DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 126 215 UD 016 186

AUTHOR Placide, Dorothy J.
TITLE Special Educational Needs Program. End of Year Report, FY 1976.
INSTITUTION Wisconsin State Dept. of Public Instruction, Madison.
PUB DATE 1 Jul 76
NOTE 104p.

EDRS PRICE MF-$0.83 HC-$6.01 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS Academic Achievement; *Compensatory Education Programs; Educationally Disadvantaged; Educational Needs; *Elementary Secondary Education; Nonpublic School Aid; Parent Participation; *Preschool Education; Program Costs; *Program Evaluation; Small Group Instruction; Staff Improvement; *State Programs
IDENTIFIERS Special Educational Needs Program; *Wisconsin

ABSTRACT

The Special Educational Needs Program (SEN) was established in 1973 to provide supplemental educational resources for children who have or are likely to have low levels of achievement, especially in relation to social and economic factors. The SEN program is unique in that it is the first and only Department of Public Instruction program which funds educational programs for nonpublic, nonsectarian agencies on the same basis as public schools. The program additionally provides for preschool children who are presently enrolled in noneducational day care and other such agencies. SEN is also the only state funded program which can provide supplemental funding for public school districts wishing to establish programs for prekindergarten students who are potentially low achievers with economic and social deprivation. During the past year, 1975-76, the SEN program funded 29 projects, serving a total of 2376 children. This report has identified the financial and statistical information relative to enrollment expenditures and grant awards issued to all participating agencies. It also contains the results of each project's standardized test data on the achievement of students participating in the SEN program. (Author/JM)

SPECIAL EDUCATIONAL NEEDS PROGRAM

END-OF-YEAR REPORT
FY 1976

July 1, 1976

PREPARED BY

Dorothy J. Placide
Consultant

Barbara Thompson, Ph.D.
State Superintendent

Robert C. Van Raalte
Assistant Superintendent
Division for Instructional Services

John P. Lawrence, Ph.D.
Program Administrator
Special Educational Needs Program

TABLE OF CONTENTS

LIST OF TABLES

Chapter I

Introduction

The Special Educational Needs Program (SEN) was established in 1973 under Chapter 90 of the statutes to provide supplemental educational resources for children who have or are likely to have low levels of achievement, especially in relation to social and economic factors. The program was refunded for the 1975-77 biennium at a reduced level (2.9 million dollars for 1974-75 compared with 1.5 million dollars for each year of the 1975-77 biennium). This reduction in the allocation resulted in the elimination of 11 projects which operated in FY1975 plus a substantial reduction of funds for most of those projects which were refunded. A total of 2,376 children are served by 12 public agencies and 17 private agencies. Of the 29 projects, 20 are preschool and serve 1,216 children.

The State Advisory Committee and Department of Public Instruction staff members evaluated and revised the program guidelines which have strengthened the efficacy of current programs. For example, all projects funded for FY1976 were required to develop objectives, strategies for implementation and evaluation procedures for each of the required components: (1) Local Advisory Program Council, (2) Staff Development, (3) Instructional Program, and (4) Parent Education and Involvement.

The SEN program is unique in that it is the first and only Department of Public Instruction program which funds educational programs for non-public, non-sectarian agencies on the same basis as public schools. The program provides for the development of supplementary educational components for preschool children who are presently enrolled in "non-educational" day care and other such agencies. SEN is also the only state funded program which can provide supplemental funding for public school districts wishing to establish programs for pre-kindergarten students who are potentially low achievers with economic and social deprivation.

The nature of the needs of the participants in the SEN program along with the creative and innovative emphasis reflects in a wide range of program intervention strategies and program emphasis. As a result, across project evaluation is vertually impossible in the instructional areas. Therefore, this report contains the results of each project's standardized test data on the achievement of students participating in the SEN program.

Chapter 2

Project Information - Description

Table 1 indicates the distribution of SEN funds between Public and Private agencies. The Public agencies (schools) had five fewer projects while serving 67.7 percent of the SEN participants and receiving 66.3 percent of the total SEN funds. The average per pupil expenditure for Public and Private agencies is reported at $626.03 and $637.69 respectively. The Private agencies were awarded 18 or 58.1 percent of the SEN projects while serving 33.3 percent of the children served and receiving 33.7 percent of the total SEN funds. The average cost per pupil reported across agencies was $629.92.

Table 1

SEN Projects by Agency Type, Expenditure and Enrollment

Agency	Project		Budgeted Expenditure		Enrollment		Average Per Pupil Expenditure
	N	%	N	%	N	%	
Public	13	41.9	$ 991,640	66.3	1,584	66.7	$626.03
Private	18	58.1	$ 505,048	33.7	792	33.3	$637.69
Total	31*	100.0	$1,496,688	100.0	2,376	100.0	$629.92

* includes Milwaukee Co-op Coordination and Green Bay Parent Education

Tables 2 and 3 present the expenditure levels, enrollment totals and per pupil cost by Public and Private agency type. Table 2 indicates this distribution between Public school projects. This table, therefore, shows range in per pupil costs from $466.86 in the Gillett Public Schools project to $740.74 per pupil in the Beloit Public Schools project.

Per pupil costs between projects cannot be directly compared because of the great differences between projects as regards (a) program model, (b) personnel qualifications, (c) amounts of intervention time per day/per week, and (d) instructional strategies and materials, etc.

Table 2

Public Agencies, Expenditure and Enrollment

Agency	Budgeted Amount	# of Participants	Per Pupil Cost
Beloit	$100,000.	135	$740.74
CESA #6	$ 80,000	160	$500.00
CESA #13	$ 82,300	120	$685.83
CESA #18	$ 60,000	100	$600.00
Gillett	$ 16,340	35	$466.86
Green Bay - Language	$100,000	153	$653.59
Parent Educ.	$ 10,000	24	$416.67
Melrose-Mindoro	$ 50,000	90	$555.56
Milwaukee P.S.	$200,000	358	$558.66
Racine	$150,000	224	$669.64
Sheboygan	$ 72,000	90	$800.00
Stoughton	$ 31,000	45	$688.89
Tomah	$ 35,000	50	$700.00
TOTAL	$986,640		
Special Experimental Project Monies	$ 5,000 (allocated - not expended)		
GRAND TOTAL	$991,640	1,584	$626.03

When looking at Table 3, it is important to note a wider variation in budgets, number of participants, and per pupil costs. Included in this table are the three projects funded out of the $100,000 allotted under discretionary funds (Commando, Tri-City, and Menominee County Education Committee). The Commando project did not receive a reduction in its funding level from FY1975 to FY1976. The tota budgets for SEN projects in Private agencies ranged from $3,000 to $79,198.

Table 3

Private Agencies, Expenditure and Enrollment

Agency	Budgeted Amount	# of Participants	Per Pupil Cost
CDI	$ 20,000	32	$625.00
CR-SDC	$ 30,100	35	$860.00
Menominee CAP	$ 35,000	60	$558.00
Rock CAP	$ 25,000	42	$595.00
Southwestern CAP	$ 60,000	90	$666.67
South Wood	$ 30,440	67	$454.33
Commando	$ 79,198	80	$989.98
Menominee Co. Ed.	$ 17,800	42	$423.81
Tri-City	$ 3,000	10	$300.00
Milwaukee Co-op	$ 14,800		
Carter	$ 30,000	48	$625.00
Cosmic	$ 8,000	12	$666.67
Harambee	$ 18,603	33	$563.73
Highland	$ 10,107	18	$561.50
Journey	$ 57,000	73	$780.82
Leo	$ 25,000	56	$446.43
Rainbow	$ 11,000	21	$523.81
Urban Day	$ 30,000	73	$410.96
TOTAL	$505,048	792	$637.69

Summarized in Table 4 are the number and kinds of persons involved in personnel categories funded by the SEN program. An examination of the table shows four types of personnel categories; these include Administrative, Qualified Teachers, Paraprofessionals, and Regular Volunteers.

SEN funds are supplemental to ongoing school or agency programs for those pupils enrolled and identified as eligible participants. Too, SEN funds are considered to be programmatic. Therefore, the skewed distribution of position

in the instructional area is consistent with the design of the program. Witnessed during this 1975-76 project year has been an increase in the number of volunteers working in SEN projects on a regular basis; this increase may be related to the reduction in funding level for projects from the previous year(s).

Table 4 identifies that one hundred and seventy-seven point seventy-seven (177.77 - full-time equivalency) positions were funded during the 1975-76 project year. It is interesting to note that while the difference between the number

Table 4

Number of Full-Time Persons Involved in Personnel Categories
(full-time equivalency)

	Staff Administration	Qualified Teachers	Paraprofessional Positions	Volunteers (regular basis)
Public	3.17	41.85	58.45	104.40
Private	4.22	36.52	33.56	52.00
TOTAL	7.39	78.37	92.01	156.40

SEN Personnel:	Administration	7.39	
	Qualified Teachers	78.37	
	Paraprofessionals	92.01	177.77 Total Paid Staff
	Regular Volunteers	156.40	
	TOTAL	334.17	

of qualified teachers between agencies is small, public schools utilized a larger number of paraprofessionals then private agencies. It was observed that many licensed teachers were employed in SEN projects on a paraprofessional salary basis.

Table 5 identifies the variety of average pupil contacts for children participating in a selection of SEN program models. It represents a sampling of charts as completed by six participating projects.

Table 5

Average Pupil Contact by School/Agency Model

Total SEN Project Participants: 133

Type of Contact	No. of Pupils	No. of Contacts Per Week Per Pupil	No. of Minutes Per Week Per Pupil	No. of Weeks Per Pupil
One-to-One	133	1	60	31
Groups of 5 or Less	-	-	-	-
Groups of 6 or More	-	-	-	-

Home Base — Chart 1

Total SEN Project Participants: 90

Type of Contact	No. of Pupils	No. of Contacts Per Week Per Pupil	No. of Minutes Per Week Per Pupil	No. of Weeks Per Pupil
One-to-One	52	1	90 min.	32
Groups of 5 or Less	53	1	90 min.	32
Groups of 6 or More	105	every other week	150 min. every other week	16

Home Base and Cluster — Chart 2

Total SEN Project Participants: 135

Type of Contact	No. of Pupils	No. of Contacts Per Week Per Pupil	No. of Minutes Per Week Per Pupil	No. of Weeks Per Pupil
One-to-One	19	1	60	31
Groups of 5 or Less	18	18	120	31
Groups of 6 or More	94	4	600	33

Home Base and School Base — Chart 3

Table 5 (continued)

Total SEN Project Participants: 358

School/ Center Base — Chart 4

Type of Contact	No. of Pupils	No. of Contacts Per Week Per Pupil	No. of Minutes Per Week Per Pupil	No. of Weeks Per Pupil
One-to-One	16	4	100	32
Groups of 5 or Less	84	4	135	32
Groups of 6 or More	413	3	188	32

Total SEN Project Participants: 224

School/ Center Base — Chart 5

Type of Contact	No. of Pupils	No. of Contacts Per Week Per Pupil	No. of Minutes Per Week Per Pupil	No. of Weeks Per Pupil
One-to-One	-	-	-	-
Groups of 5 or Less	224	4 or 5	180 or 225	22 or 38
Groups of 6 or More	-	-	-	-

Total SEN Project Participants: 48

Day Care Head Start — Chart 6

Type of Contact	No. of Pupils	No. of Contacts Per Week Per Pupil	No. of Minutes Per Week Per Pupil	No. of Weeks Per Pupil
One-to-One	40	5	75	36
Groups of 5 or Less	46	5	100	36
Groups of 6 or More	46	15	300	36

Table 5 shows the wide variations in amount of pupil contact given a sampling of the SEN project models operating during 1975-76. The real significance of these per student contact data is that they show that the SEN program was highly individualized, and that within a given week of operation, an instructional arrangement of one-to-one or instructional groups of less than five can be observed. As reported in later sections of this report (Chapters 3 and 4), the instructional pattern of the SEN program was evaluated as quite satisfactory and surely one element of the program contributing to the positive student achievement patterns which are reported.

The data reveals that a student participating in a Home Base project may receive instruction on a one-to-one basis for at least 60 minutes per week (Chart 1). In an almost similar program model (Chart 2), a student receives, in addition to 90 minutes of one-to-one instruction, a bi-weekly cluster grouping for 150 minutes.

Supplementing the regular school program, the SEN participant in Charts 4 and 6 may receive SEN programming on a one-to-one basis or in a group setting. In programming for SEN children, Chart 5 illustrates a project that provides services in a small group arrangement of less than five children.

The data in Table 6 shows the ethnic characteristics of the children participating in the 29 SEN projects. The table shows that the children participating were more likely to be White than minority, with Blacks representing the largest minority group (27%). Fifty-one percent (1,216) of the children participating were in pre-kindergarten or kindergarten. Combining the 51 percent of pre-schoolers with the 407 (18%) children served in grades 1-3, we find that priority has been given to programs for preschool and primary elementary grade children.

Table 6

Ethnicity of SEN Participants

Ethnic Group	Pre-Kindergarten	Kindergarten	Grades 1-3	Grades 4-12	Totals	Percentage
Spanish Surname	30	--	46	111	187	8%
Black	206	49	170	215	640	27%
Native American	88	--	8	46	142	6%
Oriental	9	1	1	2	13	-
All Others	798	35	182	379	1,394	59%
Grand Totals	1,131	85	407	753	2,376	100%

1,216 or 51%

18%

69%

Chapter 3

Project Component Reporting

During the 1975-76 project year, each SEN project completed the SEN Program-Self-Evaluation Report (Appendix E). This report was administered during the last quarter of the project period. The great majority of self-evaluations took place during the months of April and May.

SEN Program - Self-Evaluations were completed by the individual projects utilizing input from parents, staff, school administration, and LAPC members.

A self-evaluation process was conducted to look at specific project activities, overall strengths and weaknesses of component areas, objectives which were most successfully and least successfully met, and the unmet needs of the program.

The DPI SEN staff made an on-site visit to all of the SEN projects for the purpose of validation and made a judgment as to quality of each area. The following is a composite of the self-evaluation from the participating projects and on-site evaluations from the DPI SEN staff relative to overall program operations.

Composite Judgment of Components
(Number of Projects Receiving Each Rating)

	Adequate - Good	Very Good - Excellent
General Program Administration	9	20
LAPC	12	17
Instructional Program	8	21
Staff Development	5	24
Parent Education	13	16

General Program Administration

Evaluation items identified in this area point up the degree to which the general program administration has been involved in all components of the program.

The number of projects reporting a rating from very good to excellent in administration totaled twenty (20). In the nine (9) projects reporting an adequate to good rating in administration, eight (8) of these are private agencies, where in-kind administrative services are thought to be "unfair" and "over bearing". While administrative costs are not reported in the majority of projects, administrative costs in any SEN projects are reported at less than seven percent. An even greater decrease is approved for the 1976-77 project year.

In reporting the overall strengths of their SEN projects, administrators have cited the following:

a. Base support and genuine backing of school/agency administration.

b. The opportunity to create additional small group and individualized learning environments.

c. The opportunity to capitalize on all of the advantages of a home-base program (i.e. parent involvement and parent education).

d. The involvement of parents on the LAPC and in a formalized parent education program.

Project administrators have also identified areas of weaknesses in implementing the SEN projects:

a. The inability to locate a standardized test that would better "tell the story" of progress with the children.

b. The inability to do long-range program planning due to approval, fiscal and employment concerns.

c. The lack of funds for general program administration.

d. The annual change in LAPC membership (parent members) as their children move out of the program.

Local Advisory Program Councils

As identified in the SEN 1975-76 Handbook, indepth and meaningful involvement of the LAPC is essential in initiating, planning, developing, implementing, and evaluating the SEN project.

An evaluation of the LAPC component reflects that 17 of the 29 projects had LAPC's functioning at an excellent to very good level, while 12 projects rated themselves at a good or less level in this area. It must be stated that the average number of meetings was seven during the project year and that half of the LAPC's are functioning with by-laws governing their operations.

In those projects where the LAPC is functioning at a very good or excellent level, the strengths of the LAPC were listed as follows:

a. The LAPC has formulated written by-laws thus aiding its endeavors.
b. The LAPC is actively involved in making recommendations with respect to overall program policy and procedure.
c. The LAPC minutes are distributed to all parents of children in the program.
d. The members of the LAPC will conduct regularly scheduled meetings to review the program.

Projects reporting less effective LAPC's identified the following weaknesses and shortcomings:

a. Many parents on the LAPC were not capable of this high level of involvement in educational programs.
b. On-going monitoring of the instructional program was not possible as outside members (community, parents) were unable to be at school/home during program operation.
c. Attendance at meetings by members other than school staff was low (working parents, travel, babysitting, farm families, etc.).

It should be noted that in formulating conclusions on the effectiveness of LAPC's, projects reported that this body is a vital and essential component of the overall SEN program.

instructional Program

An evaluation (project self-evaluation and DPI staff on-site visit) of the instructional program component of the SEN projects yielded a very good to excellent rating in 21 (72%) of the projects. The remaining eight (28%) projects recorded a good rating in this area.

Projects reporting an excellent rating of the instructional program usually attributed same to a combination of the following:

a. All objectives were specific and recognize the influence of environmental factors upon intellectual development.

b. The relationship between environmental experience and development was taken into account in the implementation of project activities.

c. The program areas selected are those that can realistically be expected to be remediated by appropriate intervention and instruction.

d. Individualized and small group settings were beneficial in improving confidence, independence, self-image, and overall adjustment necessary for learning.

In summarizing its program, one project stated:

> "Our instructional approach is by necessity eclectic, having combined the 'best' of a number of models, to fit the needs of our population of children and to accommodate their variety of cultural and experiential backgrounds and differences, and their learning styles. We combine the learning strategies of direct instruction/imitation, self-correcting materials, guided discovery and open-ended discovery into an objective oriented program.
>
> Our staff has brought to the program a variety of training backgrounds, teaching styles and activity ideas. The blending of staff talents and sharing of ideas has truly enhanced the instructional program.
>
> We have a sound testing program, appropriate objectives and a wealth of material resource and personnel resource."

In assessing the instructional program component, weaknesses were also identified:

a. It is recognized that there is a weakness in the area of parent follow-up in the home.

b. Additional assistance is needed from specialists (physical education, speech, music, etc.) to better assist pupils and staff in these areas.

c. The uncertainty on the part of staff to define realistic and legitimate behavioral expectations for pre-school children in program variations.

d. A trial and error method in identifying the "appropriate" testing instrument that will assess all program efforts.

e. The inability to effectively utilize the regular school/agency staff in the preparation of educational prescriptions for the SEN children. Limited communication with content teachers hindered efficiency of some instructional methods used.

When reporting on the positive and negative outcomes (side effects) of the strategies employed, projects offered the following:

a. The only negative outcome of the entire intervention deals with the "delimiting stigma" associated with the economic criteria for selection of children.

b. Because of the close and frequent contact that staff has with parents, staff is becoming more aware of the parents' attitudes toward schools and the education enterprise.

c. A definite positive change in both older and younger siblings has been reported by staff and parents.

Staff Development (In-Service)

The pre-servicing of staff and continuous in-service training of staff are recommended by the DPI staff.

A larger number of projects reported an excellent or very good evaluation of this program component area. Only five of the projects participating recorded an adequate to good rating in this area. In identifying the strengths of the staff development efforts, projects submitted the following:

a. The amount of planning time made possible necessary time to prepare the instructional program well, and have staff interaction (cooperative planning and sharing).

b. Paraprofessionals have many opportunities to consult with trained teachers regarding the needs and interests of the students.

c. In-service is directly related to SEN program needs.

Even though projects reported overwhelming successes in this area, weaknesses and unmet needs in the area were also identified. Projects continue to report:

a. That a reduction in funds has dramatically reduced the assistance of outside consultants from other disciplines.

b. Staff development does not provide for a more continuous, on-going program with appropriate evaluation and follow-up at short term intervals.

c. Pre-school projects cite limited successes in reaching some common perceptions of Early Childhood Education between pre-kindergarten and kindergarten staff members. One project director mentioned that "having the opportunity for exchange does not always assure that communication will really happen. Widely differing philosophies among pre-school staff is a limiting factor in best utilization of staff exchange."

In reporting on the objectives that were most successfully met in staff development, those reported most frequently were as follows:

a. To help SEN staff develop more innovative, creative opportunities for under-achievers.

b. To expose staff to theory and demonstrations of screening instruments, program materials, and teaching methods and techniques.

c. To allow staff opportunities to develop new teaching materials geared to meeting the needs of SEN participants.

d. To allow SEN staff the opportunity to participate in all appropriate in-service training sponsored by the school/agency - thus becoming cognizant of the district's/agency's academic programs.

e. Through an on-going in-service program, the SEN staff will gain greater insight in child growth and development; acquire greater skill in human relations; and become aware of psychological concepts related to human development.

f. To foster improved communication skills of staff by allowing them to participate in Teacher Effectiveness Training and Parent Effectiveness Training.

Parent Education

Intense parent education activities appear to be more typical of programs geared to serve the young child. Pre-school projects evaluating the effects of parent education have reported satisfaction in this area, with more notable effects in the home-based programs and parent-operated community schools.

Drafted from the responses from a project serving middle school children is the following:

> "Parents tend to become less involved in the educational processes of the child as the child progresses in the grades. Involvement at the middle school and secondary levels is limited."

A recording of project self-evaluation in this program component area yielded the following ratings: 4 adequate, 9 good, 13 very good, and 3 excellent.

Some of the characteristics noted in projects with a very good to excellent rating are:

a. Frequent contacts with parents via letters, newsletters, conferences, group clusters, etc.

b. Teacher enthusiasm in an altruistic sense in giving of much of their own personal time to be involved with parents at in-home, family, and community affairs.

c. Use of parents as aides in the program.

d. Opportunities for follow-up of parent meetings during the "in-home" program visits with child and parent(s).

e. Parents and staff cooperatively plan activities for parent education programs.

f. Attendance at parent meetings and involvement of parents increased as the year progressed.

A majority of SEN projects reported the need for more in-service training for staff members relative to planning, implementing and evaluating parent education

programs. Efforts are sought to identify adequate evaluation of the overall effectiveness of the parent education efforts - noted are subjective evaluative data of staff and parents in terms of "feelings".

Many problems still exist in developing and implementing parent education programs. Staff report the reasons for such problems as being travel, working parents, babysitting, parent attitude, child rearing practices, etc. However, SEN staff continue to attest to the benefits and advantages of establishing strong parent education programs and are continually seeking ways to improve these efforts.

Chapter 4

Student Achievement Data Summary

The Department of Public Instruction encouraged each SEN project to develop an evaluation strategy tailored to the individual needs and objectives of the project. Techniques for evaluating the effects of the various SEN project component areas were identified as a part of project application procedures.

In addition to the strategy designed on a project-by-project basis, each project identified that it would report student achievement data on at least one standardized, norm-referenced test instrument.

When looking at the type of test instrument used, one can easily observe great variation between and among project models/project participants by age and participants by grade levels.

The following alphabetical listing of Student Achievement Data Summaries by projects has been included in this report as they were received from the respective project directors.

The data identify the number of SEN participants tested on both the pre- and post-test. For a variety of reasons, the post-test for a percent of the population was not included in the summaries - due to mobility and/or absentee factors. In analyzing the results of the testing, some distinct and encouraging results are noted.

It appears that SEN projects have aided in the cognitive development/ achievement of the participants as measured by the standardized, norm-referenced tests administered.

Projects cannot be directly compared to each other because they used very different models and worked towards different goals; therefore, neither the expenditure per pupil nor achievement results can be compared. Each project should be considered on its own merit.

STUDENT ACHIEVEMENT DATA SUMMARY

School/Agency
Beloit Public Schools, Joint District #1

Student Level
Pre-Kindergarten

SEN Project Title
Early Intervention -- Dropout Prevention

Name of Test
Preschool Language Scale

Norm Used *Test Norm Expectancy: Lang. Age = CA*

Level/Form

Center Phase Item	Date	Number Tested	Mean C.A.	Mean Age / Grade Equivalent/ Percentile	Range of Scores
1. Pre-test	*9/75*	*92*	*50.5*	*45.7 mo.*	*34 - 59*
2. Post-test	*5/76*	*90*	*58.0*	*57.7 mo.*	*43 - 72*
Difference 3. (2 minus 1)	(# months) *7.5*	*2*	*7.5*	*12 mo.*	

Name of Test
Preschool Language Scale

Norm Used *Test Norm Expectancy: Lang. Age = CA*

Level/Form

Home Phase Items	Date	Number Tested	Mean C.A.	Mean Age / Grade Equivalent/ Percentile	Range of Scores
1. Pre-test	*9/75*	*38*	*38.5*	*31.5 mo.*	*17.3 - 45.8*
2. Post-test	*5/76*	*38*	*45.5*	*43.9 mo.*	*31.5 - 64.5*
Difference 3. (2 minus 1)	(# months) *7*	*0*	*7.0*	*12.4 mo.*	

The Beloit SEN project worked with 92 four year-old children in four units in a center based training program and 38 three year-old children in a home based training program. The goals of the project (1. To affect a home environment in which parent and child relationships promote effective cognitive, affective; and psychomotor growth, and 2. To teach the language of instruction and promote the cognitive, affective and psychomotor learning necessary to function in the classroom) have been reflected in each of the project objectives and strategies for implementation.

The data recorded above reflect evaluation of one of the instructional objectives of the Beloit project. That objective has been that "following a post-test measurement of auditory comprehension and verbal ability, project children will show an increase in age equivalent score of 1.5 times the number of months of the program." These particular data were selected from among the many data sources available in the local project evaluation for inclusion in this report because the instrument utilized represents a more comprehensive picture of children's language and cognitive skills than many of the other instruments. The equally important learning avenue of listening comprehension and verbal expression are measured as well as the language of quantity, spatial and temporal concepts.

The data for both home and center phases show that the mean of the children's language age score was increased by more than 1.5 times the number of months in the program. The significance of these data, in addition to indicating the growth of children as compared to their baseline language age scores, can be found in the comparison of the mean post-test language age score to the mean post-test C.A. To have an "equal chance" to succeed in the school academic programs along with more advantaged peers, SEN children needed to "catch up". They needed to make more than the average months growth in language and cognitive skills during the project time period. Beloit's SEN children have made those kind of gains and have come

very close to completely bridging the gap between their language age and chronological age.

Other data, e.g. the test results of the Peabody Picture Vocabulary Test, Boehm Test of Basic Concepts, Illinois Test of Psycholinguistics (Verbal Expression subtest), criterion referenced tasks utilizing local norms and subjective data relative to affective behaviors (attending, responding, etc.) also indicate a greater than normal growth as a result of the SEN intervention.

The effect that the program has had on parent/child relationships is reflected in the progress of children as well as through the parents' participation and evaluation of their own growth. More than 90% of the parents indicated that as a result of the program they now talk to, listen to and read to their child more often, are more aware of important preschool learning activities to do at home and are more aware of their role in helping their child to learn.

The rationale behind Beloit's SEN intervention strategy, based on local needs assessment, has been that children who are likely to be underachievers especially in relation to socio/economic factors are children who are language deprived--who have not developed the language base necessary for reading and whose systems of organizing, ordering and classifying are insufficient to meet with academic success. They are children whose comprehension and expressive vocabularies of color, of size, of shape, of time, of space, of position, of location, of relation and of action are limited. The hypothesis, then, has been that if children are provided a training program reflecting an eclectic approach to language and concept development, responsive to their needs, in which parents are directly and indirectly 'partners' in the process, that the limitations in process and content of language can be overcome and that the project participants can approach the academic program with a greatly increased chance for success.

For the second year the evaluation of the Beloit project in terms of test data; performance of children and feedback from parents indicates program success -- success in objectives accomplished and goals met.

STUDENT ACHIEVEMENT DATA SUMMARY

School/Agency: *Child Development, Inc.*

Student Level: *Pre-Kindergarten & Kindergarten*

SEN Project Title: *Using Sensory Learning Modalities for Individual Growth in Full Day Kindergarten and Pre-Kindergarten*

Name of Test: *Boehm/Slater Cognitive Skills Assessment Battery*

Norm Used: *Items below 50%tile of national norm*

Level/Form: *Kindergarten*

Item	Date	Number Tested	Mean C.A.	Mean Age / Grade Equivalent/ Percentile	Range of Scores
1. Pre-test	late 10/75	24	5yr. 2mo.	# of items 21	11-42 items
2. Post-test	early 5/76	24	5yr. 9mo.	# of items 7.4	1-18 items
Difference (2 minus 1)	(# months) 6 mo.	0	7mo.	13.6 items 22%	10-24 items 5%-43%

Name of Test: *Boehm/Slater Cognitive Skills Assessment Battery*

Norm Used: *Items below 50%ile of national norm*

Level/Form: *Pre-K*

Items	Date	Number Tested	Mean C.A.	Mean Age / Grade Equivalent/ Percentile	Range of Scores
1. Pre-test	12/75	7*	4yr. 5mo.	# of items 17	4-38 items
2. Post-test	5/76	6*	4yr. 9mo.	# of items 7.5	1-16 items
Difference (2 minus 1)	(# months) 5 mo.	1	4mo.	9.5 items 32% increase.	3-22 items 4%-63% increase

* one child could not be tested.

The Special Educational Needs (SEN) program has been used to provide supplementary services to 32 children identified as being below age level in specified cognitive skill areas and to share with their parents information about the child's specific cognitive strengths and weaknesses and some of the activities used to improve those skill areas.

A number of tools were utilized to ascertain where the children fell on a variety of skill continuums. In this way a baseline of information was also established for evaluation purposes. Cognitive areas of concern were: number and letter knowledge; picture and story comprehension; visual and auditory memory and discrimination; large muscle and visual motor coordination; body, color and shape identification; quantity, time and space concepts; and attention span in learning situations. Tools which were administered in the fall and again in the spring included:

1. *Boehm/Slater Cognitive Skills Assessment Battery - An 84 item individual criterion-referenced device assessing a variety of cognitive areas.*
2. *Boehm Test of Basic Concepts - A 50 question norm-referenced group administered device assessing basic concepts.*
3. *A Time-on-task Observational Tool - An interval time sampling device measuring children's attending behaviors in a teacher-directed learning situation.*

4. An Interactional Analysis Device - An observational time sampling tool used to analyze child-teacher and child-child interactions in the classroom.

Combining results from the above tools and classroom teacher observations and assessments of individual children's performance, the Diagnostician and the SEN Teachers devised treatment strategies for individual SEN children. Special attention was given to sensory integration by providing specific cognitive training in each of the three sensory modalities. Following the development of the treatment plans, conferences were held with each SEN parent to share information and to discuss and integrate classroom goals, SEN-related goals, and parent goals for each child. SEN Teachers provided individual and small group learning experiences on a regular basis for SEN-identified children throughout the school year using the planned treatment strategies and the parent/staff goals.

Success was demonstrated in improvement goals by comparing SEN children's pre- and post-test results. The Boehm/Slater Cognitive Skills Assessment Battery post-test results showed a 22% improvement rate over pre-test results for kindergarten children. This gain was calculated by comparing pre- and post-test number of items below age level (lower ½ of national norm). The percentage improvement range ran from 5% to 43% increase in pre- and post-test scores. The percentage increase for pre-kindergarten children was 32% and the range was from 4% to 63%. These increases were beyond the predicted increases of 20% for both kindergarten and pre-kindergarten children. The Boehm Test of Basic Concepts indicated a 9% increase across normed percentiles. The pre-test normed percentile range was 3% to 90% and the post-test range was 3% to 95%. The pre-test mean percentile was 40. as compared to a post-test mean percentile of 49. A comparison of median percentiles, 20 for pre-test and 50 for post-test, indicated a 30% increase. The measure of on-task behavior in learning situations showed an 11% overall gain from pre- to post-test measures. The percentages of on-task behavior range from 57.4% to 100% with a mean of 78% on pre-test data. The post-test range was from 66% to 100% with a mean of 89%.

Some comparisons between SEN children and non-SEN children (kindergarten level) test scores were also made. As previously noted, SEN children demonstrated an overall percentage increase of 22% on the Boehm/Slater measure. Eleven non-SEN in the same classroom tested at the same time demonstrated only a 13% increase on that test. On the Boehm Test of Basic Concepts, a small difference was noted. The mean increase for SEN children was 9% while only 8% for non-SEN children.

In order to deteirmine where the SEN children fell in relation to others in readiness for first grade, the Metropolitan Readiness Test was given. The results were extremely encouraging given the other pre- and post-test increases for SEN children. Metropolitan scores yielded a mean national-normed percentile score of 54.5. The range was from the 17%-tile to the 94%-tile. Nineteen of the 24 May-tested SEN children scored in the upper 50% on a test normed on September-tested first graders.

This data suggests that SEN children not only made greater than predicted gains but that these gains appear to be greater for SEN than for non-SEN children in the same kindergartens.

STUDENT ACHIEVEMENT DATA SUMMARY

School/Agency: *Commando Project I*

Student Level: *Secondary*

SEN Project Title: *Commando Academy*

Name of Test: *Wide Range Achievement Test (WRAT)*

Norm Used: *Standardized norms*

Level/Form: *12-adulthood*

Item	Date	Number Tested	Mean C.A.	Mean Age / Grade Equivalent/ Percentile	Range of Scores
				Spell./Read./Math	
1. Pre-test	9/75	86	15.6	3.74 : 4.72 3.96	0.00 - 10.6
2. Post-test	5/76	86	16.4	5.02 5.68 4.85	1.30 - 12.45
Difference	(# months)				
3. (2 minus 1)	8	0	8	1.2 .9 .9	

Commando Academy is an alternative school located in Milwaukee's inner-city. It's program is designed to serve parolees, probationers, and troubled youth who have dropped out of public school. The average student age of Commando Academy is slightly over 16 years. Students are referred by the State Division of Corrections, State Division of Family Services and the Youth Service Bureau of Milwaukee County, as administered through the Social Development Commission.

The students in Commando Academy were given the WRAT (standardized test) upon entering the school and in early May, 1976. 86 students completed both pre-tests and post-tests. Of this total, 69 were male students and 17 were female students; 38 were parolees referred by the Division of Corrections, 12 were referred by the Division of Family Services, and 36 were referred by the Youth Service Bureau.

It should be noted when interpreting test data that follow that students received instruction in the basic subjects (reading, writing, and mathematics) for approximately 3 hours per day. For the remaining 3 hours of the program the students were in work situations where they were paid $2.30 per hour while being exposed to the world of work. Therefore, the test scores reflect achievement based upon 3 hours of instruction, not the usual 6 hours received in a typical public school setting. In addition, the data must be interpreted in light of the fact that the average daily attendance rate was 69%; with a 73.7% attendance rate for parolees, a 74.6% attendance rate for Division of Family Services students, and a 62.6% rate for Youth Service Bureau students.

SPELLING ACHIEVEMENT

The mean score on the spelling section of the WRAT revealed a pre-test score of 3.74 and a post-test score of 5.02, reflecting a gain of 1.2 years.

An analysis of these scores shows that the mean gain score for males was 1.26 years and 1.50 for females. Parolees had a mean gain score of 1.72 years, D/FS students gained 7 months, and YSB students 1.02 years.

Thus, spelling achievement was higher than might be expected considering the time spent in instruction and the background of the students. It does reflect the program's influence (instructors, curriculum, attendance rate) on the spelling achievement of the students.

READING ACHIEVEMENT

The mean score on the reading section of the WRAT revealed a pre-test score of 4.72 and a post-test score of 5.68, reflecting a mean gain of slightly more than 9 months.

An analysis of these scores shows that the mean gain score for male students was slightly more than 9 months, while the gain for female students was 1.07 years. Parolees had a mean gain score of 1.26 years; D/FS students gained 6 months; and YSB students gained 7 months.

Thus, on the average, student reading achievement reflected what one would expect to find in the typical public school setting; mainly, a gain of 9 months after 9 months of instruction. It is noteworthy that Commando Academy students gained the 9 months with only 3 hours of instruction per day.

MATH ACHIEVEMENT

The mean score on the math section of the WRAT revealed pre-test score of 3.96 and a post-test score of 4.85, reflecting a mean gain of 9 months.

An analysis of these scores shows that the mean gain score for male students was more than 9 months, while female students gained 6 months. Parolees had a mean gain score of slightly more than 9 months, with D/ES students also gaining about 9 months, and YSB students gaining 8 1/2 months.

Thus, as they did in reading, Commando Academy students gained as much as could be expected in a typical math program in the public schools. The big difference, as in reading, was that the gain was achieved with only 3 hours of daily instruction versus 6 hours in the public school.

SUMMARY

Although the students' entrance scores were well below their age and grade levels, it is obvious that Commando Academy, through the influence of its instructors, curriculum, work program, counselors, etc., had an impact on achievement in the three academic areas measured. An impressive statistic, which may reflect, in part, the influence of the Commando program, is that the incarceration rate (in a correctional facility) was about 5%. It should be noted that an additional 20 students were not post-tested because of their late entry into the school.

STUDENT ACHIEVEMENT DATA SUMMARY

School/Agency: Community Relations-Social Development Commission

Student Level: Pre-Kindergarten

SEN Project Title: CEDC / Milwaukee Head Start - Open Classroom

Name of Test	Norm Used	Level/Form
Carrow's Auditory Comprehension of Lang.	Tables 8-13	N/A

Item	Date	Number Tested	Mean C.A.	Raw ~~Mean~~Score-C.A. ~~Age / Grade~~ Equivalent/Norm Percentile	Range of Scores
1. Pre-test	10/7/75 - 10/21/75	32	3.79	56.28-3.4/50th percentile	18-81
2. Post-test	4/27/76 - 4/28/76	24	4.17	61.0-3.8/32nd percentile	39-81
3. Difference (2 minus 1)	(# months) 6	- 9	+ .38	4.28 + 0.4/-8	+21-0

Name of Test	Norm Used	Level/Form
Carrow's Auditory Comprehension of Lang.	Tables 8-13	N/A

Items	Date	Number Tested	Mean C.A.	Mean Age / Grade Equivalent/ Percentile	Range of Scores
1. Pre-test	10/7/75 - 10/21/75	9	4.6	56.8-3.5 /11th percentile	18-81
2. Post-test	4/27/76 - 4/28/76	9	5.2	66.7-4.1/38th percentile	51-83
3. Difference (2 minus 1)	(# months) +6	0	+ .6	+9.9 - +.6/+27	+33/2

Research on open classrooms conducted under the auspices of the Follow-through program had originally led us to believe that the first year would not be a productive one in terms of children's scores. To a certain extent this expectation was borne out. Whether there was a real loss in the ability of the children's linguistic abilities or whether the loss is a reflection of how the data is grouped is impossible to definitely state. The test results for the 3 & 4 year olds does relfect a loss in terms of scores. This loss is to some degree refuted by the observation of children by classroom personnel. Teachers in the classroom feel that there has been significant progress for the majority of the children in the room. Moreover this observation is supported by the individual progress records kept on each child. Despite the loss of growth indicated by test reults (i.e. from the data it looks as if during a 6 month period the children experienced a 4 month gain) it should be noted that the scores of the 3 & 4 year olds (were within one standard deviation) fell within a range where 66% of all other 3's and 4's are expected to score. Another factor is important in evaluating the progress of the 3's and 4's i.e. the loss and gain of children during the program year. This is why the mean C.A. only increased by .38.9. Children who were 4 years of age turned 5 during the school year, and children who dropped out during the school year were replaced by children who were some what younger. A number of other factors are crucial in interpreting this data: (1) the testing situation was foreign to many of our students, therefore, the scores do not in our opinion truly reflect the abilities of the children. (2) the second explanation might be discarded as a rationalization to defend the class were it not for a similar phenomena in other early childhood programs. If language acquisition is akin to hypothesis formation and testing, as the theoretical perspective implies, then some amount of time for data analysis would be necessary. Kagan and Moss speak of this phenomena labeling it the sleeper effect. They

elaborate on this idea stating "In psychological development, however, the effects of specific early experiences are not evidenced for long periods of time. There may be lag between a cause and open manifestation of the effect." (3) the scores of children who entered the program during midyear significantly skewed the post-test mean and distribution. If the data reported only referred to children who had been in the program all year the results would have been far more positive. (4) the norms of the Carrow which is an excellent test are never the less based on middle-class populations. Previous research indicates that middle class children are approximately 6 months to a year advanced when compared with lower Socio Economic Status children. (5) finally, this age period is the one when lower SEN children begin to lose significant ground in many developmental areas.

Considering all of these factors, our results may even be construed as positive. While the results of the other standardized test are not as positive as the results of the Carrow, even the Peabody which is not an adequate language test, indicated that the children did not lose significant ground. The mean norm score for children 4.17 years of age is 42.08. Children in our program had a mean Peabody score of 36.12. This score is well within the range where 66% of children at this age score. We had further expected that this year would be one in which teachers and students adjusted themselves to the climate of the classroom rather than show quantitative gains. The data collected during the school year supports this hypothesis-i.e. children did show a shift in learning styles; they moved as a whole from an impulsive approach to a reflective style in problem solving. The five year olds, however, scored above the norm, on the post-test thus indicating some quantitative as well as qualitative gain. The success of the children who have been in the program all year are examined. The scores of these children showed significant progress on both the Carrow and Peabody. For example, the five year olds, who were in the program all year, showed a 6 month gain during the six month intervention period - a gain of approximately 10 points in raw score and a gain from the 11th to 38th percentile.

Given the promising results in qualitative area, our next year can only show greater success. Children who return next year will have this year's success to build upon. One final area should be mentioned prior to closing this narrative - the success of reading by seven of our five year olds. While this accomplishment is not reflected in test scores, it is a significant achievement of the classroom.

STUDENTS ACHIEVEMENT DATA SUMMARY

School/Agency: *CESA #6, Chippewa Falls*

Student Level: *Grades 5 through 8*

SEN Project Title: *Community Based Language Arts Program*

Name of Test: *Stanford Achievement (for all 4 levels)*

Norm Used: *Standardized*

Level/Form: *Advanced Intermediate I & II*

TABLE 1 Item	Date	Number Tested	Mean C.A.	Mean Age / Grade Equivalent/ Percentile	Range of Scores
1. Pre-test	*10-5-75*	*11*	*10.7*	*3.6*	*3.1 - 5.1*
2. Post-test	*5-5-76*	*11*	*11.4*	*4.4*	*3.4 - 5.4*
3. Difference (2 minus 1)	(# months) *7*	-	*.7*	*.8 adjusted (1.03)*	-

TABLE 2 Item	Date	Number Tested	Mean C.A.	Mean Age / Grade Equivalent/ Percentile	Range of Scores
1. Pre-test	*10-5-75*	*55*	*11.7*	*4.8*	*3.0 - 8.4*
2. Post-test	*5-5-76*	*55*	*12.4*	*5.7*	*3.4 - 7.3*
3. Difference (2 minus 1)	(# months) *7*	-	*.7*	*.9 adjusted (1.2)*	-

TABLE 3 Item	Date	Number Tested	Mean C.A.	Mean Age / Grade Equivalent/ Percentile	Range of Scores
1. Pre-test	*10-5-75*	*59*	*12.8*	*5.6*	*4.0 - 8.3*
2. Post-test	*5-5-76*	*59*	*13.5*	*6.2*	*4.0 - 10.8*
3. Difference (2 minus 1)	(# months) *7*	-	*.7*	*.6 adjusted (.77)*	-

TABLE 4 Item	Date	Number Tested	Mean C.A.	Mean Age / Grade Equivalent/ Percentile	Range of Scores
1. Pre-test	*10-5-75*	*41*	*13.6*	*6.2*	*4.4 - 8.2*
2. Post-test	*5-5-76*	*41*	*14.3*	*7.1*	*4.6 - 10.6*
3. Difference (2 minus 1)	(# months) *7*	-	*.7*	*.9 adjusted (1.16)*	-

TABLE 5

Grade Level	Prior Yearly Rate of Growth	Adjusted Gain Score	% Increase
5	.62	1.03	66%
6	.74	1.16	57%
7	.74	.77	4%
8	.73	1.16	59%
Mean	.70	1.03	47%

The CESA #6 SEN project expected an increase in academic growth, involvement of parents with school, and an increased awareness of career opportunities as well as a positive change in the attitude of project children toward school.

The project children experienced a mean (average) gain of .8 based on 7 months between the pre- and post-test or 1.03 based on an adjusted score for 9 months -- the average length of a school year. The average project child in his previous years has experienced a yearly rate of growth of .7 or 7/10 of a school year as compared to 1.03 this year indicating an increase of 47%. Refer to tables 1-5 for individual growth patterns per grade level.

Parent involvement was increased by keeping parents aware of student progress and by encouraging participation in the instructional programs, career awareness field trips or active local parent councils.

The project children were involved in at least four career oriented field trips during the year. As a result of a follow-up survey, 73% of the students indicated that they noticed careers while on the field trip and 79% of the students enjoyed the career related activities they did before and after the trips.

After encouraging a positive attitude toward school with SEN students, we found that on a survey, 35% of these students like school better than before, 87% replied that they have a positive attitude toward being in SEN, and 47% felt they were reading better than at the beginning of the year.

ANECDOTAL REMARKS

"This class has helped me with my personality a great deal." SEN Student

"You might say she has discovered the phrase, 'I can'...I never hear her say 'I can't.' It's almost always, 'Let's try something new.'" SEN Parent

"Then to my surprise, she started to care about herself, her hair, clothes, and keeping clean. She seemed eager to go to school." SEN Parent

"I started out with an F in general business this year. Would you believe each time I got a higher grade. I'm working pretty hard and I bet I can almost get an A this time." SEN Student

"At Plombon's I found out you have to go to school to be a mechanic and that tools are going to be metric." SEN Student

STUDENT ACHIEVEMENT DATA SUMMARY

School/Agency
CESA #13, Waupun

Student Level
Three-Four-Five year olds

SEN Project Title
Kids and Parents Developing Early Learning Potential

Name of Test
Caldwell Pre-School Inventory

Norm Used *Raw Score Norms* *50%ile* *Pre-24* *Post-29*

Level/Form
1970 Revised

3 year olds

Item	Date	Number Tested	Mean C.A.	Mean Age / Grade Equivalent/ Percentile	Range of Scores
				score	*score* *%ile*
1. Pre-test	*10/75*	*47*	*3-4*	*10%ile - 17.64*	*0-32 - 0-73*
2. Post-test	*5/76*	*45*	*3-11*	*80%ile - 38.35*	*22-58 - 40-99*
Difference	(# months)				
3. (2 minus 1)	*7*	*2*	*7*	*70 - 20.71*	

Name of Test
Caldwell Pre-School Inventory

Norm Used *Raw Score Norms* *50%ile* *Pre-29* *Post-34*

Level/Form
1970 Revised

4 year olds

Items	Date	Number Tested	Mean C.A.	Mean Age / Grade Equivalent/ Percentile	Range of Scores
				score	*score* *%ile*
1. Pre-test	*10/75*	*64*	*4-3*	*56%ile 31.38*	*9-57 1-99*
2. Post-test	*5/76*	*60*	*4-10*	*91%ile 48.42*	*28-63 30-99*
Difference	(# months)				
3. (2 minus 1)	*7*	*4*	*7*	*35 17.04*	

Name of Test
Caldwell Pre-School Inventory

Norm Used *Raw Score Norms* *50%ile* *Pre-38* *Post-43*

Level/Form
1970 Revised

5 year olds

Item	Date	Number Tested	Mean C.A.	Mean Age / Grade Equivalent/ Percentile	Range of Scores
				score	*score* *%ile*
1. Pre-test	*10/75*	*23*	*5-0*	*58%ile 40.21*	*20-52 3-91*
2. Post-test	*5/76*	*23*	*5-7*	*93%ile 54.43*	*46-61 58-99*
Difference	(# months)				
3. (2 minus 1)	*7*	*0*	*7*	*35 14.22*	

Projected gain for KAP participants over the 7 month interval between pre- and post-test was 8 raw score points. Average gain as projected from the norm tables at the 50%ile would be 5 to 6 points dependent upon the age of the child. Children made the following gains as reported by age groupings.

AGE THREE
Expected gain per national norms would have been 5 points over a 12 month interval. KAP project three year old participants gained 20.71 points over a 7 month interval and moved from a pre-test average at the 10th percentile to a post-test X of the 80%ile.

AGE FOUR
Expected gain per national norms would be 6 points over a 6 month interval. KAP project four year olds moved from the 56%ile at pre-test to a mean score of 91%ile at post-test. Average gain was 17.04 points.

AGE FIVE
Expected gain per national norms would be 5 points over a 6 month interval. KAP project five year olds moved from the 58%ile at pre-test to a mean score at post-test of the 93%ile. Average gain was 14.22 points.

TOTAL GROUP
Mean gain for project participants was 17.78 raw score points. Expected objective was a gain of 8 raw score points. Expected gain across age groups at the 50%ile would be 6 points for every 6 months of growth. The group moved from a pre-test percentile rank mean of 46 to a post-test percentile ranking of 87. The increase of 33 percentile points over the predicted normative gain we attribute to intervention by KAP staff. No child enrolled in the project was receiving any other form of educational intervention.

ADDITIONAL DATA
Project participants were also screened and post-tested with the CESA #13 Early Childhood Strategies Screening Device.

75% of participants were to gain 10 tasks in the motor skills area. Actual gain at post-test was 83% mastering 10 or more motor tasks.
5 year olds = 100% 4 year olds = 75% 3 year olds = 66%

75% of participants were to gain 5 additional objectives in the auditory area. Actual gain was 88%.
5 year olds = 100% 4 year olds = 93% 3 year olds = 73%

75% of participants were to gain 6 additional objectives in the visual skill area. Actual gain was 62%.
5 year olds = 96% 4 year olds = 70% 3 year olds = 33%

75% of participants were to gain 6 additional objectives in the verbal skill area. Actual gain was 81%.
5 year olds = 100% 4 year olds = 87% 3 year olds = 62%

SUMMARY
KAP participants at all age groups made outstanding and dramatic gains on the Caldwell Pre-School Inventory. The project objectives for developmental skills were met by 4 and 5 year old children but were not met by 3 year old children. The scope and sequence of developmental activities is being revised to accommodate the developmental difference of 3 year old children.

STUDENT ACHIEVEMENT DATA SUMMARY

School/Agency
CESA #18, Burlington

Student Level
Pre-School thru 8th Gr.

SEN Project Title
Bilinqual/Bicultural Intervention

Name of Test
Auditory Comprehension of Language-Carrow

Norm Used
CA-Raw Score Equiv. Norm

Level/Form
Pre-K / Eng.

Head Start

Item	Date	Number Tested	Mean C.A.	Mean Age / Grade Equivalent/ Percentile	Range of Scores
1. Pre-test	*10/10/75*	*19*	*53 mo.*	*48 mo. 42%*	*35*
2. Post-test	*5/10/76*	*19*	*61 mo.*	*60 mo. 80%*	*46*
Difference 3. (2 minus 1)	(# months) *7*	*0*	*8 mo.*	*12 mo. 38%*	*11*

Name of Test
Peabody Picture Vocabulary Test

Norm Used

Level/Form
K / B/A

Items	Date	Number Tested	Mean C.A.	Mean Age / Grade Equivalent/ Percentile	Range of Scores
1. Pre-test	*11/3/75*	*2*	*68 mo.*	*54 mo. 14%*	*12*
2. Post-test	*5/19/76*	*2*	*75 mo.*	*62 mo. 20%*	*5*
Difference 3. (2 minus 1)	(# months) *6*	*0*	*7 mo.*	*8 mo. 6%*	*- 7*

Name of Test
Peabody Picture Vocabulary Test

Norm Used

Level/Form
Lower Elem. / A/B

Item	Date	Number Tested	Mean C.A.	Mean Age / Grade Equivalent/ Percentile	Range of Scores
1. Pre-test	*10/23/75*	*17*	*99.5 mo.*	*16.3%*	*8.3*
2. Post-test	*5/13/76*	*17*	*105.5 mo.*	*28.8%*	*11.3*
Difference 3. (2 minus 1)	(# months) *7*	*0*	*6.0 mo.*	*12.5%*	*3.0*

Name of Test
Peabody Picture Vocabulary Test

Norm Used

Level/Form
Intermediate / A/B

Item	Date	Number Tested	Mean C.A.	Mean Age / Grade Equivalent/ Percentile	Range of Scores
1. Pre-test	*10/23/75*	*14*	*137.8 mo.*	*8.8%*	*15.2*
2. Post-test	*5/14/76*	*14*	*144.8 mo.*	*16.0%*	*14.4*
Difference 3. (2 minus 1)	(# months) *7*	*0*	*7 mo.*	*7.2%*	*- .8*

STUDENT ACHIEVEMENT DATA SUMMARY

School/Agency
CESA #18, Burlington
SIN-Project Title

Student Level

Name of Test: *Peabody Picture Vocabulary Test* — Norm Used — Level/Form: *Gr. 7 / B/A*

Item	Date	Number Tested	Mean C.A.	Mean Age / Grade Equivalent / Percentile	Range of Scores
1. Pre-test	9/9/75	28	155.2 mo.	102.3 mo. 20.2%	60.3
2. Post-test	5/13/76	27	163.5 mo.	112.3 mo. 33.7%	60.3
Difference 3. (2 minus 1)	(# months) 8	- 1	8.3 mo.	10.0 mo. 13.5%	0

Name of Test: *Peabody Picture Vocabulary Test* — Norm Used — Level/Form: *Gr. 8 / B/A*

Items	Date	Number Tested	Mean C.A.	Mean Age / Grade Equivalent / Percentile	Range of Scores
1. Pre-test	9/12/75	19	168.6 mo.	99 mo. .66%	54.67
2. Post-test	5/12/76	17	174.0 mo.	117.3 mo. 9.66%	34.33
Difference 3. (2 minus 1)	(# months) 8	- 2	5.3 mo.	16.3 mo. 9 %	-20.3

Student Achievement Information:

a. *Expectations:*

At the pre-school level - two larger objectives prevailed. One, to establish a feeling of trust and acceptance in a group, and with the teacher; and two, a whole development process in language communications with a bilinqual approach. Vocabulary building, articulation, color and number concepts were learned through music, art, games, field trips, and other activities.

b. *These objectives were seemingly dealt with and met to a great extent with most of the children as indicated by observational techniques and by test scores.*

c. *It was inevitable that excellent results would be obtained. The teachers were very capable, dedicated to their work, hard-working and pleasant people. The facilities (space, equipment and materials) were of high quality and in abundance.*

d. *As a trained teacher-consultant and advisor, I thought the school had a fine, high quality education - Head Start Program.*

ELEMENTARY

a. *The elementary children had more variety in their needs. These ranged from insecurities about school and/or home to needs in phonics, math and concept development. Expectations were to get the prevalent problems indentified in their schoolwork, through the regular classroom teacher; and then after*

establishing rapport, confidence, and trust in the pupils to work with them individually and in small groups giving instruction and encouragement. Daily feedback on classwork and attitudes, plus parent conferences were to accomplish a feeling of confidence, acceptance and a gain in regular classwork achievement.

b. A fine rapport was established and the children were pleasant, happy and really wanted to accomplish new skills and experiences. Attendance was quite good and the pupil-teacher relationship was of excellent quality.

c. The SEN teachers were empathetic, hard-working, and had keen interest in the children as individuals. They saw to it that successes were built into each daily experience, and gave recognition for each accomplishment.

JUNIOR HIGH

a. With over forty students at the Junior High level being worked with, and with their many prevailing problems of just "growing up" to encounter, the bilinqual teacher has a difficult role to play. Among the goals were: 1) trying to make reading more stimulating, 2) to motivate them in their own culture - values and in their regular classes, and 3) to act as an empathetic counselor especially in their feelings of inadequacy, apathy and failure to give them supportive understanding.

b. Attitudes were improved as reported by (the amount of) advise sought from teachers, and from their improved classwork. Language scores improved (in one case a four year gain). Reading scores improved as shown by average gains of from sixteen months to thirty-two months in an eight month study time.

c. Personal interest and attention seemed the greatest factor in the successes made. As rapport and respect was established with the students more doors of communication and sharing opened. Pupils would ask advise or would bring pictures of their families. Invitations to dinner and to home parties or celebrations would indicate a sharing of their private lives. This helped communications and school achievement for both pupils and parents.

d. Much enthusiasm in regard to pupil attitude toward school and activities was reported by the four teachers of Junior High children. For example, one boy was reported to have said "The only thing I can do better than others is read". He had refused to pick up a book at the beginning of school. He had read nearly every book in the bilingual library by the middle of May.

Norms reported are taken from the test manuals.

STUDENT ACHIEVEMENT DATA SUMMARY

School/Agency
Gillett Public Schools

Student Level
3 & 4 Years Old

SEN Project Title
Pre-School Home - Bound Project

Name of Test	Norm Used	Level/Form
Minnesota Pre-School Scale	*Minnesota Pre-School Scale*	*3 Yr. / A*

Item	Date	Number Tested	Mean C.A.	Mean Age / Grade Equivalent/ Percentile	Range of Scores
1. Pre-test	*10/20/75*	*11*	*46 mo.*	*3 yrs. 10 mo.*	*18 - 69*
2. Post-test	*4/20/76*	*11*	*52 mo.*	*4 yrs. 4 mo.*	*54 - 85*
Difference 3. (2 minus 1)	(# months) *6*	*0*	*6 mo.*	*6 mo.*	

Name of Test	Norm Used	Level/Form
Minnesota Pre-School Scale	*Minnesota Pre-School Scale*	*4 Yr. / A*

Items	Date	Number Tested	Mean C.A.	Mean Age / Grade Equivalent/ Percentile	Range of Scores
1. Pre-test	*10/20/75*	*22*	*55 mo.*	*4 yrs. 7 mo.*	*34 - 82*
2. Post-test	*4/20/76*	*21*	*61 mo.*	*5 yrs. 1 mo.*	*30 - 81*
Difference 3. (2 minus 1)	(# months) *6*	*1*	*6 mo.*	*6 mo.*	

We set our program up to assure greater success in kindergarten for our children. There are two areas that we worked on with them. (1) Verbal - such as - discussing pictures, telling stories and retelling stories, colors and shapes, number and alphabet skills, sentencing and following directions.. (2) Non-verbal - listening, working in small manipulative areas such as games, building blocks, drawing, eye-hand co-ordination, such as cutting, putting together puzzles and large muscle activities such as balance beam exercises, throwing activities, and various games.

We have two different phases of our program to implement these goals. (1) Home visits - Since our area is mostly rural, our program is set up to work with the children in their homes. The teacher goes out once every two weeks and leaves materials in the home for the parent and child to work with. She explains and demonstrates the materials. She also explains the goals and the objectives of each activity to the parent. The aide then comes the next week as a follow-up. She does various activities with the children and then goes over the materials with the children and parents. The teacher then goes the next week and picks up the materials and leaves new activities and the process starts over again. (2) Library hour - The second phase is the library hour where the children come together once a week. Since our school is so crowded we have been using our public library. This hour gives the children a chance to socialize with children their own age. We do various activities from reading stories to foot painting. With the help of our parents and advisory board we can divide the children into small groups according to age and ability.

As a result of the testing program we discovered the children grew in verbal skills more than they did in the non-verbal skills. In the verbal skills the three year olds went up at an average of seventeen months growth, where they only went up

eleven months on non-verbal skills. The four year olds went up fifteen months in verbal skills and eleven months in non-verbal skills. We believe this happened because of a great emphasis on talking about every thing they are doing at the time they are doing the activity. Also all of our activities are language developmentally orientated.

All of the children were given a vocabulary test at the beginning of the program and again at the end. They all showed great improvement. They also showed improvement in knowledge of body parts and maturity by the use of a 'draw a man' test.

As a result of our program, some of the parents have expressed that they feel more comfortable working with the school and teachers. In some instances our program has helped create a better working child-parent relationship.

STUDENT ACHIEVEMENT DATA SUMMARY

School/Agency: *Joint School District #1, City of Green Bay, et al*
Student Level: *3 & 4 year olds*
SEN Project Title: *Language Experience Program for Meeting the Special Educational Needs of Children*

Name of Test: *Zimmerman Preschool Language Scale*
Norm Used: *Age-Equivalent*
Level/Form: *(Pre-K) 3 yr.*

Item	Date	Number Tested	Mean C.A.	Mean Age / Grade Equivalent/ Percentile	Range of Scores
1. Pre-test	9/75	35	3-6 (42 mos.)	2-11 (35 mos.)	2-3 - 4-5 (27-53 mos.)
2. Post-test	4/76	33	4-1 (49 mos.)	4-2 (50 mos.)	2-10 - 5-10 (34-70 mos.)
Difference 3. (2 minus 1)	(# months) 7	2	7 mos.	1-3 (15 mos.)	increase by 10 mos.

Name of Test: *Peabody Picture Vocabulary Test*
Norm Used: *Age-Equivalent*
Level/Form: *Form A*

4 yr. old (1st yr. in SEN) Items	Date	Number Tested	Mean C.A.	Mean Age / Grade Equivalent/ Percentile	Range of Scores
1. Pre-test	9/75	56	4-4 (52 mos.)	3-11 (47 mos.)	2-4 - 5-8 (28-68 mos.)
2. Post-test	4/76	58	4-11 (59 mos.)	4-9 (57 mos.)	2-6 - 7-10 (30-94 mos.)
Difference 3. (2 minus 1)	(# months) 7	2	7 mos.	10 mos.	increase by 24 mos.

Name of Test: *Peabody Picture Vocabulary Test*
Norm Used: *Age-Equivalent*
Level/Form: *Form A*

4 yr. old (2nd yr. in SEN) Item	Date	Number Tested	Mean C.A.	Mean Age / Grade Equivalent/ Percentile	Range of Scores
1. Pre-test	9/75	55	4-5 (53 mos.)	4-5 (53 mos.)	2-4 - 6-10 (28-70 mos.)
2. Post-test	4/76	50	5-0 (60 mos.)	5-6 (66 mos.)	3-6 - 7-10 (43-94 mos.)
Difference 3. (2 minus 1)	(# months) 7	5	7 mos.	13 mos.	increase by 10 mos.

Although a period of only 7 months passed between pre- and post-testing, the average age equivalent for the three year old group increased from 2 years 11 months (35 months) to 4 years 2 months (50 months), which is a gain of 15 months. When tested statistically, it is significant at the 1% level.

The group of four year old participants, who had not previously been in the SEN Project, experienced a language deficiency of 5 months as indicated by the difference between average chronological age and age equivalent in the September pre-tests.

Deficiencies of 4 and 9 months respectively in social maturity and visual motor integration were also indicated at the time of pre-testing as evidenced by testing beyond the Peabody Picture Vocabulary Test. Also, this group of four year olds was 4 to 6 months behind the four year old group who have been in the project as three year olds in all areas tested.

Although a period of only 7 months passed between pre- and post-testing, this group attained 10 months of growth. This is statistically significant at the 1% level.

Gains of 13 and 12 months between pre- and post-testing were made respectively in social maturity and visual motor integration.

Initially, the second year participants came into the project as three year olds with deficiencies of .9 to 10 months in language, social maturity and visual motor integration as indicated by pre-testing. After 6 months of intervention, this group attained 17, 20 and 14 months respectively in language, social maturity and visual motor integration as indicated by the post-tests. A one month deficiency was still evident in visual motor integration at that time.

During the period between the post-testing of the first year and the pre-testing, which was a 4 month period, this group lost 1 to 4 months of the gains made during the first year of intervention. The most pronounced loss was in the area of visual motor integration.

A period of 7 months occurred between pre- and post-testing for this group with a gain of 13 months in language. When tested, that amount of gain is significant at the 1% level. Post-testing further indicated that significant gains were made in social maturity and visual motor integration to a point where a deficiency is no longer evident in the later area.

The four year old participants who were not previously enrolled in the project were 5 to 6 months behind in the pre-testing than those participants who were returning for a second year. Post-testing indicates that the distance between the two groups ranges from 4 to 9 months in favor of the second year participants.

Follow-up studies have been conducted of the performance of the first group of four year olds who were in the project and are now completing their first year of kindergarten.

The results of the kindergarten screening of September 1975 indicate that the previous SEN pupils have brought up the performance of the total kindergarten population in some areas. Also, readiness tests for entrance into the primary grades have been administered and the former SEN pupils performend well again.

42

STUDENT ACHIEVEMENT DATA SUMMARY

School/Agency: *Joint School District #1, City of Green Bay, et al* — Student Level: *Pre-Kindergarten*

SEN Project Title: *SPECIAL PARENT EDUCATION PROJECT -- Language Experience Program for Meeting the Special Educational Needs of Children*

Name of Test: *Peabody Picture Vocabulary Test* — Norm Used: *Age Equivalent in Months & Years & Months* — Level/Form: *Form A*

Item	Date	Number Tested	Mean C.A.	Mean Age / Grade Equivalent/ Percentile	Range of Scores
1. Pre-test	*10/75*	*28*	*3-10 (46 mos.)*	*3-7 (43 mos.)*	*2-0 - 5-4 (24-64 mos.)*
2. Post-test	*4/76*	*24*	*4-4 (52 mos.)*	*4-8 (56 mos.)*	*3-0 - 6-10 (36-82 mos.)*
3. Difference (2 minus 1)	(# months) *6*	*4*	*6 mos.*	*13 mos.*	*increase by 6 mos.*

* *Intervention for Parents Only*

As the first year of operation of the SEN project in Green Bay wore on, it became very apparent that parent involvement and parent education is a crucial aspect of intervention for pre-kindergarten children.

This overall aspect became so significant that a special experiment, "Parent Education", aside from that component in the regular program, was designed and implemented during the second year of our operation.

This is a program whereby parents only of eligible participants receive intervention relating to child growth and development and child behavior through the use of: home visits; field trips; resource persons and instructional demonstrations.

The goal of the experiment was to extend to the parents instruction in basic early childhood growth, development and behavior necessary to facilitate normal language development in their children. Also, in the process of providing instruction to the parents, they would be afforded experiences which develop more positive attitudes toward schools and education.

In order to evaluate the effectiveness of the experiment, the children of these parents were administered the same standardized tests for pre- and post-testing as were those youngsters who received instruction.

A period of 6 months lapsed between pre- and post-testing for these youngsters. A gain, therefore, of 6 months would be a reasonable expectation.

Four standardized tests were administered for pre- and post-testing and gains ranged from 13 to 16 months which is highly significant when tested statistically.

Suitable commercial tests were not available for measuring parental change in attitude regarding schools and education. A locally devised instrument was used for pre- and post-testing. The instrument was designed to measure change in parent behavior in relating to the child and was constructed upon knowledge of child growth and development.

The results of the pre- and post-tests were analyzed statistically and found to be significant at the 1 per cent level.

"SPECIAL PARENT EDUCATION PROJECT"

A Parent Education Constant-Alternative Rating Scale was designed to measure change relative to knowledge of early childhood growth and development acquired by parents who were participants. The rating scales were administered as pre- and post-tests and the results analyzed. The statistical analysis indicated that the gains between pre- and post-tests were significant at the 5% level.

Also, a Parent Attitude Scale was designed and utilized to measure change toward school and education in general. Analysis of the pre- and post-tests indicate that the gains made were significant at the 1% level.

In summary, the findings of this project strongly suggest that intervention for "Parents Only" can be effective and may eventually prove to be the most effective approach to pre-kindergarten children who have special educational needs.

STUDENT ACHIEVEMENT DATA SUMMARY

School/Agency
Melrose-Mindoro Joint School District #1

Student Level
3 - 5 year olds

SEN Project Title
Educational Satellite Program

Name of Test
Metropolitan Readiness Kindergarten

Norm Used
Readiness-age equiv.

Level/Form
5 yr. / A-B

Item	Date	Number Tested	Mean C.A.	Mean Age / Grade Equivalent/ Percentile	Range of Scores
1. Pre-test	*75/9/3*	*26*	*5.2*	*4.4*	*4.2 - 5.1*
2. Post-test	*76/3/24*	*26*	*5.9*	*6.1*	*4.7 - 7.4*
Difference 3. (2 minus 1)	(# months) *7*	*0*	*.7*	*1.7*	*.5 - 2.3*

Name of Test
Peabody Picture Vocabulary Test

Norm Used
Age equivalency

Level/Form
4 yr. / A-B

Items	Date	Number Tested	Mean C.A.	Mean Age / Grade Equivalent/ Percentile	Range of Scores
1. Pre-test	*75/8*	*35*	*4.2*	*4.5*	*2.6 - 7.7*
2. Post-test	*76/4*	*35*	*5.0*	*6.0*	*3.5 - 8.7*
Difference 3. (2 minus 1)	(# months) *8*	*0*	*.8*	*1.5*	*.9 - 1.0*

Name of Test
Peabody Picture Vocabulary Test

Norm Used
Age equivalency

Level/Form
3 yr. / A-B

Item	Date	Number Tested	Mean C.A.	Mean Age / Grade Equivalent/ Percentile	Range of Scores
1. Pre-test	*75/8*	*29*	*3.3*	*3.2*	*2.0 - 4.9*
2. Post-test	*76/4*	*29*	*3.11*	*4.1*	*2.5 - 5.9*
Difference 3. (2 minus 1)	(# months) *8*	*0*	*.8*	*.9*	*.5 - 1.0*

Because the Metropolitan Readiness Test does not convert the percentile scores to age equivalency, we used a conversion chart from another test and converted the pre- and post-percentile scores to age equivalency scores. When we compared individual and group percentile scores with the age conversion, no matter where it was found on the chart, every score seemed to indicate that this conversion chart was valid.

In comparing scores of children who tested out in the same range on the pre-test as our project children, we found a very significant gain was made by project children as compared to those kindergarten children not in the project. We feel that this indicates the impact of our SEN intervention because all of these children were exposed to the same in-school program.

We also used our local checklist which tests 4 major areas: cognition, motor, affective and speech language. We used forms of this checklist on all three levels, and these indicate a comparable growth to that which was shown on the standardized tests. As a matter of act, because they are more definitive, they showed growth in all of the areas tested.

Our aides keep daily logs on the activities performed, the degree of participation and the amount of growth that each project participant demonstrates during each home visitation. The collective observations indicate that the growth in behavioral patterns that will prepare the child for eventual school activities is progressing at a rate equal to or greater than the rates indicated by our standardized tests.

Although we have no documentation we have observed that the project children have increased their activity level from occasional or partial participation to near 100% participation during the group sessions held at each school for 3 and 4 year olds.

Worthwhile benefits have been derived by our parents' participation in this program. This has been observed in the growth and development of the child and the acceptance and participation of not only the mother, but often the father as well as an occasional grandparent. We have had most of our parents request that the program be continued next year.

STUDENT ACHIEVEMENT DATA SUMMARY

School/Agency
Menominee Community Action Program - Ind. H.S.

Student Level
Three - Four - Five - Six Yrs.

SEN Project Title
Special Educational Needs Program

Name of Test	Norm Used	Level/Form
Peabody Picture Vocabulary Test	*MA Equivalent*	*3 year B*

Item	Date	Number Tested	Mean C.A.	Mean Age / Grade Equivalent/ Percentile	Range of Scores
1. Pre-test	*9-75*	*19*	*42.8 month*	*33.4 month*	*68-97*
2. Post-test	*5-76*	*18*	*49.5*	*49.7*	*68-117*
Difference 3. (2 minus 1)	(# months) *9*	*1*	*6.7*	*16.3*	

Name of Test	Norm Used	Level/Form
Peabody Picture Vocabulary Test	*MA & IQ Equivalent*	*4 year B*

Items	Date	Number Tested	Mean C.A.	Mean Age / Grade Equivalent/ Percentile	Range of Scores
1. Pre-test	*9-75*	*27*	*49.6*	*49*	*61-118*
2. Post-test	*5-76*	*25*	*60*	*55*	*67-145*
Difference 3. (2 minus 1)	(# months) *9*	*2*	*10.4*	*6*	

Name of Test	Norm Used	Level/Form
		5 & 6 Yr.

Item	Date	Number Tested	Mean C.A.	Mean Age / Grade Equivalent/ Percentile	Range of Scores
1. Pre-test	*9-75*	*15*	*64.2*	*64.6*	*69-138*
2. Post-test	*5-76*	*5*	*76*	*74.6*	*67-132*
Difference 3. (2 minus 1)	(# months) *9*	*10*	*11.8*	*10*	

During the course of the SEN Program year, certain Behavioral Objectives as written in the Program Application of Spring, 1975, were found to be not adaptable to our current SEN Program, 1975-76. These Objectives were being met by the children in their respective Head Start rooms, and duplication of this work was not felt advisable.

Other academic areas in which the SEN was involved were: Language and Visual Perception. A single Objective for each area was evaluated. There were:

Language - Objective - Program participants will demonstrate increased receptive vocabulary.

Evaluation - On the Peabody Picture Vocabulary Test, Post-test data will show an average increase in Mental Age level to bring it up to the Chronological Age level.

Visual Perception - Objective - Program participants will demonstrate increased skill in visual perception.

Evaluation- On the Frostig Developmental Test of Visual Perception, there will be an average increase of Perceptual Quotient of 15%.

In the Pre-test data for the PPVT, the 3 year old group had an average CA of 42.8 months and an average MA of 33.4 months. Post-test data shows that, with an average CA of 49.5 months, their average MA was brought up to 49.7 months. The Objective for language with this age group was reached.

In the 4 year old group, Pre-test data showed an average CA of 49.6 months and an average MA of 49. Post-test data shows the average CA was 60 months and the average MA was 55 months. This group did not reach the Objective for them in language.

All 3 and 4 year old SEN children received individual and group instruction each week--many of the lessons planned around vocabulary and concept building. Both groups should have made somewhat comparable gains. I am pleased with the gains of the "Threes" and perplexed that the "Fours" did not do as well. Most factors involved in their Instructional Program were the same, and so I am puzzled as to what caused the difference. There are some children in the "Fours" group who tested very low and have shown some indication of possible learning disabilities which are being more thoroughly studied and diagnosed by staff and Consulting Psychologist. These very low scores may have made the difference in the average of the "Fours" groups.

Results of our Visual Perception testing will be on file here. The Post-test data, although not quite complete yet, looks good so far, and hopefully will meet the Objective in that area and possibly surpass it.

Besides intensive work done in the areas discussed above, our SEN staff has been involved in the areas of Head Start where there is an indicated need. Assisting and working with Head Start staff has been a priority item for the SEN Program.

In assessing the positive outcomes of this year's program and the less successful outcomes, the SEN and Head Start staff are looking forward to a better and even more productive year-1976-77.

STUDENT ACHIEVEMENT DATA SUMMARY

School/Agency: *Menominee County Education Committee, Inc.*
Student Level: *Secondary*
SEN Project Title: *Menominee Community School*

Name of Test: *Sucher-Allred/Stanford Achievement Test*
Norm Used: *National*
Level/Form: *B-11*

Item	Date	Number Tested	Mean C.A.	Mean Age / Grade Equivalent/ Percentile	Range of Scores
1. Pre-test	12/75-2/76	22	15.5	7.8	3- 9
2. Post-test	4-5/76	22	16.0	7.3	33-10.5
3. Difference (2 minus 1)	(# months) 5	0	.5	.5	-.3-1.5

The test results are what was expected. A majority of the students were not very serious about doing their best and this is reflected in the individual student scores. Several students' tests were 1.5 grade equivalent years below the level recorded for the previous year. Some remarks toward the test were that the test results were going to be used for a study and, "we (the students) are the guinea pigs." Attitudes like this are definitely going to affect the outcome of the post-test. The use of the Sucher-Allred informal reading inventory for pre-testing would undoubtedly show a six month to a year increase in reading ability. However, the time involved in giving the test makes it impractical with start and finish times for tabulation of results on a program-wide basis.

The SAT is designed for college prep students, and with this year's results, exploration for a new test has begun. For the past two years assistance has been requested from UW-Madison Teacher Corps to set up and implement criterion reference testing for all subject areas. This has not reached the first stage of development and it appears that the Gates-MacGinitie reading test will be purchased for use in the coming academic year for pre- and post-testing.

50% of the students tested received credit for their reading course, but this is not reflected in the reading scores on their SAT's.

The reading course covered sight vocabulary, basic comprehension, decoding skills, reading rate, and leisure reading. SRA Readings, Wordcraft, EDL Wordlists, Controlled Reader, Tachistiscope, Reading Skills Pad, Guidebook to Better Reading, and the Reader's Digest Skill Builder are the materials used for Reading I.

The test results do not show a marked increase in reading ability, but the students, in the estimation of the staff, have improved their skills as a result of the reading course.

School/Agency
Milwaukee Private Community School Cooperative
SEN Project Title
Milwaukee Private Community School Cooperative

The Milwaukee Private Community School Cooperative consists of eight alternative schools and agencies that serve children in their local SEN programs.

The Cooperative serves the staff that work with these children with ongoing inservice training for 23 adult SEN staff that includes teachers, aides and administrators. From September 1975 to May 1976, there have been six educational lectures/workshops for our SEN staff based on our common needs, with one additional pending workshop for June 1976.

A noteworthy cooperative effort has been the implementation of the first State SEN Pre-School Workshop that brought together approximately 140 teachers, administrators and aides from throughout Wisconsin. Participants were able to exchange ideas and disseminate information about their various programs.

Parent involvement is a strength of the Cooperative schools and agencies. The Cooperative offered 13 planned parent education sessions for SEN parents from September 1975 to May 1976, with an additional fourteenth parent activity pending in June 1976. Noteworthy in our parent education component was our Joint LAPC's decision to instate Parent Effectiveness Training for SEN parents. P.E.T. is a training program for parents--to offer skills in the communications area for the most important job they will have--raising responsible children. After P.E.T., parents reported:

--better two-way communication
--fewer power struggles
--warmer feelings, closer relationships
--fewer emotional scenes, flare-ups, and fights.

Many parents reported on evaluations additional comments:

--were happy they took the course
--would suggest it to other parents
--wanted to come together with other parents
--parents were people too
--helpful to me
--I've stopped hollering so much
--want programs to help parents in talking to teachers
--want programs to help parents in talking about being good models for children
--would like to have P.E.T. again
--would like to have this course to continue next year
--helpful in my dealings with my teens as well as my tots
--helps me "keep cool"
--liked the instructor because he never acted as if he had all the answers
--would like to have had more practice
--would like to thank SEN

Looking back over the year, the Cooperative feels successful with its strengths and would like to continue to work with and for parents and staff. We would like to look forward to reaching those parents we have not reached, feeling strongly that for every parent we have the potential for better school performance for the child.

STUDENT ACHIEVEMENT DATA SUMMARY

School/Agency
Carter Child Development Center

Student Level
Pre-K & Primary (1-3 gr.)

SEN Project Title
Carter Child Development SEN Program

Name of Test
Peabody Picture Vocabulary Test

Norm Used
MA

Level/Form
(Pre-K) A & B

Item	Date	Number Tested	Mean C.A.	Mean Age / Grade Equivalent/ Percentile	Range of Scores
1. Pre-test	*10/15/75*	*38*	*55 months*	*51 months*	*25-80 months*
2. Post-test	*5/19/76*	*33*	*62 months*	*59 months*	*35-84 months*
3. Difference (2 minus 1)	(# months) *7*	*5*	*7 months*	*8 months*	

Name of Test
Peabody Picture Vocabulary Test

Norm Used
MA

Level/Form
(Primary) A & B

Items	Date	Number Tested	Mean C.A.	Mean Age / Grade Equivalent/ Percentile	Range of Scores
1. Pre-test	*10/15/75*	*6*	*91 months*	*75 months*	*59-94 months*
2. Post-test	*5/19/76*	*5*	*89 months*	*82 months*	*69-96 months*
3. Difference (2 minus 1)	(# months) *7*	*1*	*7 months*	*7 months*	

Because we are a Day Care program and children are enrolled in the Center when parents are working or in training, there are terminations in the enrollment when conditions change. As a result of such terminations, five (5) children were added to the program in January. Those children were pre-tested by January 15, 1976, and given a post-test during the third week of May. The scores ranged from 30-42 mo. on the pre-test & from 36 to 49 mo. at the time of post-testing.

Six of the children were selected on the bases of Illinois Test of Psycholinguistic Abilities scores. A summary of that data is included below:

	Pre-test	*Post-test*
Date:	*10/15/75*	*5/19/76*
Average age	*59 months*	*66 months*
Language age	*53 months*	*62 months*

It was expected that all SEN participants would show a month to month gain over pre-test scores. The average program gain was seven months. Of the participants, 70% exceeded this goal and 30% were one to three months below expectations.

Those pre-kindergarten children enrolled in the program on a full-time basis with regular attendance have made the greatest measurable gains. The least gain was made by those children who are school age and coming to the program at day's end. This suggests a need to adjust the activity schedule and review the methods used with this age group.

In families where parents have been utilizing the Language Bulletins and responding to weekly questionnaires, gains in some children were as high as fourteen months.

The Santa Clara Inventory was given to 40 participants. Post-inventory results show 85% of the children completing the task "almost all of the time" whereas on pre-testing the task was performed only "some of the time".

As a result of the program, children are using vocabulary terms in a much more meaningful manner. The ability to listen has also been greatly expanded.

STUDENT ACHIEVEMENT DATA SUMMARY

School/Agency
Cosmic Montessori School, Inc.

Student Level
Pre-Kindergarten, Lower Elementary

SEN Project Title
Language Enrichment Program

Name of Test	Norm Used	Level/Form
Peabody Picture Vocabulary Test	*Means Test Methods*	*A & B*

Pre-K Iter.	Date	Number Tested	Mean C.A.	Mean Age / Grade Equivalent/ Percentile	Range of Scores
1. Pre-test	*October '75*	*6*	*4-2*	*3-8*	*2-7 to 5-11*
2. Post-test	*May '76*	*6*	*4-9*	*4-4*	*3-6 to 5-11*
Difference 3. (2 minus 1)	(# months) *7*	*0*	*7*	*8*	*11-0*

Name of Test	Norm Used	Level/Form
Peabody Picture Vocabulary Test	*Means Test Methods*	

Lower El. Items	Date	Number Tested	Mean C.A.	Mean Age / Grade Equivalent/ Percentile	Range of Scores
1. Pre-test	*October '75*	*5*	*6-4*	*6-6*	*5-5 to 8-1*
2. Post-test	*May '76*	*5*	*7-0*	*6-1*	*4-6 to 7-10*
Difference 3. (2 minus 1)	(# months) *7*	*0*	*8*	*-5*	*-11 -3*

What we expect from the pupils who participate in the SEN Program is to gain in their language skills. They will show improvement in vocabulary, phonics, word-building, sight reading, writing and spelling. We also expected some children would score either at or below the chronological age because of some built in cultural and ethnic biases within the test.

What happened was that the post-test scores for the entire group-both pre-school and elementary declined. As indicated, in the cover letter, some serious emotional factors appear to have contributed to the depressed post-test scores. Thus, it would appear that the overall gain can be attributed, at least in part, to the educational process that existed prior to the post-testing.

STUDENT ACHIEVEMENT DATA SUMMARY

School/Agency
Harambee Community School

Student Level
Pre-School and Kindergarten

SEN Project Title
Harambee Community School Pre-School and Kindergarten SEN Program

Name of Test: *Peabody Picture Vocabulary Te.*
Norm Used: *PBLD Norms*
Level/Form: *A Pre, B Post*

Pre-K (ages 2.8-4.7) Item	Date	Number Tested	Mean C.A.	Mean Age / Grade Equivalent/ Percentile	Range of Scores
1. Pre-test	*9/75*	*12*	*4.2*	*3.8*	*3.3 - 4.7*
2. Post-test	*5/76*	*12*	*4.9*	*5.5*	*4.11 - 6.8*
3. Difference (2 minus 1)	(# months) *8*	*0*	*.7*	*21*	*1.8 - 2.1*

Name of Test: *Peabody Picture Vocabulary Test*
Norm Used: *PBLD Norms*
Level/Form: *A Pre, B Post*

Kindergarten Items	Date	Number Tested	Mean C.A.	Mean Age / Grade Equivalent/ Percentile	Range of Scores
1. Pre-test	*9/75*	*16*	*5.4*	*4.5*	*2.9 - 5.8*
2. Post-test	*5/76*	*15*	*6.0*	*5.3*	*3.2 - 7.3*
3. Difference (2 minus 1)	(# months) *8*	*1*	*.8*	*10*	*.5 - 1.7*

Harambee Community School broke the Special Educational Needs Program into two specific age groups. The first was the Kindergarten program including children who are 5 years old on or before December 1. The second group was the Pre-school program comprised of those children who were three year old on or before December 1, 1975.

In both of these programs, we expected to see an average of nine months growth for each of the two groups. The two groups exceede our expectations. The Kindergarten group came out with a ten month increase in mental age and the Pre-school came out with a 21 month increase.

Apparently, the strongest factor in this increase was the change in parental attitudes. Not only did they want a quality education for their children, but they were also willing to participate in giving their children a good start in their education by participation in the SEN program.

Two other factors that contributed to the success of the program were: (1) The teachers were able to give individual attention to each child. (2) Each child was able to work at his or her own pace, allowing for more successful experiences in learning.

The SEN program at Harambee School originally started with 38 children, 19 in each of the two groups. Due to several factors (death, moving out of the area, withdrawal from school) 10 children left before the end of the school year and, therefore, were not included in the above data. Five children came into the program in the middle of the first semester or the beginning of the second semester. While they were given a pre-test, no post-test was given and the pre-test was not included in the above data summary chart due to the short period of time they were at Harambee.

Additionally, one child did not receive a post-test due to illness. That child's pre-test was included since it was hoped the post-test would have been given before the reporting deadline. This did not prove to be feasible.

The mean age/grade is repeated as the mean mental age. The range of scores columns is repeated as the mental age range scores.

STUDENT ACHIEVEMENT DATA SUMMARY

School/Agency
Highland Community School, Inc.

Student Level *Primary, Pre-Kindergarten & Kindergarten*

SEN Project Title
Highland Community School SEN Program

Name of Test *Peabody Picture Vocabulary Test* Norm Used Level/Form

Pre-K

Item	Date	Number Tested	Mean C.A.	Mean Age / Grade Equivalent/ Percentile	Range of Scores
1. Pre-test	9/11-15/75	6	3.5	3 yr. 1 mo.	2.3 - 3.11
2. Post-test	5/10-14/76	6	4.2	4 yr. 10 mo.	3.6 - 6.10
Difference 3. (2 minus 1)	(# months) 9	0	.7	1 yr. 9 mo.	1.3 - 2.9

Name of Test *Peabody Picture Vocabulary Test* Norm Used Level/Form

Kindergarten

Items	Date	Number Tested	Mean C.A.	Mean Age / Grade Equivalent/ Percentile	Range of Scores
1. Pre-test	9/11-15/75	2	5.6	4.35	3.8 - 4.11
2. Post-test	5/10-14/76	2	6.3	5.95	5.8 - 5.11
Difference 3. (2 minus 1)	(# months) 9	0	.7	1.6	2 - 1

Name of Test *Botel Reading Inventory* Norm Used Level/Form

Primary

Item	Date	Number Tested	Mean C.A.	Mean Age / Grade Equivalent/ Percentile	Range of Scores
1. Pre-test	9/11-14/75	10	6.7	1.2	0 - 2
2. Post-test	5/10-14/76	9	7.4	3.6	1 - 5
Difference 3. (2 minus 1)	(# months) 9	1	.7	2.4	1 - 3

All in all this has been a successful year for Highland Community School's SEN program. The overall strengths which have contributed to our successes this year include parent participation in decision-making and all-around involvement in the life of the school; a dedicated, sensitive, and well-trained staff; and an informal atmosphere which encourages learning in an informal way without labeling students as "underachievers."

As the enclosed test results indicate, our instructional program results have greatly surpassed our expectations. For the primary children our goal was that they would progress one level on the Botel Reading Inventory. The mean gain was in fact 2.5 levels. This outstanding success can be attributed, we feel, to the close relationship the teacher was able to establish with the children. This relationship caused the students not only to want to spend time in the SEN room, but also to work hard at the work he assigned them. Close communication within the school afforded close contact between the SEN teacher and the children's

classroom teacher, consequently there was a high degree of carry-over into the regular classroom.

The instructional program for the pre-K and kindergarten children also shows a high degree of success, as measured by the Peabody Language Development Kit. We had projected as our goal that the children would gain an equivalent of six months during the program year. Our expectations were greatly surpassed when we were able to record the mean gain of 20 and 23 months. This success can be attributed to the same kinds of factors that were operative for the primary children. The teacher was extremely successful in establishing a warm and friendly relationship with the children. In fact, when, during our self-evaluation, we discussed problems, she pointed out that one of her greatest problems during the year was getting the children to leave the room so that she could work with the next child. It is only natural that learning would be greatly enhanced in such a situation.

The statistics do not speak completely of the learning environment which we were able to create as a result of the SEN program. The statistics do not tell for instance of the teachers working with the parents of the Chinese students to help them learn English, or that the children themselves came to school in September unable to speak Enlgish and are now reading at grade level. The statistics don't show the self-confidence that comes to the child who has very little to be proud of in his background or in his own accomplishments, who comes into reading and can say to the kids who are picking on him, "Say, I can read a book better than you." The statistics don't tell us about the beauty of bringing teachers and children of all different colors together to work out their problems in a human way.

In the areas of parent education and staff development, the Milwaukee Private Community School Co-op has been of immense value to us. It has allowed us to give our staff and parents opportunities which, because of our small size, we would have been unable to provide for them.

STUDENT ACHIEVEMENT DATA SUMMARY

School/Agency
Journey House, Inc.

Student Level
Primary

SEN Project Title
Journey House Community Center Tutorial Reading Program

Name of Test
*Spache Diagnostic Scales**

Norm Used
Grade Equivalent

Level/Form

Item	Date	Number Tested	Mean C.A.	Mean Age / Grade Equivalent/ Percentile	Range of Scores
1. Pre-test	9/13/75	75	8	1.52	.2 - 3.8
2. Post-test	5/15/76	63	9	2.82	.9 - 5.5
3. Difference (2 minus 1)	(# months) 8	12		1.3	

**The Slosson Oral Reading Test* was used to approximate the student's reading level when the student scored below the norms on the Spache Diagnostic Scales.

The tutorial reading program offers remedial assistance to primary students in the area of reading. A staff of 30 high school and college students serve as tutors and provide instruction for the 75 participants.

The goals for the program have been formulated as:

1. assist students in developing word attach and comprehension skills in reading by relying on strengths within their cognitive style.

2. provide an environment which encourages the development of positive attitudes towards self, others, and learning.

The Journey House target area, Milwaukee's Near South Side, is a low-income, White, Latino, and American Indian neighborhood plagued with a familiar litany of inner city problems. Some of the problems that confronted us in this program were: family disorganization, negative influences in the neighborhood, and inadequacy of education. Nearly one-fourth of the families in our target area have only one parent in the home. The incidence of mental illness, alcohol and other drug abuse is high as compared to the city as a whole. Many parents must assume multiple roles and children often lack adult models and attention.

The inner city south has the second highest rate of delinquency referrals to the Children's Court Center among the six catchment areas in the County. Approximately 42% of the pupils in the target area are one or more gardes below expected grade level in achievement. In truancy rates, the target area Junior Highs rank fifth and sixth highest in the city. The daily average attendance at the area's High School is more than 7% lower than the city average. The school ranks second in truancy cases.

The population served by the program are first, second, and third grade students residing in the target area. These students are referred to the program by teachers from three nearby public schools. After the initial assessment of reading skills and cognitive styles, these students attend tutoring sessions three days a week after school. The learning activities during the one-hour tutoring sessions are designed to provide success in reading and to encourage development of positive attitudes.

Under the direction of two half-time coordinators, a staff of about 30 high school tutors plan, prepare materials, and conduct tutoring sessions to assist students in reading. The tutors receive one week of intensive training at the beginning of the program and continued training of about 8 hours per month during the program. Concepts presented during training include: Information about Wisconsin Design of Reading Skills. Establishing a Trust Relationship. Describing Cognitive Styles and Preparing Materials to Match these Styles.

The approach in this program is a combination of prescriptive teaching based on Cognitive Styles, and a strong relationship between a tutor and students.

The Spache Diagnostic Scales and Slosson Oral Reading Test were used to measure the amount of reading progress made by each student. The following results were obtained of the 63 students who were in the program during the eight months:

vocabulary--average gain 1.23 years comprehension--average gain 1.30 years
Word Attack Skills: one grade level improvement in at least four word attack skill areas shown by 90% of the students

The development of positive attitudes was evaluated in primarily two ways. Case histories were completed on each student each week by the tutor. A comparison of behaviors near the beginning and end of the program substantiated any changes in attitude. A questionnaire was responded to by parents of the SEN participants.

From Case Study Data:	1	2	3	4	5
Self Concept	19%	68%	3%	0%	10%
Relationship With Others	14%	68%	10%	0%	8%
Attitude Towards Learning	24%	56%	5%	0%	15%

1=much positive change
2=some positive change
3=no change
4=negative change
5=always was positive

From Parent Questionnaire:

7% still no confidence	5% does not get along with others	0% attitude towards reading is worse
88% seems more confident	62% gets along better with others	18% still the same
5% always was confident	33% always did get along	68% attitude is better
		14% always had a good attitude

These results are attributed to the instructional approach of the program. The Cognitive Style Map of each student along with diagnostic reading information enables the tutor to design a learning environment based on the student's strengths and preferences. A student is more likely to be successful in reading and motivated when such an approach is used. Cognitive Styles of students are also used to group students and match these groups to tutors. The selection and preparation of materials and activities are based on the Cognitive Styles of the participants.

It should be noted that in addition to accomplishing the two goals of the program, benefits were also realized with the tutoring staff. From a questionnaire given to the tutors, 56% mentioned education as a career goal as a result of this job experience; 60% indicated this job experience affected their school work in a positive way; 45% used their earnings for school expenses, e.g. tuition; 90% improved their interpersonal relationship skills or self-confidence.

STUDENT ACHIEVEMENT DATA SUMMARY

School/Agency
Leo Community School

Student Level
Kdg. through Grade 7

SEN Project Title
Creative Language Arts Project

Name of Test
Peabody Picture Vocabulary Test

Norm Used
Mental Age

Level/Form
K-1, Form A&B

Item	Date	Number Tested	Mean C.A.	Mean Age / Grade Equivalent/ Percentile	Range of Scores
1. Pre-test	*10-75*	*18*	*5-8*	*4-11*	*3-6 to 6-8*
2. Post-test	*5-76*	*18*	*6-3*	*5-11*	*4-11 to 10-2*
Difference 3. (2 minus 1)	(# months) *7*	*0*	*7 mo.*	*1 year*	

Name of Test
Gates MacGinitie Reading Test

Norm Used
Grade Equivalent

Level/Form
Gr. 6&7, Form D

Item	Date	Number Tested	Mean C.A.	Mean Age / Grade Equivalent/ Percentile	Range of Scores
1. Pre-test	*10-75*	*15*	*11-11*	*4.4*	*3.0 to 6.3*
2. Post-test	*5-76*	*15*	*12-6*	*4.7*	*3.3 to 8.7*
Difference 3. (2 minus 1)	(# months) *7*	*0*	*7 mo.*	*3 mo.*	

Name of Test
Gates MacGinitie Reading Test

Norm Used
Grade Equivalent

Level/Form
Gr. 4&5, Form C

Item	Date	Number Tested	Mean C.A.	Mean Age / Grade Equivalent/ Percentile	Range of Scores
1. Pre-test	*10-75*	*18*	*10-3*	*3.4*	*1.7 to 4.7*
2. Post-test	*5-76*	*18*	*10-10*	*4.5*	*2.2 to 5.6*
Difference 3. (2 minus 1)	(# months) *7*	*0*	*7*	*1 yr. 5 mo.*	

We had anticipated a 2 point increase in the raw score on the Gates MacGinitie Reading Test for students in grades 2 through 7. The average increase was 12 points.

The anticipated 2 point increase for the kindergarten students and first graders on the PPVT was surpassed by an average increase of 14 points.

Besides these evident increases in vocabulary and comprehension, the SEN students have developed a better attitude toward reading, increased their communication skills, developed a better self-image, and learned new social skills.

These improvements are the results of:

1. *daily informal contact with an interested adult*
2. *the creative use of reading games and activities*

3. *frequent opportunities to express themselves by means of creative projects*

4. *monthly field trips and programs*

Our 1975-76 SEN Program has helped 56 Central City Students in ways which were even beyond our expectations.

STUDENT ACHIEVEMENT DATA SUMMARY

School/Agency: *Rainbow School, Inc.*
Student Level: *Pre-K, K, Non-graded 1-6*
ESEA Project Title: *Language Psycho-motor Development*

Name of Test: *Peabody Picture Vocabulary* — Norm Used: *50%ile or CA=MA* — Level/Form: *Pre-K / A & B*

Item	Date	Number Tested	Mean C.A.	Mean Age / Grade Equivalent/ Percentile	Range of Scores
1. Pre-test	*10/2/75*	*5*	*3.8*	*3.4 yr. equiv. 38%ile*	*24-51%ile*
2. Post-test	*5/5/76*	*5*	*4.5*	*5.5 yr. equiv. 75%ile*	*59-91%ile*
Difference 3. (2 minus 1)	(# months) *7*	*0*	*7 mo.*	*2.1 yr. equiv. 37%ile*	*35-40%ile*

Name of Test: *Gates-MacGinitie Reading Tests* — Norm Used: *50%ile* — Level/Form: *K / n.a.*

Items	Date	Number Tested	Mean C.A.	Mean Age / Grade Equivalent/ Percentile	Range of Scores
1. Pre-test	*10/75*	*2*	*5 yr. 5 mo*	*40%ile*	*38-42%ile*
2. Post-test	*5/76*	*2*	*6 yr. 0 mo*	*54%ile*	*48-60%ile*
Difference 3. (2 minus 1)	(# months) *7*	*0*	*.7 mo*	*14%ile*	*10-18%ile*

Name of Test: *Spache Diagnostic Scales* — Norm Used: *CA = grade level* — Level/Form: *Gr. 1-6*

Item	Date	Number Tested	Mean C.A.	Mean Age / Grade Equivalent/ Percentile	Range of Scores
1. Pre-test	*9/75*	*7*	*8-1*	*2-1*	*0-5-3*
2. Post-test	*5/76*	*7*	*9-0*	*3-2*	*1-3 - 6-5*
Difference 3. (2 minus 1)	(# months) *8*	*0*			

Name of Test: *Woodcock Reading Mastery Test* — Norm Used: *50%ile* — Level/Form: *Gr. 1-6*

Item	Date	Number Tested	Mean C.A.	Mean Age / Grade Equivalent/ Percentile	Range of Scores
1. Pre-test	*2/76*	*4*	*9-4*	*2-5*	*1-4 - 4-8*
2. Post-test	*5/76*	*4*	*9-7*	*2-5*	*1-4 - 4-8*
Difference 3. (2 minus 1)	(# months) *3*	*0*			

Pre-Kindergarten

We are not pleased with the accuracy of this test. Some children made enormous gains while others actually tested lower and this did not necessarily match what teachers had noted on checklists as the child's progress. For example: 1 child gained 3 years on the post-test (scored at the 91%ile). We felt this to be an exaggerated gain but have no explanation beyond our feeling that this test is not a very accurate measurement for most of our children. We are looking for a new measurement for this age level.

These are the statistics from our checklists:

Psycho-motor - possible levels of attainment for each exercise on the checklist: 1, 2, 3, 4. (4 being the highest level of attainment.)

Every time a child moved 1 category, i.e., from 1 to 2, they received 1 point.

Range of points gained from Sept-May was: 7 points - 17 points
Mean points gained: 11 points

Language - The norms for our checklists were as follows:

25% completion for under 3 years by the end of school year
50% completion for 3 years by the end of school year
75% completion for 4 years by the end of school year
100% completion for 5 years by the end of school year

4 out of 7 students were at the norm by May
2 of the 3 students who were still slightly under the norm had only been in the program since January
(3 children had left the program and could not be re-tested.)

We felt there were significant gains made in pre-reading skills and an overall increase in interest in language as evidenced by our test scores and by the teacher prepared checklists.

Non-graded 1-6

The students in the program for 9 months improved an average of 1 grade level which was the expected improvement.

The test scores of the 4 children in the program for 3 months do not reflect change, the teacher prepared checklists did show growth for these children.

Statistics from checklists:

Language: The skills categories on our checklists should be completed by the time our students leave Rainbow at 11 years old. Therefore, a 6 year old would be expected to have completed roughly 1/5 of the list, etc. Reading comprehension sections and students' approach to reading should show comparable improvement.

Of the 4 children who had been in the program for only 3 months, 3 were slightly below the norm for skills checked. (1 was at the norm.) Their approach to reading improved in all cases a good deal.

Out of the 7 children in the program for the whole year, 3 were slightly below the teacher checklist norm, 2 were at the norm, and 2 were above. In all but 1 case, their approach to reading had improved satisfactorily. These children need a second year of this intensive work to cement the skills which had begun to develop. The changes in approach to reading we considered to be most important. Now that they are reading independently and confidently we expect their skill growth to be rapid. For many of them this is the first time they have begun to <u>like</u> to read and are choosing books on their own to take home.

STUDENT ACHIEVEMENT DATA SUMMARY

School/Agency
Urban Day School

Student Level
Ages 3 to 14

SEN Project Title
Urban Day Learning Center

Name of Test
Peabody Picture Vocabulary Test

Norm Used
Mental Age Level

Level/Form
A

Age 3 - 7 group Item	Date	Number Tested	Mean C.A.	Mean Age / Grade Equivalent/ Percentile	Range of Scores
1. Pre-test	*9/10/75*	*32*	*4.6*	*3.1 M.A.*	*2.1 - 6.4*
2. Post-test	*5/10/76*	*27*	*5.4*	*5.1 M.A.*	*2.7 - 7.6*
Difference 3. (2 minus 1)	(# months) *8*	*5*	*.8*	*2.0*	

Name of Test
Iowa Test of Basic Skills

Norm Used
Grade Equivalent

Level/Form
4

Intermediate Elem. Items	Date	Number Tested	Mean C.A.	Mean Age / Grade Equivalent/ Percentile	Range of Scores
1. Pre-test	*9/75*	*14*	*10-6*	*4.0*	*1.5 - 5.2*
2. Post-test	*4/76*	*14*	*11-2*	*4.7*	*3.3 - 5.5*
Difference 3. (2 minus 1)	(# months) *7*	*0*	*7 mo.*	*.7*	

Name of Test
Iowa Test of Basic Skills

Norm Used
Grade Equivalent

Level/Form
4

Upper Elem. Item	Date	Number Tested	Mean C.A.	Mean Age / Grade Equivalent/ Percentile	Range of Scores
1. Pre-test	*9/75*	*26*	*12-8*	*5.4*	*3.3 - 7.0*
2. Post-test	*4/76*	*24*	*13-4*	*6.5*	*3.8 - 7.7*
Difference 3. (2 minus 1)	(# months) *7*	*2*	*7 mo.*	*1.1*	

Pre-School: (Ages 3-5) The degree of improvement was phenominal, with the mean difference between pre- and post-testing being 2 years' growth in mental age. This exceeded objective by 100%. Seventy-six per cent of the SEN students achieved the minimum objective of 1 year's growth in mental age in 1 year's time.

Projection: Present SEN students should continue in SEN program at least one more year, so that progress made can be carried over into primary years.

Reading Center: Growth in reading ability was substantial but not dramatic. Sixty-four per cent, instead of expected eighty per cent, made 1 year's gain in 1 year's time. Since these students have been a year or more behind in reading, without SEN intervention they would previously have gained more like 5 or 6 months in a year's time.

Reading scores of all SEN students do show a closing of the under-achieving gap. Most SEN students are now a year or less behind, instead of 2 or 3 years. Also,

by teacher observation, it is noted that approximately 90% of the students can now functionally cope with the reading in all subject areas. That is to say that even those still not up to grade level can read sufficiently well to function effectively in classes requiring much reading, such as in Social Studies.

Children in the project for the first year experienced the least amount of growth. This was contrary to what we expected. The unanticipated reasons are that they had to adjust to a new environment, being first year intermediate students, coming from a reading situation in which the focus was more on word attack skills, rather than comprehension. Students in the project for two years showed the most growth. They obviously have benefitted from a two-year intensified instructional program. The gap is being closed; but the deficiency in reading competence will continue to exist, as it is obvious the SEN students will always have to struggle to compete with their peers in high school.

Parent Involvement and Education: While this component was not a major emphasis of the program, the actual rate of participation was especially significant. Eighty per cent of the SEN parents showed a minimum participation, and fifty-four per cent were involved in at least two activities. This participation speaks to the genuine concern of parents that their children acquire the sound fundamentals of early education.

While the progress made through a total school effort to improve reading competency is gratifying, the staff of Urban Day continues to search for solutions to some serious concerns. Why is reading competency so difficult to achieve? It seems that an excessive intensity of effort is required in helping children of normal intelligence to overcome early deficiencies and to achieve up to their abilities. And what is the solution to having children read with a facility that motivates them to want to read because it is a desirable and satisfying experience?

STUDENT ACHIEVEMENT DATA SUMMARY

School/Agency
Milwaukee Board of School Directors

Student Level
Grades 2-6

SEN Project Title
Teacher Pupil Learning Center

Name of Test
Gates-MacGinitie

Norm Used
National

Middle Primary (Gr. 2) Level/Form *B-2*

Item	Date	Number Tested	Mean C.A.	Mean Age / Grade Equivalent/ Percentile	Range of Scores
1. Pre-test	10/75	41	7-5	1.5	1.0-3.4 (2.4)
2. Post-test	5/76	41	8-0	2.8	1.3-5.3 (4.0)
3. Difference (2 minus 1)	(# months) 7	0	7	+1.3	+.3-+1.9 (1.6)

Name of Test
Gates-MacGinitie

Norm Used
National

Upper Primary (Gr. 3) Level/Form *C-2*

Items	Date	Number Tested	Mean C.A.	Mean Age / Grade Equivalent/ Percentile	Range of Scores
1. Pre-test	10/75	46	8-5	2.6	1.2-6.0 (4.8)
2. Post-test	5/76	46	9-0	3.7	1.6-6.9 (5.3)
3. Difference (2 minus 1)	(# months) 7	0	7	+1.1	+.4-+.9 (.5)

Name of Test
Gates-MacGinitie

Norm Used
National

Level/Form *(Gr. 4) D-3*

Item	Date	Number Tested	Mean C.A.	Mean Age / Grade Equivalent/ Percentile	Range of Scores
1. Pre-test	10/75	47	9-5	3.2	2.0-6.6 (4.6)
2. Post-test	/76	47	10-0	3.9	2.0-10.2 (8.2)
3. Difference (2 minus 1)	(# months) 7	0	7	+.7	0-+3.6 (3.6)

Name of Test
Gates-MacGinitie

Norm Used
National

Level/Form *(Gr. 5) D-3*

Item	Date	Number Tested	Mean C.A.	Mean Age / Grade Equivalent/ Percentile	Range of Scores
1. Pre-test	10/75	50	10.6	3.3	2.0-7.4 (5.4)
2. Post-test	5/76	50	11.1	4.4	2.0-9.0 (7.0)
3. Difference (2 minus 1)	(# months) 7	0	7	+1.1	0-+1.6 (1.6)

School/Agency Student Level
Milwaukee Board of School Directors
SEN Project Title
Teacher Pupil Learning Center

Name of Test *Gates-MacGinitie* Norm Used *National* Level/Form *(Gr. 6) D-3*

Item	Date	Number Tested	Mean C.A.	Mean Age / Grade Equivalent/ Percentile	Range of Scores
1. Pre-test	10/75	51	11-5	4.0	2.0-8.0 (6.0)
2. Post-test	5/76	51	12-0	5.0	2.6-8.8 (6.2)
3. Difference (2 minus 1)	(# months) 7	0	7	+1.0	+.6-+.8 (.2)

The data are based on pupils on which both pre- and post-tests results were available. Data on the additional 52 pupils were not reported because they entered after the program began and/or withdrew from the program prior to its conclusion.

The mean scores for each grade level indicate above average growth in grades 2, 3, 5 and 6 and average growth in grade 4.

The diagnostic prescriptive approach to learning allowed teams of teachers to plan, implement and evaluate a total educational program for each pupil.

The success of the Jefferson TPLC program is due in great part to the impetus provided by planning, resources and involvement of the SEN program.

Lower Primary (Grade 1)

Because the first grade students were not able to read upon entering Jefferson TPLC in October, a battery of Reading Readiness Tests was administered to all 51 students.

The tests used were the Beery-Buktanica Visual Motor Integration Test and the Mann-Suiter Diagnostic Test of Developmental Screening.

On the visual-motor test 30 students were below age level in October and in May two students still need continued practice to indicate average achievement.

In visual memory, the October testing indicated that 43 of 51 pupils needed training. In May, 20 of the 43 students require additional training.

The visual discrimination portion of the test indicated in October that six of the 51 pupils needed additional training. In May all students mastered the necessary skills.

In the auditory memory area, the October testing indicated that 20 of the 51 pupils needed training. In May nine of the 21 need additional training.

The auditory discrimination portion of the test showed that 18 of the 51 students needed training and in May three of the 18 need additional training.

In October four of the 51 students had passed all the readiness tests. In May 21 of the remaining 47 passed the retests.

In May 25 students were administered the Gates-MacGinitie Test - Form A. The mean score for these students was a 2.9 grade equivalency. This shows an above average rate of achievement for these first grade students.

STUDENT ACHIEVEMENT DATA SUMMARY

School/Agency: Racine Unified School District No. 1 | Student Level: Grades 2-3

SEN Project Title: Reading/Language Arts Model Program

Repeat the following data section for each student level reported.
Complete project narrative following the S.A.D.S. Information
USE NO MORE THAN THESE TWO PAGES FOR YOUR FULL REPORT!

Name of Test: Woodcock Reading Master Test-Total Rdg. | Norm Used: Grades 3 3.0 pre 3.8 post | Level/Form: Form B-Post

	Item	Date	Number Tested	Mean C.A./Months	Grade Equivalent	Range of Scores
Group A	1. Pre-test	9-13-75	23	7 yrs.9mo.	1.98 G.E.	1.2-2.9
	2. Post-test	4-28-76	23	8 yrs.4mo.	2.73 G.E.	2.0-3.6
	3. (2 minus 1) Difference	(# months) 7.5	0	7 mos.	7.5 months	

Grades 2-3

N	Pre $\bar{X}$	95% C.I.	Post $\bar{X}$	95% C.I.	Change
23	1.98	1.78-2.17	2.73	2.54-2.91	*

Name of Test: Woodcock Reading Mastery Test Total Reading | Norm Used: pre 4.0 5.0 6.0 Post 4.8 5.8 6.8 | Level/Form: A-pre Form B-post

	Item	Date	Number Tested	Mean C.A./Months	Grade Equivalent	Range of Scores
Group A	1. Pre-test	9-13-75	43	10 yrs.2mo.	3.38 G.E.	1.9-5.1
	2. Post-test	4-28-76	43	10 yrs.9mo.	4.07 G.E.	2.4-6.8
	3. (2 minus 1) Difference	(# months) 7.5	0	7 months	6.9 months	

Grades 4-6

N	Pre $\bar{X}$	95% C.I.	Post $\bar{X}$	95% C.I.	Change
43	3.38	3.19-3.56	4.07	3.892-4.32	*

Name of Test: Woodcock Reading Mastery Test Total Reading | Norm Used: Grade 2 2.5 pre 2.8 Grade 3 3.5 pre 3.8 post post | Level/Form: A-pre Form B-post

	Item	Date	Number Tested	Mean C.A./Months	Grade Equivalent	Range of Scores
Group B	1. Pre-test	1-18-76	32	8 yrs.3 mo.	2.33 G.E.	1.5-3.4
	2. Post-test	4-28-76	32	8 yrs.6 mo.	2.66 G.E.	1.7-3.8
	3. (2 minus 1) Difference	(# months) 3.3	0	3 months	3.3 months	

Grades 2-3

N	Pre $\bar{X}$	95% C.I.	Post $\bar{X}$	95% C.I.	Change
32	2.33	2.12-2.55	2.66	2.42-2.90	*

Name of Test: Woodcock Reading Mastery Test -Total Reading | Norm Used: pre 4.5, 5.5, 6.5 post 4.8, 5.8, 6.8 | Level/Form: A-pre Form B-post

	Item	Date	Number Tested	Mean C.A./Months	Grade Equivalent	Range of Scores
Group B	1. Pre-test	1-18-76	67	10 yrs.4mo.	3.36 G.E.	2.1-6.3
	2. Post-test	4-28-76	67	10 yrs.7mo.	3.51 G.E.	2.3-6.0
	3. (2 minus 1) Difference	(# months) 3.3	0	3 months	1.5 months	

Grades 4-6

N	Pre $\bar{X}$	95% C.I.	Post $\bar{X}$	95% C.I.	Change
67	3.36	3.20-3.53	3.51	3.36-3.67	*

* Indicates significance at the .05 level or beyond

The Special Educational Needs Program in Racine serviced 224 children in grades 1-6 from eight schools. As of January 1976, 112 of these children came into the SEN program so that we could comply with the Public Law 93-380 governing regulations for Title I. Thus the participants will be referred to in this report as "Group A," those receiving treatment from September 1975 to June 1976; and those as "Group B" who received treatment from January 1976 to June 1976.

Children were eligible for program participation based on the following criteria: (1) scored below the 29th percentile (Racine norms) on the 1974-75 Metropolitan Achievement Test. (2) 75% come from low socio-economic home environments.

Final selection of participants was made jointly by teachers and principals who were guided by criteria in the economic as well as the social area.

The program staff consisted of a 1/2 time project coordinator, 3 1/2 reading resource teachers and 16 SEN aides. The role of the Project Coordinator was to supervise program staff and coordinate all facets of the program. The reading resource teacher diagnosed each child's reading difficulties and wrote prescriptions aimed at remediation. The SEN aides implemented the prescriptions in their instructional activities.

A span in each of the eight schools called the SEN Center, was allotted to program staff. Children come to the center in small groups (generally two at a time) for 45 minute periods approximately four days a week. These center visits were scheduled so that the same homeroom classes were not missed daily.

Summary of Findings for SEN Program Participants Percentage of Children Attaining Establsihed Criteria in Pre-Post Language Arts Tests, by Grade Groups

		Grade 1		Grade 2-3		Grade 4-6	
		Group A	Group B	Group A	Group B	Group A	Group B
Language Arts-usage mechanics	Pre	X	X	14.8%	0.0%	2.4%	0.0%
	Post	X	X	55.6%	54.8%	17.1%	12.1%
Spelling	Pre	0.0%	X	0.0%	15.6%	15.0%	12.9%
	Post	35.3%	X	44.4%	68.8%	52.5%	30.6%

Skills in language usage and mechanics were measured by a locally developed battery of criterion-referenced tests. The same form of the test was administered for pre and post tests. The criterion of success at all grade levels 1-6 was 75% mastery.

A locally constructed Spelling Test was administered to all SEN children as a pre and post test. The various levels of the Spelling Test corresponded to first through sixth grade levels of spelling achievement. The Criterion of Mastery was 75%.

The above chart shows that grades 2-3 far exceeded the post results of grade 5-6 in language arts. One reason for this is that the amount of skills increase from primary to intermediate levels. For children at the lower quartile, 75% mastery is a high expectation; so we feel that the gains made were realistic even if the goal was not met.

Summary of Findings for SEN Program Participants by Grade Groups in Relationship to Established Criteria of 1 month growth per month in program.

	Grade 1		Grade 2-3		Grade 4-6	
	Group A	Group B	Group A	Group B	Group A	Group B
Woodcock Letter Ident.	-	X	*	-	X	X
Woodcock Word Ident.	*	X	-	-	*	-
Woodcock Word Attack	X	X	*	*	**	-
Woodcock Word Comp.	X	X	*	*	**	**
Woodcock Passage Comp.	X	X	-	-	-	*
Woodcock Total Reading	X	X	*	*	*	-

X no participants
- criterion not met by the group
* criterion met by the group
** criterion exceeded by the group

Summary of Findings for SEN Program Participants on Dolch Basic Word List by Grade Groups in Relationship to Established Mastery Criteria of 95%

	Grade 1		Grade 2-3		Grade 4-6	
Dolch Basic Word List	Group A	Group B	Group A	Group B	Group A	Group B
(grade 1 - 186 words)	*	X				
(grades 2-6 - 220 words)			*	*	*	**

The objectives for the Dolch Basic Word List was met by each group and exceeded by Group B grades 4-6. However, the word identification on the Woodcock was one of the lower sub tests. Perhaps we should expand word recognition tasks by working on the Harris Johnson or Core Vocabulary list. The Passage Comprehension Subtest also shows that additional work needs to be done. We are looking into ways to better this reading skill. On the total reading subtest all groups except group B grades 4-6 met the criteria. We are not surprised at this outcome when one realizes that they were only in treatment for 3.3 months.

In addition to the instructional program as reported, our SEN project also included a L.A.P.C. component, parent education and involvement component and a staff development component. The L.A.P.C. group had monthly meetings as of January, 1976 and became involved in the planning and evaluating of the program, especially the parent involvement component.

Monthly activities were planned for the parents and children in the SEN project. The success of these were measured by the enthusiasm of those attending. Also, twice a month each parent was contacted by aide or resource teacher to provide student progress.

Fifty-two hours of staff inservicing was attended through the school year by resource teachers and aides. Because of this training the program operation ran smoothly.

In conclusion, we feel the components of the Racine SEN project have been successful as evidenced by student achievement data and/or a display of self-confidence in the students' daily activities.

STUDENT ACHIEVEMENT DATA SUMMARY

School/Agency
Rock County Community Action Program

Student Level
Pre-Kindergarten

SEN Project Title
C.A.P. Child Care

Name of Test
Developmental Test of Visual Motor Integration by K. Beery

Norm Used
Pre-K. 56 months

Level/Form
Beery 2-16

Item	Date	Number Tested	Mean C.A.	Mean Age / Grade Equivalent/ Percentile	Range of Scores
1. Pre-test	10/24/75	34	45 mo.	39 months	16 - 51 mo.
2. Post-test	5/3/76	34	51 mo.	50 months	34 - 77 mo.
3. Difference (2 minus 1)	(# months) 6 months	0	6 mo.	11 months	18 -16 mo.

The Beery Visual Motor Integration Test (VMI) was given to three, four, and five year olds who are not in kindergarten (reported above). The average gain for each participant was eleven months over a six month program period.

The VMI was also given to a group of eight kindergarten children. At the time of the pre-test, the mean CA was five years five months. The mean pre-test score on the VMI was four years ten months. The range of scores was four years four months to five years seven months.

The post-test mean for the kindergarten group was five years eight months. The range was five years zero months to six years five months. This indicates that over a period of six months the children in the kindergarten group gained an average of ten months as measured by the VMI.

This amount of growth can be attributed to several factors. Those students who showed the greatest need were given intensive individualized attention. All of the participants were given remedial and developmental activities in small groups as well. It should also be noted that the wide variety of materials available offered a greater opportunity to give each child the type of learning experience he or she needed most. The materials and staff development program gave the day care teachers an incentive to develop more creative teaching methods.

The 1974-75 SEN project was in operation for four months. During that time each participant showed an average gain of three months as compared to an average gain of eleven months during the 1975-76 project. Therefore, it is reasonable to conclude that the 1975-76 project was more successful than the 1974-75 project.

STUDENT ACHIEVEMENT DATA SUMMARY

School/Agency
Sheboygan Public Schools

Student Level
Pre-Kindergarten

SEN Project Title
Special Educational Needs Development

Name of Test
Peabody Picture Vocabulary Test

Norm Used

Level/Form
A & B

Item	Date	Number Tested	Mean C.A.	Mean Age / Grade Equivalent/ Percentile	Range of Scores
1. Pre-test	*10/75*	*90*	*4-5*	*4-2*	*2-1 - 7-1*
2. Post-test	*4/76*	*89*	*5-0*	*5-5*	*2-7 - 8-7*
3. Difference (2 minus 1)	(# months) *6*	*- 1*	*5 mo.*	*1-3*	*-6 - 1-6*

The main purpose of the SEN project was to provide identified four year old children with a special developmental educational program so that they would be able to better interact with their peers when they entered kindergarten and the mainstream of our educational program.

Some growth due to natural maturation was expected. Additional accelerated improvement was hoped for to narrow any gaps in social and educational development before these children started kindergarten. The above data shows that when the children had a mean chronological age of 4 years 5 months, they tested out at a mean age of 4 years 2 months. However, at the time of the post-test when children had matured and reached a mean chronological age of 5 years, the post-test showed a mean age of 5 years 5 months. This gain is greater than what would be expected in the time elapsed between pre- and post-tests.

In language development, teacher evaluations noted an improvement in verbalization from one word sentences to more complex sentences. Children became better able to express their ideas. Timid and shy children became more outgoing. Children without siblings made strides forward in their peer relationships.

In visual development, the children improved in their eye-hand coordination. They learned to work with a wide variety of materials used in the classroom. These experiences should make it easier to adapt to the kindergarten setting.

In motor development, children were observed to improve on tasks such as dressing, buttoning, zipping, etc. Through the use of rhythm and motor perceptual material, children became more aware of their own body and what it is capable of doing. Cutting tasks, games with small parts, etc., encouraged small motor development; gym activities, games, etc., encouraged large motor development

In social-emotional development, children gained a better perception of themselves and a much more confident manner. They became more aware of each other's feelings and their own feelings through positive interaction. The result was an improvement in self-image.

Other experiences included songs and various activities involving music. The art experiences included class craft projects, murals, paintings, etc., which were displayed in the rooms. Children used numbers, shapes, and counting as tools for math awareness.

Varied intellectual stimulation was provided through numerous field trips. This community involvement and awareness of environment outside of the immediate school setting gave rise to new ideas related to new experiences.

Parents showed a positive reception to the idea of interacting in the program. Parent meetings and home visits relieved some negative feelings of parents which had been retained from earlier experiences. Parents with a more positive attitude toward school were able to help the child. Meetings of a guidance counselor, psychologist, social worker, speech therapist, and teacher with parents and child enabled parents to be able to aid the child. Many parents came to the P.E.T. (Parent Effectiveness Training) sessions. Home visits encouraged a cooperative effort in solving problems related to both school and home. This became a meaningful experience in both directions.

Parent participation in the classroom on a once-a-month basis became helpful to all concerned. Some Spanish-speaking parents were encouraged and motivated to learn English. Teachers tried to show parents how to deal with specific situations that arose in the home as well as in the classroom. With insights gained that some tasks are work or learning experiences to children but seem like play to adults, parents learned the value of sharing some activities with children at home. The pamphlet for home activities, which each family received, could serve as a carryover until fall.

Some children received referrals for psychological testing. This early spotting of potential difficulties could also help to minimize problems before entrance into kindergarten.

Joint staff meetings were held with members of Green Bay and Milwaukee SEN programs. Staff compared notes and discussed various aspects of their programs. They felt this was mutually advantageous. This exchange of information prepared them for active participation at the state meeting in Waukesha. Local staff meetings were held monthly.

The majority of parents in a random sample responding to a survey at the end of the programs (year long program and six week program) said they felt SEN had been a worthwhile experience for their child. Negative comments concerned the fact that kindergarten included a repetition of some of the same experiences and field trips. A number of the parents indicated they felt that the program could be run once or twice a week rather than five days a week with the child being able to make an equivalent gain. All parents expressed an appreciation of the bus service. The most frequent supportive comments were that the child talked more, showed a willingness to share, and got along better with others.

STUDENT ACHIEVEMENT DATA SUMMARY

School/Agency	Student Level
Southwestern Wisconsin Community Action Program, Inc.	*3-0 to 4-5/Pre-Kindergarten. 3-0 to 4-9 Beginning of Program Pre-Kindergarten*

SEN Project Title
SEN - Head Start

Name of Test	Norm Used	Level/Form
Jordan-Massey School Readiness Survey	*Raw score - Ave. raw score goal 72.5 out of 96 80 out of 96 for 4 yr. olds 65 out of 96 for 3 yr. olds*	*One Form Available*

Item	Date	Number Tested	Mean C.A.	Mean Age / Grade Equivalent/ Percentile	Range of Scores
1. Pre-test	*10/14/75*	*88*	*4-2*	*37 out of 72.5 readiness goal or 51% of readiness*	*0-85*
2. Post-test	*5/10/76*	*84*	*4-9*	*70.5 out of 72.5 readiness goal or 97.2% of readiness*	*0-92*
3. Difference (2 minus 1)	(# months) *7*	*- 4*	*7 mo.*	*33.5 ave. score increase or 46.2% of readiness increase*	*0-7*

In October of 1975, 88 three and four year old children were given the Jordan-Massey School Readiness Survey. Two five year olds were also tested. This data reflects only the results for the three and four year olds who remained in the program for the complete year. During the seven months the program was in operation, four of the original children dropped out and fourteen new children were added. The most children served at any given time was 104. The least children served at any given time was 90.

The testing results show that the three and four year olds were at 51% of readiness in the fall. After seven months in the program, they were tested at 97.2% of readiness for school. The children showed an average gain of 46.2% of readiness. Also, after seven months in the program, a child's average score increased 90.5% of his/her original score.

The Jordan-Massey proved to have limitations for testing three year olds because of their limited attention. The test results also do not reflect the gains made by children who were unable to take the test both in the fall and spring.

STUDENT ACHIEVEMENT DATA SUMMARY

School/Agency
South Wood County Child Care Center, Inc.

Student level
Pre-School 3 & 4 year olds

SEN Project Title
Special Educational Needs In Head Start

Name of Test
Development Profile by Alvern & Boll
Learning Accomplishment Profile by Sanford

Norm Used *Developmental & Chronological Age Match*

Level/Form

Item	Date	Number Tested	Mean C.A.	Mean Age / Grade Equivalent/ Percentile	Range of Scores
1. Pre-test	11/1/75	71	51	Cognition: 38 mo. Language: 36 mo.	Cog.-22-64 mo. Lan.-19-50 mo.
2. Post-test	5/1/76	68	58	Cognition: 62 mo. Language: 63 mo.	Cog.-34-78 mo. Lan.-32-84 mo.
3. Difference (2 minus 1)	(# months) 6	3	7	Cognition: 24 mo. Language: 27 mo.	Cog.-12-14 mo. Lan.-13-34 mo.

What We Expected

In the project proposal for Special Educational Needs in Head Start two major goals were projected:

I. To bring the developmental age of 60 children in the SEN program up to their chronological age in areas of cognition and language.

II. Fifty percent of the parents of SEN children would participate in one-half of the educational and leadership opportunities offered by the Head Start Center Parent Involvement Component.

What Happened?

Goal I *The Children* - *A total of 71 children were enrolled in the program. The goal was exceeded: the goal in cognition was 107% successful and the goal in language was 109% successful. In addition to matching the developmental and chronological age in cognition, the project exceeded the goal by a mean average of 4 months. In addition to matching the developmental and chronological age in language, the project exceeded the goal by a mean average of 5 months. The project accomplished a remarkable increase in the range of developmental mean scores in cognition: a low of 12 months increase and a high of 14 months increase; and in the range of developmental mean scores in language: a low of 13 months increase and a high of 34 months increase.*

Goal II *The Parents* - *There were a total of 57 parents of children enrolled in Center programs. The number of parents needed to accomplish goals was 29. The number of parents achieving goals was 26. The project reached 90% of the stated goal.*

Why Did It Happen?

The goals of the program were accomplished with a very high percentage of success because of many factors. The staff and parents worked as a team to assess the child's strengths and weaknesses and to design a program that would assist the child to function at his optimum potential.

The implementation of that program by the Center staff of teacher, teacher assistant, tutor and parent volunteer working with the Educational Coordinator was carefully planned and coordinated. A careful log was kept on each child's progress and objectives were rewritten as the child's progress was evaluated by the team.

Staff training was ongoing. All classroom staff participated in pre-service and in-service; attended workshops and worked with other consultants in the area of child development and services to children with special needs. Probably the best training was their participation in the SEN Workshop sponsored by the Milwaukee Private School Cooperative. The opportunity to be presentors and to learn from other SEN projects was invaluable.

The involvement of parents of SEN identified children was a big factor in the gains made by the children. Parents were volunteers in the classroom where they could learn first hand what the children were doing and why. Parents attended group meetings where child development, and parent-child concerns, chosen by the parents themselves, were discussed. Each family was visited, at least three times during the year, by the classroom teacher. Parents were kept informed about their child's progress.

While the goal of parent involvement was 90% successful, in future programming, the SEN project is challenged to change tactics and increase the number of opportunities that are presented within the parent's house or home area, approaching the parent directly rather than offering only classroom/Center located options.

STUDENT ACHIEVEMENT DATA SUMMARY

School/Agency: *Stoughton Joint School District #3*

Student Level: *Middle School*

SEN Project Title: *Providing Needed Instructional Resources Through the Continuation of a Special Grandparent Program*

Name of Test: *Gates-MacGinitie Reading Test*

Norm Used: *Pre-test 7.1* *Post-test 7.7*

Level/Form: *D, E / 2, 3*

Item	Date	Number Tested	Mean C.A.	Mean Age / Grade Equivalent / Percentile	Range of Scores
1. Pre-test	10/1-10/75	45	13.0	5.0 G.E.	2.9 - 8.1
2. Post-test	4/20-23/76	44	13.7	5.4 G.E.	2.8 - 10.2
3. Difference (2 minus 1)	(# months) +6.5	- 1	+ 0.7	+0.4	-0.1 - 2.1

The purpose of the SEN Special Grandparent Program at Stoughton Middle School is to more effectively meet the educational, emotional, and social needs of low-achieving adolescent children through the human resources of the Stoughton community. This unique program generates, coordinates, and utilizes additional human instructional community resources to allow for greater personalization of the learning situation for these students. This concern from caring adults and the development of positive relationships have produced motivational, self-concept, and academic gains.

It was anticipated that SEN students as a group would increase their composite (vocabulary and comprehension) mean growth reading scores on the Gates-MacGinitie Reading Test by 3.0 months. This objective was accomplished. The actual mean group increase for 45 students was 4.0 months gain per pupil. A total of 6.5 months of program intervention occurred between the administration of the pre- and post-tests. Baseline data from the previous year, 1974-75, showed a 2-month corporate mean growth in reading skills for 35 SEN students as measured by the Gates-MacGinitie Reading Test. However, 59% of those SEN students did improve their reading skills by three months or better.

Limitations of attempting to measure growth in reading skills through the citing of gains achieved on one test instrument are apparent. Other variables such as student motivation to complete the test, good health, and emotional stability of the student at the time of test administration may greatly influence the accuracy and reliability of the test performance. This may be particularly true when attempting to assess the progress of low-achieving students, who by the time they are in Middle School, have encountered years of frustrations and failures in learning to read. Deprived and unstable family and home conditions of SEN students may further act to reduce the reliability and validity of standardized test instruments.

In an attempt to increase the reliability of measurement, this local project will replace the Gates-MacGinitie Reading Test which is designed to cover the entire range of ability or performance for a specified grade or age group, with a standardized diagnostic test developed primarily to assess below average performance. Students who may have been frustrated by a test instrument designed to assess all reading levels may experience success on a diagnostic test. A more accurate, reliable measurement of below average performance is afforded by the less difficult nature of a diagnostic test.

Perhaps more indicative of student progress is the fact that 75% of the local SEN students were assessed by their regular classroom teachers as having made progress, based on student and classroom-specific criteria, with respect to their individual

goals. In addition, 71% of the individual student-specific instructional plans constructed by the SEN special grandparent staff were achieved. SEN intervention through specific strategies, activities, materials, and human resources determined the accomplishment of these individual behavioral and instructional goals.

Another important impact on the SEN students was the development of more positive student attitudes toward school personnel and school in general. On the Stoughton Attitude Survey, students showed an average increase of 2 points per student. The anticipated outcome was a 1-point increase per student. Creative and personalized strategies utilized by the SEN staff have assisted these students in feeling more positive about themselves and have developed better attitudes about school in general.

Furthermore, SEN student followup evaluation indicated that 95% were satisfied with their involvement with the local SEN program. Also significant is the fact that 86% of the SEN students responded that they had been helped by being in the local SEN program.

As stated previously, this concern from caring adults has produced motivational, self-concept, positive attitude gains, and academic gains for SEN students.

General local SEN program strengths which have contributed to student growth and achievement include the following:

1. SEN success in integrating its supplemental services into the regular instructional program;
2. Increased communication among supportive services personnel;
3. Successful efforts to ensure acceptance of this program by students, professional staff, parents, and community and to avoid the stigma which students, particularly, can associate with programming for special student needs;
4. The generation of additional instructional resources from the community;
5. Effective coordination of the instructional and staff development programs which has produced effective communication and productive working relationships among the non-professional SEN staff; and
6. Increased communication between the Middle School and the community resulting in more positive attitudes toward the Middle School.

STUDENT ACHIEVEMENT DATA SUMMARY

School/Agency
Tomah Public Schools

Student Level
Pre-School

SEN Project Title
Pre-School Project for Low Achieving Children

Name of Test
Peabody Picture Vocabulary Test

Norm Used
Mental Age

Level/Form
B

Item	Date	Number Tested	Mean C.A.	Mean Mental Age / ~~Grade Equivalent/ Percentile~~	Range of Scores
1. Pre-test	4/75	50	3.9	3.6	2.4 / 5.10
2. Post-test	4/76	50	4.9	5.6	3.7 / 8.4
3. Difference (2 minus 1)	(# months) 12	0	1.0	2.0	1.3 / 2.5

STATISTICAL RESULTS OF THE TOMAH PUBLIC SCHOOLS SPECIAL EDUCATIONAL NEEDS PROGRAM 1975-76

Research has shown the important relationship of early experience and pre-school programs to intelligence and later school achievement. Teachers in pre-school and special education programs have verified that success in school is highly dependent upon basic skills learned early in life. This preacademic preparation has been called "readiness".

Intelligence and academic achievement are founded upon well developed information processing systems, notably language and visual motor integration. A child's ability to read and write depends upon his readiness in visual motor integration and language comprehension. Our task as teachers is to help the child organize his senses and physical mechanisms so that the information he received can be smoothly processed and demonstrated as basic reading and writing skills. The finest reading series available will be of little or no value to the child who is deficient in his basic information processing abilities.

Having recognized that readiness skills in language and visual motor integration are a necessity in academic achievement, measures in these areas were chosen to diagnose pre-schoolers not ready for reading or writing skills. The measures chosen were the Peabody Picture Vocabulary Test and the Beery Developmental Test of Visual Motor Integration.

Through early detection of a child'd deficiences in the areas of cognitive, psychomotor, social, locomotor, speech skills, and economic background, we expected each child to progress to a level where he could enter kindergarten on a more equal basis with average children.

Knowing that readiness skills are basic in school achievement, it is important to know how much success is made by a pre-school program in order to justify its validity. The Special Educational Needs Program (SEN) of the Tomah Public Schools statistically analyzed its readiness scores for such a purpose.

Tests were administered to students before they entered the SEN program and after the program was completed. Also, a controlled group of students was administered tests before and after the program completion. However, the control group was

not included in the SEN program. The control group was used to compare the difference in progress between the SEN children and children who did not participate in the SEN program.

The control group results indicate that the average chronological age of its students increased from 3.9 to 4.9 or 10 months. Results of the Peabody Picture Vocabulary Test (a language measure) indicated that the control group increased from a mental age of 4.0 to a mental age of 5.4 or 14 months. Results of the Beery Developmental Test of Visual Motor Integration indicate that the control group progressed from an average mental age of 3.9 to 4.7 or a gain of 6 months.

The average chronological age of the children admitted to the SEN program increased from 3.9 to 4.9 or 10 months. The average mental age on the Peabody Picture Vocabulary Test increased from 3.6 to 5.6 or 20 months. The average mental age on the Beery Developmental Test of Visual Motor Integration increased from 3.4 to 4.7 or 13 months. (Most children's socialization skills improved based on pre- and post-teachers observation checklists.)

In summary, the control group increased 10 months in chronological age and an average of 10 months in mental age on the 2 basic measures. Students in the SEN program increased 10 months in chronological age and an average of 16.5 months in mental age on the 2 basic measures. These results indicate that the students in the SEN program advanced 60% higher in readiness skill development over the controlled group. These results tend to confirm previous research on the validity of pre-school programs for readiness skill development necessary for later school achievement. The increase is possible because of early detection and SEN intervention through classroom experiences and home instruction based on each child's individual needs.

STUDENT ACHIEVEMENT DATA SUMMARY

School/Agency
Tri-City Youth Services, Inc.

Student Level
Grades 9-12

SEN Project Title
New Ways Learning Center

Name of Test
Tests of Academic Progress

Norm Used
2-4 standard deviation

Level/Form
9-12 / S

Item	Date	Number Tested	Mean C.A.	Mean Age / Grade Equivalent/ Percentile	Range of Scores
1. Pre-test	*Jan. 1*	*8*	*16*	*Read. 45 / Math 43 192/20/30%*	*Read. 8%-85% Math 8%-79%*
2. Post-test	*May 15*	*8*	*16.5*	*Read. 48/Math 45.7 297.5/25.5/35%*	*Read. 13%-75% Math 9%-84%*
3. Difference (2 minus 1)	(# months) 5.5	*0*	*.5*	*Read. 3 Math 2.7 5.5/5.5/5%*	*Read. 5%-10% Math 1%- 5%*

The reported scores obtained from the Test of Academic Progress (TAP) reflect a composit score of eight students in the areas of reading and math only. The test was administered on a pre-post test basis with a time lapse between pre- and post-testing of five and one-half (5½) months.

All scores for TAP were obtained from raw scores (number of right answers), converted into standard scores established nationwide for all high school students, grades nine (9) through twelve (12). Standard scores were averaged for all students tested to obtain the cumulative results.

In the area of language arts, on the pre-test, the cumulative standard score is forty-five (45). On the post-test the cumulative standard score of forty-eight (48) indicates an increase of three (3) standard deviations.

In the area of Mathematics, an increase of 2.7 standard deviations was obtained using the same method employed in tabulating scores in language arts.

The expected average annual increase in both language arts and math skills is three (3) standard deviations. Based on this, an increase of between 1 and 2 standard deviations was anticipated for the period between January 1 and May 15.

Test scores indicate, however, a year's development in both reading and math skills in less than one-half of the prescribed time.

One reason for this unexpected improvement in reading and math skills is the concentrated effort to employ these skills in all areas of academic endeavors. All classes at New Ways Learning Center are actively engaged in incorporating these skills into the curriculum. In the last year, the level of activity in any given class in the areas of reading and math has been increased 20-25%. This was successfully accomplished without sacrificing student interest and participation in elective classes.

This increase in activity in reading and in math does not, in my estimation, undermine the primary reason for the increase in performance levels: students can learn and do learn in an environment that is safe, non-threatening, humane and fair. Our first priority at New Ways is to produce that learning environment.

Chapter 5

Summary

With the close of the second full year of operations, this Special Educational Needs (SEN) Program Report again recaps some of the historical background on the program. For a summary of activities during FY1975, the reader is directed to Appendix E.

During the past year, 1975-76, the SEN program funded 29 projects (Milwaukee Co-op Coordination and Green Bay's "Parent Education" project are not included). These projects were distributed between 12 public schools and 17 private, non-profit, non-sectarian agencies. Three projects were funded from the $100,000 established as discretionary funds. All of the 1.5 million dollars released to the Department for SEN-based programs had been allocated for project activities during this project year.

Public agencies, while programming for 66.7 percent of the participants, received $991,640 or 66.3 percent of the total SEN funds and private agencies received $505,048 or 33.7 percent of the funds. A total of 2,376 children were served in the SEN program with a per-pupil cost averaging $629.92.

This report has identified the financial and statistical information relative to enrollment expenditures and grant awards issued to all participating agencies.

Projects were staffed by 177.77 (full-time equivalent) locally employed staff who bring a variety of teaching strategies to the children and their parents. For example, projects were funded for bilingual children, for urban inner city children, for children in alternative school programs at the secondary level, for parent education, for specific program models, for teenage probationers, and for actual and potential dropouts. The majority of children being served and staff employed were in preschool programs.

Program implementation is monitored at the state and local levels. The Department of Public Instruction encouraged an evaluation strategy tailored to the individual needs and objectives of the SEN program clients on a project-by-project basis. In addition, each project identified a pre-test/post-test design in measuring student achievement on a standardized test. The reporting of each project on student achievement is included in this report. The student achievement data summaries and narrative reports support the fact that local programs have developed and implemented viable programs for serving children with special educational needs.

In a self-evaluation of project operations and effectiveness, projects reported on each program component of the SEN program. SEN projects recorded that the administration of projects was efficient and rated 20 of 29 projects functioning at a very good to excellent level in this area. Likewise, 21 projects rated their instructional program at a very good to excellent level with eight projects receiving a rating of adequate to good.

Parent education and the active involvement of LAPC's continue to be the component areas rated at lower levels by project staff and DPI SEN staff.

The information contained in this summary is expanded upon in the enclosed Special Educational Needs End-of-Year Report - FY1976. This report also contains information regarding the following:

SEN Statutes

SEN FY1975 Evaluation Summary

SEN Program Self-Evaluation

SEN - Student Achievement Data Summaries

SUBCHAPTER V
SPECIAL EDUCATIONAL NEEDS

115.90 DEFINITIONS. (1) In this subchapter, "children with special educational needs" means preschool children to children in the 8th grade who have or are likely to have low levels of academic achievement, especially in relation to social and economic factors.

(2) Any public school district which is determined to have children with special educational needs according to s. 115.91 may apply for funds under s. 115.92. Nonprofit, nonsectarian agencies may apply for funds under s. 115.92. Prior to accepting applications from any such agency, the state superintendent shall determine that it has adequate management and accounting capacity and such agency shall agree that its accounts related to such programs may be audited.

115.91 IDENTIFICATION OF PUPILS WITH SPECIAL EDUCATIONAL NEEDS. (1) Annually, the state superintendent shall establish criteria by which characteristics of social and economic factors can be measured on which she will make grants to school districts or agencies for programs for children with special educational needs.

(2) Each school district or agency for which a program is approved under s. 115.92 shall select the individuals who have or are likely to have the greatest special educational needs.

115.92 APPLICATION AND APPROVAL OF PROGRAMS TO SERVE PUPILS WITH SPECIAL EDUCATIONAL NEEDS. (1) Annually, the state superintendent shall issue guidelines for developing and approving programs for serving children with special educational needs. Such guidelines shall incorporate the factors which in her judgment provide the greatest likelihood for successful programs.

(2) The school districts and other agencies eligible under s. 115.90 shall submit applications to serve the number of children determined under s. 115.91. Such proposals shall demonstrate how other available funds will be incorporated into the program, that funds under s. 20.255 (1) (fd) will be directed to the children selected under s. 115.90 and that funds under s. 20.255 (1) (fd) will not be used to supplant or replace other funds otherwise available for these children.

(3) The state superintendent shall approve applications which she determines will enhance the potential for academic success of the children. Priority shall be given to programs for preschool children.

115.94 LOCAL ADVISORY PROGRAM COUNCILS. No application for funds under this subchapter shall be reviewed by the state superintendent unless the school district or other eligible applicant has established a local advisory program council consisting of parents, community representatives, school administrators, and teachers to advise on the development of applications and the implementation of approved programs.

CHAPTER 90, LAWS OF 1973 (Published August 4, 1973) (Revised 1975 Chapter 39)

20.255 (fd) SPECIAL NEEDS. Biennially, the amounts in the schedule for financial grants pursuant to subchapter V of chapter 115 of which $250,000 shall be appropriated at the discretion of the state superintendent to enhance the educational opportunities of children who come from socially, economically or culturally disadvantaged environments. Grants under this paragraph shall be paid during the school year in which the approved program is operated.

SPECIAL EDUCATIONAL NEEDS

1975-76 Project Directory

Name of Agency/Address	Contact Persons	Name of Project
Beloit Public Schools 220 W. Grand Avenue Beloit, WI 53511 (608) 365-0131	Eugene W. Tornow, Superintendent Nancy Gurrie, Project Director	Early Intervention - Dropout Prevention
Child Development, Inc. 2012 Fisher Street Madison, WI 53713 (608) 251-3366	Hickory R. Hurrie, Director Aurelia Strupp, Project Director	Using Sensory Learning Modalities for Individual Growth in Full Day Kindergarten and Pre-Schoolers
Commando Project I 522 W. North Avenue Milwaukee, WI 53212 (414) 372-6260	Jesse Wade, Director Jules Modlinski, Project Director	Commando Academy
Community Relations - Social Development Commission 161 W. Wisconsin Ave. Suite 6146 Milwaukee, WI 53203 (414) 562-8600	Donald Sykes, Executive Director Ena A. Harris, Project Director	Child & Family Development Center Open Classroom
Cooperative Educational Service Agency #6 725 W. Park Avenue Chippewa Falls, WI 54729 (715) 723-0341	Henry G. Anderson, Coordinator Gordon Clay, Project Director	Community Based Language Arts Program
Cooperative Educational Service Agency #13 908 W. Main Street Waupun, WI 53963 (414) 324-4461	Dwayne Schmaltz, Coordinator Carlotta Hebblethwaite, Project Director	Kids and Parents Developing Early Learning Potential - Project KAP
Cooperative Educational Service Agency #18 532 N. Pine Street Second Floor Burlington, WI 53105 (414) 763-2457	Dale Jensen, Coordinator & Project Director	Bilingual - Bicultural Intervention
Gillett Public Schools Gillett, WI 54124 (414) 855-2138	Warren Eiseth, Superintendent Robert Hruska, Project Director	Pre-School Home - Bound Project
Green Bay Public Schools 100 N. Jefferson Street Green Bay, WI 54301 (414) 432-0351	Merrill Grant, Superintendent LeRoy Heim, Project Director	1) A Language Experience Program for Meeting the Special Educational Needs of Children 2) Parent Education Program

Name of Agency/Address	Contact Persons	Name of Project
Melrose-Mindoro Public Schools Melrose, WI 54642 (608) 488-2201	Louis Grzadzielewski, Superintendent Mylo Hayford, Project Director	Educational Satellite Program
Menominee Community Action Program - Indian Head Start P. O. Box 397 Keshena, WI 54135 (715) 799-3384	Harley Lyons, Executive Director Dolores K. Boyd, Project Director	Special Educational Needs Program
Menominee County Education Committee, Inc. P. O. Box 149 Keshena, WI 54135 (715) 799-3910	Patricia A. Corn, President Al Pyatskowit, Project Director	Menominee Community School
Milwaukee Private Community School Co-op 1441 N. 24th Street Milwaukee, WI 53205 (414) 933-9070	Angel Souers, Project Coordinator	Milwaukee Private Community School Cooperative
*Carter Child Development Center 1831 W. Juneau Avenue Milwaukee, WI 53233 (414) 933-4044	Veledis Carter, Executive Director & Project Director	Carter Child Development Center
*Cosmic Montessori Society Inc. 2133 W. Wisconsin Ave. Milwaukee, WI 53233 (414) 344-4474	Shirley Warren, Project Director	Language Enrichment
*Harambee Community School, Inc. 110 W. Burleigh Street Milwaukee, WI 53212	Sister Mary Jane Kreidler, Administrator Michelle Merrell, Project Director	Harambee Pre-School and Kindergarten SEN Program
*Highland Community School, Inc. 2004 W. Highland Avenue Milwaukee, WI 53233 (414) 342-1412	Sara Spellman, Administrator & Project Director	Highland Community School SEN Program
*Journey House, Inc. 1100 S. 16th Street Milwaukee, WI 53204 (414) 647-0548	Sandra Lardinois, Director & Project Director	Journey House Special Education Needs Program

Name of Agency/Address	Contact Persons	Name of Project
*Leo Community School 2458 W. Locust Street Milwaukee, WI 53206 (414) 442-1100	Sister Susan Hetebrueg, Administrator Sister Sharon Roedl, Project Director	Creative Language Arts Project
*Rainbow School, Inc. 3104 W. Kilbourn Street Milwaukee, WI 53208 (414) 765-9266	Christine Hollibush, Coordinator & Project Director	Language, Psycho-Motor Development
*Urban Day School 1441 N. 24th Street Milwaukee, WI 53205 (414) 933-9070	Sister Virgine Lawinger, Coordinator & Project Director	Urban Day Learning Center
Milwaukee Board of School Directors P. O. Drawer 10K Milwaukee, WI 53201 (414) 475-8045	Lee R. McMurrin, Superintendent George Friedrich, Project Director	Teacher Pupil Learning Center
Unified School District #1 of Racine County 2230 Northwestern Ave. Racine, WI 53404 (414) 637-9511	C. Richard Nelson, Superintendent Jan Floyd, Project Director	Special Educational Needs
Rock County Community Action Program Committee, Inc. 2300 W. Kellogg Avenue P. O. Box 1429 Janesville, WI 53545 (608) 756-2371	John Daley, Executive Director Sandra Strands, Project Director (acting)	CAP Child Care - SEN
Sheboygan Public Schools 830 Virginia Avenue Sheboygan, WI 53081 (414) 458-4621	Warren Soeteber, Superintendent Donald Hoeft, Project Director	Special Educational Needs Development (SEND)
Southwestern Wisconsin Community Action Program, Inc. 302 N. Iowa Street Dodgeville, WI 53533 (608) 935-2326	JoAnn Garner, Project Director	SEN Home Start
South Wood County Child Care Center, Inc. 2139 - 8th Street S. Wisconsin Rapids, WI 54494 (715) 421-2066	Nellie Miller, Project Director	Special Educational Needs in Head Start

Name of Agency/Address	Contact Persons	Name of Project
Stoughton Joint School District #3 P. O. Box 189 Stoughton, WI 53589 (608) 873-6624	James Fricke, Superintendent Lois Gorsuch, Project Director	Providing Needed Instructional Resources Through the Continuation of a Special Grandparent Program
Tomah Public Schools Lincoln Avenue Tomah, WI 54660 (608) 372-5986	J. M. Kavanaugh, Superintendent Thomas Pedersen, Project Director	SEN Project
Tri-City Youth Services, Inc. 141 N. Fourth Avenue P. O. Box 841 Wisconsin Rapids, WI 54494 (715) 423-3370	James Disher, Administrator Peter Plant, Project Director	New Ways Learning Center

*Members of the Milwaukee Private Community School Cooperative

Program Models

1975-76
Special Educational Needs

Basic Program Components

Local Advisory Program Council | Staff Development (Inservice) | Instructional Program | Parent Involvement and Education

A. Objectives
B. Strategies
C. Evaluation

SEN Program Strategies (Models)

Pre-School

A. In-School Model

1. Beloit P. S.
2. Carter Child Dev.
3. Child Dev., Inc.
4. Comm. Rel./Soc. Dev.
5. Cosmic Montessori
6. Green Bay P. S.
7. Harambee
8. Highland
9. Menominee Co. CAP
10. Rainbow
11. Rock Co. CAP
12. Sheboygan P. S.
13. South Wood
14. Urban Day

B. Home-Based Model

1. Beloit P. S.
2. CESA #13
3. Gillett P. S.
4. Melrose-Mindoro P. S.
5. Southwestern CAP

C. Combined Model In-School/Home-Base

1. Tomah P. S.

D. Parent Education

1. Green Bay P. S.

Grades K-8

A. Student Tutors

1. Journey House

B. Community Involvement

1. CESA #6
2. Stoughton P. S.

C. Diagnostic Prescriptive

1. Milwaukee P. S.
2. Racine P. S.
3. CESA #18 (Bilingual)
4. Leo

Grades 9-12

A. Tutoring Model

1. Commandoes

B. Alternative Program

1. Tri-Cities (New Ways Learning Center)
2. Menominee Co. Comm. School

WISCONSIN DEPARTMENT OF PUBLIC INSTRUCTION
126 Langdon Street
Madison, Wisconsin 53702

TO:

FROM: Jack Lawrence

DATE: February 25, 1976

SUBJECT: Onsite SEN Evaluation

In order to discuss the results of your self-evaluation, a team onsite visit will be made to your project on;

Because of our very strict onsite schedule, we are asking that you make every effort to meet with us at the time set above. The D.P.I. staff will meet separately from 11:30 A.M. to 12:30 P.M.; therefore, do not schedule a luncheon meeting for us.

Dorothy Placide, Frank Evans, and myself will comprise the Department evaluation team: We do not anticipate classroom visits.

We ask that the following are present for our discussion:

1. Project Director
2. One representative of the LAPC (Preferably an officer)
3. One SEN staff member
4. One parent being served by the parent education component
5. Any other district or agency administrative staff member

mrd

WISCONSIN DEPARTMENT OF PUBLIC INSTRUCTION
SEN PROGRAM–SELF-EVALUATION
PI-1722

INSTRUCTIONS: Complete in the manner in which you, as reviewer, will best judge the sufficiency of each criterion. DPI staff will schedule an onsite visit to discuss this evaluation. Complete prior to the visit. In some cases the staff may ask for documentat on supporting your ratings. You may choose to further explain any response on the reverse side attaching additional pages as necessary.

Legal Name of Agency

Address (Street, City, State, Zip Code)

Title of Project

I hereby certify that to the best of my knowledge the information contained in this evaluation report is correct and complete.

Signature of Project Director — Date

Signature of School or Agency Administrator — Date

I. GENERAL PROGRAM ADMINISTRATION

1. Total SEN Project Participants	2. Total SEN Budget $	3. 1974-75 Audit Submitted ☐ Yes ☐ No

4. Pupil Contact

Type of Contact	No. of Pupils	No. of Contacts Per Week Per Pupil	No. of Minutes Per Week Per Pupil	No. of Weeks Per Pupil
One-to-One				
Groups of 5 or Less				
Groups of 6 or More				

5. Staff

	Full-Time Equivalency	DPI Use Only
SEN Staff Administration		
Qualified Teachers		
Paraprofessionals		
Volunteers (regular basis)		

6. Ratings

Circle appropriate rating. Explain those circled "N/A" on reverse. Rate in terms of "what is" not "what ought to be."

A. To what degree:	Missing or Unacceptable	Limited	Adequate	Good	Very Good	Excellent	N/A	DPI Use Only
1. did the program administration insure that LAPC meetings occurred?	0	1	2	3	4	5	6	
2. did the program administration insure that the LAPC was informed of project activities?	0	1	2	3	4	5	6	
3. did the program administration insure that staff development activities were implemented properly?	0	1	2	3	4	5	6	
4. did the program administration insure that instructional or intervention strategies occurred as described and according to schedule?	0	1	2	3	4	5	6	
5. did the program administration insure that effective parent education and involvement programs were conducted?	0	1	2	3	4	5	6	
6. did the program administration insure that the evaluation design for all components was implemented as described and according to schedule?	0	1	2	3	4	5	6	
7. are written job descriptions and responsibilities correct?	0	1	2	3	4	5	6	
8. are proper accounting procedures utilized?	0	1	2	3	4	5	6	
9. are project facilities suitable for the program?	0	1	2	3	4	5	6	
10. was the program implemented by October 1, 1975? (status of staff employment and client services)	0	1	2	3	4	5	6	
11. is the project information being disseminated?	0	1	2	3	4	5	6	
12. has the governing board adopted policies directly related to the SEN program?	0	1	2	3	4	5	6	

I. GENERAL PROGRAM ADMINISTRATION (continued)

6. Ratings

Circle appropriate rating. Explain those circled "N/A" on reverse. Rate in terms of "what is" not "what ought to be."

A. To what degree	Missing or Unacceptable	Limited	Adequate	Good	Very Good	Excellent	N/A	DPI Use Only
13. is base support provided by the school agency?	0	1	2	3	4	5	6	
14. is there documentation of each child's eligibility, as per guidelines?	0	1	2	3	4	5	6	
15. is local program monitoring appropriate for all component areas?	0	1	2	3	4	5	6	
16. is personnel appropriate?	0	1	2	3	4	5	6	
17. is each staff member knowledgeable about the program goals and objectives?	0	1	2	3	4	5	6	
18. have 1974-75 SEN participants been followed during the current year?	0	1	2	3	4	5	6	
19. have the basic program goals been met?	0	1	2	3	4	5	6	
20. did project personnel assume certain needs on the part of the children?	0	1	2	3	4	5	6	
21. was a formal needs assessment done prior to defining the needs of the project participants?	0	1	2	3	4	5	6	

B. To what degree were the following implemented according to proposal:	Missing or Unacceptable	Limited	Adequate	Good	Very Good	Excellent	N/A	DPI Use Only
1. LAPC	0	1	2	3	4	5	6	
2. Staff Development Inservice	0	1	2	3	4	5	6	
3. Instructional Program	0	1	2	3	4	5	6	
4. Parent Education and Involvement	0	1	2	3	4	5	6	

7. Overall strengths of the program.

8. Overall weaknesses of the program.

9. Describe briefly any major changes in the program and indicate why the changes were made.

II. COMPONENT A—LAPC

1. Number of Meetings (July 1, 1975 to June 30, 1976)	DPI Use Only	2. Does the LAPC have written by-laws? ☐ Yes ☐ No	DPI Use Only	3. Does Membership Meet Statutory Requirements? ☐ Yes ☐ No	DPI Use Only

4. Number of LAPC Members: Parents ____ Community Representatives ____ School Administrators ____ Teachers ____

5. Ratings

Circle appropriate ratings. Explain those circled "N/A" on reverse. Rate in terms of "what is" not "what ought to be"

A. To what degree has the LAPC assisted:	Missing or Unacceptable	Limited	Adequate	Good	Very Good	Excellent	N/A	DPI Use Only
1. in program planning?	0	1	2	3	4	5	6	
2. in goal setting?	0	1	2	3	4	5	6	
3. in objective setting?	0	1	2	3	4	5	6	
4. in dissemination of information?	0	1	2	3	4	5	6	
5. in evaluation?	0	1	2	3	4	5	6	

B. To what degree	Missing or Unacceptable	Limited	Adequate	Good	Very Good	Excellent	N/A	DPI Use Only
1. were LAPC recommendations approved by the governing board for implementation?	0	1	2	3	4	5	6	
2. were LAPC activities relevant to overall program operations?	0	1	2	3	4	5	6	
3. was the LAPC involved in decisions producing major changes in project activities?	0	1	2	3	4	5	6	
4. are there procedures for evaluating the effectiveness of training for LAPC?	0	1	2	3	4	5	6	

6. List the objectives which were most successfully met: Why?

7. List the objectives which were least successfully met. Why?

8. What are the strengths of your LAPC?

9. What are the weaknesses of your LAPC?

10. What are the "unmet identified" needs in this component area?

III. COMPONENT C– INSTRUCTIONAL PROGRAM

1. Ratings

Circle appropriate rating. Explain those circled "N/A" on reverse Rate in terms of "what is" not "what ought to be."

A. To what degree	Missing or Unacceptable	Limited	Adequate	Good	Very Good	Excellent	N/A	DPI Use Only
1 were the teaching and support staff involved in determining each child's needs, strengths, interests and learning styles?	0	1	2	3	4	5	6	
2. are assessments updated to keep current with each child s growth?	0	1	2	3	4	5	6	
3. was there a direct relationship between what individual students did and their diagnosed needs?	0	1	2	3	4	5	6	
4. did teaching methods and materials vary from child to child in accord with their individual diagnoses?	0	1	2	3	4	5	6	
5. were accurate and meaningful student records kept?	0	1	2	3	4	5	6	
6. were planned parent-staff conferences held?	0	1	2	3	4	5	6	
7 were program specialists and consultants used?	0	1	2	3	4	5	6	
8. were materials and supplies appropriate?	0	1	2	3	4	5	6	
9. was the intervention strategy developed based on the diagnosed needs of the children?	0	1	2	3	4	5	6	
10 was the intervention strategy based on the findings of your local needs assessment?	0	1	2	3	4	5	6	
11 was the intervention strategy consistent with research-based findings about successful intervention strategies?	0	1	2	3	4	5	6	
12. did the evaluation procedures reflect the objectives of the instructional program?	0	1	2	3	4	5	6	
13. have the evaluation procedures for implementing these processes been actually followed?	0	1	2	3	4	5	6	

2. Are agency, community, state and/or federal resources coordinated and used to support the SEN instructional program? DPI Use Only

☐ Yes ☐ No

3. List the objectives which were most successfully met. Why?

4. List the objectives which were least successfully met. Why?

5. What are the strengths of your Instructional Program?

6. What are the weaknesses of your Instructional Program?

7. What are the identified "unmet needs" of this component area?

8. Did you change the intervention strategy from what was proposed in the application? If so, briefly describe the present program. Why were these changes made? Did the level of funding affect this component?

9. Have you observed any unanticipated positive and/or negative outcomes of the intervention strategies? If so, briefly describe these.

PI-1722

IV. COMPONENT D—STAFF DEVELOPMENT AND INSERVICE

1. Total number of hours to date spent on staff development and inservice.	2. Total number of hours pending for staff development and inservice.

3. Rating:

Circle appropriate rating. Explain those circled "N/A" on reverse. Rate in terms of "what is" not "what ought to be."

A. To what degree:	Missing or Unacceptable	Limited	Adequate	Good	Very Good	Excellent	N/A	DPI Use Only
1. has the program been implemented as described in the proposal?	0	1	2	3	4	5	6	
2. does the staff participate in planning the program?	0	1	2	3	4	5	6	
3. was the program designed to meet the identified needs of each individual staff member?	0	1	2	3	4	5	6	
4. has the program contributed to the attainment of the instructional program objectives?	0	1	2	3	4	5	6	
5. has the program been reflected in the classroom?	0	1	2	3	4	5	6	
6. do staffing patterns identify and provide for special talents and skills, individual choice, and input from parents, aides, and teachers?	0	1	2	3	4	5	6	
7. do the evaluation procedures reflect the effectiveness of training for staff?	0	1	2	3	4	5	6	

4. List objectives which were most successfully met. Why?

5. List objectives which were least successfully met. Why?

6. What are the strengths of your Staff Development Program?

7. What are the weaknesses of your Staff Development Program?

8. What are the identified "unmet needs" of this component area?

9. Describe briefly any major changes in the Staff Development Program and why the changes were made.

V. COMPONENT E--PARENT EDUCATION AND INVOLVEMENT

1. Rating

Circle appropriate rating. Explain those circled "N/A" on reverse. Rate in terms of "what is" not "what ought to be."

A. To what degree:	Missing or Unacceptable	Limited	Adequate	Good	Very Good	Excellent	N/A	DPI Use Only
1. were parents participants in the program?	0	1	2	3	4	5	6	
2. has the program enabled parents to expand their skills in assisting their child's learning?	0	1	2	3	4	5	6	
3. was the program responsive to the assessed interests and needs of the parent?	0	1	2	3	4	5	6	
4. did the program place emphasis on overall knowledge of the organization and operation of the school or agency?	0	1	2	3	4	5	6	
5. did the instructional staff become involved in parent education and involvement?	0	1	2	3	4	5	6	
6. were the methods of presentation, scheduling (time of day, frequency, location), and learning climate for parents appropriate?	0	1	2	3	4	5	6	
7. were there procedures for evaluating the effectiveness of training for parents?	0	1	2	3	4	5	6	

2. List the objectives which were most successfully met. Why?

3. List the objectives which were least successfully met. Why?

4. Describe briefly your major activities in the area of parent education and involvement.

5. Did you change your program strategies from what was proposed in the application? If so, why?

6. What are the strengths of your Parent Education Program?

7. What are the weaknesses of your Parent Education Program?

8. What are the identified "unmet needs" of this component area?

FINAL EVALUATION SUMMARY
1974-75

This First Annual Evaluation Report of the SEN Program has described (a) the financial and participatory elements of the SEN Program over its first two years; (b) the demographic characteristics of the children served by SEN; (c) the general characteristics of the projects funded; and (d) the results gathered through the evaluation of the operation of the SEN Program and the effects of the program on students, teachers and parents. A synopsis of each of these sections follows, along with some recommendations which are worthy of consideration for future programs of this type.

The Special Educational Needs Program (SEN) is a state funded educational program for underachieving students who are socially and economically disadvantaged and was initiated during the 1973-75 biennium under s. 115.90-115.94, Wisconsin Statutes.

During the past two years, the SEN Program funded 40 projects of which 19 were public and 21 were nonpublic. These projects were distributed between rural and urban locations and were primarily geared to meeting the academic achievement needs of the students selected for the program.

The projects conducting a SEN-sponsored program reported that 4,348 children were served by the SEN effort with a majority of these children attending the public schools. A total of $2,774,457 was spent on the SEN Program yielding an average pupil cost of $638.

Consistant with the design of the SEN Program, the greatest percentage of full-time positions funded were those involved in instructional activities where more than 90 percent of full-time paid positions were teachers and instructional aides.

Concerning the students who participated in the SEN Program, the majority were enrolled in the Pre-K, and early elementary (grades 1-3) level. Ethnically, the composition of the student population was 61 percent were White; 27 percent were Black; 7.1 percent were Spanish Surnamed; while 4.7 and .3 percent were American Indian and Oriental respectively.

Time of operation of the SEN Program was also considered. Seventeen, or 42 percent, of the projects were funded for more than two semesters; nineteen, or 48 percent, were funded for two semesters (or the current academic year); and four, or 10 percent, of the projects were funded late and ran for only one semester.

Each project was required to submit an evaluation report summarizing the degree to which their objectives were accomplished. The results suggested that the SEN Program was generally effective with the greatest impact on students, and parent and teacher groups also benefiting from the program.

The evaluation of the student objectives using a per-project analysis showed that 30 of the 35 projects submitting data met or exceeded at least 50 percent of their objectives. When analyzing the 13 projects which also selected student comparison groups, in which to assess their project, the SEN students consistently showed greater achievement progress than the comparison students. When considering the parent- and teacher-related objectives, the results were also quite favorable. Each of the nine (9) projects which developed parent objectives and the five (5) projects which established teacher objectives reported that they met or exceeded at least 50 percent of their objectives with a majority of these projects indicating that they met or exceeded 80 to 100 percent of the parent and teacher objectives which were evaluated.

The student objectives were also examined using a pupil analysis of achievement and documenting the percent of pupils who met or exceeded a specified range of the objectives in each project and across the SEN Program. These analyses proved to be a further illustration of the promise of the SEN Program. Of the 3,118 students who were evaluated in the 35 projects which reported the data, approximately 65 percent, or about 2,027 pupils, were reported to have met or exceeded 50 to 100 percent of the objectives which were set for the SEN Program. Remarkably, more than one-quarter of the student population were evaluated as meeting or having exceeded 100 percent or all of the objectives which were established for them.

The following materials are available upon request from the Department of Public Instruction - Special Educational Needs Office. Additional specific information may also be requested directly from the participating projects.

1. SEN Program - Interim Report FY 1974
2. Individual Evaluation Reports submitted by each project - 1974-75
3. SEN Final Evaluation Report - 1974-75
4. Special Educational Needs Program - 1975-76 Handbook
5. SEN Proposal Application - FY 1975, FY 1976, FY 1977
6. Slide-Tape presentations on some specific projects
7. Comprehensive File for each project - containing information relative to each phase of the project
8. Project Self-Evaluation Report - 1975-76
9. Evaluation - SEN Pre-School Dissemination Workshop - FY 1976

State of Wisconsin DEPARTMENT OF PUBLIC INSTRUCTION

Barbara Thompson, Ph.D.
State Superintendent

Dwight M. Stevens, Ph.D.
Deputy State Superintendent

DIVISION FOR INSTRUCTIONAL SERVICES
Robert C. Van Raalte, Assistant Superintendent

TO: All SEN Project Directors

FROM: Jack Lawrence, SEN Program Administrator

DATE: April 26, 1976

SUBJECT: Instructions for Completing STUDENT ACHIEVEMENT DATA SUMMARY / PROJECT REPORT -- Due May 21, 1976

Each project is to complete its Student Achievement Data Summary (S.A.D.S.) and Project Report on the enclosed two-page form. Please try to stay within the borders indicated. IMPORTANT! Please submit two (2) copies of the report under a cover letter and identify who was responsible for completing the information. You are to type your report in the form which will be printed as is in the Department's Final Report.

Interpretation of student achievement must be supported by data and all such data (subjective/objective) must be compiled and filed in your school/agency.

A data summary form should be used for each age/grade group wherever appropriate. Where the number of participants in any group is less than ten (10) children, you may opt to average/group the scores and compute accordingly (3's and 4's may be grouped at a pre-kindergarten level).

Although you may have given more than one standardized test, please select only one for reporting at each age/grade level.

Possible listings of student levels: Pre-kindergarten, Kindergarten, Ungraded, Lower Elementary (1-3 grades), Upper Elementary, Middle School, Secondary, etc.

1. Write the complete name of the tests as well as the level and forms used.

2. Write the norms used for age/grade level as given in the test manual or locally devised by your school/agency.

3. Under the "mean age/grade equivalent", please report in terms of months where possible.

4. In interpreting the student achievement data in the narrative section, you are encouraged to explain:

   a. what you expected

   b. what happened

126 Langdon Street, Madison, Wisconsin 53702

c. why you think it happened

d. what else happened that is not reported on the data summary form (this evidence/data must be on file in your school/agency).

5. Test scores for participants not given on data summary form may or may not be discussed in the project narration - unless numbers were sizable enough to make a difference in total average gains.

All SEN projects shall report according to these procedures. Please contact Mrs. Placide or myself if you wish additional clarification or assistance relative to this report.

REMEMBER! DUE DATE -- May 21, 1976!

JPL/mrd

enc.

STUDENT ACHIEVEMENT DATA SUMMARY

School/Agency	Student Level
SEN Project Title	

Repeat the following data section for each student level reported.
Complete project narrative following the S.A.D.S. Information
USE NO MORE THAN THESE TWO PAGES FOR YOUR FULL REPORT!

Name of Test	Norm Used	Level/Form

Item	Date	Number Tested	Mean C.A.	Mean Age / Grade Equivalent/ Percentile	Range of Scores
1. Pre-test					
2. Post-test					
3. Difference (2 minus 1)	(# months)				