

DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 113 692

88

CS 002 195

AUTHOR Brottman, Marvin A.
 TITLE Multigrade Helping Relationship Program; A Third Year Evaluation of the ESEA Title III. End of Project Report.
 INSTITUTION Chicago Board of Education, Ill. Dept. of Government Funded Programs.
 SPONS AGENCY Bureau of School Systems (DHEW/OE), Washington, D.C.
 PUB DATE 75
 NOTE 47p.; Not available in hard copy due to marginal legibility of original document

EDRS PRICE MF-\$0.76 Plus Postage. HC Not Available from EDRS.
 DESCRIPTORS Attendance; *Cross Age Teaching; Curriculum Development; Elementary Education; Inservice Education; Peer Teaching; *Reading Achievement; *Reading Instruction; *Reading Programs; Social Studies; Student Attitudes; Student Teacher Relationship; Study Skills; Team Teaching; *Tutorial Programs

IDENTIFIERS Elementary Secondary Education Act Title III; ESEA Title III

ABSTRACT

The purpose of the program described in this report was to improve reading and other basic skills of third- and sixth-grade children by providing a program in which sixth-grade children tutored third-grade children. Three classrooms of third-grade children and three classrooms of sixth-grade children were involved in this endeavor over a three-year period of time. During the first two years of the project, there were minimal reading score gains. During the final year of the project it was shown that more than half of the children in each grade gained more than they had the preceding year. Some of the other findings were that teachers participated in inservice programs extensively, developed and modified units of instruction, and utilized a variety of major curriculum systems. Attendance rose in the entire school during the three years. Research skills showed only minimal gains on a standardized test. A test of children's attitudes indicated that they liked each other and liked what they were doing. Teachers indicated positive feelings about themselves and the program. (MKM)

 * Documents acquired by ERIC include many informal unpublished *
 * materials not available from other sources. ERIC makes every effort *
 * to obtain the best copy available. Nevertheless, items of marginal *
 * reproducibility are often encountered and this affects the quality *
 * of the microfiche and hardcopy reproductions ERIC makes available *
 * via the ERIC Document Reproduction Service (EDRS). EDRS is not *
 * responsible for the quality of the original document. Reproductions *
 * supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made from the original. *

ED113692

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

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

A THIRD YEAR EVALUATION OF THE ESEA TITLE III

MULTIGRADE HELPING RELATIONSHIP PROGRAM

End of Project Report

Prepared by

Marvin A. Brottman, Ph.D.

Governors State University

For The

Department of Government Funded Programs

Board of Education of the City of Chicago

June 1975

002 195

Table of Contents

| | Page |
|---|------|
| Acknowledgements | i |
| Description of project; Summary of objectives | 1 |
| Objective 1, Teachers will participate in in-service programs | 3 |
| Objective 2, Each teacher will modify and define existing units of instruction and will write six mini-units | 3 |
| Objective 3, Teachers will use at least one major curriculum system and one or more compatible supplementary system in each main subject area | 4 |
| Objective 4, Fifty percent of the participants in both grade levels will show an increase in the rate of growth in reading skills over that of the same pupils in the previous year | 5 |
| Table 1, Third Grade Reading Scores | 7 |
| Table 2, Sixth Grade Reading Scores | 7 |
| Objective 5, Attendance of pupils will improve over that of last year by 20 percent. In addition, attendance of pupils in both grades will be compared to that on non-Multigrade third and sixth grade pupils | 8 |
| Objective 6, Research skills will be developed in children | 10 |
| Objective 7, Evaluation of children's attitudes towards each other, themselves, and towards school | 11 |
| Table 3, Research Skills, Third Grade Scores | 12 |
| Table 4, Research Skills, Sixth Grade Scores | 12 |
| Table 5, Tool I, Classroom Life | 14 |
| Table 6, Tool II, My Teacher | 16 |
| Table 7, Tool III, Postclass Reactions | 18 |
| Table 8, Tool IV, How this Class Feels | 20 |
| Table 9, Tool V, How Do You Feel About These Things? | 21 |
| Table 10, Tool VI, How Do You Think Your Teacher Feels? | 23 |
| Objective 8, Teachers will describe changes in comfort and competence in working with colleagues and others | 26 |
| Conclusions | 27 |

ACKNOWLEDGEMENT

The outside evaluator, Dr. Marvin A. Brotzman, wishes to express gratitude for the generous cooperation given to him by the many personnel involved with the Multigrade Helping Relationship Program.

The Department of Government Funded Programs, Board of Education of the City of Chicago, was the source of assistance, direction, and support. Special recognition is given to Mr. Clifford Claiborne, Administrator of Chicago Title III Program, for his assistance in the initiation and continuance of this project of the past three years. Mrs. Chesna Weisberg for the past three years gave generously of her time to work with the evaluator. Her wise counsel, support, and leadership were deeply appreciated. A special note of thanks is given to teachers who participated in the program. They are: Edith Grohs, Patricia O'Connell, Jimmie Pate, Kathleen Retker, Jacqueline Spillman, and Ambrose Williams. Thanks is also given to the following teacher's aides: Sandra Hauley, Ernestine Greggs, Beverly Hill, and Sandra Harris.

The staff members of the project through the years were most helpful in evaluating the program. The doors to the project were always open, and they had the vital task of distributing, collecting, and tallying the data obtained from various sources. The work was always well done and completed in time to meet the necessary deadlines.

A word of thanks is also due to the many parents, community members, and students whose help made this project possible.

EVALUATION OF THE MULTIGRADE HELPING RELATIONSHIP PROGRAM

THIRD YEAR REPORT 1974-75

Introduction

The Multigrade Helping Relationship Program funded by ESEA Title III, completed its three year operation in June 1975. This project was initiated in 1972. The Applications for Continuation Grants were submitted in May 1973 & 1974, and were approved for the three years of funded operation.

The basic concept of the original proposal, for funding under public law 89-10, as amended Title III, Elementary and Secondary Education Act, remained unchanged throughout the years that this program has operated.

The primary purpose of the project, Multigrade Helping Relationship Program, was to raise pupil's achievement in reading and related skills. In order to achieve the objectives of the project as expressed in the primary purpose, a wide range of personnel was involved in this program. These personnel included teachers, school counselors, administrators, parents, community representatives, and students.

This final report will attempt to answer the major questions that were posed by the original project proposal. In addition to these, some questions were added and included in the evaluation proposal. These are the questions to be answered:

OBJECTIVE 1. TEACHERS WILL PARTICIPATE IN IN-SERVICE PROGRAMS.

OBJECTIVE 2. EACH TEACHER WILL MODIFY AND REFINE EXISTING UNITS OF INSTRUCTION AND WILL WRITE SIX MINI-UNITS.

OBJECTIVE 3. TEACHERS WILL USE AT LEAST ONE MAJOR SYSTEM AND ONE OR MORE COMPATIBLE SUPPLEMENTARY SYSTEMS IN EACH MAIN SUBJECT AREA.

OBJECTIVE 4. FIFTY PERCENT OF THE PARTICIPANTS IN BOTH GRADE LEVELS WILL SHOW AN INCREASE IN THE RATE OF GROWTH IN READING SKILLS OVER THAT OF THE SAME PUPILS THE PREVIOUS YEAR.

OBJECTIVE 5. ATTENDANCE OF PUPILS WILL IMPROVE OVER THAT OF LAST YEAR BY

20 PERCENT. IN ADDITION, ATTENDANCE OF PUPILS ON BOTH GRADES WILL BE

COMPARED TO THAT OF NON-MULTIGRADE THIRD AND SIXTH GRADE PUPILS.

OBJECTIVE 6. RESEARCH SKILLS WILL BE DEVELOPED IN CHILDREN.

OBJECTIVE 7. EVALUATION OF CHILDREN'S ATTITUDES TOWARDS EACH OTHER, THEMSELVES,
AND TOWARDS SCHOOL.

OBJECTIVE 8. TEACHERS WILL DESCRIBE THEIR COMFORT AND/OR COMPETENCE IN WORKING
WITH (A) COLLEAGUES, (B) CURRICULUM, (C) CHILDREN, (D) AIDES, (E) VISITORS,
AND (F) ADMINISTRATORS.

The Multigrade Helping Relationship Program has been in operation at the Aldridge Elementary School located in the Altgeld-Murray Public Housing Project on Chicago's far south side from September 1972 to June 1975. The program has developed a procedure to allow children in sixth grade classrooms to work closely with children in third grade classrooms using a tutoring partnership relationship. The older children worked with younger ones on a variety of carefully structured tasks. The relationship went beyond a simple remedial tutoring relationship in that children worked together on a variety of subject matter units and projects as well as in skill development, both as partners and as groups of partners. The children worked together more frequently in math and in reading than in the other subject areas. All the other areas were included from time-to-time.

Six classroom teachers were involved in the project from its inception. Three were third grade and three were sixth grade teachers. In addition, four teacher aides were employed from the beginning of the program. The aides worked with both third and sixth grade teachers.

Although the number of pupils varied over the course of three years, about 50 third and about 60 sixth grade children were involved in the project. Children assigned to the participating teachers were asked to volunteer for the tutoring program and were matched by choice and/or by ability. Both third and sixth grade children were trained for the program at the beginning of each year. Teacher aides were involved in the training but functioned primarily in freeing teachers to do most of the necessary work.

Objective 1, Teachers will participate in in-service programs.

This objective remains unchanged from the original 1972 project proposal. The purpose of including this objective was to encourage the six teachers in the program to work together to plan and implement the program. Over a three year period, the six teachers (with one being replaced by a new teacher at the beginning of the last year) met together as a group occasionally including other faculty, teacher aides, evaluators, parents, and resource people. A regular schedule was established so that each day the teachers met regularly from 12 to 12:30.

In the beginning, the primary group tasks included selection and development of teaching units; decisions about grouping pupils, the training program for teacher aides, and the development of the evaluative techniques in consultation with outside evaluators.

In the course of these discussions, some modifications were made in several of the objectives of the program which were subsequently submitted as part of the proposal for renewal. In addition to the revised objectives, two additional objectives were added because it was felt by the teachers that these were pertinent to the thrust of the Multigrade Program. The two objectives not in the original proposal concerned the measurement of children's attitudes and behaviors towards themselves and others, and this last year, the self-perception of teachers of their competence in working with others.

Since the evaluator worked closely with the teachers in the project, it can be stated with assurance that the objective was met.

Objective 2, Each teacher will modify and define existing units of instruction and will write six mini-units.

The objective was achieved. Between September 1972, and May 1973, five units of instruction were prepared. Although the initial schedule

suggested that a given unit would be taught over a two month period of time, in practice it was determined that units would take more time than was available. Consequently, during the first year of operation, teaching units were rescheduled for the end of the year or the beginning of the following year.

From 1973 to 1974, two units of instruction were developed. These were implemented during that year in addition to continued use of those developed the preceding year. For the third and final funding year of the project, many units were derived from the previously developed longer teaching units. These were used with smaller groups of children and were modified as needed changes were identified.

Overall, the following units were developed, modified and used; Map Skills, Learning about the Earth, The Indians, Our Changing Earth, The African Family South of the Sahara Desert, and Man's Dependence on Plants. Copies of these units were attached as appendices to the Final Reports of the years 1973 and 1974. Overall, the units developed by the teachers were used extensively by all teachers, modified continually and used as a basis for developing a number of mini-units.

Objective 3, Teachers will use at least one major curriculum system and one or more compatible supplementary system in each main subject area.

This objective was well met. During the first two years of the project, a variety of major and minor curriculum systems were used in the area of language arts, reading, math, science, and social studies. Teachers were consistently involved in examining new systems, modifying old systems in order to make each system used appropriate to the levels and interest levels of their children. During the final year of operation, those systems used earlier continued to be used with little or no modification. Since the teachers worked as a team, each teacher had complete access to curriculum

systems used by other teachers. The physical arrangements of the classrooms were such that these materials were easily accessible to both children and teachers of all grades.

Objective 4, Fifty percent of the participation in both grade levels will show an increase in the rate of growth in reading skills over that of the same pupils in the previous year.

This objective has been modified each of the three years of the project. The initial objective read "pupils will raise achievement levels in reading by participation in the program." To determine the achievement of this objective in 1973, two comparison groups were established for third grade children; the Multigrade group of third graders was an experimental group while the remainder of the third graders not involved in the program were identified as a control group. The test used at that time was the Metropolitan Achievement Test, Reading Subtest that was being used by elementary schools in Chicago. A comparison of posttest mean scores of the two groups showed a modest difference in favor of the control group and so it was suggested in the Final Report, 1973, that participation in the Program appeared to make little difference in reading test scores.

For the 1974-75 school year, Chicago schools discontinued the use of the Metropolitan Achievement Test and began using the Iowa Test of Basic Skills. Since there were no levels low enough in the Iowa Test to measure third grade children, the California Achievement Tests, Form A, Level 2, was used in the project. The original objective was modified somewhat so that during the second year it read "fifty percent of the children in each level will make greater growth in reading skills as compared to a control group." This specification of the fifty percent was made in anticipation that it could be achieved. Again, the Multigrade children were designated as an experimental group and the other third grade children were identified

A comparison of posttest scores between the two groups showed a slight advantage to the experimental group over the control group. However, the difference was so slight, it was not seen as presenting anything that could allow one to say that the Multigrade children performed better.

The final modification of the objective to compare the rate of growth of children to themselves would allow an inference to be made that if the rate of growth this year was greater than that of the previous year, part of the increase might be attributed to participation in the Multigrade Program. Pupils who were not in attendance in the school during both years were not included in the sample.

Inspection of Table 1 showing third grade reading scores comparing median and mean scores for 1973 to 1974 and again for 1974 to 1975, does not indicate clearly whether or not 50 percent of the total number of pupils in the sample of 43 made gains greater the current year than they made the preceding year. In examining the 43 sets of scores, however, the differences between the scores does indicate that 22 of the 43 pupils in the sample did make gains in the current year greater than those gains made the preceding year. Therefore, the objective for third graders was in fact achieved.

For sixth graders, the same modification of objectives were made as for third grade pupils. The Metropolitan Achievement Test Reading Subtest was used in 1973 and the Iowa Test of Basic Skills, Form 6, Level 10-11 was used in 1974 and 1975. No important gains were made in 1973 or 1974.

Table 2 contains a summary of sixth grade reading scores for all three years.

For sixth grade pupils, the objective was achieved. Of the 47 pupils in the sample, 26 of the children did show gains between 1974 and 1975 greater than those made between 1973 and 1974. Again, as with third graders a simple inspection of differences in median and mean scores does not indicate the numbers of pupils involved in making the gain. A direct inspection of

Table 1
Third Grade Reading Scores
California Achievement Test, Form A, Level 2

| | May, 1973 N=43 | May, 1974 N=43 | May, 1975 N=43 |
|-----------------------|-------------------|-------------------|-------------------|
| Range | 1.2-3.1 | 1.5-5.5 | 1.5-7.7 |
| Median | 1.62 | 2.60 | 3.50 |
| Mean | 1.73 | 2.69 | 3.65 |
| Mean Score Difference | | .96 | .96* |

*22 students improved over their previous year

Table 2
Sixth Grade Reading Scores
Iowa Test of Basic Skills, Form 6, Levels 10-11

| | May, 1973 N=47 | May, 1974 N=47 | May, 1975 N=47 |
|-----------------------|-------------------|-------------------|-------------------|
| Range | 1.8-6.0 | 2.1-6.8 | 1.8-8.2 |
| Median | 3.30 | 4.30 | 5.10 |
| Mean | 3.40 | 4.27 | 5.29 |
| Mean Score Difference | | .87 | 1.02* |

*26 students improved over their previous year

these specific scores does show that the gains were made.

The achievement of this new objective is very important for the program. The individual objective was changed in order to hypothesize that children who were involved in the Multigrade Program would have their reading scores improved as compared to those same children during the time that they were not participants in the program. This has been achieved. Whether or not the Multigrade Program was a main factor in affecting these scores is not clear since no comparisons were made between Multigrade participants and non-Multigrade participants. In some future study, it might be important to inspect all of these data and compare them.

Objective 5. Attendance of pupils will improve over that of last year by 20 percent. In addition, attendance of pupils in both grades will be compared to that of non-Multigrade third and sixth grade pupils.

This objective has remained the same over the project's three years with the addition this year of the comparison of project to non-project pupil attendance.

The sample of pupils each year has always excluded those ill or absent for more than one week since extended absence due to conditions beyond the influence of the school would not have been a fair assessment of the possible influence of the program on school attendance. Actual possible days of attendance were counted from September to May 30 each year.

In the 1973 Final Report, it was reported that attendance for the same pupils improved 14.5 percent over that of the previous year. 1974 showed an increase in attendance of 15.5 percent. Information about current Multigrade children is listed below:

Number of pupils included in attendance figures, 92

School Year 1973-1974
Maximum possible attendance-171 days

School Year 1974-1975
Maximum possible attendance-168 days

| | |
|--------------------------|------|
| Total absences 1973-1974 | 1593 |
| 1974-1975 | 1198 |

Decrease 395

Increase in attendance 25 percent.

The second part of Objective 5 calls for a comparison of the attendance of Multigrade children to the other third and sixth graders.

Maximum days of attendance-168

| | |
|---|-----|
| Number of non-Multigrade pupils 1974-1975 | 109 |
| Number of Multigrade pupils 1974-1975 | 92 |

| | |
|---|-------|
| Maximum days attendance, non-Multigrade | 18312 |
| Absences | 1.33 |

| | |
|-------------------------------------|-------|
| Maximum days attendance, Multigrade | 15456 |
| Absences | 1198 |

| | |
|---------------------------|-----|
| Non-Multigrade attendance | 93% |
| Multigrade attendance | 93% |

The comparison of Multigrade pupil attendance between 1974 and 1975 shows a substantial increase in attendance. As indicated above, attendance has improved each year over that of the preceding year suggesting that the program has had some effect on attendance. This notion is not substantiated when comparing attendance for Multigrade and non-Multigrade children; attendance is almost identical.

A comparison of attendance by grade for Multigrade to non-Multigrade shows little difference.

| Grade | Multigrade | | | Non-Multigrade | | |
|-------|------------|----------|-----------|----------------|----------|-----------|
| | Pupils | Absences | % Absence | Pupils | Absences | % Absence |
| 3 | 41 | 464 | 9 | 59 | 628 | 9 |
| 6 | 51 | 734 | 7 | 50 | 805 | 6 |
| | 92 | 1198 | | 109 | 1423 | |

In conclusion, it appears the original objective has been surpassed while the additional objective has not been substantiated.

Objective 6, Research skills will be developed in children.

In this project, research skills were defined as the use of reference materials, text books other than regular text books, library books, magazines, pictures, materials from home and other reference materials. In addition to the use of reference materials, research skills were also defined in terms of scores obtained through use of the California Achievement Test, Study Skills Subtest for third grade pupils and for sixth grade pupils the Iowa Test of Basic Skills, Form 6, categories Map Reading, Reading Graphs and Tables, and Knowledge and Use of Reference Materials.

In the first year of the program, the development of research skills was determined only by frequency of use of reference material. In 1974, skill measurement included standardized achievement test scores. No attempts were made to obtain "hard" data over the three-year life of the project. Instead, the goal was to have the children demonstrate that they were involved in a learning process that could be defined as research skill.

In each of the three years, children in both grade levels showed a substantial increase in the frequency of their use of the various materials from the beginning of the year to the end of the year.

Teachers used a variety of approaches to encourage the use of these materials including direct assignments in various subject matter areas and the use of a theater ticket approach in which each type of reference material was color coded. After using the material, the student deposited a ticket in a box which corresponded in color to the ticket. Periodically, a summary of the number of tickets was posted on a wall chart so that all students in the class could see the frequency of use.

The use of the Study Skills Subtest of the California Achievement Test for third graders was decided in order to obtain a rough approximation whether or not third graders improved in their ability to (a) Order Terms, utilize (b) Table of Contents and (c) an Index. These tests were not used

for any purpose except to give the teachers a better indication of some achievement. Table 3 summarizes scores for third graders on the California Achievement Test, Level 2, Study Skills Subtest.

As can be seen in Table 3, third graders gained substantially in ABC Order use from pre-test to posttest in 1974, but in 1975, they dropped in their score from pre-test to posttest. For both years, there was approximately the same amount of gain in the second and third categories, Table of Contents, and Index. It can be said for third grade children there appears to be some gain but not enough to warrant saying that this aspect of the objective has been achieved.

For sixth grade students the Iowa Test of Basic Skills, Form 6 was used as a means of obtaining some indication of their research skill achievement in the categories: (a) Map Reading, (b) Reading Graphs and Tables, and (c) Knowledge and Use of Reference Materials. In 1974, as shown in Table 4, there was a slight gain in Map Reading Skills and some drop in the two other categories. This changed somewhat in 1975, showing a gain in Map Reading Skills, a greater gain in Reading Graphs and Tables, and a lower gain in Knowledge and Use of Reference Materials. The scores for this year would seem to indicate that sixth graders have in fact, gained somewhat in their research skills in these three categories.

Indices of the acquisition of research skills as shown by the frequency of use of materials and standardized tests overall suggests that this objective was achieved.

Objective 7, Evaluation of children's attitudes towards each other, themselves, and towards school.

In order to assess various attitudes children hold toward each other, the Multigrade Program, and their teachers, six instruments or tools were used. These are the same tools that were used the previous two years and

Table 3
Research Skills
Third Grade Scores, Study Skills Subtest
California Achievement Test, Level 2

| Category | 1974 | | 1975 | | Difference |
|-------------------|---------------|---------------------------|---------------------------|------------------|------------|
| | Maximum Score | N=29 Pre-test Posttest | N=50 Pre-test Posttest | N=59 Posttest | |
| ABC Order | 5 | 1.48 | 2.78 | 2.20 | - .58 |
| Table of Contents | 3 | 1.03 | 1.40 | 1.59 | + .19 |
| Index | 2 | 0.58 | 0.78 | 1.17 | + .39 |
| | 10 | 3.09 | 4.96 | 4.96 | |

Table 4
Research Skills
Sixth Grade Scores, Iowa Tests of Basic Skills, Form 6

| Category | 1974 | | 1975 | | Difference |
|---|--------------------------------|-------------------------|--------------------------------|-------------------------|------------|
| | Obtained Mean Pre-test N=56 | Scores Posttest N=56 | Obtained Mean Pre-test N=49 | Scores Posttest N=53 | |
| Map Reading | 4.23 | 4.88 | 4.06 | 4.64 | + .58 |
| Reading Graphs and Tables | 4.36 | 3.59 | 3.78 | 4.78 | +1.00 |
| Knowledge and use of Reference Materials | 4.64 | 3.98 | 4.35 | 4.63 | + .28 |

were adapted from the tools found in the book Diagnosing Classroom Learning Environments by Robert Fox, et al., Chicago, SRA 1966. Each tool was selected to measure one particular aspect of the program that was deemed important by teachers and evaluators.

The procedures for the administration of the tools were essentially the same as that of previous years. All tools were to be administered to both third and sixth grade children during the months of October and again in May. All tools were unsigned. Where deemed appropriate, third grade teachers were to read certain items to their children if there was a question of their understanding the words or meaning. In all cases the same teachers were involved in administering the tools as in previous years, so it was assumed there would be consistent administration of the instruments. Some modifications were made in Tool No. 3, Postclass Reactions, when teachers indicated a concern that children still had some difficulty with the language of individual items. The changes were made at the beginning of this current year so that both pre-test and posttest results reflect the modification of the tool. This tool as well as all others used are included in the Appendix.

Since this is the third and final funding year of the project, the data obtained from the various tools will be examined in terms of the relationship between responses for third and sixth grade children for this year as well as differences in responses to the same tools over the last three years.

Tool 1, Classroom Life, was designed to identify the extent to which children appeared to like the tutoring class and how they felt about how hard they worked in comparison to others in class. As can be seen in Table 5, third graders have made no dramatic shifts in their perceptions from the pre-test to the posttest. As shown in Item 2, there was a slight shift to the perception of "working less hard" at the end of the year than at the beginning of the year. Other than that one item there was consistency from pre-test to posttest.

Table 5
Tool I - Classroom Life
Summary of Pretest-Posttest Responses

| GRADE 3 | | | | | GRADE 6 | | | | |
|----------------|--------|---------|------------------|---------|----------------|--------|---------|-----------------|---------|
| Pretest N = 54 | | | Posttest, N = 54 | | Pretest N = 53 | | | Posttest N = 53 | |
| Item | Number | Percent | Number | Percent | Item | Number | Percent | Number | Percent |
| 1a | 36 | 67 | 39 | 72 | 1a | 30 | 57 | 21 | 39 |
| b | 16 | 30 | 12 | 22 | b | 21 | 40 | 29 | 55 |
| c | 2 | 3 | 3 | 6 | c | 2 | 3 | 3 | 6 |
| 2a | 36 | 67 | 29 | 54 | 2a | 39 | 74 | 27 | 51 |
| b | 17 | 31 | 22 | 41 | b | 14 | 26 | 26 | 49 |
| c | 1 | 2 | 3 | 5 | c | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 3a | 32 | 59 | 29 | 54 | 3a | 38 | 72 | 29 | 55 |
| b | 14 | 26 | 21 | 39 | b | 13 | 25 | 22 | 41 |
| c | 8 | 15 | 4 | 7 | c | 2 | 3 | 2 | 4 |
| 4a | 17 | 31 | 16 | 29 | 4a | 17 | 32 | 16 | 30 |
| b | 28 | 52 | 30 | 55 | b | 31 | 58 | 34 | 64 |
| c | 9 | 17 | 8 | 16 | c | 5 | 10 | 3 | 6 |
| 5a | 33 | 61 | 28 | 52 | 5a | 31 | 58 | 18 | 34 |
| b | 17 | 31 | 21 | 39 | b | 13 | 25 | 27 | 51 |
| c | 4 | 8 | 5 | 9 | c | 9 | 17 | 8 | 15 |
| 6a | 43 | 80 | 41 | 76 | 6a | 41 | 77 | 38 | 72 |
| b | 9 | 17 | 12 | 22 | b | 11 | 21 | 15 | 28 |
| c | 2 | 3 | 1 | 2 | c | 1 | 2 | 0 | 0 |
| 7a | 15 | 28 | 20 | 37 | 7a | 12 | 23 | 18 | 34 |
| b | 31 | 57 | 25 | 46 | b | 37 | 70 | 33 | 62 |
| c | 8 | 15 | 9 | 17 | c | 4 | 7 | 2 | 4 |
| 8a | 27 | 50 | 27 | 50 | 8a | 29 | 55 | 24 | 45 |
| b | 21 | 39 | 24 | 45 | b | 21 | 40 | 29 | 55 |
| c | 6 | 11 | 3 | 5 | c | 3 | 5 | 0 | 0 |
| 9a | 15 | 28 | 16 | 29 | 9a | 11 | 21 | 3 | 6 |
| b | 29 | 54 | 28 | 52 | b | 35 | 66 | 37 | 69 |
| c | 10 | 18 | 10 | 19 | c | 7 | 13 | 13 | 25 |

For sixth graders there was a shift on Item 1 from "liking the tutoring class" to "sometimes liking the class," in Item 2 from "working hard" to "sometimes working hard," in Item 3 from being "very interested" to "sometimes being interested," in Item 5 from observing that "most children do what the teacher tells them" to "some of the students do what the teacher tells them" and in Item 9 from "pupils always acting friendly" to an increase of "pupils hardly ever acting friendly."

Grade 3 pre-test posttest scores were consistent with those of third graders over the previous two years with the exception of Item 6. In the past two years third graders were not convinced that the "teacher likes it a lot if they help each other in the tutoring class." This year students agreed that the "teacher does like it a lot." This would seem to imply that the entire notion of the tutoring class has been accepted by children to the extent that the tutoring process is acceptable and students have no reluctance to express that fact.

For sixth graders there appeared to be a change this year as compared to the preceding two years in Items 1, 5, and 9. These items concerned liking the class, doing what the teachers tells them to do, and friendliness of children to each other. In each of the three cases, there was a decrease in the frequency of observation. Taken collectively they would seem to suggest their becoming somewhat tired or disenchanted with certain aspects of the tutoring process. All scores taken together would seem to indicate that both groups of children saw the tutoring class as a place where they liked to be, where they worked together, and where they seemed to enjoy the tutoring process.

My teacher, Tool 2, is an instrument that asked how the children would like their teacher to change (see Table 6). Third graders wanted more help with work as shown on the posttest compared to the pre-test and seemed to want the teacher to "smile and laugh less." Other than those two items, scores were consistent between pre-test and posttest.

Table 6
 Tool II - My Teacher
 Summary of Pretest-Posttest Responses

| GRADE 3 | | | | | GRADE 6 | | | | |
|----------------|--------|---------|-----------------|---------|----------------|--------|---------|-----------------|---------|
| Pretest N = 53 | | | Posttest N = 54 | | Pretest N = 52 | | | Posttest N = 53 | |
| Item | Number | Percent | Number | Percent | Item | Number | Percent | Number | Percent |
| 1a | 18 | 34 | 29 | 53 | 1a | 12 | 23 | 22 | 41 |
| b | 26 | 49 | 21 | 39 | b | 38 | 73 | 30 | 57 |
| c | 5 | 9 | 4 | 7 | c | 2 | 4 | 1 | 2 |
| NR* | | | 4 | | | | | | |
| 2a | 5 | 9 | 10 | 18 | 2a | 2 | 4 | 8 | 15 |
| -b | 25 | 47 | 19 | 35 | b | 27 | 52 | 28 | 53 |
| c | 22 | 42 | 25 | 47 | c | 23 | 44 | 17 | 32 |
| NR | | | 1 | | | | | | |
| 3a | 27 | 51 | 28 | 52 | 3a | 19 | 37 | 23 | 43 |
| b | 20 | 38 | 21 | 39 | b | 30 | 58 | 29 | 55 |
| c | 5 | 9 | 5 | 9 | c | 3 | 5 | 1 | 2 |
| NR | | | 1 | | | | | | |
| 4a | 24 | 45 | 23 | 43 | 4a | 26 | 50 | 19 | 36 |
| b | 19 | 36 | 21 | 39 | b | 24 | 46 | 31 | 58 |
| c | 8 | 15 | 10 | 18 | c | 2 | 4 | 3 | 6 |
| NR | | | 2 | | | | | | |
| 5a | 26 | 49 | 18 | 33 | 5a | 21 | 40 | 21 | 39 |
| b | 18 | 34 | 28 | 52 | b | 28 | 54 | 29 | 55 |
| c | 9 | 17 | 8 | 15 | c | 3 | 6 | 3 | 6 |
| | | | | | | | | | |
| 6a | 24 | 45 | 28 | 52 | 6a | 23 | 44 | 30 | 56 |
| b | 24 | 45 | 17 | 31 | b | 25 | 48 | 18 | 34 |
| c | 5 | 10 | 9 | 17 | c | 3 | 6 | 5 | 10 |
| | | | | | NR | 1 | | | |
| 7a | 20 | 38 | 27 | 50 | 7a | 19 | 37 | 19 | 36 |
| b | 28 | 53 | 23 | 42 | b | 30 | 58 | 30 | 56 |
| c | 3 | 6 | 4 | 8 | c | 2 | 4 | 4 | 8 |
| NR | | | 2 | | NR | 1 | | | |
| 8a | 23 | 43 | 28 | 52 | 8a | 20 | 38 | 18 | 34 |
| b | 21 | 40 | 24 | 44 | b | 29 | 56 | 26 | 49 |
| c | 7 | 13 | 2 | 4 | c | 3 | 6 | 9 | 17 |
| NR | | | 2 | | | | | | |
| 9a | 23 | 43 | 25 | 46 | 9a | 25 | 48 | 21 | 39 |
| b | 22 | 42 | 20 | 37 | b | 26 | 50 | 27 | 51 |
| c | 7 | 13 | 9 | 17 | c | 1 | 2 | 5 | 10 |
| NR | | | 1 | | | | | | |

ERIC NR = No Response

Sixth graders wanted the teacher to "help them more," ask them less about how they will work, and wanted more "smiling and laughing." By-and-large both third and sixth graders were in agreement as to how they perceived their teacher.

In comparison with previous years, third graders wanted more help with work, "yelling from the teacher," direction from the teacher that work is done, and more "understanding from the teacher."

Sixth graders wanted more help from the teacher this year than in previous years, also more "yelling from the teacher," and wanted the teacher to "make them behave more." Taken together, third and sixth graders were in some agreement that they wanted the teacher to assume more direct involvement in the operation of the class as compared to third and sixth graders of previous years.

Tool 3, Posttest class reactions, was designed to elicit responses from students immediately following a tutoring class. Because the responses followed one class meeting, it is difficult to generalize about other tutoring classes. In interpreting any differences between third and sixth graders, it should be remembered that sixth grade children were tutoring third grade children and the nature of the tutoring relationship would suggest certain differences in perception. Table 7 summarizes these results.

With the exception of Item 2, "understanding why a lesson was being done," third grade scores were relatively unchanged from the pre-test to the posttest. In any particular item slight changes were in the direction of "understanding a little less why a lesson was being performed."

Sixth graders agreed with third graders that they didn't quite understand why the lesson was being performed, but other than that one item, they were consistent with their pre-test perceptions. In comparing third grade to sixth grade perceptions, sixth graders understood more why the lesson was being performed. They needed much less help than third graders (but they were tutoring third graders in the subject matter) and other than that were in agreement with their third grade partners.

Table 7
 Tool III - Postclass Reactions
 Summary of Pretest-Posttest Responses

| GRADE 3 | | | | | GRADE 6 | | | | |
|----------------|--------|---------|-----------------|---------|----------------|--------|---------|-----------------|---------|
| Pretest N = 51 | | | Posttest N = 54 | | Pretest N = 52 | | | Posttest N = 53 | |
| Item | Number | Percent | Number | Percent | Item | Number | Percent | Number | Percent |
| 1a | 36 | 71 | 36 | 67 | 1a | 37 | 71 | 35 | 66 |
| b | 14 | 27 | 16 | 30 | b | 15 | 29 | 15 | 28 |
| c | 0 | 0 | 2 | 3 | c | 0 | 0 | 3 | 6 |
| NR* | 1 | | | | | | | | |
| 2a | 35 | 69 | 32 | 59 | 2a | 45 | 87 | 39 | 73 |
| b | 13 | 25 | 22 | 41 | b | 7 | 13 | 11 | 21 |
| c | 3 | 6 | 0 | 0 | c | 0 | 0 | 3 | 6 |
| 3a | 21 | 41 | 24 | 45 | 3a | 38 | 73 | 31 | 58 |
| b | 27 | 53 | 28 | 52 | b | 10 | 19 | 18 | 34 |
| c | 1 | 2 | 2 | 3 | c | 3 | 6 | 4 | 8 |
| NR | 2 | | | | NR | 1 | | | |
| 4a | 13 | 25 | 13 | 24 | 4a | 1 | 2 | 4 | 8 |
| b | 31 | 61 | 25 | 46 | b | 33 | 63 | 25 | 47 |
| c | 6 | 12 | 16 | 30 | c | 18 | 35 | 24 | 45 |
| NR | 1 | | | | | | | | |
| 5a | 16 | 31 | 18 | 33 | 5a | 13 | 25 | 16 | 30 |
| b | 25 | 49 | 25 | 46 | b | 29 | 56 | 30 | 57 |
| c | 10 | 20 | 11 | 21 | c | 9 | 17 | 7 | 13 |
| | | | | | NR | 1 | | | |
| 6a | 33 | 65 | 29 | 54 | 6a | 30 | 58 | 32 | 60 |
| b | 7 | 14 | 20 | 37 | b | 12 | 23 | 13 | 25 |
| c | 10 | 20 | 5 | 9 | c | 10 | 19 | 8 | 15 |
| NR | 1 | | | | | | | | |

*NR = No Response

In the preceding two years, third grade perceptions were lowered somewhat in their understanding of "why the lesson was being performed," in their "understanding the lesson" itself and increased somewhat in identifying "somebody needing help."

Sixth graders on the other hand "learned more" in the particular tutoring class this year than in previous years, "understood it a little less," and "saw others needing help" a bit more often.

Tool 4, how this class feels, summarized in Table 8 was designed to have the children describe how other children felt about five particular concerns of the classroom.

Third graders were remarkably unchanged in their perceptions from the pre-test while sixth graders showed an increase in their perception of Item 1 "that almost all children feel it is good to take part as much as possible in classroom work." Other than that one item, sixth graders scores were unchanged from pre-test scores.

In comparing third grade to sixth grade perceptions, there was only Item 4 where there was substantial disagreement. Third graders perceived more children "enjoying their school work" than did sixth graders.

This year compared to the preceding two years, third graders perceived "asking the teacher for help is a good thing to do" much more often than in previous years. A most dramatic drop occurred in Item 3, "it is good to help pupils with their school work except during tests" from almost 100 percent the previous two years to 47 percent the present year. Other than that item, they were fairly consistent in their responses over the three-year period. As with Tool 3, third graders and sixth graders were in close agreement on most of the items described by the particular tool.

Tool 5, How do you feel about these things?, is summarized in Table 9. This tool was designed to allow a comparison to be made between children's perceptions of how others felt with their perception of their own feelings

Table 8
 Tool IV - How This Class Feels
 Summary of Pretest-Posttest Responses

| GRADE 3 | | | | | GRADE 6 | | | | |
|----------------|--------|---------|-----------------|---------|----------------|--------|---------|-----------------|---------|
| Pretest N = 52 | | | Posttest N = 54 | | Pretest N = 54 | | | Posttest N = 53 | |
| Item | Number | Percent | Number | Percent | Item | Number | Percent | Number | Percent |
| 1a | 27 | 52 | 28 | 52 | 1a | 25 | 46 | 30 | 57 |
| b | 15 | 29 | 15 | 28 | b | 20 | 37 | 14 | 27 |
| c | 10 | 19 | 11 | 20 | c | 9 | 17 | 9 | 16 |
| 2a | 28 | 54 | 32 | 59 | 2a | 27 | 50 | 31 | 59 |
| b | 11 | 21 | 18 | 34 | b | 16 | 30 | 19 | 36 |
| c | 13 | 25 | 4 | 9 | c | 11 | 20 | 4 | 5 |
| 3a | 17 | 33 | 20 | 37 | 3a | 22 | 41 | 25 | 47 |
| b | 14 | 27 | 15 | 28 | b | 17 | 31 | 15 | 29 |
| c | 19 | 37 | 19 | 35 | c | 15 | 28 | 13 | 24 |
| NR* | 2 | | | | | | | | |
| 4a | 27 | 52 | 18 | 34 | 4a | 16 | 30 | 12 | 23 |
| b | 10 | 19 | 14 | 26 | b | 24 | 44 | 24 | 45 |
| c | 14 | 27 | 22 | 40 | c | 14 | 26 | 17 | 22 |
| NR | 1 | | | | | | | | |
| 5a | 27 | 52 | 28 | 52 | 5a | 24 | 44 | 27 | 51 |
| b | 13 | 25 | 19 | 35 | b | 20 | 37 | 18 | 34 |
| c | 11 | 21 | 7 | 13 | c | 10 | 19 | 8 | 15 |
| NR | 1 | | | | | | | | |

*NR = No Response

Table 9
 Tool V - How Do You Feel About These Things?
 Summary of Pretest-Posttest Responses

| GRADE 3 | | | | | GRADE 6 | | | | |
|----------------|---------------|----------------|-----------------|----------------|----------------|---------------|----------------|-----------------|----------------|
| Pretest N = 52 | | | Posttest N = 54 | | Pretest N = 52 | | | Posttest N = 53 | |
| <u>Item</u> | <u>Number</u> | <u>Percent</u> | <u>Number</u> | <u>Percent</u> | <u>Item</u> | <u>Number</u> | <u>Percent</u> | <u>Number</u> | <u>Percent</u> |
| 1a | 38 | 73 | 29 | 54 | 1a | 40 | 77 | 34 | 64 |
| b | 12 | 23 | 22 | 41 | b | 9 | 17 | 18 | 34 |
| c | 2 | 4 | 3 | 5 | c | 3 | 6 | 1 | 2 |
| 2a | 38 | 73 | 25 | 47 | 2a | 39 | 75 | 34 | 64 |
| b | 8 | 15 | 26 | 48 | b | 10 | 19 | 18 | 34 |
| c | 5 | 10 | 3 | 5 | c | 3 | 6 | 1 | 2 |
| NR | 1 | | | | | | | | |

NR = No Response

on two items from Tool 4.

For third and sixth graders there was a substantial drop in their agreement with both items from pre-test to posttest. In reviewing the preceding two years, the scores for both grades was consistent on the pre-test and posttest. This apparent shift in their feelings suggests some change in their understanding of what was to occur in class as part of the tutoring program. It should be pointed out however, that even though there was a reduction in their perception that it is good to "take part in classroom work" and to "ask teacher for help," a majority of children in both classes agreed that these were appropriate types of behavior.

Comparing the results on those two items for Tools 4 and 5, one is struck by the consistency of the children's perception of how they saw others in the class in comparison to themselves; they saw themselves the same as others.

Table 10 contains a summary of responses to Tool 6, How do you think the teacher feels? This tool asked the same two questions of pupils as Tool 5 and the first two items of Tool 4, but it was trying to determine how they viewed their teacher's perception.

Third graders showed a drop in their perception of her agreeing that "it is good to take part as much as possible in classroom work" as well as a drop in "asking the teacher for help is a good thing to do."

Sixth graders, on the other hand, showed a substantial increase in perceiving that the teacher would almost always agree that "it is good to take part in classroom work," but showed a consistent perception of Item 2.

The substantial disagreement between third and sixth graders might be explained in part in that sixth graders are assuming the "role of teacher" for the tutoring process while third graders are still in the role of "student." This role difference might allow the sixth graders to identify more closely with the teacher's role.

Table 10
Tool VI - How Do You Think Your Teacher Feels?
 Summary of Pretest-Posttest Responses

GRADE 3

GRADE 6

| Student | | | Teacher | | | Student | | | Teacher | | |
|----------------------------|-----|---------|----------------------------|---------|-----|----------------------------|------|-----|----------------------------|-----|---------|
| Pretest N=50 Posttest N=54 | | | Pretest N=56 Posttest N=54 | | | Pretest N=57 Posttest N=53 | | | Pretest N=55 Posttest N=53 | | |
| Item | No. | Percent | No. | Percent | No. | Percent | Item | No. | Percent | No. | Percent |
| 1a | 25 | 50 | 41 | 73 | 35 | 65 | 1a | 35 | 61 | 45 | 82 |
| b | 16 | 32 | 15 | 27 | 18 | 33 | b | 20 | 35 | 10 | 18 |
| c | 9 | 18 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 2 | c | 2 | 4 | 0 | 0 |
| 2a | 28 | 56 | 29 | 52 | 23 | 43 | 2a | 36 | 63 | 35 | 66 |
| b | 16 | 32 | 22 | 39 | 28 | 52 | b | 15 | 26 | 16 | 30 |
| c | 6 | 12 | 5 | 9 | 2 | 5 | c | 6 | 11 | 2 | 4 |

[Handwritten mark]

In order to compare the perception of the children with the actual perception of teachers, each teacher was asked to complete Tool 6 for each child in their tutoring class. This allowed a direct comparison to be made between the children's perception of the teacher and the teacher's perception. The results are summarized in the same Table 10.

For third graders, teachers changed somewhat from the pre-test to the posttest, increasing Item 1 from 0 to 11 percent in that she would not agree most of the time. There was also a similar drop in Item 2 reducing from 52 to 37 percent in that she would almost always agree that "asking the teacher for help is a good thing to do." Teachers remained fairly consistent in their perception of sixth grade responses.

The comparison of the children's perception of teacher and the teacher's perception was remarkably consistent for both sets of pupils and teachers self-perceptions. This accuracy of perception is substantially greater this year than in the preceding two years for both grade levels.

It should be recalled that the objective evaluations of children's attitudes towards each other, themselves, and towards school, was added to the original project proposal as a result of consultations between this evaluator and project staff. It was added because it was thought important to try to determine what certain attitudes children held in relationship to certain aspects of the program over a three-year period of time. The data available through instruments designated as Tools 1 through 6 strongly support the idea that children share the perception of teachers as to appropriate goals and behavior within the Helping Relationship Project. Children seem to enjoy the tutoring class, their tutor, and seem to share with each other and with the teacher that one can learn and enjoy learning if the rules operating within a classroom and a program are clearly understood.

There has been little substantive change in these perceptions over three years. At the start the children enjoyed the class, the tutoring relationship,

and teachers perceived this enjoyment. One might expect that as teachers became more familiar with the program, clarified techniques in using various materials produced for the program, students would increase in their enjoyment and value the tutoring relationship more than indicated in the Tools. This apparently has not been the case. In trying to suggest why this hasn't happened, one obtains information not from the Tools but from personal observations and conversations with the teachers. In these conversations, teachers indicate consistent satisfaction in working within the program, in having teacher's aides to assist them within the program, and in their relationships with each other. This appears to be relatively unchanged over the past three years. Only one teacher from the original group left the program, and she was replaced by a new teacher in the beginning of this year. The change of one teacher did not seem to affect the working relationship among the others. Consistency over three years may be reflected in children's scores for the same period. The building principal continues to support the program to the maximum and has been consistent in that support over the entire life of the project. The fact that there has been no decrease in that support would suggest another reason as to why there has been so little change.

The apparent lack of dramatic change does not reduce the value of the program in terms of the data shown by the Tools. In order to accurately assign some value to these results, one would have to compare the children involved in the tutoring program with children not involved in the program. That data has not been collected and therefore no comparisons may be made. However, a worthwhile research project undertaking would be to follow-up the children who participated in the tutoring program over the past three years and compare their scores on standardized tests as well as their continuing attitudes towards school with a comparable group of children from the Aldridge School who did not participate in the program. On that basis, long term results might demonstrate and support the contention that this has been a valuable

experience both to the children and to the teachers.

Objective 8, Teachers will describe their comfort and/or competence in working with (a) colleagues, (b) curriculum, (c) children, (d) aides, (e) visitors, and (f) administrators.

This objective was added as a result of discussions held by the evaluator with the teachers. For each of the categories given below each teacher was asked to describe comfort and/or discomfort in working within each of these areas, before they participated in the program as compared to the present time. Of the six teachers participating in the program, one was added during the past year, therefore, that teacher's perceptions were expected to vary somewhat from those of other teachers who were involved in the original development and implementation of the program.

As might be expected, there was very little change in the perceptions of the teachers as reported in October and again at the present time. In part, this lack of change may be due to the fact that each teacher was asked to recall how they felt before and after participating in the program.

A. Colleagues

By and large all teachers agreed that they now had a great deal of comfort in asking other team members for help in a variety of areas ranging from curriculum to working with individual children:

B. Curriculum

Initially, many problems were encountered in developing curriculums in social studies, science, reading, and mathematics. By working together, the problems were gradually resolved as the results achieved allowed each teacher to feel greater satisfaction at the end of the year than they did at the beginning.

C. Children

All teachers reported a greater degree of comfort in working with both third and sixth grade children as a result of their participation in the

program. They did express some concern about how they would feel in the future if they were to work at some grade level other than grade three or six.

D. Teacher Aides

Teachers felt great comfort in working with teacher aides as a result of their experience in the program. The only reservation they expressed was how they might get along without teacher aides in the future as a result of the advantages accrued in the past.

E. Visitors

All teachers indicated comfort in having visitors in the classroom as a result of the experience in the program. Although visitors were more frequent when the program began, there continued to be a trickle of visitors over the final year of the program.

F. Administrators

All but the newest teacher indicated considerable comfort with the administrators in their school. They still felt some concern with outside administrators who would visit, but they indicated that their administrators would support them if a situation arose that required a particular level of support.

Conclusion

The original purpose of the Multigrade Helping Relationship Program was to improve reading and other basic skills of third and sixth grade children by providing a program in which sixth grade children tutored third grade children. Three classrooms of third grade children and three classrooms of sixth grade children were involved in this endeavor over a three-year period of time.

Six original objectives and two supplementary objectives were proposed. To the greatest extent these objectives were achieved. Teachers did

participate in in-service programs extensively. They developed and modified units of instruction and they utilized a variety of major curriculum systems.

The main purpose of the project, however, was to improve certain skills of children. These were not met to the same extent as might have been hoped. Reading scores did not improve dramatically. During the first two years of the project there were minimal reading score gains. However, during the final year of the project with a modification of the objective it was shown that more than one-half the children in each grade did gain more than they had the preceding year. Whether or not these gains can be attributed to the program activities is difficult to establish.

The most impressive gain was made in attendance of the children each year. Children improved their attendance by at least 14 percent and in the final year, attendance improved by 25 percent. Again the question as to whether or not the program influenced the attendance increase is not clear. In an attempt to clarify this, Multigrade participants were compared in their attendance to non-Multigrade participants. In this comparison no differences were shown. However, the fact the Multigrade children did attend school with great regularity can be seen as important whether or not it was attributable to the program.

Research skill gains remained an objective of contention among the teachers. Initially their desire was to show that children acquired skills defined as "research skills." In an attempt to document this with "hard" data, subtest scores on achievement tests were used as were counts of frequency of material use. In these endeavors, children showed considerable gains in terms of frequency of usage of materials but minimal gains score on the various subtests. It might be said this objective was achieved at a minimum level.

An objective added at the beginning of the project, that of trying to determine the extent to which children's attitudes towards each other, themselves, and school might change over time as part of their program participation was documented. Children liked what they were doing and each other

better over a period of time. Accurate documentation of long term changes or gains in attitudes could be determined only by a long term follow-up study of these children over at least a three to six-year period of time.

The newest objective added, that of asking teachers to describe their self-perceptions in relation to other teachers, curriculum, teacher aides, visitors, and administrators demonstrated consistency of positive feelings about themselves and the program over the life of the program. It was noted in the Interim Report 1975, that teachers were asked to recollect how they thought they felt about these items at the beginning of the project and to compare that recollection with their current perception of their feelings. This process is at best highly suspect but it was only intended to document.

After three years of evaluating this project, this evaluator feels that the hard data is not present that might be desirable to enable one to say that the tutoring relationship was successful. As one looks at bits and pieces of data, examines observations of the tutoring process as well as conversations with teachers, children, administrators, one must come to the conclusion that there was a sense of accomplishment in the project; whether or not it made the desired gains is an open question.

APPENDIX

- Tool
1. Classroom Life
 2. My Teacher
 3. Postclass Reactions
 4. How this Class Feels
 5. How Do You Feel about these Things?
 6. How Do You Think Your Teacher Feels?

1001 1

DATE _____

YOUR NUMBER _____

CLASS _____

CLASSROOM LIFE

HERE IS A LIST OF SOME STATEMENTS THAT DESCRIBE LIFE IN THE CLASSROOM. CIRCLE THE LETTER IN FRONT OF THE STATEMENT THAT BEST TELLS HOW YOU FEEL ABOUT THIS CLASS. THERE ARE NO RIGHT OR WRONG ANSWERS.

1.

- A. I LIKE THIS TUTORING CLASS.
 - B. SOMETIMES I LIKE THIS TUTORING CLASS.
 - C. I DO NOT LIKE THIS TUTORING CLASS.
-

2.

- A. I WORK HARD IN THIS TUTORING CLASS.
 - B. SOMETIMES I WORK HARD IN THIS TUTORING CLASS.
 - C. I DO NOT WORK HARD IN THIS TUTORING CLASS.
-

3.

- A. I AM VERY INTERESTED IN THIS TUTORING CLASS.
- B. I AM SOMETIMES INTERESTED IN THIS TUTORING CLASS.
- C. I AM NOT INTERESTED IN THIS TUTORING CLASS.

4.

- A. I WORK HARDER THAN MOST OF THE CHILDREN IN THIS TUTORING CLASS.
- B. I WORK AS HARD AS MOST OF THE CHILDREN IN THIS TUTORING CLASS.
- C. I DO NOT WORK AS HARD AS MOST OF THE CHILDREN IN THIS TUTORING CLASS.

5.

- A. MOST OF THE CHILDREN IN THIS TUTORING CLASS DO WHAT THE TEACHER TELLS THEM TO DO.
- B. SOME OF THE CHILDREN IN THIS TUTORING CLASS DO WHAT THE TEACHER TELLS THEM TO DO.
- C. NOT MANY OF THE CHILDREN IN THIS TUTORING CLASS DO WHAT THE TEACHER TELLS THEM TO DO.

6.

- A. THE TEACHER LIKES IT A LOT IF WE HELP EACH OTHER WITH OUR WORK IN THIS TUTORING CLASS.
 - B. THE TEACHER SOMETIMES LIKES IT IF WE HELP EACH OTHER WITH OUR WORK IN THIS TUTORING CLASS.
 - C. THE TEACHER DOES NOT LIKE IT IF WE HELP EACH OTHER WITH OUR WORK IN THIS TUTORING CLASS.
-

7.

- A. MY WORK IS MUCH BETTER THAN MOST OF THE OTHER CHILDREN IN THIS TUTORING CLASS.
- B. MY WORK IS ABOUT THE SAME AS MOST OF THE OTHER CHILDREN IN THIS TUTORING CLASS.
- C. MY WORK IS NOT AS GOOD AS MOST OF THE OTHER CHILDREN IN THIS TUTORING CLASS.

8.

- A. PUPILS IN THIS TUTORING CLASS HELP EACH OTHER WITH THEIR SCHOOLWORK MOST OF THE TIME.
- B. PUPILS IN THIS TUTORING CLASS SOMETIMES HELP EACH OTHER WITH THEIR SCHOOLWORK.
- C. PUPILS IN THIS TUTORING CLASS NEVER HELP EACH OTHER WITH THEIR SCHOOLWORK.

9.

- A. PUPILS IN THIS TUTORING CLASS ALWAYS ACT FRIENDLY TOWARD ONE ANOTHER.
 - B. PUPILS IN THIS TUTORING CLASS SOMETIMES ACT FRIENDLY TOWARD ONE ANOTHER.
 - C. PUPILS IN THIS TUTORING CLASS HARDLY EVER ACT FRIENDLY TOWARD ONE ANOTHER.
-

DATE _____

CLASS _____

(DON'T WRITE YOUR NUMBER
IF YOU DON'T WANT TO)

MY TEACHER

PRETEND THAT YOU COULD HAVE YOUR TEACHER CHANGE IN SOME WAY FOR EACH NUMBER. CIRCLE THE ANSWER THAT BEST TELLS HOW YOU WOULD LIKE YOUR TEACHER TO ACT IN THIS TUTORING CLASS. THERE ARE NO RIGHT OR WRONG ANSWERS.

- | | | | |
|--|---------------------------|-------------------------|---------------------------|
| 1. HELP WITH WORK | A. MORE THAN SHE DOES NOW | B. SAME AS SHE DOES NOW | C. LESS THAN SHE DOES NOW |
| 2. YELL AT US | A. MORE THAN SHE DOES NOW | B. SAME AS SHE DOES NOW | C. LESS THAN SHE DOES NOW |
| 3. MAKE SURE WORK IS DONE | A. MORE THAN SHE DOES NOW | B. SAME AS SHE DOES NOW | C. LESS THAN SHE DOES NOW |
| 4. ASK US TO DECIDE ABOUT HOW WE WILL WORK | A. MORE THAN SHE DOES NOW | B. SAME AS SHE DOES NOW | C. LESS THAN SHE DOES NOW |
| 5. SMILE AND LAUGH | A. MORE THAN SHE DOES NOW | B. SAME AS SHE DOES NOW | C. LESS THAN SHE DOES NOW |
| 6. MAKE US BEHAVE | A. MORE THAN SHE DOES NOW | B. SAME AS SHE DOES NOW | C. LESS THAN SHE DOES NOW |
| 7. TRUST US ON OUR OWN | A. MORE THAN SHE DOES NOW | B. SAME AS SHE DOES NOW | C. LESS THAN SHE DOES NOW |
| 8. MAKE US WORK HARD | A. MORE THAN SHE DOES NOW | B. SAME AS SHE DOES NOW | C. LESS THAN SHE DOES NOW |
| 9. SHOW THAT SHE UNDERSTANDS HOW WE FEEL | A. MORE THAN SHE DOES NOW | B. SAME AS SHE DOES NOW | C. LESS THAN SHE DOES NOW |

DATE _____

YOUR NUMBER _____

CLASS _____

POSTCLASS REACTIONS

HERE ARE SOME QUESTIONS ABOUT WHAT HAPPENED IN CLASS TODAY, CIRCLE THE LETTER IN FRONT OF THE STATEMENT THAT BEST TELLS HOW YOU FEEL ABOUT WHAT HAPPENED. THERE ARE NO RIGHT OR WRONG ANSWERS.

1.

- A. I LEARNED A LOT TODAY IN THIS TUTORING CLASS.
- B. I LEARNED A LITTLE TODAY IN THIS TUTORING CLASS.
- C. I DID NOT LEARN ANYTHING TODAY IN THIS TUTORING CLASS.

PLEASE WRITE WHY YOU FEEL THIS WAY. _____

2.

- A. I UNDERSTAND VERY WELL WHY WE WERE DOING TODAY'S LESSON IN THIS TUTORING CLASS.
- B. I UNDERSTAND A LITTLE BIT WHY WE WERE DOING TODAY'S LESSON IN THIS TUTORING CLASS.
- C. I DO NOT UNDERSTAND AT ALL WHY WE WERE DOING TODAY'S LESSON IN THIS TUTORING CLASS.

WHAT DO YOU THINK WAS THE REASON WE DID WHAT WE DID? _____

3.

- A. I UNDERSTOOD TODAY'S LESSON MOST OF THE TIME;

B. I UNDERSTOOD TODAY'S LESSON SOME OF THE TIME.

C. I DID NOT UNDERSTAND TODAY'S LESSON AT ALL

WHAT MADE YOU FEEL YOU DID NOT UNDERSTAND? _____

4.

A. I NEEDED A LOT OF EXTRA HELP DURING THIS TUTORING PERIOD TODAY.

B. I NEEDED A LITTLE HELP ONCE OR TWICE DURING THIS TUTORING PERIOD TODAY.

C. I NEEDED NO HELP DURING THIS TUTORING PERIOD TODAY.

WHAT KIND OF HELP DID YOU NEED? _____

5.

A. I SAW SOMEBODY NEEDING A LOT OF HELP IN THIS TUTORING CLASS TODAY.

B. I SAW SOMEBODY NEEDING HELP A FEW TIMES IN THIS TUTORING CLASS TODAY.

C. I SAW NOBODY NEEDING HELP IN THIS TUTORING CLASS TODAY.

HOW COULD THEY BE HELPED? _____

6.

A. I WAS VERY SATISFIED WITH WHAT MY PARTNER AND I TALKED ABOUT DURING THIS TUTORING CLASS TODAY.

B. I WAS PRETTY SATISFIED WITH WHAT MY PARTNER AND I TALKED ABOUT DURING THIS TUTORING CLASS TODAY.

C. I WAS NOT SATISFIED WITH WHAT MY PARTNER AND I TALKED ABOUT DURING THIS TUTORING CLASS TODAY.

WHY DO YOU FEEL THIS WAY? _____

DATE _____

YOUR NUMBER _____

CLASS _____

HOW THIS CLASS FEELS

SCHOOL CLASSES ARE QUITE DIFFERENT FROM ONE ANOTHER IN HOW PUPILS THINK AND FEEL ABOUT SCHOOLWORK, ABOUT ONE ANOTHER, AND ABOUT TEACHERS. HOW DO YOU THINK YOUR CLASSMATES FEEL ABOUT THE FOLLOWING THINGS? PUT A CHECK IN ONE OF THE BOXES UNDER "HOW MANY FEEL THIS WAY?" FOR EACH OF THE STATEMENTS BELOW. THERE ARE NO RIGHT OR WRONG ANSWERS.

HOW MANY CHILDREN IN THIS CLASS FEEL THIS WAY?

- | | | | |
|---|---------------|---------------|---------------|
| 1. IT IS GOOD TO TAKE PART AS MUCH AS POSSIBLE IN CLASSROOM WORK. | A. ALMOST ALL | B. ABOUT HALF | C. ONLY A FEW |
| 2. ASKING THE TEACHER FOR HELP IS A GOOD THING TO DO. | A. ALMOST ALL | B. ABOUT HALF | C. ONLY A FEW |
| 3. IT IS GOOD TO HELP OTHER PUPILS WITH THEIR SCHOOLWORK EXCEPT DURING TESTS. | A. ALMOST ALL | B. ABOUT HALF | C. ONLY A FEW |
| 4. SCHOOLWORK IS MORE OFTEN FUN THAN IT IS NOT FUN. | A. ALMOST ALL | B. ABOUT HALF | C. ONLY A FEW |
| 5. OUR TEACHER REALLY UNDERSTANDS HOW PUPILS FEEL. | A. ALMOST ALL | B. ABOUT HALF | C. ONLY A FEW |

DATE _____

YOUR NUMBER _____

CLASS _____

HOW DO YOU FEEL ABOUT THESE THINGS?

PUT A CHECK IN THE BOX THAT TELLS HOW YOU FEEL ABOUT EACH OF THE STATEMENTS BELOW. THERE ARE NO RIGHT OR WRONG ANSWERS.

| | | | |
|---|--------------------------|--------------------------------|------------------------------------|
| 1. IT IS GOOD TO TAKE PART AS MUCH AS POSSIBLE IN CLASSROOM WORK. | A. I AGREE ALMOST ALWAYS | B. I AGREE ABOUT HALF THE TIME | C. I DO NOT AGREE MOST OF THE TIME |
|---|--------------------------|--------------------------------|------------------------------------|

| | | | |
|---|--------------------------|--------------------------------|------------------------------------|
| 2. ASKING THE TEACHER FOR HELP IS A GOOD THING TO DO. | A. I AGREE ALMOST ALWAYS | B. I AGREE ABOUT HALF THE TIME | C. I DO NOT AGREE MOST OF THE TIME |
|---|--------------------------|--------------------------------|------------------------------------|

DATE _____

YOUR NUMBER _____

CLASS _____

HOW DO YOU THINK YOUR TEACHER FEELS?

PUT A CHECK IN THE BOX THAT TELLS HOW YOU THINK YOUR TEACHER FEELS ABOUT EACH OF THE STATEMENTS BELOW. THERE ARE NO RIGHT OR WRONG ANSWERS.

1. IT IS GOOD TO TAKE PART AS MUCH AS POSSIBLE IN CLASSROOM WORK.
- | | | |
|----------------------------------|---|---|
| A. SHE WOULD AGREE ALMOST ALWAYS | B. SHE WOULD AGREE ABOUT $\frac{1}{2}$ THE TIME | C. SHE WOULD NOT AGREE MOST OF THE TIME |
|----------------------------------|---|---|

2. ASKING THE TEACHER FOR HELP IS A GOOD THING TO DO.
- | | | |
|----------------------------------|---|---|
| A. SHE WOULD AGREE ALMOST ALWAYS | B. SHE WOULD AGREE ABOUT $\frac{1}{2}$ THE TIME | C. SHE WOULD NOT AGREE MOST OF THE TIME |
|----------------------------------|---|---|

MULTIGRADE HELPING RELATIONSHIP

Aldridge School

The three years of the project have given us some significant insights into the tutorial relationship. For one, there are optimum levels beyond which children from the two different age groups prefer not to be together; on the other hand they definitely, with few exceptions, want to be part of the process. This, we feel parallels a sibling relationship with its usual ambivalent feelings. Secondly, and this is perhaps obvious though overlooked, very specific tasks must be established for the tutoring process in which the pupils can experience actual improvement in skills rather than the perfunctory process of getting through a workbook or playing educational games. Finally, in working with the multi-age groups on the science and social studies units, it is not practical to have a total unit designed for the tutorial relationship. Rather, it is feasible to work with several mini-units over shorter periods of time, allowing each group to work independently on units designed for each age level.

In watching the groups working together, we were gratified at the ease with which they mingled. During the three-year project period, we worked with a different set of pupils each time and there was never any evidence of rancor or resentment at being together; the atmosphere in many instances could be only described as protective.

Since data this last year indicated that we had achieved our objectives, we feel that it is necessary to continue the concept, if only in a modified form. We are currently in the process of requesting a coordinator for the project through the Area A discretionary fund. If a coordinator position is granted, we can extend the tutorial relationship to more pupils, and use the regular school time for the program. We also plan to use the 8:30-9:00 a.m. segment to provide the pupils with additional tutoring time.

If, however, we are unable to secure extra personnel, we will establish helping relationships between likely rooms and encourage the teachers to devise, if only in a limited form, some tutoring sessions for their most needy pupils, using materials and processes originally devised by the staff of the project.

Program dissemination was in three parts -- oral reports to various groups, brochures, and an issue of The Chicago Principals Reporter ("Title III in Chicago") in which the program was outlined. (The magazine has a circulation of 3000.) Talks presented to groups reached interested people in a more concentrated form.

The following items were disseminated:

- Chicago Principals Reporter, Spring 1973, vol. 63, No. 1
- Brochures
- Sample units
- Booklet with illustrative material highlighting facets of program
- Special display booth designed for the project and presented as a donation to the school.

STATE BOARD OF EDUCATION
ILLINOIS OFFICE OF EDUCATION
SPRINGFIELD, ILLINOIS 62706

TITLE III, ESEA, STATISTICAL DATA

SECTION 1 PROJECT INFORMATION

A. REASON FOR SUBMISSION OF THIS FORM (Check one)

1. INITIAL APPLICATION FOR TITLE III GRANT 2. RESUBMISSION 3. APPLICATION FOR CONTINUATION GRANT 4. END OF BUDGET PERIOD REPORT

B. ILLINOIS GRANT NUMBER (In all cases except initial application, give assigned Illinois Grant Number)

C. MAJOR DESCRIPTION OF PROJECT (Check one)

1. INNOVATIVE 2. EXEMPLARY

D. TYPE(S) OF ACTIVITY (Check one or more)

1. PLANNING 2. CONDUCTING PILOT ACTIVITIES 3. OPERATION OF PROGRAM

E. PROJECT TITLE

Multigrade Helping Relationship

F. BRIEFLY SUMMARIZE THE PURPOSE OF THE PROPOSED PROJECT

In the Multigrade Helping Relationship an upper-grade class is joined to a lower-grade class on a partner-like basis. The older pupils work with the younger ones on carefully constructed tasks. Because special units and projects are a major part of all the pupils' learning experiences, the partner-like relationship is beyond that of a tutorial one. It is hoped that this project may provide a model for multigrade organization.

G. NAME OF COUNTY

COOK

H. NAME OF APPLICANT (Administrative District)

BOARD OF EDUCATION OF THE CITY OF CHICAGO

PHONE (Include Area Code)

312-641-4141

I. ADDRESS (Street, City, Zip Code)

228 NORTH LASALLE STREET CHICAGO, ILLINOIS 60601

J. PROJECT DIRECTOR

Chesna C. Weisberg

OFFICE PHONE (Include Area Code)

312-785-2767

K. OFFICE ADDRESS (Street, City, Zip Code)

630 EAST 131st STREET, CHICAGO, ILLINOIS 60627

L. SUPERINTENDENT (Administrative District)

Joseph P. Hannon

OFFICE PHONE (Include Area Code)

312-641-4400

M. OFFICE ADDRESS (Street, City, Zip Code)

228 NORTH LASALLE STREET CHICAGO, ILLINOIS 60601

N. TYPE OF PROPOSAL (Check one or more)

- PROGRAM FOR HANDICAPPED DEMONSTRATION PROGRAM NEITHER

PERCENTAGE OF EXPENDITURES FOR HANDICAPPED 100

O. AVERAGE PER PUPIL (ADA) EXPENDITURE (first preceding year)

AVERAGE PER PUPIL (AOA) EXPENDITURE (second preceding year)

P. DISTRIBUTION OF STUDENTS BY AREAS SERVED

100 Intra City Pre-Kindergarten Program

Geographically Isolated Areas Program for Handicapped

100 Program for Minority Group Other

Q. OF THE TOTAL NUMBER OF PERSONS SERVED GIVE THE PERCENTAGE OF CHILDREN WHICH COME FROM FAMILIES WITH ANNUAL INCOMES OF:

1. 15 % \$2000 or less 3. 60 % over \$3000
2. 25 % \$2001 \$3000

DATE SUBMITTED

September 1975

SIGNATURE OF SUPERINTENDENT (Administrative District)

SECTION II BUDGET SUMMARY FOR PROJECT (Include amount from Item G below)

| | ILLINOIS GRANT NO. | BEGINNING DATE | ENDING DATE | FUNDS REQUESTED |
|--|--------------------|----------------|-------------|-----------------|
| A. INITIAL APPLICATION OR REAPPLICATION | | 6/30/72 | 6/29/73 | \$65,890 |
| B. APPLICATION FOR FIRST CONTINUATION GRANT | | 6/30/73 | 6/29/74 | 65,401 |
| C. APPLICATION FOR SECOND CONTINUATION GRANT | | 6/30/74 | 6/29/75 | 73,780 |
| D. TOTAL TITLE III FUNDS | | | | |
| E. END OF BUDGET PERIOD REPORT | | | | |

Complete Part G only if this project includes construction, acquisition, remodeling, or leasing of facilities for which Title III funds are requested.

F. TYPE OF FUNCTION (Check applicable items)

REMODELING OF FACILITIES LEASING OF FACILITIES

G. TOTAL SQUARE FEET IN THE PROPOSED FACILITY TOTAL SQUARE FEET IN THE FACILITY TO BE USED FOR TITLE III PROGRAMS AMOUNT OF TITLE III FUNDS REQUESTED FOR FACILITY

SECTION III - ENROLLMENT, PROJECT PARTICIPATION DATA AND STAFF MEMBERS ENGAGED

| A. PROJECT ENROLLMENT AND PARTICIPATION | | GRADES | | | | | | ADULT (Exclude Teachers) | OUT OF SCHOOL YOUTH | TOTAL | STAFF MEMBERS ENGAGED IN IN-SERVICE TRAINING PROJECTS |
|--|------------------|--------|-----|----|----|-----|-----|--------------------------|---------------------|-------|---|
| | | PRE-K | K | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4-6 | | | | |
| 1. School Enrollment in Geographic Area Served | (a) Public | | 105 | 96 | 83 | 116 | 318 | | | 719 | |
| | (b) Non-Public | | | 35 | 35 | 30 | 100 | | | 200 | |
| 2. Persons Participating in Project | (a) Public | | | | | 66 | 66 | | | 132 | |
| | (b) Non-Public | | | | | | | | | | |
| | (c) Not-Enrolled | | | | | | | | | | |

B. TOTAL NUMBER OF PARTICIPANTS BY ETHNIC GROUP (Applicable to figures given in item a above)

| WHITE | NEGRO | AM. INDIAN | PUERTO RICAN | ORIENTAL | MEX. AMERICAN | OTHER (Specify) | TOTAL |
|-------|-------|------------|--------------|----------|---------------|-----------------|-------|
| | 132 | | | | | | 132 |

C. RURAL/URBAN DISTRIBUTION OF PARTICIPANTS SERVED OR TO BE SERVED BY PROJECT

| | RURAL | | METROPOLITAN AREA | | |
|--------------------------------|-------|----------|--------------------------------------|----------|-------|
| | FARM | NON-FARM | CENTRAL-CITY LOW SOCIO ECONOMIC AREA | SUBURBAN | OTHER |
| PERCENT OF TOTAL NUMBER SERVED | | | 100% | | |

SECTION IV - PERSONNEL FOR ADMINISTRATION AND IMPLEMENTATION OF PROJECT

| A. PERSONNEL PAID BY TITLE III FUNDS | STAFF ASSIGNED TO PROJECT | | |
|--|---|-----------|----------------------|
| | FULL-TIME | PART-TIME | FULL-TIME EQUIVALENT |
| 1. ADMINISTRATIVE SUPERVISION | | | |
| 2. TEACHERS: (a) Pre-Kindergarten | (b) Kindergarten | | |
| | (c) Grades 1-6 | 2 | |
| | (d) Grades 7-12 | | |
| | (e) Other | | |
| | 3. SUBJECT-MATTER SPECIALISTS (Artists, Scientists) | | |
| 4. TECHNICIANS (Audiovisual, Computer Specialists) | | | |
| 5. PUPIL PERSONNEL WORKERS (Counselors, etc.) | | | |
| 6. MEDICAL / ID / PSYCHIATRIC PERSONNEL | | | |
| 7. RESEARCHERS / EVALUATORS | | | |
| 8. MATERIALS AND DEVELOPERS | | | |
| 9. JOURNALISTS (Writers, Editors, P. R. Personnel) | | | |
| 10. OTHER PROFESSIONAL | | | |
| 11. PARAPROFESSORS (Special Teacher Aides) | 4 | | |
| 12. OTHER NON-PROFESSIONAL (Clerical, Bus Drivers) | | | |

B. NUMBER OF CONSULTANTS TO BE PAID BY TITLE III FUNDS TOTAL CALENDAR DAYS RETAINED

20 days