---|---|
| | 0 | 2 | 28 |
| | 5.7 | | |

| SENTENCES | 0-4 | 5-7 | 8-10 |
|---|---|---|---|
| | 0 | 5 | 25 |
| | 9.0 | | |

DATA NOT RECEIVED

----- SCHOOL   C -----

### ENTRY SURVEY MEASURE

| NUMBER OF PUPILS | 0-4 | 5-10 | 11-16 | 17-22 |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| | 0 | 0 | 27 | 6 |
| MEAN SCORE | 15.1 | | | |

### ICP UNIT PACING AND PROFICIENCY

| | UNIT 1 | UNIT 2 | UNIT 3 | UNIT 4 | UNIT 5 | UNIT 6 | UNIT 7 |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|

DATA NOT RECEIVED

### ICP COMPLETION MEASURE

| | 0-6 | 7-14 | 15-22 | 23-30 |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| | 0 | 0 | 1 | 34 |
| | 27.8 | | | |
| | DE12 | | | |
| | DE18 | | | |

### BRP UNIT PACING AND PROFICIENCY

| | UNIT 1 | UNIT 2 | UNIT 3 | UNIT 4 | UNIT 5 | UNIT 6 | UNIT 7 | UNIT 8 | UNIT 9 | UNIT 10 |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|

### BRP END-OF-YEAR MEASURE

| SIGHT WORDS | 0-8 | 9-13 | 14-18 |
|---|---|---|---|
| | 3 | 9 | 23 |
| | 13.8 | | |

| WORD ELEMENTS | 0-3 | 4-6 | 7-9 |
|---|---|---|---|
| | 2 | 0 | 29 |
| | 7.3 | | |

| LETTER NAMES | 0-2 | 3-4 | 5-6 |
|---|---|---|---|
| | 0 | 1 | 34 |
| | 5.7 | | |

| SENTENCES | 0-4 | 5-7 | 8-10 |
|---|---|---|---|
| | 5 | 22 | 8 |
| | 6.4 | | |

DATA NOT RECEIVED

STATE    MICHIGAN
DISTRICT  SCH DIST OF THE CITY

## SCHOOL  H

**ENTRY SURVEY MEASURE**

| | 0-4 | 5-10 | 11-16 | 17-22 |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| NUMBER OF PUPILS | 0 | 2 | 17 | 12 |
| MEAN SCORE | | 15.8 | | |
| DATE EARLIEST | | | | |
| COMPLETED LATEST | | | | |
| DURATION MINIMUM | | | | |
| IN WEEKS MAXIMUM | | | | |

**ICP UNIT PACING AND PROFICIENCY**

| | UNIT 1 | UNIT 2 | UNIT 3 | UNIT 4 | UNIT 5 | UNIT 6 | UNIT 7 |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| PUPILS 1 | 30 | 30 | 30 | 30 | 30 | 30 | 30 |
| 2 | | | | | | | |
| MEAN SCORE | 11.9 | 11.6 | 11.8 | 12.0 | 11.3 | 11.1 | 11.8 |
| EARLY DATE | OC 6 | OC13 | OC26 | OC29 | DE 1 | DE 7 | DE14 |
| LATE DATE | OC 6 | OC13 | OC26 | OC29 | DE 1 | DE 7 | DE14 |
| DURATION MIN | 1 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 5 | 1 | — |
| IN WEEKS MAX | 1 | 2 | 2 | 5 | 1 | 1 | |

**ICP COMPLETION MEASURE**

| | 0-6 | 7-14 | 15-22 | 23-30 |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| | 0 | 0 | 0 | 16 |
| | 27.4 | | | |
| MIN PACE | 7 UNITS 10 WEEKS | | | |
| MAX PACE | 7 UNITS 10 WEEKS | | | |

**BRP UNIT PACING AND PROFICIENCY**

DATA NOT RECEIVED

**BRP END-OF-YEAR MEASURE**

| | SIGHT WORDS | | | WORD ELEMENTS | | | LETTER NAMES | | | SENTENCES | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | 0-8 | 9-13 | 14-18 | 0-3 | 4-6 | 7-9 | 0-2 | 3-4 | 5-6 | 0-4 | 5-7 | 8-10 |
| | 0 | 0 | 27 | 0 | 0 | 27 | 0 | 0 | 27 | 0 | 0 | 27 |
| | 17.8 | | | 8.9 | | | 5.9 | | | 9.9 | | |

## SCHOOL  G

**ENTRY SURVEY MEASURE**

| | 0-4 | 5-10 | 11-16 | 17-22 |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| NUMBER OF PUPILS | 0 | 0 | 16 | 8 |
| MEAN SCORE | | 15.7 | | |
| DATE EARLIEST | | | | |
| COMPLETED LATEST | | | | |
| DURATION MINIMUM | | | | |
| IN WEEKS MAXIMUM | | | | |

**ICP UNIT PACING AND PROFICIENCY**

| | UNIT 1 | UNIT 2 | UNIT 3 | UNIT 4 | UNIT 5 | UNIT 6 | UNIT 7 |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| PUPILS | | | DATA NOT RECEIVED | | | | |

**ICP COMPLETION MEASURE**

| | 0-6 | 7-14 | 15-22 | 23-30 |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| | 0 | 0 | 0 | 26 |
| | 27.9 | | | |
| MIN PACE | JA 4 | | | |
| MAX PACE | JA 4 | | | |

**BRP UNIT PACING AND PROFICIENCY**

DATA NOT RECEIVED

**BRP END-OF-YEAR MEASURE**

| | SIGHT WORDS | | | WORD ELEMENTS | | | LETTER NAMES | | | SENTENCES | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | 0-8 | 9-13 | 14-18 | 0-3 | 4-6 | 7-9 | 0-2 | 3-4 | 5-6 | 0-4 | 5-7 | 8-10 |
| | 2 | 10 | 13 | 0 | 16 | 10 | 0 | 0 | 25 | 0 | 14 | 4 |
| | 13.3 | | | 6.2 | | | 5.8 | | | 3.8 | | |

SWRL KINDERGARTEN PROGRAM

PARENT OPINIONNAIRE

School  8 Schools -- 149 returns

To help evaluate the SWRL Kindergarten Program used on a limited basis in Birmingham this last year, we are requesting that teachers, parents and administrators react to several questions.  Your assistance is appreciated.  Check all appropriate items. Please return the form to school within two days.

1.  My child has enjoyed participation in the SWRL Program
    75.2%          17.4%          6.0%                              .7%
    112 very much    26  much     9  some        1 very little      1 not at all

2.  Did you receive printed literature explaining the SWRL Program?
    96.6%          3.4%
    144  yes       5 no.   Comment on its adequacy   adequate, excellent, informative,

    easy, too difficult, good, not as expected

3.  Did you participate in a parent orientation program at school?
    61.7%          38.3%
    92 yes         57 no.

4.T  To the extent that I am able to judge, the objectives related to teaching con-
     cepts of color, size, etc., were accomplished.
     90.3%          8.7%
     131 very well    14 moderately well     --poorly

5.  To the extent that I am able to judge, the objectives related to teaching
    beginning reading were/are being accomplished
    78.3%          20.3%                   1.4%
    108  very well   28  moderately well    2  poorly

6.  The SWRL Program has had the following effect on my child
    81.9%                         2.7%                      10.7%
    122  stimulated and challenged    4  unduly pressured    16 both
        7  neither
        4.7%

7.  Compared to other Kindergarten Programs I am familiar with, the SWRL Program is
    85.6%          10.6%              3.8%
    113  superior    14  about the same    5  inferior

8.  Having participated in the Parent Assistance Program (PAL) my reaction to its
    effectiveness is
    51.5%          29.8%              15.7%              3.0%
    69  very favorable    40  favorable    21  mixed emotions    4  unfavorable

9.  The part(s) of the SWRL Program my child liked most was:

    Reading and Books, Games, Numbers, Tests, Worksheets, Merit badge, All, Puzzles,

    Stories and characters, pictures, humor

20 23

SWRL KINDERGARTEN PROGRAM

TEACHER OPINIONNAIRE

MARCH 1973          School    TALLY

To help evaluate the SWRL Kindergarten Program used on a limited basis in Birmingham
this last year, we are requesting that teachers, parents and administrators react to
several questions.  Your assistance is appreciated.  Check all appropriate areas and
return to the Director of Curriculum within 2 days.

1.  My participation in the SWRL Program was:

    A. ---ICP
        __2__ very satisfying   __6__ satisfying   ____ so so   ____ Unsatisfying

    B. ---BRP
        __4__ very satisfying   __3__ satisfying   __1__ so so   ____ unsatisfying

2.  The children enjoyed participating in the SWRL Program

    A. ---Instructional concepts:  __5__ very much   __4__ some   ____ not at all

    B. ---Reading:  __7__ very much   __2__ some   ____ not at all

3.  The time required to adequately teach the Instructional Concepts Program was:

     __4__ just right   __4__ excessive

4.  The time required to adequately teach the Reading Program was:

     __5__ just right   __2__ excessive

5.  In what ways was the Program good for your children?

    A.

    B.

6.  What approximate percent of parents reacted to the program?

     __48.5__ enthusiastically __29.7__ positively __12.3__ indifferently __9.5__ negatively

7.  In terms of readiness for the next school year, SWRL children compared with
    non-SWRL children (this year or other years)

     __4__ better prepared   __4__ about the same   ____ less well prepared

8.  Objectives of the Instructional Concepts Program were accomplished

     __7__ very well   __1__ moderately well   ____ poorly

9.  Objectives of the Beginning Reading Program were accomplished

     __6__ very well   __3__ moderately well   ____ poorly

10. Record keeping was:

___no problem ___7___ time consuming but necessary

___1___ unnecessarily time consuming

11. The SWRL Program in terms of my 1973 Kindergarten Philosophy is

___7___ acceptable ___2___ in conflict (explain)

_____

_____

12. The PAL Program was

___7___helpful ___1___unnecessary ___2___not used _____a problem (explain)

_____

_____

13. The Tutor Program was

___4___helpful _____unnecessary ___3___not used _____a problem (explain)

_____

_____

14. District In-Service preparation for participation in the program was

___2___very adequate ___5___adequate ___1___inadequate

15. Would you want to participate in the SWRL Program next year?

___7___Yes ___1___no

16. I feel the program should be:

___6___continued ___6___expanded _____eliminated

17. Criticisms of the program:

A. Record Keeping is a problem
B. Holding to a time schedule
C.

18. Suggestions for improving the teaching of the program.

Introduce vowels        screen out children not "ready"        Re-evaluate time schedules
                         Grouping children may help

19. Additional Comments:

ICP is not necessary for some children

_____

2225

SWRL KINDERGARTEN PROGRAM

ADMINISTRATOR OPINIONNAIRE

March, 1973      School___, _TALLY_____

To help evaluate the SWRL Kindergarten Program used on a limited basis in Birmingham this last year, we are requesting that teachers, parents and administrators react to several questions. Your assistance is appreciated. Check all appropriate areas. Please return to the office of Director of Curriculum within 2 days.

1.  The SWRL Program has had the following effect on the children in my building.

    __5__ stimulated and challenged  __1__ unduly pressured
    __1__ no noticeable difference from previous program

2.  Children have seemed to enjoy participating in the Program.

    __2__ very much  __5__ much  __1__ some  ____ very little  ____ not at all

3.  In my estimation the objectives of the Instructional Concepts have been

    __6__ very well  __1__ moderately well  ____ poorly

4.  In my opinion the objectives of the BRP are or have been accomplished.

    __5__ very well  __2__ moderately well  ____ poorly

5.  Compared to other Kindergarten Programs the SWRL Program is

    __5__ superior  __1__ about same  __1__ inferior

6.  We oriented parents to the program by

    __7__ providing literature  __6__ conducting an orientation program at school
    ____ other.
    (comment on parent reception of this orientation_____

    _____

7.  With regard to the SWRL Program, parents have been

    __7__ supportive  ____ indifferent  ____ negative

8.  My involvement in record keeping was

    __6__ no problem  __1__ time consuming but necessary  ____ excessively time consuming

9.  The reaction of the kindergarten teacher involved in the program has been

    __7__ positive  ____ indifferent  ____ negative

26

23

10. The SWRL Program assessed in terms of my Kindergarten Philosophy is

    __6__ acceptable    __1__ in conflict (explain)_____

11. I feel the program should be

    __5__ continued    __4__ expanded    _____ eliminated

12. The PAL Program was

    __6__ helpful    _____ unnecessary    __1__ not used    _____ a problem (explain)

    _____

    _____

13. The Tutor Program was

    __3__ helpful    _____ unnecessary    __4__ not used    _____ a problem (explain)

    _____

    _____

14. At my school, if given the opportunity next year, I would like to involve

    __7__ all kindergarten classes    _____ 1 class    _____ no class

15. Criticism of Program_____

    _____

16. Suggestions for improving the operation of the program  Re-evaluate pacing schedule;

    Include all children in program but fit it to their needs;  Screen children out

    not "ready"_____

17. Additional comments:_____

    _____

    _____

24

-2-    27

## SUBTEST RESULTS OF PACER READING TEST

### Table 3
### SWRL Evaluation for Goetz By LaBay (1974)

Data Format (I1, F3.0,6F2.0) - SIGHT VOCABULARY

ANALYSIS OF COVARIANCE: Problem No. 1  Covariate Variable 1 Criterion Variable 2

| Sources | DF | SSX | SP | SSY | ADJ DF | ADJ SSY | ADJ MSY |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Between | 1. | 268.000 | 18.875 | 1.332 | 1. | 1.563 | 1.563 |
| Within | 70. | 6783.000 | -49.938 | 132.613 | 69. | 132.246 | 1.917 |
| Total | 71. | 7051.000 | -31.063 | 133.945 | 70. | 133.808 | |

Analysis of Variance (Covariate) F = 2.766 DF = 1, 70 Omega Squared = 0.935
Analysis of Variance (Criterion) F = 0.703 DF = 1, 70 Omega Squared = 0.962
Analysis of Covariance(Criterion) F = 0.815 DF = 1, 69 Omega Squared = 0.960
Correlation of Cov. & Crit. Var. = -0.032  Slope = -0.007

### Table 4
### SWRL Evaluation for Goetz By LaBay (1974)

Data Format (I1, F3.0, 6F2.0) - INITIAL CONSONANT SUBSTITUTION

ANALYSIS OF COVARIANCE.  Problem No. 2   Covariate Variable 1   Criterion Variable 3

| Sources | DF | SSX | SP | SSY | ADJ DF | ADJ SSY | ADJ MSY |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Between | 1. | 268.000 | 4.875 | 0.090 | 1. | 0.121 | 0.121 |
| Within | 70. | 6783.000 | -22.625 | 59.410 | 69. | 59.335 | 0.860 |
| Total | 71. | 7051.000 | -17.750 | 59.500 | 70. | 59.455 | |

Analysis of Variance (Covariate) F = 2.766 DF = 1, 70 Omega Squared = 0.935
Analysis of Variance (Criterion) F = 0.100 DF = 1, 70 Omega Squared = 0.970
Analysis of Covariance (Criterion) F = 0.140 DF = 1, 69 Omega Squared = 0.969
Correlation of Cov. & Crit. Var. = -0.027  Slope = -0.003

## Table 5
### SWRL Evaluation for Goetz By LaBay (1974)

Data Format (I1, F3.0, 6F2.01) - INFLECTED ENDINGS

ANALYSIS OF COVARIANCE. Prob No. 3    Covariate Variable 1    Criterion Variable 4

| Sources | DF | SSX | SP | SSY | ADJ DF | ADJ SSY | ADJ MSY |
|---------|-----|--------|--------|---------|--------|---------|---------|
| Between | 1. | 268.000 | -6.375 | 0.152 | 1. | 0.315 | 0.315 |
| Within | 70. | 6783.000 | 75.563 | 179.629 | 69. | 178.787 | 2.591 |
| Total | 71. | 7051.000 | 69.188 | 179.781 | 70. | 179.102 | |

Analysis of Variance (Covariate) F = 2.766  DF = 1, 70  Omega Squared = 0.935
Analysis of Variance (Criterion) F = 0.059  DF = 1, 70  Omega Squared = 0.971
Analysis of Covariance (Criterion)F = 0.122  DF = 1, 69  Omega Squared = 0.970
Correlation of Cov. & Crit. Var. = 0.061  Slope = 0.011

## Table 6
### SWRL Evaluation For Goetz By LaBay (1974)

Data Format (I1, F3.0, 6F2.0) - COMPOUND WORDS

ANALYSIS OF COVARIANCE. Problem No. 4    Covariate Variable 1    Criterion Variable 5

| Sources | DF | SSX | SP | SSY | ADJ DF | ADJ SSY | ADJ MSY |
|---------|-----|--------|---------|---------|--------|---------|---------|
| B tween | 1. | 268.000 | -28.438 | 3.012 | 1. | 3.219 | 3.219 |
| Within | 70. | 6783.000 | 38.813 | 332.102 | 69. | 331.879 | 4.810 |
| Total | 71. | 7051.000 | 10.375 | 335.113 | 70. | 335.098 | |

Analysis of Variance (Covariate)  F = 2.766  DF = 1, 70  Omega Squared = 0.935
Analysis of Variance (Criterion)  F = 0.635  DF = 1, 70  Omega Squared = 0.963
Analysis of Covariance (Criterion  F = 0.669  DF = 1, 69  Omega Squared = 0.962
Correlation of Cov. & Crit. Var. = 0.007  Slope = 0.006

## Table 7
### SWRL Evaluation for Goetz By LaBay (1974)

Data Format  (I1, F3.0, 6F2.0) - COMPREHENSION - SENTENCE COMPLETION

| Sources | DF | SSX | SP | SSY | ADJ DF | ADJ SSY | ADJ MSY |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Between | 1. | 268.000 | -10.563 | 0.414 | 1. | 0.669 | 0.669 |
| Within | 70. | 6783.000 | 78.813 | 226.906 | 69. | 225.991 | 3.275 |
| Total | 71. | 7051.000 | 68.250 | 227.320 | 70. | 226.660 | |

| | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Analysis of Variance (Covariate) | F = 2.766 | DF = 1, 70 | Omega Squared = 0.935 |
| Analysis of Variance (Criterion) | F = 0.128 | DF = 1, 70 | Omega Squared = 0.970 |
| Analysis of Covariance (Criterion) | F = 0.204 | DF = 1, 69 | Omega Squared = 0.969 |
| Correlation of Cov. & Crit. Var. = 0.054 | Slope = 0.012 | | |


## Table 8
### SWRL Evaluation for Goetz by LaBay (1974)

Data Format  (I1, F3.0, 6F2.0)      COMPREHENSION - MAIN IDEA, ETC.

| Sources | DF | SSX | SP | SSY | ADJ DF | ADJ SSY | ADJ MSY |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Between | 1. | 268.000 | -10.563 | 0.548 | 1. | 0.669 | 0.669 |
| Within | 70. | 6783.000 | 78.813 | 216.811 | 69. | 225.991 | 3.275 |
| Total | 71. | 7051.000 | 68.250 | 217.3590 | 70. | 226.660 | |

| | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Analysis of Variance (Covariate) | F = 2.766 | DF = 1, 70 | Omega Squared = 0.935 |
| Analysis of Variance (Criterion) | F = 0.130 | DF = 1, 70 | Omega Squared = 0.970 |
| Analysis of Covariance (Criterion) | F = 0.210 | DF = 1, 69 | Omega Squared = 0.969 |
| Correlation of Cov. & Crit. Var. = 0.067 | Slope = 0.034 | | |

QUESTIONS ASKED ABOUT THE.
SWRL KINDERGARTEN PROGRAM

1.  Was the SWRL Kindergarten Program developed for use with groups or with
    individual children?

    The instructional program was developed to be effective when
    instruction is provided on a whole class, small group, or individual
    basis.  The program has been shown to produce the intended outcomes
    with high dependability in a variety of instructional settings.

2.  Is the Instructional Concepts Program (ICP) a reading readiness program?

    ICP was developed to help kindergarten children quickly learn
    conceptual skills identified as fundamental to, academic achievement.
    It is a general school readiness rather than a reading readiness
    program.  ICP is not a prerequisite for the Beginning Reading
    Program (BRP), which is a complete beginning reading program for
    the kindergarten pupil.  The development of prereading and direction-
    following skills is stressed in early sections of BRP.

3.  How were the concepts selected for ICP?

    From an analysis of curriculum guides, a list of concepts commonly
    used in first-grade instruction was compiled.  This list of concepts
    was revised in accordance with the suggestions of experienced pri-
    mary grade teachers and curriculum specialists, and analyses of pre-
    test and posttest performance of more than 1,400 kindergarten children.

4.  Are the two programs, BRP and ICP, used concurrently?

    ICP is not a prerequisite for BRP.  However, it is suggested that
    if both ICP and BRP are to be used, that one or two units of ICP
    be completed before instruction in BRP begins.  The initial experi-
    ence of teachers and pupils with ICP will facilitate the introduction
    of BRP.  After Unit 1 of ICP is completed, BRP Teacher Training should
    commence so that BRP can be introduced concurrently with ICP Unit 3
    or sooner.  Since ICP takes approximately 12 weeks to complete, the
    two programs will run concurrently for approximately eight weeks.

5.  How has program effectiveness been insured?

    Effective product development procedures typically involve field testing
    of the product under conditions similar to those in which it will ulti-
    mately be used and revision of the product based upon performance of
    pupils under those conditions.  The SWRL Kindergarten Program has been
    tried out with more than 100,000 kindergarten children.  Each of the
    Kindergarten Program components has undergone continuous sequential
    evaluation.  Beginning with early formulation activities in 1966, through
    the large-scale tryouts of 1969-70 and 1970-71, the Laboratory has
    continued to modify the Kindergarten Program on the basis of pupil
    performance data and teacher feedback.  The Kindergarten Program is
    now ready for large-scale distribution.

6. How was the effectiveness of the Kindergarten Program evaluated?

The Kindergarten Program underwent the continuous formative evaluation cycle of development, evaluation and revision. Data were collected through criterion-referenced tests based on prespecified program outcomes, classroom observations by development personnel, and questionnaires and meetings with tryout teachers.

The measurement of pupil performance was criterion referenced. This means that measures were employed to determine a pupil's achievement in relation to an established performance criterion. The criterion-referenced approach to evaluation may be contrasted with norm-referenced measures, employed to determine a pupil's status in relation to others on the same instrument. The overall effectiveness of BRP was thus continuously evaluated in terms of the degree to which its designated instructional outcomes were attained in a variety of settings and at a given cost level.

7. What data exist on the effects of structured reading instruction on the personality of the kindergarten child?

Extensive data regarding the effects of BRP on kindergarten children were collected during the five-year tryout period through classroom observations and questionnaires completed by teachers and parents. Teachers and parents reported that their children did not experience undue pressure in the reading program, and that the children enjoyed participating in the program more than they enjoyed most school activities.

8. Was the Kindergarten Program developed for use with children of a particular aptitude level or socioeconomic status?

The Kindergarten Program was developed to accommodate the entire population of children who had not yet achieved the program objectives. A wide aptitude range was considered in the development of the program, and the widest possible range of socioeconomic status was included in field testing. The program was individualized such that students of all abilities could function at levels appropriate to their needs.

9. How is the progress of individual pupils assessed?

The programs are organized into units to provide check points for assessment of each child's progress. The teacher is able to verify the skill attainment of each child by administering the Criterion Exercise following each unit of instruction. If necessary, the teacher can prescribe certain Practice Exercises for pupils who have not yet attained the unit skills.

10. Are the Criterion Exercises a form of standardized test?

No. Criterion Exercises assess pupil learning on specific outcomes. They are not general achievement measures and are not used to compare pupils.

292

11. What are the duration and number of units of each instructional program?

> The ICP consists of seven units and is completed in approximately 58 days if 20 minutes per day are used for instruction. The BRP is organized into ten units. Tryouts indicate that children are able to attain the planned learning outcomes of BRP when an average of approximately 25 minutes per day are used.

12. Does the Kindergarten Program affect a teacher's normal grouping procedures?

> The classroom can be organized in any way suitable to the teacher. The program permits individualization of instruction based on reliable information concerning the progress of each child.

13. Does the Kindergarten Program include learning games?

> Games suggested for use with each unit of instruction are designed to maximize the participation of children in activities which relate directly to attainment of unit skills.

14. Can any of the activities in the Kindergarten Program be performed by a non-professional?

> When learning tasks require considerable practice (as they do in learning to read), non-professionals can help maintain and strengthen learning. The assistance of aides, parents, and other students can be a powerful tool in maximizing learning outcomes and individualizing instruction.

15. Must the suggested instructional schedule be followed?

> It is recommended that the suggested instructional scheduling be followed in order to complete the program during the school year and to maximize skill attainment. Time allocations should be adjusted by the teacher to adapt to the abilities of the children in a given class.

16. Were the Instructional Support Systems developed for use with all pupils or just for those requiring additional help?

> The Tutorial Program supplements regular classroom instruction in BRP by providing individualized practice for those pupils requiring additional help to attain program outcomes. The Parent Assisted Learning Program supplements regular classroom BRP instruction for the entire class by utilizing the structured assistance of each child's parents. The Summer Reading Program is a parent-managed program used following the kindergarten year. The program was developed to maintain the reading skills acquired in kindergarten.

17. What data exist on the effectiveness of the support programs (PAL, Tutorial and Summer Reading), in supplementing the reading instruction presented by the teacher?

> Tryouts of each program revealed that its use in combination with BRP resulted in increased pupil achievement over use of BRP alone.

18. How structured is each of the Support Programs? Are there specific procedures for the tutor or parent to follow in responding to the pupil's answers?

> The specially prepared materials used by tutors and parents provide pupils with individualized practice on program outcomes. Tutors and parents are trained in specific support skills such as how to respond to incorrect answers and how to conduct instructional practice sessions.

19. Are the Practice Exercises in the Tutorial Program different from the Practice Exercises in BRP?

> No, the same Practice Exercises are used in both programs. These exercises, assigned on the basis of each child's Criterion Exercise performance, are designed to provide additional individual practice on specific unit skills.

20. Does the Summer Reading Program material include the same storybooks and practice exercises used in the BRP?

> Parents using the Summer Reading Program receive ten weekly kits of specially prepared materials. Each kit contains practice exercises, a storybook, a record sheet, and an animal poster.

21. What is included in the Kindergarten Program Quality Assurance System?

> The Quality Assurance System includes assessment materials and procedures developed to provide en route information on each aspect of the instructional and instructional support programs to insure that the prespecified performance criteria have been attained.

22. What kind of training is provided for the Kindergarten Program?

> School district personnel are trained in program use prior to their participation in the Kindergarten Program. The Laboratory has developed systematic training programs for each of the instructional and support systems. Each training system includes: 1) a program for training district appointed trainers who in turn assume responsibility for training teachers, and 2) a program for training teachers.

> The training system is organized to require approximately 1½ hours per program.

23. Can initial orders be placed for individual components of ICP and/or BRP, e.g., for storybooks only?

> The integrity of instruction is protected by restricing initial orders to complete instructional systems: ICP and/or BRP.

24. Are the support systems available for purchase independent of the BRP?

> Availability of the support systems is contingent upon purchase of the BRP. The support systems were developed and structured to supplement BRP, and assume initial BRP instruction by the classroom teacher.

25. How were publishers notified of the intended private sector distribution of the Kindergarten Program?

> All eligible publishers received the February 15, 1971, Request for Proposal and all had an equal opportunity to respond to the BRP for publication and marketing of the program.