

DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 116 875

RC 008 946

AUTHOR McConnell, Beverly
 TITLE Bilingual Mini-School Tutoring Project. Evaluation Progress Report Number 4, Final Evaluation, Program Year 2, July 1975.
 INSTITUTION Mabton School District, Wash.
 SPONS AGENCY Washington Office of the State Superintendent of Public Instruction, Olympia.
 REPORT NO EPR-4
 PUB DATE Jul 75
 NOTE 48p.; For related documents, see RC 008 943-945
 EDRS PRICE MF-\$0.76 HC-\$1.95 Plus Postage
 DESCRIPTORS Academic Achievement; Bilingual Education; *Early Childhood Education; Educational Objectives; Formative Evaluation; *Interstate Programs; *Migrant Education; Mobile Educational Services; Paraprofessional Personnel; *Parent-Participation; *Tutorial Programs
 IDENTIFIERS *Washington

ABSTRACT

The Bilingual Mini-School Tutoring Project offers parents a major role in their children's education as decision makers responsible for hiring and other areas of program operations and as teachers providing bilingual, bicultural instruction. The program design has two components: the mobile and the non-mobile component. The non-mobile program has been in operation since February, 1974 at Connell and Moses Lake, Washington while the mobile program has only been in operation since May 1974. Program objectives are of three types: institutional, procedural, and educational product objectives. Institutional objectives involve coordination with school administrators and enrollment of children. Procedural objectives involve the use of Spanish and English, dual language teaching skills, and teaching bicultural lessons, math, and reading. The educational product objectives include gains in first and second language, mastery of cultural heritage lessons, and accelerated gains in math and reading. This fourth progress report covers program operations from July 1, 1974 through June 30, 1975. The narrative section of the report describes the functioning of the parent advisory groups, the logistics of the mobile program, and the way in which the program has managed to follow children to eight different communities in four different states. Overall, the objectives are being met or partially met. (NQ)

 * Documents acquired by ERIC include many informal unpublished *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. *

ED116875

BILINGUAL MINI-SCHOOL TUTORING PROJECT

FUNDED BY U.R.R.D.

(COMBINED WITH OTHER FUNDING SOURCES TO PROVIDE AN INTERSTATE PROGRAM SERVING MIGRANT CHILDREN)

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



MERCER GUZMAN

Enrolled in the Bilingual Mini-School Tutoring Project in three states during 1974-74 program year: Oregon, fall of '74; Texas, winter '74-75; Washington State, spring '75.

GRANTEE:

Mabton School District
Henry Milhofer, Supt.
Arno Johnson, Director
of Federal Projects

Louise Gustafson
Project Manger
R.O. Box 2367
Pasco, WA 99302
509-547-8442

Rafael Guerra
Educational Director
La Grulla, Texas

Evaluation Progress Report Number 4
Final Evaluation, Program Year 2
Prepared by Beverly McConnell, Evaluator

008946

BILINGUAL MINI-SCHOOL TUTORING PROJECT

A PROJECT WITH INTERSTATE COORDINATION
TO PROVIDE CONTINUITY IN EDUCATION
TO MIGRANT CHILDREN

Program Year Two, Final Evaluation Report

July, 1975

Mabton School District's URRD* Project "Bilingual Mini-School Tutoring Project" was initiated in February, 1974. This report represents the fourth progress report on this program, covering program operations from July 1, 1974 through June 30, 1975.

The report is organized in four sections:

1. The Rationale for this Program
2. Evaluation of Progress Toward Objectives
3. Narrative Progress Report
4. Conclusion

Report prepared by:

Beverly McConnell,
Evaluator

*Urban, Racial, Rural Disadvantaged Project of the
Washington Supt of Public Instruction

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	Page
THE RATIONALE FOR THIS PROGRAM	1
The Mobile Component	1
The Non-mobile Component	6
EVALUATION OF PROGRESS TOWARD ACHIEVEMENT OF PROJECT OBJECTIVES	9
<u>Institutional Objectives:</u>	
1(A) Coordination with School Administrators	9
1(B) Enrollment of Children	15
<u>Procedural Objectives:</u>	
2.1 Use of Spanish and English, Dual Language Teaching Skills	17
2.2 Teaching Bicultural Lessons	20
2.3 Teaching Math and Reading	22
<u>Educational Product Objectives:</u>	
3.1 Gains in First and Second Language	23
3.2 Mastery of Cultural Heritage Lessons	27
3.3 Accelerated Gains in Math and in Reading	29
SUMMARY OF PROJECT OBJECTIVES	32
NARRATIVE PROGRESS REPORT	33
CONCLUSION	42

LIST OF TABLES

Table	Page
1. Teachers Evaluated on Dual Language Teaching	18
2. Months During Which Cultural Heritage Lessons Were Taught	20
3. Peabody Picture Vocabulary Test Scores	24
4. Change in Language Classification of Project Children	25
5. Cultural Heritage Mastery Tests with Satisfactory Rating Related to Attendance February through June, 1975	27
6. Wide Range Achievement Test Scores	30

THE RATIONALE FOR THIS PROGRAM

What happens to a migrant child who moves four times in his first grade year, encountering a different "system" for the teaching of reading and mathematics at each school in which he enrolls?

THE MOBILE COMPONENT

The mobile component of the bilingual mini schools project represents an approach to the problems faced by this mobile child of migrant farm workers who moves from school to school.

Bilingual mini schools, using a combination of funding sources, trains an adult from the families who migrate to serve as a teacher (some men, some women). Other members of the families of these teaching adults are still working in the migrant stream and she or he moves with them. Since a number of families usually move together from one crop location to the next there are, among these families, a number of children. The teaching adult tutors these children in each location to which they move. She or he usually works with from six to ten children which is why the program is referred to as a "mini" school.

What about the responsibility of the public school? The project recognizes that the public school has the primary responsibility for providing education and all migrant children are helped to enroll in the schools. The administrative staff, with the teacher, makes contact with the school officials and explains that in addition to the school room instruction these children will receive, we would like to continue to work with the children we are

2

following for from one-and-one-half to two hours per day. During this time the tutoring teachers can work with the child bilingually, using the same math and reading series the child has already started using when enrolled either in Texas or at another site and also providing lessons in both Spanish and English. In this way, no matter what materials are in use at the local school, the child can continue with these basic areas of instruction using familiar materials in the special tutoring time. The school-room instruction will amount to extra reinforcement. In addition to the academic areas, the child will be provided lessons in both Spanish and English through a special language curriculum. And he will have lessons the content of which is to help him learn more about his own and other cultures.

The arrangements made with the local school administrator, the child and his parents, can be that the child receives this tutoring during the regular school day, on a released time basis from his classes. Or the tutoring can be during non-school hours, after school or in the "other half" of a short day program such as kindergarten.

Why this approach?

What else has been tried?

There have been educators of migrant children who have been very concerned about the confusion and learning loss that occurs when a child must continually change books and the approach to teaching of basic subjects, particularly in the crucial first years of school. One solution they have proposed in the past is

that if "migrant funds" from the federal government are provided a school that the schools should all agree to teach migrant children using the same curriculum materials. This would lessen the problems of the child of moving from school to school. However, this approach has always been defeated for practical reasons. School administrators have felt that a teacher in a classroom which received migrant children for a portion of the year has enough to contend with resulting from the higher child-teacher ratio during the migrant stay, and should not also be required to familiarize himself/herself with a whole new series of books from which to teach the migrant children.

An alternative to requiring teachers to use one set of materials with migrant children, and another with their year-round children, would be for migrant host schools to utilize the same materials proposed for migrant children for all children throughout the year. Most schools would not agree to limit their selection of teaching materials on this basis.

Another solution suggested has been to segregate the migrant children and to hire teachers who would teach only during the migrant season. If migrant curriculum materials were nationally mandated, this special teacher would use only these and no confusion would result from whatever local materials other teachers in the school used. However, this too poses practical problems. It is difficult to obtain qualified teachers for a short assignment. There may not be enough migrant children at any grade level to justify a special class. If migrant children from several grade levels are combined, the teacher must be very skillful in individualizing instruction. If she is not, she may confuse beginning



children by having them put into material above their skills, or frustrate older children by beginning over repeatedly so that no progress occurs. And any type of segregation of children, even when done for purposes of special instructional needs, is a cloudy civil rights area.

For all of the reasons described above, the proposals for mandating migrant curriculum materials have never been carried out. This leaves the schools using a great variety of materials and approaches and all the adjustment placed on the migrant child.

Bilingual Mini Schools represent a different approach to providing the migrant child with continuity in curriculum materials from site to site. The migrant adult teacher tutors the child during his home base period in Texas (the target site for this program is Grulla, Texas). The families move north and at each work stop arrangements are made to continue the tutoring, using the same materials. The child gets reading and math instruction from the public school in which he enrolls during the regular school year or anywhere a special school is offered during the summer for migrant children. And from the supplementary tutoring he gets a second period of reading and math instruction using materials he has been using at previous sites. Most of the host schools are not staffed to provide special language instruction so this aspect of the program, plus the bicultural activities represent an addition to his schooling.

Most of the concepts described above were operationally worked out by a companion program, Bilingual Mini Head Start. This preschool program provides bilingual, bicultural instruction by trained migrant adult paraprofessionals who move with the children.



From this program, which has operated three years, it has been found that it is possible to track the children from site to site and many children are served at two, three, or four different locations during their yearly migration. From 65% to 75% of the children served at the home base in the preschool program have been followed successfully to other sites during their migration. The program has worked out the logistics of how to provide administrative support to help find housing for the "mini" schools, how to coordinate with local programs, how to provide professional staff who move on an itinerant schedule to assist the paraprofessional teachers, and how to monitor project operations which have been carried out in four northern states to which families moved for work, as well as home base in Texas.

With the support of URRD money for teacher salaries and related costs while teachers are in Washington state schools, the program began its service to the school-age children this past year. Control and contrast groups have been tested in both language and the key academic areas in Texas this fall. The effects of moving with the children and providing continuity will therefore be measurable in one year's time when a full year of operation of the school-age program has taken place. All paraprofessional teachers are paid from a Title VII grant administered by Intermediate School District 104, Ephrata, Washington, when they are working in the Texas site or in work locations in states other than Washington state. Intermediate School District 104 also conducts the preschool companion program which is now into its fourth year of operation. The administrative, training, and evaluation staff of this program services this school-age extension, augmenting the URRD funds which are used.

THE NON-MOBILE COMPONENT

Bilingual Mini Head Start, above described, has operated year-round in two sites in Washington State: Connell and Moses Lake, Washington. The children leaving this preschool program go into two different schools from the Connell center, and into four different schools at the Moses Lake center. The parents of the children expressed a keen interest in seeing bilingual instruction continued, as well as special training in two languages and cultural activities. The supplementary tutoring idea provided the answer to this need. By continuing to work with the children outside of school hours they could receive the continuation of instruction in the Spanish and English language program, the cultural knowledge lessons and activities, plus reinforcement of the instruction the child is receiving in school in math and reading through continued work in the reading and math series begun as preschoolers. A referral form for public school teachers to indicate any concept areas they feel the child could use added help in provides a communication link between the classroom and the supplementary tutoring program. Lessons for kindergarten children are carried out during the "other" half day from his public school half-day kindergarten. Children in first, second grade (or in special cases higher grades) are served on an after-school basis.

There are national implications involved in this non-mobile program. Many, many school districts have children who represent a small minority of their students who are scattered between many grades and schools. Urban Indian

7

children, for example, are often "lost" within the larger majority in schools throughout a city. How to continue instruction for them that will offer them cultural identity and continued development of the language of the home is an unsolved problem. Civil Rights commissions are empowered to attempt to assure culturally relevant education for each child, but for practical reasons their attention goes to larger minorities. The practicality of a supplementary program such as the Bilingual Mini School model which brings together children of different ages and grade levels, from different schools throughout the city, who are provided with both individualized academic instruction and language and culture lessons by adults from the same cultural community would have utility in this situation.

Feeling that this program has wider implications, therefore, the evaluation of this program is keeping track of the different methods used to coordinate a supplementary program to that the child receives in his regular classroom. Several different administrative relationships have already been utilized at different sites. In Texas now, the program is operating on a released time basis. This helps the teacher of the migrant classes who was burdened with an unreasonably large class size by releasing, serially, seven or eight children at a time who go for the tutoring. At Umatilla, Oregon, the tutoring teacher worked at space provided within the school and took children individually or in very small groups from classrooms throughout the day by a prearranged schedule worked out with the teachers as the target children were spread in several classes. The Connell program

offers after-school instruction at space provided by one school; from the other school children go for after-school instruction to a day care center. At Moses Lake children are bussed to a central center and then to their homes all over the city.

To summarize, educators can look to this program to gain insight into two key questions:

For the Mobile Component:

Can the use of migrant adults, trained as teachers, provide meaningful continuity in the education of children in a moving population?

For the Non-Mobile Component:

Can the use of a supplementary tutoring program provide a practical way of providing continuing language and cultural instruction as well as academic reinforcement to a target group who represent a minority of children within a school district?

9

EVALUATION OF PROGRESS TOWARD ACHIEVEMENT OF PROJECT OBJECTIVES

INSTITUTIONAL OBJECTIVE:

- 1.1 ISD 104 will arrange with the schools of each target school district in which Mini Head Start children are enrolled in public school, and with the children's families, for a time and place for children to receive tutoring to supplement the regular school program, as evidenced by reports of contacts made with school officials and parents and enrollment in regular tutoring for at least 80% of the eligible children in each district.

FINDINGS:

(Part A) Coordination with School Administrators at Each Site

PERMANENT SITES:

Moses Lake, Washington

As this was the second year of program operation, the administrators of the three elementary schools were already informed of the purpose of the continued bilingual tutoring. Coordinative contact records indicate that school officials at all three, schools, administrators and teachers, were contacted at various times during the year in relationship to the needs of one or another of the individual students. The Community Coordinator worked closely with outreach personnel employed by the school to maintain contacts with families, to supply names of our students for inclusion in the public school summer school, to work out transportation needs and provide lunches even in some cases where some children would not under normal circumstances be included in the lunch program.

Connell, Washington

At Mesa Elementary School the principal loaned the program the portable classroom used during the migrant expansion, and our program was held there during most of the year. When the migrant expansion occurred this classroom was needed and the program was in real difficulty trying to find other space. At this point two teachers from the school offered to make space in their classrooms rather than have the tutoring program discontinued. Contact records indicate that teachers have visited the tutoring program and made such comments as reported by Mrs. Pat Graham that the teachers are

"very professional, know what they are doing, are well prepared." Mrs. Graham is a second grade teacher.

At Connell, tutoring children walk from the school to the day care center where tutoring is carried out. Coordinative contact records indicate much consultation particularly with the kindergarten teacher, on children's behavior, academic needs, and ways the two programs can help each other. The Bilingual Mini School arranged a dance program for cultural heritage enrichment and offered to make this experience available to all children in the elementary school. This did not work out although the principal offered use of the school gym to hold the program. The teachers working with the migrant expansion commented on the program's value by noting the differences in performance and school readiness of children in our program and migrant children who enter with no background. Children in our program serve other children as interpreters, and their understanding of school procedures helps other children who follow their lead.

MOBILE SITES:

URRD supports school-age tutoring for the migrant children from La Grulla, Texas while they are located in Washington State. Using other funding sources this tutoring is carried on in Texas, Oregon, and Illinois--wherever the families move that we have trained staff among the adult migrants who can provide the tutoring. This evaluation represents the first full year of operation of the mobile program (which got under way in May, 1974). In that time tutoring has been provided in eight locations, in four states. Summary of the coordinative contacts with public school personnel is given below.

Pasco, Washington (dates of operation July 1, 1974 through September 6, 1974--again April 21, 1975 through June 30, 1975 and continuing)

In 1974 Mr. Guerra, the educational director, met with the teacher of Grulla children at Longfellow School and the tutoring was set up at the school during the migrant summer school program. When this program ended, space was made available by Green Giant Company at the labor camp in a trailer and was continued until September 6 when the teacher and most families returned to Texas.

In the spring of 1975, coordination and scheduling were worked out by Mr. Robinson, resource trainer for the Bilingual Mini Schools tutoring project. His report is quoted below:

I first made contact with two principals in the Pasco, Washington School System--Mr. Les Dominguez at Longfellow School and Mr. Larry Hill at Captain William Gray. We had been able to identify five school age children in Pasco who were eligible for tutoring but unfortunately had not been able to provide the school system with their names in advance of placement so they could be taught by



a single teacher at one location. I discovered that Captain William Gray School serves as the clearinghouse for all migrant student placement in Pasco and their policy is to keep all children of each family at the same school. Mr. Hill was very cooperative in providing us with information as to where Mini Head Start children were located and also said he would try to see to it that any further Mini Head Start school-age tutorees would be placed at Longfellow, if possible, where there was the greatest concentration of our children. I felt this was an extremely nice gesture on his part to facilitate our project and its goals.

At Longfellow School, I discussed our proposed tutoring program with Mr. Dominguez. He was helpful in locating space for us to set up shop and introduced us to the teachers of the children involved. Both teachers remarked that they felt we were better equipped to deal with the educational needs of the children with our curriculum and individualized instruction and were quite willing to release the children at virtually any hour to our teacher. We were given space in the migrant classroom in which we were able to provide instruction. The migrant teacher, Susan Switz, was also cooperative in providing space and even allowing our personnel the use of some of the equipment in the room.

Umatilla, Oregon (dates of operation August 26, 1974 through November 1, 1974)

Tutoring of school-age children from Grulla began in the Umatilla area before the public schools opened. Contacts were made with the school principal after school opened at which time the school provided space for the tutoring and assisted the program to work out a schedule whereby children were released from their regular classrooms for periods of time to go with our tutor. She worked with children individually or in small groups throughout the day. As an accommodation to the school, the tutoring teacher also worked with some children referred by the school as needing special help as well as the Grulla migrant children we were following.

Prosser, Washington (dates of operation May 1, 1975 through June 30, 1975 and continuing)

Contact at this site was again made by Mr. Robinson on behalf of the project and his report is quoted below:

I met with Mr. Bill Borne, Principal at Riverview School in Prosser, Washington, at which we had three school-age tutorees enrolled. Lack of space at this school seemed to be rather acute at this particular

time of the year due to the rather massive influx of migrant children. Mr. Borné spent some time trying to secure adequate space for our tutoring program. I showed him our curriculum materials and tried to describe how our tutoring program worked. He seemed impressed and remarked how important he felt it was that the children were receiving the individualized material. He was also apparently impressed with the continuity of education we are able to offer each child.

I also conferenced with the three teachers at Riverview involved with our children--each child had been placed in a different classroom. The teachers expressed some frustration as to their ability to effectively deal with short term students and to evaluate any progress they might be making. They requested our assistance in this matter. They also indicated they would like to make use of our teacher and material for other non-Mini Head Start migrant children. I demonstrated the materials for them and they seemed to have mainly positive comments. Because they were eager to accommodate our program they also were willing to allow the children to be released to us at the same time each day.

Walla Walla, Washington (operating dates May 1 through May 12, 1975)

One child we had been working with in Texas moved into the Walla Walla area, and the project teacher, working with preschool level children adjusted her schedule to provide continued tutoring for this child at the labor camp outside of school hours. Coordinative contact records indicate many contacts by the project manager with school personnel in the Walla Walla-College Place area, but none on behalf of this particular child as released time for tutoring was not required.

Mabton, Washington (operating dates May 5, 1975 through June 4, 1975. The program also served children at Mabton during May and June in 1974 but this report is limited to the program year from July 1, 1974 through June 30, 1975).

Mr. Robinson made coordinative contacts for the children we were following. His report follows:

At Mabton, Washington, I met with Mr. Arno Johnson, the Assistant Superintendent of the School District, and with Mr. Bill Leggett, Principal, at Fox Elementary School. We had four children enrolled at this school and felt that was a great enough concentration of children to assign a teacher. Mr. Johnson was interested in the logistics of the Mini Head Start program, both in its preschool and school-age components, and he asked to be kept informed

of our activities in Mabton so he could make knowledgeable reports to various parent and community groups. Mr. Leggett was very accommodating with us in setting up the tutoring program at his school. He was able to secure space in the migrant classroom where our children could be brought as a group for lessons. He expressed much satisfaction with the relationship between his staff and the Mini Head Start tutor during the past summer.

The two teachers involved with our children at Fox Elementary School were again highly cooperative in providing released time for tutoring. One teacher was familiar with part of our curriculum and praised the use of it in both English and Spanish. Like others, she also expressed a desire to refer some additional migrant students to us for special help and we indicated a willingness to do so if our resources allowed.

From the various discussions I had with the principals and especially with the teachers, I was made aware that most feel they cannot effectively cope with the short term migrant student, at least to the level they would like. Even when a bilingual aide is assigned to the class, they feel highly disadvantaged in working with students with little or no English skills. Every individual with whom I conferred seemed to basically agree with our method of providing individualized instruction on a follow-up basis to children who had been begun in the material as preschoolers. Principals and teachers alike seemed to be most impressed with our method of providing continuity of education for our children from Texas to their northern summer locations.

Lynden, Washington (date of operation June 25, 1975 through June 30, 1975 and continuing)

A coordinative contact report has not been received by the evaluator as yet for this program which just got under way within the last two weeks.

Hoopeston, Illinois (date of operation May 5, 1975 through June 30, 1975 and continuing)

Like Walla Walla, this site provides tutoring at the farm labor camp outside of school hours by the teacher assigned there to work with the preschool children. As no released time arrangement has been worked out with the schools, coordinative contact with the school has not been reported.

Grulla, Texas (date of operation December 9, 1974 through April 4, 1975)

A long series of meetings went into coordination at the home base site. These included Grulla school administrative personnel and teaching staff, and administrative personnel from the Rio Grande Independent School District as well as project personnel from a number of other of the special programs funded to this school district. Project officers from the U.S. Office of Education funding this program in Texas also met with local public school staff and project personnel.

Arrangements were made for space in the local school in which children could be tutored in the special curriculum which is utilized at all sites (and which provides continuity of instructional materials, therefore, for those children who move north in the season). Children from the first grade were given two-hour blocks of time for this tutoring. Children from kindergarten came for 45-minute blocks of time, during the morning and another 45 minutes during the afternoon.

CONCLUSION:

Coordination with school personnel at these ten operating sites has been presented in some detail because the project sees the validity of this type of educational effort which overlaps district and even state lines as being possible only as a cooperative effort. Project documentation supports the conclusion that careful coordination has taken place and that the type of program offered is seen as needed and useful by teachers and administrators in the host districts.

(Part B) Enrollment of at Least 80% of Eligible Children in Each District

An eligible child, in terms of this objective, was considered to be one who had been enrolled in the preschool program at some time, who subsequently enrolled in public school.

Although this was the prime target group, other children were accepted by referral on a space available basis. These were children which the school district felt had a special need, particularly in terms of bilingual instruction, which the district was not staffed to meet.

The evaluator was not able to approach this objective in terms of tracing what had happened to all children who had ever been enrolled in the preschool program since it began in 1971. However, in the Washington centers a roster was made of all children enrolled in the preschool program in the Spring of 1974 who would have been old enough for school by September, 1974. Excluding children who had moved from the area, there were 35 of these children, out of which 28 did enroll in the school-age tutoring program some time during the year. This represents 80% of eligible children, which meets the project goal.

In Texas a survey of all children in kindergarten and first grade revealed that 46 children were enrolled who had at one time been in the preschool Mini Head Start program. Of these the project was able to accommodate 33 in the tutoring program, which is 72% of eligible children. Lack of space and staff prevented us from serving the remaining 13. The choice was made on the basis of those who were most likely to be able to serve in the north based on their parents' current migration plans.

ADDITIONAL FINDINGS:

In applying for grant funds, the project estimated it would serve 50 children. During the 1974-75 program year the total number of children actually served was 118, more than twice the number estimated.

Of the 50 children estimated to be served it was anticipated that 45 would be Mexican American and 5 Anglo. Of the 118 children actually served, 111 were Mexican American and 7 Anglo.

Of the 118 children served, 100 had been enrolled previously in the Mini Head Start preschool program; 18 were newly enrolled as school-age children accepted as referrals from the school districts in which the program operated because of special need.

CONCLUSION:

The project partially met its goal of serving at least 80% of eligible children at each site. However, the total number of children served (118) was more than double the estimated number (50) in the project proposal.

PROCEDURAL OBJECTIVE:

- 2.1 Tutoring teacher trainees will teach children using both Spanish and English following the plan for alternating language use recommended to them by the educational director, as verified by observations of bilingual teaching made by the trainers or educational director at least twice during the period of program operation.

FINDINGS:

As reported in the mid-year evaluation, the curriculum for teaching Spanish and English used by the Bilingual Mini Schools Tutoring Project was changed during the program year. The educational director selected the DISTAR language program, as taught bilingually, as the primary vehicle for language instruction. This material was phased in during the summer and fall at all sites as materials could be reproduced and teachers trained in its use.

To evaluate the competency of teachers in teaching the new curriculum, a new observation instrument also had to be developed. This was only ready for use during the second half of the program year. The following table, therefore, indicates the teachers involved in the tutoring during the program year, and those who have had two or more observations of bilingual teaching skills as required in the project objective. An asterisk indicates either that the teacher was terminated before the dual language observation instrument was available for use, or that the period of employment was insufficient for evaluation.

The rather large number of different teachers reported is explained by the fact that in many cases, particularly in the mobile program, a teacher taught preschool children during part

of her day and did tutoring of only a few children at that particular site for a few hours a day. This piggyback arrangement allowed the program to serve children at more sites.

TABLE 1
TEACHERS EVALUATED ON DUAL LANGUAGE TEACHING

Site	Period of Time in Tutoring Program	Two or More Observations of Dual Language Teaching Rated Satisfactory
CONNELL		
A	7/ 1/74-11/ 1/74	*
B	9/ 6/74- 5/30/75	Yes
C	1/ 1/75- 6/30/75	Yes
D	11/ 4/74- 6/13/75	No
E	6/16/75- 6/30/75	*
MOSES LAKE		
F	7/ 1/74- 6/30/75	Yes
G	10/28/74- 1/31/75	*
TEXAS-MOBILE		
H	5/ 5/75- 6/30/75	*
I	12/ 9/74- 4/ 4/75	Yes
	4/21/75- 6/13/75	
J	8/26/74-11/ 1/74	Yes
	12/ 9/74- 3/28/75	
	5/ 5/75- 6/ 4/75	
K	6/ 9/75- 6/30/75	Yes
L	12/ 9/74- 3/28/75	Yes
	5/ 1/75- 5/12/75	
M	7/ 1/74- 9/ 6/74	*
N	12/ 9/74- 4/ 4/75	Yes
	5/ 1/75- 6/ 6/75	
O	4/25/75- 6/20/75	Yes
	6/25/75- 6/30/75	
P	6/25/75- 6/30/75	Yes

*Indicates teacher was terminated before dual language teaching instrument, was available for use, or that the teacher had taught less than two months which is the minimum time period for training and completion of two formal observations. Some teachers indicated as having passed two observations with less than two months in the tutoring program were observed as teachers in the preschool program.

CONCLUSION:

The project met its goal of training staff in dual language teaching skills for all but one teacher utilized in the program during the second half of the program year.

PROCESS OBJECTIVE:

- 2.2 Tutoring teacher trainees will give instruction in at least one lesson from the curriculum of bicultural materials each month, as documented by reports of curriculum materials taught to each child submitted to the project evaluator weekly.

FINDINGS:

TABLE 2

MONTHS DURING WHICH CULTURAL HERITAGE LESSONS WERE TAUGHT

Center and Teacher's	1974						1975					
	July	Aug.	Sep.	Oct.	Nov.	Dec.	Jan.	Feb.	Mar.	Apr.	May	Jun
CONNELL, WA												
A	No	Yes	No	No	Yes
B	No	No	No	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
C	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	Yes	Yes	Yes	..
D	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
MOSES LAKE, WA												
A	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	Yes
B	Yes	Yes	Yes
PASCO, WA												
A	No	Yes
B	No	Yes	Yes
C	Yes	Yes
D	Yes
UMATILLA, OR												
A	No	No
GRULLA, TEXAS												
A	Yes	No	Yes	Yes
B	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
C	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
D	Yes	No	Yes	Yes
PROSSER, WA												
A	Yes
B	Yes
MABTON, WA												
A	Yes
WALLA WALLA, WA												
A	Yes
HOOPESTON, ILL												
A	No

Yes = cultural heritage lessons were taught that month.

No = cultural heritage lessons were not taught that month.

.. = either the center was not open or that teacher was not teaching during that month.

TO SUMMARIZE THE FINDINGS:

July through December, 1974, cultural heritage lessons were taught by teachers in 70% of the months reported.

During January, cultural heritage workshops were held at all sites and a mastery test system introduced to measure how well children had learned cultural heritage lessons. In the January to June period the number of months in which cultural heritage lessons were reported went up to 83%.

CONCLUSION:

The program partially met its objective to include cultural heritage lessons every month. Over the entire year the percentage of months in which cultural heritage lessons were reported by tutors was 79%. In the first half of the year this percentage was 70% which went up to 83% in the latter half of the year. However, as the implied standard was 100%, this goal was only partially met.

PROCESS OBJECTIVE:

- 2.3 Tutoring teacher trainees will give instruction in the academic skills of reading and math, using University of Kansas primer followed by Sullivan Reading materials, and Singer Math materials, as documented by reports of curriculum progress submitted to the project evaluator weekly.

FINDINGS:

Project files contain weekly progress reports from every teacher for every week of program operation, with individual end-of-week reports on placement in the above-named curriculum areas.

CONCLUSION:

This objective was met. /

PRODUCT OBJECTIVE:

- 3.1 At least 50% of the project children will show at least a five-point raw score gain on the Peabody Picture Vocabulary test in both their first and second language after each 100 days cumulative attendance in the program.

FINDINGS:

Testing Procedures. Attendance records are kept cumulatively for each child. When a child passes a "testing" point, which means after he has attended the program for a period of 100 days, or any subsequent 100-day attendance interval, the tester is notified at that site and the child is tested that month.

For this evaluation the scores of children in the school-age tutoring program who were tested after any 100-day interval of attendance are compared to the score the child achieved for the previous test. If the child was tested after 200 days attendance, the comparison score would be the score he received after 100 days. For a 100-day test, the comparison score would be the pretest, which is given within the first 30 days of the child's attendance.

In the evaluation findings which are on the following table, if a child had more than one test during the July, 1974 through June, 1975 period, only the latest test is used. Primary language is defined as that language in which the child received the highest score on the post-test. Children are tested in the Peabody Picture Vocabulary Test, Form A in English and Form B in Spanish.

TABLE 3

PEABODY PICTURE VOCABULARY TEST SCORES

GAINS IN ENGLISH

PRIMARY LANGUAGE: Number tested for whom English is first language	Number and percentage who gained five points or more between tests	Meets goal?
40*	28 70%	Yes
SECOND LANGUAGE: Number tested for whom English is second language		
28	17 61%	Yes

GAINS IN SPANISH

PRIMARY LANGUAGE: Number tested for whom Spanish is first language	Number and percentage who gained five points or more between tests	Meets goal?
28	16 57%	Yes
SECOND LANGUAGE: Number tested for whom Spanish is second language		
40	14 35%	No

*Of 40 listed as primary language English, 18 entered program as Spanish dominant.

CONCLUSION:

The project met the arbitrary goal of a five-point raw score gain for children in their primary language in both Spanish and in English. Children for whom English was a second language also met this goal. Children learning Spanish as a second language did not meet the goal.

ADDITIONAL FINDINGS:

Another type of analysis is shown below which is an indication of the increase in bilingual capability by the project children. A language classification system is used to indicate the

extent to which the child has a second language capability. Each time the child is given the Peabody Picture Vocabulary Test a new classification is entered based on the comparison between his scores in his first and second language.

The lowest classification is "negligible"--meaning the score in the child's second language is 9 points or less. The next classification step would be "fair" where the second language score is 10 points or more, but is not as high as 50% of the score he got in his first language. The next classification is "bilingual" in which the score in the second language is 50% or more as high as the score in the first language. And the top classification is "equal" in which the second language score has equaled or excelled the score in the first language, at which point the child can communicate readily in either language and profit from instruction in either language.

Of the 68 children for whom Peabody test scores were available in the school-age tutoring program, the following table shows the change in language classification between the latest score and the initial score the child had when he was pre-tested upon entering the program.

TABLE 4
CHANGE IN LANGUAGE CLASSIFICATION OF PROJECT CHILDREN

	BEFORE PROGRAM EXPERIENCE (on pretest within first 30 days after enrollment)		AFTER PROGRAM EXPERIENCE (on latest test taken during the last program year)	
	No.	%	No.	%
Negligible	38	56	10	15
Fair	15	22	13	19
Bilingual	14	21	26	38
Equal	1	1	19	28

TO SUMMARIZE THE FINDINGS FROM TABLE 4:

1. When children first entered the program (most in pre-school) 56% had only a negligible knowledge of their second language. After program experience children whose dual language capability would still be considered negligible were less than 15% of the total group.
2. Children who enrolled in the program already having the ability to communicate in two languages, so they would be classified as bilingual or equal in the above categories, represented only 22% of the total group on their pretests. After program experience, two-thirds of the total group (66%) had achieved this dual language capability.

CONCLUSION:

The relative strength of the two languages which this program attempts to teach has increased significantly for the majority of children enrolled. This measure of increased dual language capability is probably a more significant indication of language gains than the raw score gains reported above.

PRODUCT OBJECTIVE:

- 3.2 At least 75% of project children will receive a performance rating of satisfactory for one or more cultural heritage lessons (i.e., songs, finger plays, educational games, stories about family traditions or traditional holidays, dances, etc.) for each four weeks enrollment in the program. as evidenced by cultural heritage mastery tests submitted to the project evaluator.

FINDINGS:

The cultural heritage mastery tests were developed during the year. In January, workshops were held at all sites to explain their use to teachers, and this objective was activated as of February 1, 1975. The table which follows indicates the number and percentage of children, by site, who had a cultural heritage test with a satisfactory score for each 20-day period of attendance between February 1 and June 30, 1975.

TABLE 5

CULTURAL HERITAGE MASTERY TESTS WITH SATISFACTORY RATING RELATED TO ATTENDANCE FEBRUARY THROUGH JUNE, 1975

Center:	Number of Children With 20 or More Days Attendance	Number and Percentage of Children Passing One or More Cultural Heritage Tests per 20 Days Attendance	Meets 75% Goal?
CONNELL, WA 29	16	55%	No
MOSES LAKE, WA 20	1	5%	No
TEXAS-MOBILE SITES 29	15	52%	No
TOTAL OF ALL SITES 78	32	41%	No

COMMENT:

None of the sites met the goal, and there was a general feeling among teachers that the amount of teaching of cultural heritage lessons necessary before giving a mastery test was hard to work into the schedule in the amount that is necessary to achieve the project goal, given the limited period of time each day for children who are also attending school. The standard set was the same for the school-age tutoring program as for the preschool children who are in the program a full day. The frequency of testing required for the coming year has therefore been reduced.

The really significant failure to meet the goal at Moses Lake represented a case where the teacher felt that she had a religious conflict in relationship to much of the cultural heritage curriculum. Her religious faith does not allow celebration of holidays, and much of the cultural heritage curriculum is holiday related. She has subsequently left the program (for unrelated reasons). It is therefore anticipated that with new staffing, this aspect of the curriculum can again be fully implemented at this site.

CONCLUSION:

There is some indication that the goal set was unreasonably high for the time available to tutor children in the school-age program. However, as stated, the goal was only partially met..

PRODUCT OBJECTIVE:

- 3.3 At least 50% of the project children will have advanced by at least one month in grade equivalent level score for each 20 days cumulative attendance since their previous test on the math and on the reading sections of the Wide Range Achievement Test, administered individually in the child's primary language.

FINDINGS:

Testing and Analysis Procedures and Rationale: The Wide Range Achievement Test is administered as a pretest within the first 30 days after children enroll in the program. During the past program year it has then been given approximately every six months to all children who had attended the program 40 or more days (i.e., two of the "attendance units" of 20 days each) since the previous test. In the Spring of 1975, on advice of the evaluation consultant, a system of testing on 100-day attendance intervals, individually determined, was initiated (this is the basis on which all other tests are given).

For this evaluation, any WRAT test administered July 1974 through June 1975 to a child in the school-age program, in which there had been at least 40 days attendance since the previous test, is included in the analysis below. Since the enrollment in this program is continuous from preschool into school-age, this means that some of the tests were given while children were still enrolled in the preschool. More than one test for an individual child may be included as the gain standard is from test to test based on attendance during the intervening period. There are more math tests reported than reading because some children, when tested as preschoolers (which would be the pretest comparison for a test given later as school-age enrollees) were enrolled at a time

when reading was not in the preschool curriculum. Their WRAT testing therefore included math but did not include the reading subtest. If a pretest comparison score was not available for the reading score, that test could not be included for analysis.

The grade equivalent score is published by the test authors. Based on their standardization sample this represents an increment increase which corresponds to a month of schooling at whatever grade level is reported. Using the 20-day attendance period as a rough equivalent of a month of school, a gain of one grade equivalent month for each attendance period represents a basis for determining how much gain would represent "normal" progress. A gain of more than one grade equivalent month for each 20 days also provides a rough measure that the progress the child is making is somewhat accelerated. We are hoping the added tutoring is helping some children who might not be making "normal" progress, to achieve it, or better still achieve accelerated progress as the population we serve misses a good deal of school and needs acceleration during attendance periods.

TABLE 6
WIDE RANGE ACHIEVEMENT TEST SCORES

GAIN IN MATH		
Number of Cases in Analysis Group	Number and Percentage of Children Who Gained One or More Months in Grade Equivalent Score for Each 20 Days Attended Between Tests	Meets Goal?
110	86 (78%)	Yes
GAIN IN READING		
Number of Cases in Analysis Group	Number and Percentage of Children Who Gained One or More Months in Grade Equivalent Score for Each 20 Days Attended Between Tests	Meets Goal?
72	46 (64%)	Yes

TO SUMMARIZE THE FINDINGS FROM TABLE 6:

1. Over three-fourths of the children in the school-age tutoring programs have shown gains in math that are somewhat accelerated (more than one month increase in score per 20 days attendance in the program).
2. Nearly two-thirds of the children also show a somewhat accelerated gain in reading scores.

CONCLUSION:

The project has met its goals, for the academic areas of math and reading.

SUMMARY OF PROJECT OBJECTIVES

	<u>Exceeded</u>	<u>Met</u>	<u>Partially Met</u>	<u>Not Met</u>
<u>INSTITUTIONAL OBJECTIVES</u>				
1(A) Project will coordinate with school administrators at each site.		X		
(B) Project will enroll at least 80% of eligible children at each site. (Note: Project enrolled more than double the number of children for which it was funded but this turned out to be slightly less than 80% of those eligible at one site.)			X	
<u>PROCEDURAL OBJECTIVES</u>				
2.1 Teachers will use approved techniques for dual language teaching.			X	
2.2 Teachers will give lessons from bicultural curriculum each month.			X	
2.3 Teachers will give lessons in math and reading reporting weekly progress.		X		
<u>EDUCATIONAL PRODUCT OBJECTIVES</u>				
3.1 Children will show at least a 5-point raw score gain on PPVT after each 100 days attendance				
(a) In Spanish as first language.		X		
(b) In Spanish as second language.			X	
(c) In English as first language.	X			
(d) In English as second language.		X		
3.2 At least 75% of project children will receive a rating of satisfactory on cultural heritage tests.			X	
3.3 At least 50% of project children will show an advancement of one or more months in grade equivalent score on WRAT for each 20 days attended between tests.				
(a) GAINS IN MATH		X		
(b) GAINS IN READING		X		

NARRATIVE PROGRESS REPORT

This is the fourth evaluation report on this program which has been in operation since February, 1974 in the permanent sites in Washington, and since May, 1974 for the mobile component. The mid-year evaluation narrative report discussed curriculum and staff training and the many ways in which these had to be developed and specially tailored to fit program needs. This narrative progress report will describe the functioning of the parent advisory groups, which are an important aspect of the U.R.R.D. concept. It will also describe the logistics of the mobile program and the way in which the program has managed to follow children, so far to eight different communities in four different states.

PARENT ADVISORY COMMITTEE

A parent advisory committee has been formed for the school-age tutoring project in conjunction with the Mini Head Start program, which is the bilingual preschool companion program. In Washington State the organization is town meeting style--all parents of children invited to attend all meetings, with the parents electing officers. In Texas the parent advisory group decided to incorporate with an official board of trustees. This was done so that the group could apply for funds to expand the program services. The group is planning toward construction of a building to house the program and is engaged in money raising toward this end. In Texas the official board members include townspeople in addition to parents (only parents belong in the Washington State centers, although guests are frequently present and always welcome.)



At left: Beatriz Olivas, chairperson of the Parent Advisory Committee at Moses Lake, Washington.

Parents screen and select all paraprofessional staff for the U.R.R.D. tutoring for school-age children, and for Bilingual Mini Head Start.

At right: Rafael Guerra, Educational Director for the U.R.R.D. tutoring project and Bilingual Mini Head Start.

Mr. Guerra meets with parents at the labor camps to review project proposals and make program decisions during the work season months.

During the winter the parent group is incorporated as the "La Grulla Migrant Co-op."

Mr. Guerra grew up working as a migrant. "My mother took me to the fields in a cardboard box when I was two weeks old." Mr. Guerra now holds a master's degree in education.



One reason for this inclusion of townspeople is that one of the primary functions of the Parent Advisory Committee is to screen and hire all of the paraprofessional teachers employed in the program. The Parent Advisory Committee, through its personnel committee--or the board in the case of the Texas group which is incorporated as the "La Grulla Migrant Co-op," has final authority over these personnel decisions. Intermediate School District 104, which manages the programs, does not require right of review of these personnel actions. In La Grulla, the community is very small and "everybody" is "related to" everybody else it seems. Parents of children in the program are hired as teachers in the program, and by selecting townspeople for some positions on the board, rather than all parents, the board has been able to avoid nepotism and leave most of the parents eligible for consideration for teacher, or other openings (the advisory committee also selects the staff for kitchen and transportation work).

In Texas, although there is an official board, there are also general parent meetings to which all parents are invited as at the other sites. While the mobile project is in its northern phase, many key program decisions have to be made. Usually April and May (which are work months in the north) are the months in which the proposals and budgets need to be reviewed by the parent advisory committees and authorization given for various funding applications. Mr. Rafael Guerra, the educational director, and Mr. Jaime Ramirez, the site coordinator, hold meetings with clusters of parents in the farm labor camps in Washington State, for discussion of proposals and other business that must be handled during this period.

BILINGUAL MINI HEAD START
Parent-Community Advisory Group
Evaluation

Your evaluation is needed to help us improve the educational program for your children. Please check your opinion of the parts of the program you observe. Please write in comments if you feel we should change something.

EDUCATIONAL PROGRAM	WELL DONE	SATISFACTORY	NEEDS CHANGE	SUGGESTIONS
1. Reading				
2. Math	yes			
3. Language (English & Spanish)	yes			
4. Handwriting	yes			
5. Reinforcing Activities	yes			
6. Cultural Heritage	yes			
TEACHING METHODS				
1. Teachers give lots of encouragement.	yes			
2. Teachers keep children on task.	yes			
3. Children work at their own pace in reading, math and handwriting.	yes			
4. Program keeps track of each child's progress.	yes			

OVERALL COMMENTS ON THE EDUCATION PROGRAM:
(Use other side of paper)

Beatriz H. Gilman

April 1975--Comment page of parent evaluation of program, Moses
Lake, Washington

I think the teaching program as a whole is very good, the reading and math is very good because it prepares them for ~~more~~ a little more advanced things when they start school.

As for the English and Spanish distar I think that's a very good part of spine head state. It's also very important especially for a little kid to communicate with other kids in their own language like a Mexican kid with an English and vice-versa. I'm really amazed at all the Spanish some of these kids speak, and it's not just slang Spanish it's correct Spanish.

The way the teachers teach is very good and fair. ~~They~~ They ^{kids} work at their own pace.

If one child is more advanced than the other. The one that's more advanced is put to work in his ~~or~~ book or given something to do while the child that isn't is taken aside ~~and~~ but the teacher is taught slowly and with a lot more patience.

As for a keeping track of their progress in the tester for the center here, their tested on everything and I'm ~~am~~ sometimes amazed at the progress the kids make.

This is my ~~own~~ opinion.

John H.

This year parents selected by the parent advisory groups held formal evaluations of program operations. The committee of parents was given briefing on all aspects of the curriculum and teaching methods we are using and then observed the program in operation and filled out written evaluations which were mailed to the evaluator. Evaluation reports as written by two parents at the Moses Lake center are included as part of this narrative report.

This process of parent evaluation of program, as well as other ways in which parents participate in the management of the U.R.R.D. tutoring project and Mini Head Start have been incorporated as official project objectives in the proposal which will be carried out in the coming year.

LOGISTICS OF THE MOBILE PROGRAM

As discussed in the first section of the evaluation where the program rationale is given, the key to being able to "follow" mobile migrant children successfully is flexibility in being able to serve the child even though there are very small numbers at any one location. In the Texas centers two teachers were able to work full time with school-age children, taking one group after another on a schedule worked out with their teachers and the administrators of the elementary school. Two other teachers taught preschool children during the morning and then took on school-age tutoring in the afternoon as the regular school schedule can allow children more free time for such tutoring after lunch, without disturbing regular class groups in the morning.



Annual trek begins from south Texas town of La Grulla, where most of the 1,300 inhabitants are migrant workers

"Home Base" for the mobile component is La Grulla, Texas, as shown above in a picture taken from an article about migrants published in U.S. News and World Report, April 28, 1975. The picture below, from the same article, shows families loading busses as they leave to work in the asparagus fields and canneries in Washington State.



This situation of being able to arrange time for tutoring⁴⁰ mainly in the afternoon (and in some cases we are doing it in the evening when the children are back at the camps) has meant that we have been able to "piggy back" the school-age tutoring, utilizing trained staff who work with the preschool program most of the day to handle afternoon or evening tutoring of school-age children. This has given us the flexibility, and the trained staff, to reach children at many locations.

At present we are only working with kindergarten and first grade children. This coming winter we will continue with some children going into second grade. As the number of grade levels covered increases, the clusters of school-age children will become larger at individual sites, and the problem of staffing for very small numbers of children will be somewhat reduced.

A "cycle" as we have been evaluating it begins with the children we are able to serve in the home base area, La Grulla. We then see how many of these children we can serve in one or more of the locations to which they move in the north. The first complete "cycle" back to home base will not have occurred until this fall, so the mid-year evaluation which will be the next report on this program will contain information on what percentage of children we achieved continuity with service at two or more sites. At this time the project has already achieved continuity with just over 50% of the children served in the home base program. This is expected to increase when we pick up children we know are headed for work locations where we can serve them during the fall harvest season.

Aniceto Zarate taught successive groups of children on a released time basis while they attended school in La Grulla.

In April he and the children moved north and he tutored in the schools and in the farm labor camp for families working at Pasco, Washington.



All curriculum materials are individualized and programmed, with in-book tests to check mastery.

He thinks he might use a little help at right, but you are on your own on a test page.

Evaluation results show the project is meeting its goals of accelerated progress in math and reading.



CONCLUSION

The U.R.R.D. Bilingual Mini School Tutoring Project is operating as a program which offers parents a major role in the education of their children: as decision makers responsible for hiring and many other areas of program operations, as teachers providing bilingual, bicultural instruction.

The program operations this year have demonstrated that it is feasible to have a program which moves with mobile children. Cooperation from school districts to this supplementary tutoring has demonstrated that the approach is seen as useful as an extension of what the public schools are able to provide the short-term migrant child.

In permanent sites the program has demonstrated a way in which paraprofessional teachers can provide bilingual instruction and individualized assistance to children in a manner which has won the respect of teachers.

The program achieved success in helping children with negligible second language skills develop a true bilingual capability in Spanish and English.

The means of teaching and measuring increased knowledge of cultural lesson materials has been developed, and although the project did not meet its goals yet in this area, the level of performance has shown improvement as the project matures.

Children are demonstrating accelerated gains in math and in reading which meet the project goals.

There are so many unique aspects to this program that it must still be considered in a developmental stage. Nonetheless the evidence exists that it is reaching substantial numbers of children (more than double the projected number in the proposal) and is having a significant effect on their educational progress.