DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 137 465 UD 016 848

AUTHOR Miller, Harry L.
TITLE Central ESEA Title I Remedial Services for Eligible Nonpublic School Pupils; Corrective Reading Component, 1975-1976.
INSTITUTION New York City Board of Education, Brooklyn, N.Y. Office of Educational Evaluation.
PUB DATE 76
NOTE 37p.; New York City Board of Education Function No. 09-69626

EDRS PRICE MF-$0.83 HC-$2.06 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS *Corrective Reading; Elementary Secondary Education; *Individualized Instruction; *Nonpublic School Aid; *Reading Programs; *Reading Skills
IDENTIFIERS *Elementary Secondary Education Act Title I; *New York (New York)

ABSTRACT

This document presents a description and an evaluation of the Corrective Reading Services Program, a component within the ESEA Title I nonpublic school program. This component was designed to serve approximately 12,000 eligible, educationally deprived children in 229 schools in New York City during the 1975-76 school year. The purpose of the program was to improve the reading level of participating pupils through corrective reading and to supplement the regular reading programs of the schools served. The findings indicated that the major program objective, that of significant improvement of reading levels, was met successfully. Of the twenty two component groups analyzed, in twenty the post test scores exceeded predicted scores. Only two components failed to achieve at significant levels. The single most outstanding implementation feature of the program was the diagnostic prescriptive model of instruction, with a considerable emphasis on individualization. The small group setting and the great variety of instructional materials contributed to the effectiveness of the successful programs. (Author/AM)

EVALUATION REPORT

Function # 09-69626

CENTRAL ESEA TITLE I REMEDIAL SERVICES FOR ELIGIBLE NONPUBLIC SCHOOL PUPILS: CORRECTIVE READING COMPONENT 1975 - 1976

prepared by

Harry L. Miller, Ed.D.

An evaluation of a New York City School District educational project funded under Title I 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

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

Table of Contents

		page
Chapter I	The Program	1
Chapter II	Evaluation Procedures	4
	Reading Achievement Measures	4
	Program Implementation	5
	Paraprofessional Impact Measures	6
Chapter III	Findings	8
	Table 1. Observations of Class Activities by Category in Minutes and Percentages	9
Chapter IV	Summary of Major Findings, Conclusions and Recommendations	15
List of Appendices		18
	M.I.R. Forms	19-24
	Data Loss Form	25
	Program Abstract	26
	Paraprofessional Contact Form	27

Chapter I

THE PROGRAM

The Corrective Reading Services program is a component within the program entitled "ESEA Title I Nonpublic School Programs,"(Function No. 09-69626). The component was designed to serve approximately 12,000 eligible, educationally deprived pupils in 229 schools of New York City during the 1975-76 school year. The purpose of the program is to improve significantly the reading level of participating pupils through a corrective reading component designed to supplement the regular reading program of the schools served. The program was recycled from the previous year.

The term 'nonpublic schools' included schools of a number of religious denominations, among them Roman Catholic, Hebrew, Lutheran, Greek Orthodox, Episcopal, Ukranian, Society of Friends, and Seventh Day Adventist. The program also allows for participation of non-denominational schools.

Personnel involved in the program included during this school year: one coordinator, five field supervisors, 142 teachers, one school secretary, one stenographer, and two typists.

Daily programs of the teachers consisted of six hours and twenty minutes at assigned schools. Four hours of this program were devoted to classroom instruction, one hour to conference and other professional duties, and the remainder to lunch and class preparation.

Students in the program must meet the dual eligibility criteria of residence in a target attendance area, defined by the United States

Office of Education, and a level of reading achievement below minimum grade level competency. Children selected for Corrective Reading are also required to understand the English language. Eligibility for the program at various levels of the system is determined as follows:

The competency of entering first graders, in schools whose principals elected to include first graders in the program, was measured by the Clymer-Barrett Pre-Reading Test, using as a criterion the cutoff raw score of 54. Pupils are phased out of the reading program and given standard first grade curriculum after periods of instruction that enable them to reach this performance level.

Children in grades two through twelve are given appropriate standardized tests to determine their need for the program. Minimum levels of competency for eligibility and specific tests to be used in determining competency were outlined in internal communications from the coordinator of the program to the Title I reading teachers. Assessment of pupil reading performance for placement purposes was scheduled for September-October 1975; it should be noted that, although these assessments and the beginning of remedial reading classes are ordinarily completed by early October, the public school budgetary uncertainties in Fall 1975 created delays in teacher assignments that resulted in a late start for many of the remedial reading classes in the nonpublic schools. Classes met regularly from their starting date until the second or third week in June.

Frequency of instructional sessions is determined by the grade level of the children, the severity of individual reading retardation,

school schedules, and the recommendation of principals. In general, corrective reading classes include from five to ten pupils for 45 to 60 minute periods twice a week. Where the eligible population is small and teachers are assigned to a school only one day a week, groups of five or six meet for 45 minutes to one hour periods, in other schools where pupils require intensive services, they may meet as many as five times a week for one hour sessions. Classes for first graders are generally kept small, and meet for as short a period as thirty minutes.

Emphasis in the selection process is placed on students between grades one and six, although students above that level who show significant retardation were given service. The final selection of pupils is determined cooperatively by principals and teachers of the nonpublic schools, and Title I teachers. First priority is given to those children whose reading needs were greatest.

Paraprofessionals are not employed as part of the program per se, but some districts do assign paras to the nonpublic schools within the district serviced by the remedial program. In classrooms where they are present, their duties include work with selected pupils on a one-to-one or small group basis under the guidance of the corrective reading teacher, assistance with the preparation of materials, and assistance with clerical and housekeeping tasks.

Chapter II

EVALUATION PROCEDURES

The Corrective Reading Services Component in the nonpublic schools program is designed to supplement the regular reading program in those schools in order to raise the reading achievement levels of educationally deprived children in grades one through twelve, reading one or more years below grade level. The measurement of the basic objective employed an historical regression technique, with program effectiveness determined by its success in increasing children's reading ability beyond expectation; the .05 level of risk was set for statistical decision-making.

The objectives for the evaluation included first, to determine whether the program succeeded in that basic effort, second, to establish whether the program was being implemented in accordance with funding proposal guidelines, and third, to assess the effectiveness of the paraprofessional services.

Reading Achievement Measures

> Objective: To determine whether as a result of participation in the Corrective Reading Component, the reading achievement scores of the students show a statistically significant improvement, using the real posttest score and the anticipated posttest score.

All subjects were administered the appropriate levels of a reading test, given pre- and post their program experience. Pretests were administered in September-October, and posttests in late April and early May.

Grade 1: The Clymer-Barrett Prereading Battery, in the categories of word meaning, listening,matching, alphabet and copying at readiness levels. Because, for this group, expected scores cannot meaningfully be computed, the number and percentages of pupils achieving a criterion cut-off raw score of 24 in Visual Discrimination; of 18 in Auditory Discrimination; and of 12 in Visual Motor skills were to be reported.

Grades 1-3: Stanford Achievement Test at appropriate levels. Using grade-equivalent norms, the historical regression procedure was to be applied to pretest results to obtain predicted (without treatment) posttest results for each pupil. The difference between the real posttest and the anticipated posttest grade-equivalent means were to be analyzed for statistical significance at the .05 level with the correlated t test. (Students in the third grade achieving below the 1.9 level were given the Stanford Achievement Test; those above that level the Stanford Diagnostic Reading Test.)

Grades 3-8: Stanford Diagnostic Test at appropriate levels. Treatment prescribed as above.

Grades 9-12: The Iowa Silent Reading Test at appropriate levels. A correlated z ratio is required, applied to the difference between percentile-score means, to ascertain statistically significant improvement at the .05 level in a "modified real vs. anticipated gain" design.

Variation in pretest dates considerably increased the number of groups that required separate analysis. Children who were carried over in the program from the preceding year were not retested in September; instead, their April posttest scores from the preceding spring were used as pretest scores in this analysis. There were also a significant number of children admitted to the program after the first of the year, who received at most four months of service. These groups were also analyzed separately where there were at least thirty of them who were tested at a given grade level.

Program Implementation

Objective: To determine the extent to which the program, as actually carried out, coincided with the program as described in the project proposal.

In the pursuit of this objective the evaluator made two visits to each of twenty schools selected from among the nonpublic schools in the program. Although it would have been appropriate for this sample to have been selected in some random fashion, a number of difficulties precluded that optimum selection plan. Several other components of the program were being evaluated at the same time, and site visit overlap was deemed undesirable; since two schools were to be visited in one day, pairs of sites had to be within some reasonable distance of one another. The twenty schools chosen, consequently, constituted a representative, rather than a random, sample, of nonpublic program schools in the four major boroughs of New York City. No other principle of selection, however, was employed, and the sample may be considered a non-biased one.

Visits included not only an extended period of observation in the classroom of the remedial reading teacher, but a visit to the principal's office with an offer to discuss the program, and occasional informal discussions over lunch with the corrective reading teacher and her colleagues. Observations in the classroom were coded in time units under a number of activity categories related to the goals of the program.

The first block of visits were made in the fall of 1975, and took place between October 30 and January 29. The second block of visits were made between March 25 and May 11, 1976.

Paraprofessional Impact Measurement

> Objective: To determine if, as a result of receiving supplementary paraprofessional services, participants achieve a statistically significant improvement in reading achievement level.

This objective was required in a modification of the original evaluation design dated September 30, 1975. The procedure described in that

memorandum called for a record of the number of paraprofessional contact hours with each pupil, the subsequent designation of pupil subgroups with differing degrees of "intensity of paraprofessional contact," and a comparison of these groups with all pupils receiving component treatment and no supplementary paraprofessional service.

A log form for paraprofessionals to complete monthly was designed for recording pupil-paraprofessional contact (a copy of the form is included in the Appendix). The design was modified after site visits had revealed more about the nature of the contact under study, further discussion of the form preceded a tryout in an attempt to discover whether or not there was sufficient variance in contact to satisfy the requirements of the analysis, and the final form was put into use quite late in the year.

The September 30 evaluation design for this objective asked for a covariance analysis, with pretest results used as the covariate. Permission was granted for the use of an equivalent method that employs a multiple regression technique instead of covariance, and which does not require a pre-categorization of contact hours into various degrees of intensity.

Chapter III

FINDINGS

Objective #1

The major program objective, significant improvement of reading levels over expectation, is judged to be unequivocally successful, as shown in the analysis on the Mailed Information Form presented in the Appendix.

First graders who were administered the Clymer-Barrett Pre-reading Battery substantially increased their mastery of the three major skills areas: the percentage of those above the cut-off score on Visual rose from 33% in October to 94% in May; in the same period, from 19% to 77% on Auditory; and from 24% to 76% in Visual Motor skills.

In the twenty-two other grade-level/test level groups for which an analysis was made, actual posttest scores exceeded predicted posttest scores at the .001 level for eighteen; at the .05 level or better for two of the groups; for only two relatively small groups of third graders did the improvement beyond expectation fail to meet the .05 criterion level set by the program. Thirteen out of nineteen of the components analyzed in terms of grade-equivalent scores achieved at better than one month of reading gain for each month of instruction; four out of four of those analyzed in terms of normal curve deviates achieved gains of better than half a standard deviation during the period of instruction.

Objective #2

A summary of class observations is displayed in Table 1 and indicates an overall excellent implementation of the general corrective reading

Table 1.

Observations of Class Activities,
By Category, in Minutes and Percentages

CLASS FORMAT	Minutes	Percentage
Total Group	1300	46
Small Group/Individual	1535	54
OBJECTIVES		
Reading Sub-Skills	1735	61
Practice	290	10
Motivation	390	14
Mixed	420	15
MATERIALS		
Blackboard	245	9
Teacher-Made	540	19
Commercial Excercises	635	22
Books and Stories	595	21
Mixed (Including Games, Activities)	820	29
PUPIL INVOLVEMENT IN LESSON		
High	265	9
Good	2420	86
Fair to Poor	150	5
PARAPROFESSIONALS		
Time in Classes with Para Present	1730	100
Tine Engaged in Direct Instructional Tasks	970	56

design envisioned by the program. Format observations show an almost even split between "total group" and "individual or small group" instruction, though it must be realized that a total group in no case exceeded ten children. "Reading sub-skills" under the Objectives category combines a great variety of skills such as comprehension, using context to determine meaning, vocabulary, etc. "Practice" includes drill sessions as well as individual reading activities. Under the Materials category, "mixed" observations included a variety of games and activity projects for younger children such as making cookies while learning to read a recipe.

The evaluative comments on program implementation below focus on a number of significant areas of corrective reading, recognized as such in the teacher training design outlined for the nonpublic school program by central staff:

Diagnosis. This is clearly an important and on-going activity in the program, and random visits encountered a variety of informal diagnostic efforts built into instructional sequences, in addition to the formal diagnostic procedures required for each child. Serious and quite adequate attention is devoted to this crucial area.

Motivation. More motivational effort was observed on the part of teachers with younger age groups, which is appropriate, but also some ingenious and successful attempts to establish reading motivation with older groups. Consistent attention is being given to this instruction necessity, and as the observation summary indicates, the great majority of pupils show consistently good levels of interest and involvement.

Interest in Reading. It was found that consistent and widespread attention was being given to this more specific motivational objective. Most of the classes had attractive collecions of paperbacks, many "read aloud" lessons were encountered, as well as systematic efforts to encourage out-of-classroom reading. In some instances, however, class libraries were rather minimal; conversations with one of the field supervisors revealed that these cases are likely to be recently initiated programs, which have not had the time to build up a collection over the years. Although recent budget difficulties present some barriers to overcoming this deficiency, I would recommend attention to doing so. In a few instances, the corrective reading rooms were themselves cramped and unattractive, hardly ideal for making the reading process a desirable prospect, but the local space problems that create such a handicap appear difficult to surmount.

Individualizing. Better than half of the timed observations were in the individual-instruction mode, considerably better than anticipated. Although the proportion of time that should be spent in a corrective reading program, on individualized activity is surely a matter of instructional judgment, it seemed that some of the "total group" time was probably duplicating regular classroom instruction and could profitably be shifted to individualized activities that might more directly relate to specific diagnosis of need. Judging from a long conversation with one of the field supervisors, a good deal of pressure on this issue is brought to bear on the teaching staff by central office and the evaluator can only recommend that it be maintained. It is possible, of course, that in anticipation of a visit from an evaluator the teachers observed tended to

plan lessons that would highlight their own teaching activities; the timed sample of activities may, as a result, not truly represent the actual state of affairs.

Prescriptive teaching. Really excellent throughout. The great majority of lessons observed had clear objectives, took small bites, and demonstrated a good match between materials and objectives.

Methods and Materials. The evaluator found, on the whole, a splendid variety of language experiences and a wide range and mix of methodologies. The program is impressive in this area. Materials, on the other hand, were more uneven. Most of the classrooms possessed excellent audio-visual equipment, and used it to good advantage; others seemed far behind. The presence of equipment is, of course, a budgetary matter; whether it is adequately used does have a bearing on the earlier observation about individualizing, as a more complete utilization of self-pacing hardware depends on the degree to which children are encouraged to work by themselves. Considering the very high quality of much of the commercial materials available in all of the classes, the evaluator did not expect to find much teacher-made material and it was indeed in the minority. Some of it was imaginative and useful.

Classroom organization. Rather uneven, but it is clear that some teachers are fighting valiantly to do as well as they can with very poor space.

Classroom management. The evaluator saw very few children who presented much of a problem and not a single instance of teacher inability to handle a pupil. On the other side, a good deal of warmth was seen between

children and teachers generally; a pervasive sense of rapport and genuine affection.

In summary, a first-rate classroom instructional program was found operating quite close to general program objective and standards. In view of the administrative difficulties imposed early in the year by a re-shuffling of teaching staff as a result of the budget crisis, the ability of the staff to carry on the program at a high standard is even more impressive.

The teachers themselves attested almost unanimously to the excellence of their relationships with nonpublic school teaching staffs, and in the course of the visits I observed many specific instances of cooperation and helpfulness. A number of principals went out of their way for the opportunity to assure me of their high opinion of the corrective reading teacher and of the real needs being met by the program. Supervisory linkages with central office appear to be well-organized, and supervision seems to be accepted as helpful by teachers in the field.

Objective #3

Attempts to establish the effectiveness of the paraprofessional services in those schools to which they were assigned, by assessing their impact on reading level improvement, proved to be negative. As the relevant Mailed Information Report table in the Appendix indicates, for the fourteen component groups with a large enough N to permit analysis, only one group showed a statistically significant impact on reading level for paraprofessional contact. One might expect to find such a single significant difference by chance.

These results, however, should be assessed with some care. The delays described in the preceeding chapter resulted in our obtaining records of paraprofessional contact for only a limited period of time, two months at the most. Data for a full school year, or for a period close to it, might well show more positive results, and a serious effort to gather more adequate information is recommended for next year.

As indicated in Table 1, a very considerable percentage of paraprofessional time is devoted to actual small group and individual instruction. Almost all the teachers observed who had paraprofessional help used this resource fairly well, and deployed them instructionally to a far greater extent than some of the general literature on paraprofessionals would suggest as the norm. Even if no statistical linkage to reading gains can be established, the presence of paraprofessionals does seem to encourage higher levels of individualization in the classroom and may be justified for that reason alone.

Action of Earlier Recommendations.

The 1974-75 evaluation report recommended that: 1) the program be recycled; 2) the program be expanded to include all Title 1 eligible pupils; 3) expenditures for materials and supplies be continued at proportional levels; 4) the position of assistant to the Coordinator be continued; 5) teacher preferences be considered in the selection of equipment; 6) standardized tests be machine rather than hand scored to minimize errors.

Recommendations 1, 3, and 5 have been implemented. The others have obvious connections to budgetary allocations, and their lack of implementation is clea y related to current budget stringencies.

Chapter IV

SUMMARY OF MAJOR FINDINGS, CONCLUSIONS, AND RECOMMENDATIONS

Major Findings and Conclusions

1. Outstanding results in the areas of reading achievement were found in almost all areas of the program, with only two relatively small third grade components failing to achieve gains in reading greater than expected.

a. First graders made very substantial gains in mastery of three major skill areas; in one of these areas the percentage of the group achieving better than the criterion rose to 94%.

b. Of the twenty-two component groups analyzed, posttest scores exceeded predicted scores at the .05 level or better, with 18 at the .001 level.

c. Thirteen of nineteen component groups analyzed in terms of grade-equivalent scores achieved at better than one month of reading gain for each month of instruction; four out of four of those analyzed in terms of normal curve deviates achieved gains of better than half a standard deviation during the period of instruction.

Overall, these results merit exemplary status as a reading program for educationally disadvantaged children.

2. Implementation of the program, assessed through field visists, revealed that the program is a first-rate corrective reading effort, operating close to general program objectives and standards.

a. There is an emphasis on individual diagnosis that is followed through with a corresponding emphasis on individual and small group

instruction.

b. The program is characterized by the presence of excellent prescriptive teaching, and imaginative and consistent efforts at motivation.

c. A wide variety of materials are available and are in use, in conjunction with a wide range of appropriate teaching methodologies.

d. The program has achieved a high level of student interest and involvement.

3. Paraprofessional are efficiently employed, and devote a majority of their time to instructional tasks. An analysis of the impact on reading gains of paraprofessional contact with individual children, however, indicated no significant relationships at any grade level.

Recommendations

The following recommendations endorse the positive features already in operation, described in the preceding section, and suggest a few desirable changes that should be manageable within current restrictions:

1. The recycling of the Corrective Reading Services component of the Nonpublic Schools program is strongly recommended, for at least the number of children served this year. The program's observed instructional effectiveness and outstanding pupil achievement in reading makes it of great value in a period in which public concern over reading performance remains at a high level.

2. Administrative and supervisory staff should continue their efforts to increase the proportion of instructional time devoted to individual and small group instruction based on consistent diagnostic activities, and a fuller utilization of materials and hardware designed for individual-

ization.

3. A strong effort should be made to retain at least the current level of paraprofessional participation in the program, and a further attempt made at measuring the effectiveness of paraprofessional contact, beginning as early as possible in the school year.

4. Consideration should be given to strengthening the materials resources of those schools that are, for one reason or another, below the average in size of classroom libraries, commercial materials, and other such resources.

LIST OF APPENDICES

A. M.I.R. Forms

B. Data Loss Form

C. Program Abstract

D. Paraprofessional Contact Form

MAILED INFORMATION REPORT FOR CATEGORICALLY AIDED EDUCATION PROJECTS

SECTION II

1975-76 School Year

Due Date: July 1, 1976

SED Project Number: 3 0 0 0 0 0 | 7 6 | 0 0 3 |

BE Function Number (N.Y.C. only): 0 9 6 9 6 2 6

Project Title Central ESEA Title I Remedial Services for Eligible Nonpublic School Pupils: Corrective Reading Component

School District Name Board of Education of the City of New York

School District Address 110 Livingston Street
Brooklyn, New York 11201

Name and Title of Person Completing this form:

Name Harry L. Miller

Title Evaluator

Telephone Number 212 (Area Code) 737-1614

Date this form was completed 6 / 14 / 76

Function No. 09-69626

Table 9 Historical Regression Design (6-step Formula) for reporting norm referenced achievement tests in Reading and Mathematics.

In the Table below, enter the requested assessment information about the tests used to evaluate the effectiveness of major project component/activities in achieving cognitive objectives. This form requires means obtained from scores in the form of grade equivalent units as processed by the 6-step formula.(see District Evaluator's Handbook of Selected Evaluation Procedures, 1974, p. 29-31) Before completing this table, read all footnotes. Attach additional sheets if necessary.

Component Code	Activity Code	Test Used 1/	Form		Level		Total N 2/	Group ID 3/	Number Tested 4/	Pretest		Predicted Posttest Mean	Actual Posttest		Obtained Value of t	
			Pre	Post	Pre	Post				Date	Mean		Date	Mean		
6 0 8 2 3 0 0	7 2 0	SAT74	B	A	Primary Lev. 1		336	1st	94	10/75	.797	1.425	5/76	1.669	4.799	.001
* 6 0 8 2 3 0 0	7 2 0	C1-B	A	B	Visual			1st	75	10/75	33.3		5/76	94.0		
* 6 0 8 2 3 0 0	7 2 0	C1-B	A	B	Auditory			1st	"	10/75	18.7		5/76	77.0		
* 6 0 8 2 3 0 0	7 2 0	C1-B	A	B	Vis.Motor			1st	"	10/75	24.0		5/76	75.7		
6 0 8 2 3 0 0	7 2 0	SAT74	B	A	Primaryl		1886	2 & 3	80	2/76	1.535	1.674	5/76	2.151	7.282	.001
6 0 8 2 3 0 0	7 2 0	SDRT66	X	W	1	1	1192	3rd	65	2/76	2.326	2.591	5/76	2.687	1.624	.10 N.S
6 0 8 2 3 0 0	7 2 0	SAT74	B	A	Primary			2 & 3	1409	10/75	1.242	1.371	5/76	2.335	51.276	.001
6 0 8 2 3 0 0	7 2 0	SDRT66	X	W	1	1		3rd	945	10/75	2.034	2.447	5/76	2.735	16.744	.001
6 0 8 2 3 0 0	7 2 0	SAT74	B	A	Primaryl			2 &3	331	5/75	1.594	1.893	5/76	2.400	13.582	.001

1/ Identify the test used and year of publication (MAT-58, CAT-70, etc.).

2/ Total number of participants in the activity.

3/ Identify the participants by specific grade level (e.g., grade 3, grade 5). Where several grades are combined, enter the 4th and 5th digits of the component code.

4/ Number of pupils for whom both pre and post test data are provided.

* olumns contain percentages attaining above scores of 24, 18, and 12 for each of the subtests listed

A) Total N can not be separated into time periods since, most often, pre and post data are missing

CORRECTIVE READING SERVICES IN NONPUBLIC SCHOOLS ESEA TITLE I 1975-1976
FUNCTION NO. 09-69626

Table 9 Historical Regression Design (6-step Formula) for reporting norm referenced achievement tests in Reading and Mathematics.

In the Table below, enter the requested assessment information about the tests used to evaluate the effectiveness of major project component/activities in achieving cognitive objectives. This form requires means obtained from scores in the form of grade equivalent units as processed by the 6-step formula.(see District Evaluator's Handbook of Selected Evaluation Procedures, 1974, p. 29-31) Before completing this table, read all footnotes. Attach additional sheets if necessary.

Component Code	Activity Code	Test Used 1/	Form		Level		Total N 2/	Group ID 3/	Number Tested 4/	Pretest		Predicted Posttest Mean	Actual Posttest		Obtained Value of t	
			Pre	Post	Pre	Post				Date	Mean		Date	Mean		
6 0 8 2 3 0 0	7 2 0	SDRT66	X	W	1	1		3rd	46	5/75	2.194	2.660	5/76	2.621	-.735	.10 N.
6 0 8 2 4 0 0	7 2 0	SDRT66	X	W	1	1	3410	4 & 5	114	2/76	2.567	2.723	5/76	2.969	4.219	.001
6 0 8 2 4 0 0	7 2 0	SDRT66	X	W	1	1		4 & 5	1778	10/75	2.434	2.720	5/76	3.122	23.103	.001
6 0 8 2 4 0 0	7 2 0	SDRT66	X	W	1	1		4 & 5	1139	5/75	2.503	2.912	5/76	3.178	15.405	.001
6 0 8 2 4 0 0	7 2 0	SDRT66	X	W	2	2	2177	5 & 6	123	2/76	3.817	4.067	5/76	4.303	2.451	.05
6 0 8 2 4 0 0	7 2 0	SDRT66	X	W	2	2		5 & 6	1553	10/75	3.419	3.849	5/76	4.151	18.142	.001
6 0 8 2 4 0 0	7 2 0	SDRT66	X	W	2	2		5 & 6	428	5/75	3.849	4.417	5/76	4.666	5.269	.001
6 0 8 2 5 0 0	7 2 0	SDRT66	X	W	1	1	1941	7 & 8	56	5/75	3.521	3.900	5/76	4.561	6.182	.001
6 0 8 2 5 0 0	7 2 0	SDRT66	X	W	1	1		7 & 8	83	10/75	3.207	3.478	5/76	4.151	5.110	.001

1/ Identify the test used and year of publication (MAT-58, CAT-70, etc.).
2/ Total number of participants in the activity.
3/ Identify the participants by specific grade level (e.g., grade 3, grade 5). Where several grades are combined, enter the 4th and 5th digits of the component code.
4/ Number of pupils for whom both pre and post test data are provided.

Table 9 Historical Regression Design (6-step Formula) for reporting norm referenced achievement tests in Reading and Mathematics.

In the Table below, enter the requested assessment information about the tests used to evaluate the effectiveness of major project component/activities in achieving cognitive objectives. This form requires means obtained from scores in the form of grade equivalent units as processed by the 6-step formula.(see District Evaluator's Handbook of Selected Evaluation Procedures, 1974, p. 29-31) Before completing this table, read all footnotes. Attach additional sheets if necessary.

	Component Code	Activity Code	Test Used 1/	Form		Level		Total N 2/	Group ID 3/	Number Tested 4/	Pretest		Predicted Posttest Mean	Actual Posttest		Obtained Value of t
				Pre	Post	Pre	Post				Date	Mean		Date	Mean	
*	60823000	720	C1-B	A	B	Visual			1st	119	10/75	70.7		4/76	96.9	
*	60823000	720	C1-B	A	B	Auditory			1st	119	10/75	11.1		4/76	83.9	
*	60823000	720	C1-B	A	B	Vis. Motor			1st	119	10/75	10.4		4/76	73.9	

1/ Identify the test used and year of publication (MAT-58, CAT-70, etc.).

2/ Total number of participants in the activity.

3/ Identify the participants by specific grade level (e.g., grade 3, grade 5). Where several grades are combined, enter the 4th and 5th digits of the component code.

4/ Number of pupils for whom both pre and post test data are provided.

* Means columns contain percentages attaining above scores of 24, 18, and 12 for each of the three subtests listed.

Table 11 Norm referenced achievement data not applicable to Table 9.

PARAPROFESSIONAL COMPONENT

In the table below, enter the requested assessment information about the tests used to evaluate the effectiveness of major project component/activities in achieving cognitive objectives. Before completing this form, read all footnotes. Attach additional sheets if necessary.

Component Code	Activity Code	Test Used 1/	Form		Level		Total N 2/	Group ID 3/	N 4/	Score Type 5/	Pretest			Posttest			Statistical Data	
			Pre	Post	Pre	Post					Date	Mean	6/ S.D.	Date	Mean	6/ S.D.	7/ Test	8/ Value
6 0 8 2 3 0 0	7 2 0	SRAT74	B	A	PRIMARY		336	1st	94		10/75			5/76	-.179*			-1.63 NS**
6 0 8 2 3 0 0	7 2 0	SRAT74	B	A	PRIMARY		1886	2 & 3	1409		10/75			5/76	.007			.24 NS
6 0 8 2 3 0 0	7 2 0	SRAT74	B	A	PRIMARY			2 & 3	331		5/75			5/76	-.065			-1.08 NS
6 0 8 2 3 0 0	7 2 0	SDRT66	X	W	1	1	1192	3	945		10/75			5/76	.051			1.40 NS
6 0 8 2 3 0 0	7 2 0	SDRT66	X	W	1	1		3	46		5/75			5/76	.051			.28 NS
6 0 8 2 . 0 0	7 2 0	SDRT66	X	W	1	1	3410	4 - 5	114		2/76			5/76	.021			.16 NS
6 0 8 2 . 0 0	7 2 0	SDRT66	X	W	1	1		4-5	1778		10/75			5/76	-.05			-1.83 NS

1/ Identify test used and year of publication (MAT-58; CAT-70, etc.)

2/ Total number of participants in the activity.

3/ Identify the participants by specific grade level (e.g., grade 3, grade 5). Where several grades are combined, enter the 4th and 5th digits of the component code.

4/ Total number of participants for whom both pre and post test data are provided.

5/ 1 = grade equivalent; 2 = percentile rank; 3 = z score; 4 = publisher's standard score; 5 = stanine; 6 = raw score; 7 = other.

6/ Standard Deviation - only required of the following districts: Albany, Buffalo, Hempstead, Mount Vernon, New York City, Niagara Falls, Rochester, Syracuse, Utica, Yonkers.

7/ Test statistics (e.g., t; F; X^2).

8/ Obtained value of test statistic (e.g. F=13.2

*Analysis of paraprofessional contact hours with individual students, in a regression analysis that is the equivalent of ANOVA. Entry under "posttest mean" is standardized coefficient representing contact weight.

**Related t value.

Table 11 Norm referenced achievement data not applicable to Table 9.

PARAPROFESSIONAL COMPONENT

In the table below, enter the requested assessment information about the tests used to evaluate the effectiveness of major project component/activities in achieving cognitive objectives. Before completing this form, read all footnotes. Attach additional sheets if necessary.

Component Code	Activity Code	Test Used 1/	Form		Level		Total N 2/	Group ID 3/	N 4/	Score Type 5/	Pretest			Posttest			Statistical Data	
			Pre	Post	Pre	Post					Date	Mean	6/ S.D.	Date	Mean	6/ S.D.	7/ Test	8/ Value
6082400	720	SDRT66	X	W	1	1		4 - 5	1139		15/75			5/76	.008			.24 NS
6082400	720	SDRT66	X	W	2	2		5 - 6	3610		2/76			5/76	.285			2.83 .06
6082400	720	SDRT66	X	W	2	2		5 - 6	1553		10/75	1		5/76	.023			.77 NS
6082500	720	SDRT66	X	W	1	1	1941	7 & 8	83		10/75			5/76	-2.67			-1.25 NS
6082500	720	SDRT66	X	W	1	1		7 & 8	56		5/75			5/76	-.331			-1.61 NS
6082500	720	SDRT66	X	W	2	2		7 & 8	682		10/75			5/76	.006			.13 NS
6082500	720	SDRT66	X	W	2	2		7 & 8	817		5/75			5/76	-.05			-1.24 NS

1/ Identify test used and year of publication (MAT-58; CAT-70, etc.)

2/ Total number of participants in the activity.

3/ Identify the participants by specific grade level (e.g., grade 3, grade 5). Where several grades are combined, enter the 4th and 5th digits of the component code.

4/ Total number of participants for whom both pre and post test data are provided.

5/ 1 = grade equivalent; 2 = percentile rank; 3 = z score; 4 = publisher's standard score; 5 = stanine; 6 = raw score; 7 = other.

6/ Standard Deviation - only required of the following districts: Albany, Buffalo, Hempstead, Mount Vernon, New York City, Niagara Falls, Rochester, Syracuse, Utica, Yonkers.

7/ Test statistics (e.g., t; F; X^2).

8/ Obtained value of test statistic (e.g. F=13.2:

OFFICE OF EDUCATIONAL EVALUATION - DATA LOSS FORM

(attach to MIR, item #30) Function # 09-69626 APPENDIX B

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	
						N	%		Number/ Reason
6 0 8 2 3	7 2 0	Grade 1	SRAT66 C1-B	336	288	48	14%	Missing and/or invalid grade or test codes, scores in groups less than 30	48
6 0 8 2 3	7 2 0	Grades 2,3	SRAT74 SDRT66	3078	2882	196	6%	Pupils left program for a variety of reasons	1096
6 0 8 2 4	7 2 0	Grades 4,6	SDRT I SDRT II 66	5587	5135	452	8%		
6 0 8 2 5	7 2 0	Grades 7-9	SDRT I SDRT II 66	2251	2000	251	11%		
6 0 8 2 6	7 2 0	Grades 10,12	ISRT 73	527	457	70	13%		

(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.

APPENDIX D

LOG: STUDENT CONTACTS FOR _____
Instructional area

School _____ Boro _____ Month _____

Class _____ Teacher _____
Initial

Aide _____

Whole Group Contacts (See instructions)

Day of Month																				Total
Group Contact (No. of Hours to Nearest Half-Hour)																				X

Name of Pupils

Individual/Small Group Contacts
(No. of Quarter-Hour Units - See instructions)

																				Total

31. PROGRAM ABSTRACT

If you operated a component of more than 60 hours of treatment with results which showed gains (norm referenced) in excess of one month's gain for each month of treatment or operated a component of less than 60 hours of treatment with results which showed (criterion-referenced) that at least 90% of the population demonstrated mastery of the objectives, please abstract the aspects of the component which appear to account for the unexpected results. Such examples can thus be duplicated and made readily available through the New York State Educational Programs to other school districts as well as State and Federal agencies that are interested in replicating successful projects. Identify the component by code and provide a one page summary of the findings in relation to the objectives.

Component Code	Activity Code	Objective Code
6 0 8 2 3	7 2 0	8 0 1

2 6 Component Abstract

The Corrective Reading Services Component in the umbrella Non-public School Program was designed to supplement the regular reading programs in these schools in order to raise the reading achievement levels of educationally deprived children in grades one through twelve, reading one or more years below grade level.

Outstanding results in the area of reading achievement merits exemplart program status. One: Of twenty two component groups analyzed, in twenty the posttest scores exceeded predicted scores at the .05 level or better, with eighteen at the .001 level; only two components failed to achieve at significant levels. Two: Thirteen out of nineteen of the components analyzed in terms of grade-equivalent scores achieved at better than one month of reading gain for each month of instruction; four out of four of those analyzed in terms of normal corve deviates achied gains of better than half a standard deviation during the period of instruction.

The single most oustanding implementation feature was the diagnostic prescriptive model of instruction, with a considerable emphasis on individualization, carried out in small groups in a setting which contained a great variety of instructional materials.