DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 135 922 UD 016-819

AUTHOR Strum, Irene
TITLE Bilingual Program In Auxiliary Services for High Schools; School Year 1975-76.
INSTITUTION New York City Board of Education, Brooklyn, N.Y. Office of Educational Evaluation.
PUB DATE 76
NOTE 42p.; New York City Board of Education Function No. 09-67604

EDRS PRICE MF-$0.83 HC-$2.06 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS *Bilingual Education; *Compensatory Education Programs; *English (Second Language); High Schools; *High School Students; Mathematics Instruction; Non English Speaking; Reading Instruction; Secondary Education
IDENTIFIERS *Elementary Secondary Education Act Title VII; ESEA Title VII; *New York (New York)

ABSTRACT

The bilingual program of the Auxiliary Services for High Schools (ASHS) provides an alternative educational system in New York for students who are bilingual or speak no English but do speak Spanish, French, Italian, Greek or Chinese. The program's primary purpose is to prepare pupils for the General Education High School Equivalency (HSE) examination in English or Spanish; therefore reading and mathematics skills are emphasized. An English as a Second Language (ESL) component is included for the improvement of English skills. The bilingual program uses native or dominant languages to improve competency in reading, mathematics, and social studies. Participants are helped to keep their cultural heritage. In the 1975-1976 school year there were 12 bilingual centers. The results of the evaluation showed that the basic evaluation objectives were achieved by students for whom data was available. English reading improved significantly. Reading in the native or dominant language and in mathematics showed a significant gain. For students whose HSE results were known, approximately 80 percent passed. (Author/JM)

EVALUATION REPORT

Function No. 09-67604

BILINGUAL PROGRAM IN AUXILIARY SERVICES FOR HIGH SCHOOLS SCHOOL YEAR 1975-1976

DR. IRENE STRUM

An evaluation of the New York City school district educational project funded under Title VII of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965 (PL 89-10) performed for the Board of Education of the City of New York for the 1975-1976 school year.

Dr. Anthony J. Polemeni, Director

Dr. Richard T. Turner, Asst. Admin. Director

BOARD OF EDUCATION OF THE CITY OF NEW YORK
OFFICE OF EDUCATIONAL EVALUATION
110 LIVINGSTON STREET, BROOKLYN, N. Y. 11201

TABLE OF CONTENTS

CHAPTER		PAGE
I.	The Program	1
II.	Evaluative Procedures	5
	Evaluation Objectives	5
	Evaluation Instruments	6
	Size of the Bilingual Program and Sample of Students Tested	7
	Evaluation Procedures	10
	Time Schedule	10
III.	Findings	11
IV.	Summary of Major Findings, Conclusions, and Recommendations	26

APPENDIX

Discrepancy Checklist

Interview Schedule

Agenda for Meeting of Center Administrators April 10, 1976

Program Abstract

Data Loss Form

LIST OF TABLES

Table		Page
1.	Bilingual Program in ASHS, 1975- 976	2
2.	Size of Bilingual Program and Sample of Responses	9
3.	Changes in Reading in English	12
4.	Frequency Distribution of Difference Scores for the Ability to Speak English and Sign Test Results	14
5.	Changes in Reading Comprehension in the Dominant Language	16
6.	Changes in Mathematics Grade Equivalents Measured in the Dominant Language	18
7.	Gains in Mathematics in Relation to Number of Months in Program	19
8.	Results of the High School Equivalency Examination	21

CHAPTER I

THE PROGRAM

The bilingual program of the Auxiliary Services for High Schools (ASHS) constitutes a parallel or alternative educational system in New York City for secondary school aged students who are bilingual or speak no English but only Spanish, French, Italian, Greek, or Chinese. It not only provides for those students who were former dropouts or potential dropouts, but also for those students who were not achieving in secondary schools and were bilingual or non-English speaking and who needed to be served in a non-traditional type of program. The bilingual program within ASHS was established in 1972 in the Bronx and Manhattan; by 1974-1975 there were a total of twelve centers which continued to operate in 1975-1976. Of the four day centers, two are in Manhattan and one is in each of the boroughs of the Bronx and Brooklyn. All have bilingual programs in Spanish; each Manhattan center also has either a French or Chinese bilingual program. The eight evening centers are located in each of the five boroughs, two in Manhattan, Brooklyn, and Queens, and one in the Bronx and Staten Island. Five of the evening centers have Spanish bilingual programs; French, Greek, and Italian bilingual programs are provided at centers in Brooklyn, Queens, and Staten Island, respectively. See Table 1.

Table 1
Bilingual Program in ASHS, 1975-1976

Center	Location	Hours	Dominant Language
DAY:			
1. Ebbets Field School	65 Court Street Bklyn, NY 11201	8:30AM-4PM	Spanish
2. Forsyth Street School	198 Forsyth Street NY, NY 10002	8AM-4PM	Spanish Chinese
3. 93rd Street School	257 W. 93 Street NY	9AM-4PM	Spanish French
4. Roberto Clemente	431 Jackson Ave. Bronx, NY 10455	9AM-4PM	Spanish
EVENING:			
5. Brandeis HS	145 W. 84 Street NY, NY 10024	5:30-8:30PM	Spanish
6. Julia Richman HS	316 E. 67 Street NY, NY 10021	5:30-8:30PM	Spanish
7. Taft HS	240 E. 172 Street Bronx, NY 10457	5:30-9PM	Spanish
8. Prospect Hts. HS	Union & Classon Aves. Bklyn, NY 11225	6-9PM	French
9. Maxwell Vocational HS	145 Pennsylvania Ave. Bklyn, NY 11207	5:30-8:30PM	Spanish
10. Jamaica Vocational HS	162-02 Hillside Ave. Jamaica, NY 11432	5:30-8:30PM	Spanish
11. JHS 10, Q.	31 Ave. bet. 45 & 46 Long Island City, NY	5:30-8:30PM	Greek
12. Staten Island	St. Marks Place Staten Island, NY	5:30-8:30PM	Italian

The bilingual program primarily prepares pupils for the General Education High School Equivalency (HSE) examination in English or Spanish, the latter taken by those in the Spanish bilingual program. Therefore, emphasis is on the acquisition of reading and mathematics skills. The

rrogram provides for the development of increasing English skills in English as a Second Language (ESL). Beyond the ESL, however, the bilingual program uses native or dominant language to develop competencies in the areas of reading, mathematics, and, to a lesser extent, social studies and science. The instructional program in the native or dominant language also provides the opportunity for participants to retain and further develop their own cultural heritage. The bicultural aspect strengthens community participation in the bilingual program and support for establishing examinations in French, Italian, Greek, and Chinese for the HSE Diploma. The program emphasizes bilingual guidance and counseling for both the academic and vocational needs of students.

The bilingual program is characterized by continuous movement of students into and out of the program. Students enter throughout the year and complete the HSE at various times, since examinations are scheduled several times a month. Some of those passing return for ESL and the regular ASHS program; others go on to further bilingual training and vocational educational programs offered by public and private agencies or obtain jobs. There is a core of regularly attending students, but their number is less than the official register or enrollment for the class. Students frequently hold full- or part time jobs in addition to attending the ASHS bilingual program.

Center facilities vary from regular school buildings to large multiple-use rooms. Of major importance is the location - in a community that can best be served by bilingual education.

A prospective student is either placed on a waiting list or accepted into the program immediately. Intake procedures include interviews with the counselor and/or educational advisor and diagnostic and placement testing. An individualized instructional program is prepared for each student. To implement the objectives of each student's program, individualized or small group instruction is undertaken. Educational activities include English language skills (language skills and conversation), reading in English, dominant language skills (instruction in the dominant language and culture in the academic content areas of the HSE), and mathematics (offered in the dominant language). Counseling services are provided by the educational advisor or the regular ASHS guidance counselor for the following purposes: educational counseling, college placement counseling, job development, job placement, vocational counseling, special bilingual counseling.

To support instruction, curriculum development, establishment of bicultural curriculum resource files and resource libraries at each center are staff activities. The bilingual staff is also encouraged to use the professional reference library at Clemente. Staff improvement procedures such as workshops, institutes, conferences, and participation in university programs are ongoing during the school year.

CHAPTER II

EVALUATIVE PROCEDURES

This chapter of the report describes the evaluation objectives, the evaluation instruments ueed, the sample size, types of evaluation procedures used, and the time schedule.

Evaluation Objectives

Objective #1. As a result of participation in the bilingual program, the reading scores of the participants will show a statistically significant difference between pre- and posttests.

Objective #2. As a result of participation in the bilingual program, students will show a statistically significant difference between pretest rating and posttest rating in their ability to speak English.

Objective #3. As a result of participation in the bilingual program, the reading level of the participant in the Spanish, Italian, Greek, French, or Chinese language will show a statistically significant difference between the pretest score and the posttest score.

Objective #4. As a result of participation in the bilingual program, the mathematics grade of the participant will show s statistically significant difference between pretest and posttest.

Objective #5. As the result of participation in the bilingual program, at least 80% of the students enrolled in the bilingual preparation component for the HSE examination (Spanish language form), will pass the HSE in Spanish.

Objective #6. To assess the discrepancy between the program as described in the proposal and the program planned and actually carried out in the implementation.

Evaluation Instruments

The instruments used in the study included formal standardized instruments and project-developed instruments. For Objective #1, the assessment of English language reading was obtained by using the Stanford Achievement Test, Primary I or Primary II. For students whose reading in English was at or above the ceiling of these tests, Metropolitan Achievement Tests or California Achievement Tests were given. In one center JHS 100 Q, the McCall-Crabbs Test was used.

For Objective #2, the assessment of speaking was made using the New York City Board of Education's Rating Scale of Pupil's Ability to Speak English on a pre- and posttest basis. This measure produces letter ratings, estimating English language ability in six letter categories, A to F.

For Objective #3, different instruments were used for each respective language to assess the increase in competence in the student's ability to read in the respective native language. For Spanish, the InterAmerican Reading Test, Prueba de Lectura by Guidance Testing Associates, parts I and III, reading and vocabulary, was used; forms L3-CES and L3-DES were administered in pre- and posttesting, respectively. For French, the Science Research Associates' Laboratoire des Lectures was used for pre- and posttesting; this is a complete reading kit with pretest, placement, and instructional materials. Grade equivalents, determined by the number of words in the various sections, the number of words per sentence, the types of questions asked, were established by the teacher of the course in consultation with the publisher. For the Greek, Italian, and Chinese programs, project-developed tests were used since standardized tests are not available. Greek and Italian testing relied primarily on old New York State Regents examinations in high school Greek and Italian. To measure vocabulary and reading comprehension in Chinese, the teacher, using standardized reading tests in English as models, designed an original instrument. No claim is made for the reliability of any of the project-developed tests.

For Objective #4, the New York Arithmetic Computation Test, Form D was used. This is a basic tool used by the Board of Education to assess mixed fundamental arithmetic skills for grades 7-12. It was administered in the student's dominant language.

A cumulative record card was maintained for each participant in the bilingual program. HSE scores as well as results from other tests were entered on the card as obtained.

The discrepancy analysis specified in Objective #6 was accomplished by the evaluator through site visits in which a checklist was used and through an interview schedule which was completed by center administrators. The checklist and interview schedule were developed from the Program Proposal and included all of the essential program components. A copy of these instruments appears in the Appendix.

Size of the Bilingual Program and the Sample of Students Tested

There have been 1243 students served by the ASHS bilingual program in the 1975-1976 school year. Of these, many have completed the program by passing the HSE, entering vocational training programs, getting jobs, etc. Some were discharged due to lack of attendance in order to make room for other students. Approximately 1,000 students were Spanish, almost 100 were French, 56 were Italian, 60 were Greek, and 24 were Chinese. Included in the total for the Chinese were three VietNamese.

For evaluation purposes, the sample consisted of those students who had both pre- and posttest scores for a specific test. This number varied since not every student was given every test. In some schools, students who were not enrolled in ESL were not tested in English language ability or reading in English. The Chinese bilingual program was so new that pupils spoke, understood, or read too little English to be tested.

Some students completed only a pretest but no posttest because of dropping out of the program or leaving before posttests could be administered. Their scores could not be included in the final sample for the analysis of that particular evaluation objective.

The sample of students consisted of those who had both pre- and post-test scores for a particular evaluation objective. Table 2 indicates the enrollment in the bilingual program and the number of students included in the sample for each evaluation objective. Most students completed testing for reading in the dominant language and mathematics.

Table 2

Size of Bilingual Program and Sample of Responses

Dominant Language	School	Enrolled in Program	Read Eng.	Speak Eng.	and Posttests for ation Objective: #3 Read Dom Lang	#4 Math Dom Lang
Spanish	1. Ebbets Field	50	25	21	48	46
Spanish	2. Forsyth	75	69	69	69	69
Spanish	3. 93rd Street	63	15	31	35	35
Spanish	4. Clemente	74	15	58	58	55
Spanish	5. Brandeis	250	39	156	160	158
Spanish	6. Richman	83	26	37	63	62
Spanish	7. Taft	200	69	168	172	170
Spanish	9. Maxwell	150	38	150	150	150
Spanish	10. Jamaica	60	0	57	59	59
French	3. 93rd Street	52	20	28	52	43
French	8. Prospect	46	42	42	44	46
Greek	11. JHS 10, Q.	60	53	56	54	54
Italian	12. Staten Island	56	22	56	45	42
Chinese	2. Forsyth	24	0	1	15	16

Evaluation Procedures

Both formal and informal methods of assessment were used. Site visits were made where instructional groups were observed, professional and paraprofessional staff were interviewed, and conferences with center administrators were held. Center administrators were asked to evaluate the program in their own center for a discussion of strengths and weaknesses at one of their monthly meetings; a copy of the agenda is appended.

Evaluation records were distributed to each center administrator to report pre- and posttest data and other relevant statistics for each student. These forms and interview schedules were submitted to the program coordinator for transmittal to the evaluator.

Statistical analysis was performed separately for each center. At centers where two bilingual programs were implemented, data from each program were analyzed separately. Methods of statistical analysis used relied primarily on the correlated *t* test. In addition, the Sign Test was used for the assessment of changes in English language skills; this statistical test was selected because the data were ordinal and determination of ranks difficult with so many students making changes of one or two categories on this rating scale. Additional statistical techniques included the use of percentage comparisons for those who passed the HSE, and frequency distributions to indicate gains in arithmetic competency in relation to time in program.

Time Schedule

Students were pretested as they entered the program. Before taking HSE, students were generally posttested; all students who had not passed the HSE and were still in attendance in May 1976, were posttested during that month. Visits by the evaluator were made during the Spring semester.

Evaluation records and interview schedules were submitted to the evaluator by the program coordinator in June 1976.

CHAPTER III

FINDINGS

The first evaluation objective was to determine that as a result of participation in the bilingual program, the reading grade of the participants will show a statistically significant difference between the pretest score and the posttest score. The assessment of this objective was made by administering the Stanford Achievement Test, Primary I or Primary II, to all students. At some centers, students who scored so high so that a ceiling effect was observed were given the Metropolitan Achievement Test (MAT) or the California Achievement Test (CAT). In the Greek Bilingual Program at JHS 10Q, the McCall - Crabbs Test in vocabulary and reading comprehension was used. At Jamaica, students who were not participating in the English language skills part of the program were not tested for this objective. Students enrolled in the Chinese Bilingual Program were also not tested.

Raw scores, the number right, were recorded for each student for both pretest and posttest on the SAT and t tests to determine the significance of the difference between correlated means were conducted. The same statistical test was used for pre- and posttest grade equivalent scores on the CAT and McCall - Crabbs.

Regardless of test used, significant gains in reading in English were obtained in all centers except for a very small number who took SAT, Level II at one school. The objective was attained. Students within the program gained in reading in English. These data are reported in Table 3.

Table 3

Changes in Reading in English

Center	N	Test/Score	Pretest Mean	Posttest Mean	Mean Diff.	SDD	t
Spanish							
#1	9	a	92.89	103.33	10.44	4.03	7.33*
	16	c	5.94	7.15	1.21	.96	4.85*
#2	69	a	90.18	97.75	7.26	5.28	11.36*
#3	11	a	75.64	85.64	10.00	4.09	7.73*
	4	b	91.50	105.50	14.00	2.45	9.90*
#4	15	a	73.33	88.87	15.54	6.23	9.33*
#5	39	a	76.08	85.44	9.36	7.28	7.93*
#6	26	a	90.27	100.23	9.96	6.66	7.48*
#7	69	a	86.43	97.90	11.47	8.51	11.12*
#9	38	a	88.08	90.97	2.89	3.63	4.84*
#10	0						
French							
#3	15	a	71.07	80.53	9.46	6.18	5.93*
	5	b	70.20	81.80	11.60	10.64	2.18
#8	30	a	53.30	71.87	18.57	8.39	11.92*
	12	b	49.58	72.83	23.25	13.11	5.88*
Greek							
#11	53	d	3.73	4.69	.96	.60	11.54*
Italian							
#12	22	a	94.00	103.32	9.32	11.84	3.94*
Chinese							
#2	0						

*$p < .01$

(a) SAT, Level I - raw score (number right)
(b) SAT, Level II - raw score (number right)
(c) CAT - grade equivalent
(d) McCall - Crabbs - grade equivalent

The second objective stated that as a result of participation in the bilingual program, students will show a statistically significant difference between pretest rating and posttest rating in the ability to speak English The Sign Test was used for the analysis of the data from 930 students for whom teachers completed pre- and posttest ratings on the New York City Board of Education Rating Scale of Pupils' Ability to Speak English. There were 394 pairs that remained the same -- showed no change -- and six who scored the highest rating possible on the pretest and were eliminated from further analysis. Only two showed less or a decline from pre- to posttest; 528 students showed a gain in the rating on the Ability to Speak English Scale. This change was found to be statistically significant. Therefore, the objective to improve ability to speak English was attained for a significant number of students who were tested. The school by school tally of the frequency of difference between pre- and posttest rating on Ability to Speak English is presented in Table 4.

Table 4

Frequency Distribution of Difference Scores for the Ability to Speak English and Sign Test Results

School	Total	Positive or Gain in Pre - Post Rating			Negative Differences	Ties	Maximum Scored	
		+1	+2	+3	-1			z or p (a)
Spanish								
#1	21	12				9		.006*
#2	69	18	2			48	1	.002*
#3	31	11				17	3	.012*
#4	58	33				25		.000*
#5	156	93	17			46		.000*
#6	37	9				27	1	.004*
#7	168	91	5	1		71		.000*
#9	150	40	1		1	108		.000*
#10	57	23	34			71		.000*
French								
#3	28	13	3			12		.004*
#8	42	37	3			2		.000*
Greek								
#11	56	36	12	1	1	6		.000*
Italian								
#12	56	33				22	1	.000*
Chinese								
#2	1					1		-

(a) See Siegel, Non-parametric Statistics. N.Y.: McGraw-Hill, 1956, 68-74.

**p<.01

Objective #3 stated that as a result of participation in the bilingual program, the reading level of the participants in the Spanish, Italian, Greek, French, or Chinese language will show a statistically significant difference between the pretest score and the posttest score in the respective language. Reading tests in the dominant language were administered to assess vocabulary and comprehension. Overall results for each respective language were based upon completed pre- and posttest scores for 814 Spanish dominant language students, 96 French dominant language students, 54 Greek dominant language students, 45 Italian dominant language students, and 15 Chinese dominant language students.

In eight of the nine centers for Spanish dominant language students, it was found that the difference between pre- and posttesting was significant. Posttest means were higher than pretest means. The results for the French bilingual program indicated significant gains at both centers. Students in the Greek, Italian, and Chinese bilingual programs also showed significant gains in reading in their respective dominant language. The objective was attained. The results of these analyses, school by school, are reported in Table 5.

Table 5

Changes in Reading Comprehension in the Dominant Language

Dominant Language	School	N	Pretest Mean	Posttest Mean	Mean Difference	SDD	t
Spanish(a)	#1	48	70.81	71.90	1.08	7.18	1.03
	#2	69	61.26	70.17	8.91	5.04	14.56*
	#3	35	58.54	67.43	8.89	8.54	6.07*
	#4	58	52.03	66.12	14.09	11.10	9.58*
	#5	160	61.59	77.03	15.44	9.57	20.34*
	#6	63	66.75	73.25	6.50	5.91	8.66*
	#7	172	53.50	63.69	10.19	12.03	11.08*
	#9	150	59.05	65.20	6.15	6.27	11.98*
	#10	59	63.66	75.90	12.24	6.80	13.71*
French(b)	#3	52	6.64	9.13	2.49	1.17	15.26*
	#8	44	6.59	9.43	2.84	.78	23.95*
Greek(a)	#11	54	12.50	14.81	2.31	1.73	9.73*
Italian(a)	#12	45	59.91	68.76	8.85	10.27	5.71*
Chinese(a)	#2	15	76.60	80.47	3.87	3.33	4.35*

(a) raw score - number right
(b) grade equivalent

*$p < .01$

For objective #4, as a result of participation in the bilingual program, the mathematics grade of the participant will show a statistically significant difference between the prerating and the postrating, the New York Arithmetic Computation Skills Test was administered in the dominant language. School by school results indicated statistically significant gains at every site. The objective of growth in mathematics was attained. These data are presented in Table 6.

Table 6

Changes in Mathe[illegible]rade Equivalents M[illegible]ured in the Dominant L[illegible]guage

Dominant Language	School	N	Pretest Mean	Posttest Mean	Mean Difference	SDD	t
Spanish	#1	46	5.35	6.53	1.18	1.17	6.77*
	#2	69	5.46	6.47	1.01	.74	11.27*
	#3	35	5.07	6.21	1.13	.89	7.37*
	#4	55	5.23	6.98	1.75	1.14	11.33*
	#5	158	5.58	7.23	1.65	1.22	16.92*
	#6	62	5.70	6.93	1.23	1.29	7.45*
	#7	170	5.25	6.04	.79	.86	11.88*
	#9	150	5.47	5.98	.51	.45	13.97*
	#10	59	5.88	7.27	1.39	.98	10.75*
French	#3	43	6.80	8.64	1.84	1.75	6.79*
	#8	46	6.54	8.93	2.39	1.42	11.27*
Greek	#11	54	4.88	5.58	.70	.66	7.76*
Italian	#12	42	8.83	10.13	1.30	1.29	6.53*
Chinese	#2	16	7.54	9.33	1.79	1.10	6.33*

*$p < .01$

Test data from centers having the same dominant language bilingual program were analyzed to determine gains in grade months in relation to the number of months in the program. For each dominant language, a majority of the students achieved one or more grade equivalents per month of participation in the program; i.e., a majority of students in the program four months showed gains of four grade equivalents or more in pre-posttest comparisons. See Table 7.

Table 7

Gains in Mathematics in Relation to Number of Months in the Program

	Bilingual Program									
	Spanish (N=804)		French (N=89)		Greek (N=54)		Italian (N=42)		Chinese (N=16)	
	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%
Gained the same or greater number of grade equivalents as months of participation in program	572	71.1	77	86.5	37	68.5	26	61.9	15	93.8
Gained fewer, remained the same, or lost grade equivalents	232	28.9	12	13.5	17	31.5	16	38.1	1	6.2

Objective #5 stated that as the result of participation in the bilingual program, at least 80% of the students enrolled in the bilingual preparation component for the HSE examination (Spanish language form), will pass the HSE in Spanish. The objective of passing the HSE was the goal for most students in the bilingual program, regardless of dominant language. However, students who were French, Greek, Italian, or Chinese found there was no prospect for them to take the HSE in a form in their native language. These students must take the examination in English. The implication for the program is the emphasis on ESL to develop English language skills for these students, and the emphasis on Spanish language skills and the content areas for Spanish language students.

The number of students who took the Spanish HSE in the school year 1975-1976 from the bilingual program was a total of 474. Of those, a total of 167 passed, or 35.2% of them. At this writing, the results were not known for 61%. Among students whose results were known, more than 90% passed in HSE*. In the light of these results, it is clear that the criterion established for this evaluation objective, that over 80% of the students from the bilingual program who took the HSE in Spanish and for whom results were available at the time of this report passed, has been exceeded. HSE results are reported in Table 8.

---

*An additional 47 received their test results before this report was duplicated; 37 or almost 80% passed the HSE.

Table 8

Results of High School Equivalency

School	Number Who Took HSE	Number Whose Results Are Known	Passed No.	Passed %	Failed No.	Failed %
Spanish HSE						
#1	43	19	19	100	-	
#2	42	18	14	77.8	4	22.2
#3	35	13	12	92.3	1	7.7
#4	24	4	1	25.0	3	75.0
#5	139	58	54	93.1	4	6.9
#6	15	7	7	100	-	
#7	88	31	29	93.5	2	6.5
#9	68	27	23	85.2	4	14.8
#10	22	8	8	100	-	
English HSE						
#3	11	5	5	100		
#8	3	1	1	100		
#11	-	-	-	-		
#12	12	2	2	100		
#2	-	-	-	-		

A small number of students enrolled in bilingual programs other than Spanish took the HSE in English. Among those for whom test results are known, all passed. These date are also included in Table 8.

The sixth evaluation objective was to assess the discrepancy between the program as described in the proposal and planned and actually carried out in the implementation. The results of this discrepancy analysis accumulated from observations and interviews with program staff while on-site and at conferences, indicated that generally the program as carried out coincided with the program as described in the proposal.

In establishing the bilingual program in ASHS at each center, community and community agencies participated. Most centers had high registrations and waiting lists. Attendance levels varied among centers. At some it appeared that more participants could have been served. In the ongoing operation of the program, parent and community participation was generally low; however, some educational advisors had organized active student groups at their respective centers.

In most centers, individual program objectives were set. Educational advisors and/or guidance counselors maintained a folder for each student which contained a student's program and educational activities. Records of interviews were included. The program coordinator had introduced a cumulative record card for each student upon which test information, date of entry and withdrawal were recorded.

Instructional activities varied among centers and according to student needs. In some centers, each student worked with individual assignments and received tutuorial assistance from teachers and/or paraprofessionals. At other centers, small groups worked together with a staff member. In still others, large group instruction was implemented.

The Spanish bilingual program emphasized Spanish language skills and content in Spanish. The French, Greek, Italian, and Chinese bilingual programs concentrated on ESL and English reading skills rather than on improvement of dominant language skills and cultural heritage. This situation reflected the apparent primary goal of the program which was passing the HSE. Once it was found the HSE was available only in Spanish and English, the Spanish language students concentrated on content and Spanish language skills, whereas the Italian, Greek, French, and Chinese students concentrated on English. Student programs reflected this situation.

Curriculum has been designed by educational advisors, teachers, and the curriculum coordinator who also obtained fine materials, primarily in Spanish. Materials in French appeared adequate; the educational advisor was planning to design materials in French or Haitian literature. In the Chinese bilingual program the teacher had designed many materials for oral - aural exercises in learning English. In addition, he adapted many reading materials for teaching English language skills. Little if any materials were used or developed for improving skills in Chinese. Materials in the Greek bilingual program were inadequate, in the Italian bilingual program, more satisfactory. Whatever materials were available and/or requested from the coordinator by center personnel were quickly sent to a center from Clemente where the curriculum reference library was located.

Centers had few resource libraries of their own for either staff or pupils, primarily because of space and storage constraints. Some centers had no storage facilities; in others, there was one steel closet for all materials and equipment at that center.

In one center, the "library" was a steel cabinet kept in a small, unheated ante room that also served as an ESL center, since available space in the multipurpose "classroom" room was divided among reading instruction in English, in French, and in Spanish, and mathematics instruction in English, all of which occurred simultaneously.

Communication among bilingual program components was minimal. Contact with Clemente tended to be greater among day schools and Spanish bilingual program staff than evening and other language staff. However, opportunities were planned and implemented for staff development. Conferences, institutes, workshops at Clemente and elsewhere, college and university programs and courses were provided for teachers and educational advisors. Each center provided independent training for paraprofessionals which varied among centers. Development and training appeared most satisfactory for those in the Spanish bilingual program and for those in day schools.

There have been many accomplishments of the bilingual program for ASHS during the school year 1975-1976. There have been many consistent efforts to use counseling along with instruction to individualize educational and vocational objectives for each pupil. The average number of months a student remained in the program ranged from three to nine, while the average number of counseling interviews per student ranged from three to ten. It is obvious that, in general, students talked with guidance counselors and/or educational advisors approximately once a month.

Although not all guidance counselors were bilingual, they worked very closely with the educational advisors who were. The effectiveness of this procedure was demonstrated in part through motivation for HSE, college, and vocational training. Results from the HSE in Spanish and English indicated that approximately 80% of the students who took the exam passed it. More

than 20% of the pupils in the program applied to college and of these somewhat less than half were accepted. Therefore, approximately one-third of the students in bilingual ASHS received college acceptance. A similar proportion were accepted into vocational training programs. Although job placement opportunities were extremely limited and few centers had job developers or bilingual job developers, job placement was effected for four percent of the students. These statistics indicate the enthusiasm and perseverence of staff and students in bilingual ASHS.

CHAPTER IV

SUMMARY OF MAJOR FINDINGS, CONCLUSIONS, AND RECOMMENDATIONS

In general, the results of this evaluation showed that the bilingual program in ASHS did achieve the basic evaluation objectives for the students for whom data was available.

The students for whom completed results were analyzed showed significant gain in their English reading scores.

The results of the language assessment rating by teachers of student ability to speak English showed significant improvement on the rating scale. Many of the students began at the lower levels of the scale,, showing little or no English, and they have acquired more skills in speaking English than they had prior to the program. However, it is clear that the bulk of the students in the program still have not mastered the skills of speaking English. While there has been progress that is significant, more development is needed. The rating scale itself has been the subject of severe criticism, relying on teacher judgment. It is highly subjective and general in its categories.

Reading in native or dominant language also showed significant gain in each of the respective languages for students whose test results were complete. The tests used had limited reliability and validity. Prueba de Lectura was the only instrument used to measure reading in Spanish; lack of normative data precluded the use of grade equivalents and limited assigning meaning to the average number of questions answered correctly. The Laboratoire de Lecture, the adapted French test, directly linked evaluation to instruction, but failed to provide meaning for the posttest except to indicate a "gain". Another independent test, perhaps the French Regents or Cooperative Language Test would augment the measure. The tests for Greek, Italian, and Chinese were project - developed, teacher-constructed tests. Regardless of the

limitations of the various tests, the results showed there were gains that were statistically significant and the objective was realized.

Assessment in mathematics among the twelve centers showed significant gains in grade equivalents.

For those students whose results were known, approximately 80% passed the HSE. The present reporting system made scoring the data difficult. Moreover, many students took the test after evaluation data were collected.

This program deserves continuation. It is a program that not only serves many bilingual potential and real drop-outs, but many who are new to this country. Some gains may appear small but to the students in this program they are real. For some, this is their first experience of success.

The evaluator of the 1974-1975 bilingual program in ASHS recommended the following:

1. Maintenance of a low profile to consolidate the program;
2. Staffing the program with persons who have more than bilingual qualifications, who have middle school certification, knowledge of native culture, individualization of instruction, and not merely foreign language teachers;
3. Strengthening of formal testing;
4. Bringing English into every area;
5. Viewing bilingual ASHS as a system.

These recommendations were implemented to some extent. There was no expansion of the bilingual program in ASHS except to introduce a Chinese language bilingual program at an already established bilingual center. The recruitment and selection of staff have suffered because of budgetary constraints. In most centers, professional and paraprofessional staff were native to the dominant language and possessed some teacher certification. Motivation and dedication were high. Staff

development and training for increasing skills in bilingual education, individualized instruction, curriculum development, and testing are essential. The importance of formal testing has been accepted generally. At some centers, however, tests that appeared irrelevant to student programs were omitted. Emphasis on the need for pre- and posttesting should be included in coordinator - center communications. Standardized procedures and materials have been introduced and were implemented. All centers used the cumulative record card for student test data. At most centers, an individual folder was maintained for each student which included program and progress through ASHS.

Implementation of recommendations was weakest in curriculum. Oral and written English language skills tended to be minimal in Spanish bilingual programs and dominant language skills tended to be minimal in other language bilingual programs. Bicultural curriculum was also limited.

Recommendations for the program as a result of the 1975-1976 evaluation are:

1. Development and selection of more suitable tests in both English language and dominant language skills;
2. Integration of English language skills and dominant language skills in every student's program;
3. Development of bilingual and bi-cultural curriculum for each bilingual program, especially languages other than Spanish;
4. Increased communication between the coordinator and bilingual staff, particularly at evening centers;
5. Staff development and paraprofessional training in individualized instruction, techniques of teaching, test development;
6. Curriculum development and implementation to improve language skills of illiterates who need bilingual education.

All these recommendations, particularly numbers 1 and 6, may be unfeasible for one program to implement. These should be implemented by the joint efforts of the Office of Bilingual Education, the Office of Educational Evaluation, and the individual programs.

APPENDIX - DISCREPANCY CHECKLIST

Number enrolled in ESL

Number enrolled in Bil

Community response to high school
in dominant language

How is there reinforcement of the
cultural identity of the student?

Staff improvement procedures:
workshops at center

institutes

conferences

university programs

Spanish curriculum prototype available?

Resource library in center

Use of professional reference
library at Clemente

Para advancement to college

Bi-cultural curriculum development
resource file

Classroom:
teacher + aide(s)

kind of materials:

kind of instruction

SRA in math

Internal forms for formative evaluation:

BILINGUAL PROGRAM
ASHS

Administrator _____ Dominant Language _____

Center _____ Day _____ Evening _____

Total Enrolled _____

1. Planning and Development

1.1 Curriculum has been prepared in:

Subjects	Languages
_____	_____
_____	_____
_____	_____
_____	_____
_____	_____
_____	_____

1.2 Explain parent/community participation:

2. Staff Development

2.1 Number of professional workshops at own Center _____

2.2 Number of professional workshops at other Centers _____

2.3 Describe other professional training:

2.4 Describe paraprofessional training:

3. Counseling

3.1 Extent of college counseling and orientation

3.2 Extent of counseling on vocational and job skills

3.3 Types of jobs developed:

4. Instruction

4.1 Indicate the kind of instruction for the following classes:

	Individualized	Structural Group
English Language Skills		
Basics I	_____	_____
Int. II	_____	_____
Int. III	_____	_____
Adv. IV	_____	_____
Reading in English		
Rd. I	_____	_____
Rd. II	_____	_____
Rd. III	_____	_____
Rd. IV	_____	_____
Dominant Lang. Skills		
Int.	_____	_____
Adv.	_____	_____
Satellite 2	_____	_____
Mathematics	_____	_____
H.S. Equiv.	_____	_____

4.2 Indicate adequacy of:

Equipment _____

Material _____

Testbooks _____

Storage availability _____

_____

5. Recommendations

Meeting April 30, 1976 - 10:am

Topic: Program Evaluation

Agenda:

1. Program Strengths
2. Program Weaknesses
3. Recommendations
4. Evaluation Procedures

    4.1 Formative Evaluation
    4.2 Summative Evaluation

Please prepare a statement on program strengths, weaknesses, and recommendations for:

a. Your Center
b. A.S.H.S. in general
c. Title VII in general

Specific reference should be made to:

1. Administrative matters
2. Curriculum development
3. Educational, vocational, and bilingual counseling as related to college placement, job development and placement, and bilingual
4. Clerical skills instruction

OFFICE OF EDUCATIONAL EVALUATION - DATA LOSS FORM

(attach to MIR, item #30) Function #_____

In this table enter all Data Loss information. Between MIR, item #30 and this form, all participants in each activity must be accounted for. The component and activity codes used in completion of item #30 should be used here so that the two tables match. See definitions below table for further instructions.

Component Code	Activity Code	(1) Group I.D.	(2) Test Used	(3) Total N	(4) Number Tested/ Analyzed	(5) Participants Not Tested/ Analyzed		(6) Reasons why students were not tested, or if tested, were not analyzed	Number/ Reason
						N	%		
			Eng. Read. (a)	1243	433	810	65.2	Absence	139
								left program before posttesting	66
								Not in ESL	601
								used different test for posttest	4
			Reading Dom. Lang. (b)	1243	1024	219	17.6	left program before posttesting	200
								Vietnamese in Chinese program	3
								Absence	16
			Math: NACT (c)	1243	1005	238	19.1	left program before posttesting	214
								Absence	24
			NYC Lang. Fluency (d)	1243	930	313	25.2	left program before posttesting	252
								Not in ESL	36
								Absence	25

(1) Identify the participants by specific grade level (e.g., grade 3, grade 9). Where several grades are combined, enter the last two digits of the component code.

(2) Identify the test used and year of publication (MAT-70, SDAT-74, etc.).

(3) Number of participants in the activity.

(4) Number of participants included in the pre and posttest calculations found on item#30.

(5) Number and percent of participants not tested and/or not analyzed on item#30.

(6) Specify all reasons why students were not tested and/or analyzed. For each reason specified, provide a separate number count. If any further documentation is available, please attach to this form. If further space is needed to specify and explain data loss, attach additional pages to this form.

(a) SAT, CAT, or McCall-Crabbs

(b) Lectura de Lectura, SRA Laboratoire des Lectures, or project developed/adapted tests

(c) Administered in dominant language

Bilingual Program in Auxiliary Services for

High Schools

ABSTRACT

The bilingual program in the Auziliary Services for High Schools (ASHS) aimed at improving language skills in English and the student's native or dominant language, math skills, and attainment of the High School Equivalency (HSE) diploma. In the 1975 - 1976 school year there were twelve bilingual centers, four day and eight evening. Bilingual programs were offered in Spanish, French, Greek, Italian, and Chinese.

The results of the evaluation showed that the basic evaluation objectives were achieved by students for whom data were available. English reading scores showed significant gains between pretest and posttest. Changes in ability to speak English were also statistically significant, with most changes indicative of improvement in skill. Reading in native or dominant language showed significant gain in each of the respective languages for students whose test results were complete. Assessment in mathematics showed significant gains in grade equivalents. For students whose HSE results were known, approximately 80% passed.

This program deserves continuation. It is a program that not only serves many bilingual potential and real drop-outs, but many who are new to this country. Some gains may appear small, but to the students in this program they are real. For some, this is their first experience of success. Enthusiasm and perseverence of staff and pupils are responsible for attainmer of program objectives.