DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 138 697 UD 016 971

AUTHOR Ramsay, James G.
TITLE Program for Institutionalized Children, 1974-75.
INSTITUTION New York City Board of Education, Brooklyn, N.Y. Office of Educational Evaluation.
PUB DATE 75
NOTE 41p.; New York City Board of Education Function No. 09-59636-74

EDRS PRICE MF-$0.83 HC-$2.06 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS Achievement Gains; After School Programs; *After School Tutoring; Educationally Disadvantaged; *Elementary Secondary Education; Individualized Instruction; *Institutionalized Persons; Itinerant Teachers; Program Evaluation; Remedial Mathematics; Remedial Reading; *Tutorial Programs
IDENTIFIERS *Elementary Secondary Education Act Title I; ESEA Title I; *New York (New York)

ABSTRACT

This program for institutionalized children, funded under the Elementary Secondary Education Act of 1965, involved approximately 2181 children in 35 institutions in the New York City metropolitan area. Children were institutionalized for a variety of reasons: they were orphaned, neglected, dependent, in need of supervision, or emotionally disturbed. For each child selected to participate in the program, there was a demonstrable need for extra help in reading and/or mathematics. Participants were expected to improve their reading and/or mathematics abilities. The program was designed to provide regular after school tutorial learning experiences for the children in reading and/or mathematics. The tutors were all licensed teachers. Tutoring took place in the child's place of residence. Personal, individual relationships between the tutors and each of their students were established. The program operated from September 1, 1974 through June 30, 1975. The analyses of the test score data indicate that the program did increase the reading and/or mathematics ability through the children's participation in after school tutorial and small group sessions. The data from site visits and observations also indicate that the program was successful. (Author/JM)

EVALUATION REPORT

FUNCTION NUMBER 09-59636-74

PROGRAM FOR INSTITUTIONALIZED CHILDREN, 1974-75

Prepared by: James G. Ramsay, Ph.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 1974-75 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

LIST OF TABLES

CHAPTER I: THE PROGRAM

The program for Institutionalized Children, 1974-75, involved approximately 2181 children in 35 institutions in the New York City metropolitan area. There were 98 sites where the program was conducted; these sites were the institutions and group homes connected to them. Children come to be in the institutions for a variety of reasons: they may be orphaned, neglected, dependent, in need of supervision, or emotionally disturbed. Children in the institutions and group homes were selected to participate in the program through two different selection procedures. In the larger institutions, children were selected through test scores on standardized and teacher made tests. In the smaller institutions, children were selected through recommendations made by teachers and through recommendations of institutional and group home supervisors. For each child selected to participate in the program, there was a demonstrable need for extra help in reading and/or mathematics. These needs are found in an overwhelmingly high percentage of children residing in such institutions.

As a result of being in the program, children were expected to show greater improvement in measured achievement in reading and/or mathematics when compared, through the historical regression method, to increases in achievement that could be expected to occur without benefit of the program. In order to accomplish this objective, the program was designed to provide regular after school tutorial learning experiences for the children in reading and/or mathematics. The tutors, all licensed teachers selected by the Program Coordi-

nator in conjunction with the institutional supervisors, formed the heart of the program. While techniques varied considerably from tutor to tutor, the clear similarity among the various techniques was the establishment of personal, individual relationships between the tutors and each of their students. Tutoring took place in the child's place of residence. The tutors were, for the most part, not connected with the children's regular schools. The tutors attempted, in every case, to make concrete and to personalize the content that they gave the children. This one-on-one situation, where an interested adult interacted with a child in a less formal setting than the child's regular school, was felt to be the setting most cond cive to achieving the objectives of the program. The program operated from September 1, 1974 through June 30, 1975.

CHAPTER II: EVALUATIVE PROCEDURES

Evaluation Objectives

1. "As a result of participation in the Program for Institutionalized Children, the reading grade of the students will show a statistically significant difference between the real posttest score and the anticipated posttest score."[1]

2. "As a result of participation in the Program for Institutionalized Children, the mathematics grade of the students will show a statistically significant difference between the real posttest score and the anticipated posttest score."[2]

3. "To determine the extent to which the program is implemented, and the extent to which the program conforms with the description in the project proposal."[3]

Evaluation Instruments

1. The Metropolitan Achievement Test.[4]

2. The Site Visit Interview and Observation Schedule (see Appendix C).

Data from the Metropolitan Achievement Test (MAT) were used to evaluate Evaluation Objectives #1 and #2. Data from the Site Visit Interview and Observation Schedule were used to evaluate Evaluation Objective #3.

Sampling and Evaluation Sequence

The overall plan for this year's evaluation of the Program

---

1. Williamson, W.E. An Evaluation Design for: B/E #09-59636-#09-59674, Program for Institutionalized Children. New York: Board of Education, Office of Educational Evaluation, August, 1974, p. 3.

2. Ibid, p. 4.

3. Ibid, p. 4.

4. Bixler, H. H. et al. Metropolitan Achievement Test. New York: Harcourt, Brace, Jovanovich, 1971.

for Institutionalized Children was to obtain pretest and posttest scores on every child participating in the program. Theoretically a child would be pretested in September, 1974, and posttested in the last week of May, 1975. This testing sequence was, however, impossible to maintain in all cases due to a variety of reasons. The most frequent reason was the mobility of many children in the program. Because of court decisions, parents taking children home, placement in another institution or home, and children who went A.W.O.L. from the institution, some children left the program earlier than the June 30, 1975 closing date while others entered later than the September 1, 1974 beginning date. Thus, while the majority of children in the Program were pretested in September or October, 1974, and were posttested in the last week of May, 1975, the span of time between pretesting and posttesting for some children did vary. Because of this variation, a separate analysis was prepared, based on the length of time the children were actually in the program.

Another factor which disrupted the testing schedule and in some cases made it impossible to conduct was the emotional component found in the behavior of many of the children. Testing was difficult and frequently impossible with institutionalized children. Taking a standardized test like the MAT appears to be very frustrating for emotionally disturbed children who are years below grade level in reading and/or mathematics. Several children did not attempt to finish the pretest or the posttest while others simply refused to take the tests at all. Each reason for missing test scores was tallied. The number of missing scores for each reason

is presented on the Data Loss Form in Appendix B.

Finally, some of the individual institutions and group homes did not begin the program until the end of September, 1974, or, in some cases, until the beginning of January, 1975, because of problems in hiring personnel and in scheduling and space requirements. The site visits were begun in January, 1975, when all of the sites had functioning programs. These visits continued periodically until the middle of May. A total of 74 sites were visited.

CHAPTER III: FINDINGS

Test Score Data

For the first statistical analysis of the data, the test scores were grouped by component code. For each component code grouping a one-way analysis of variance was performed, comparing observed posttest score means with predicted posttest score means. Predicted means were generated using the "historical regression" formula. Predicted means were an indication of increases in test scores that could have been expected if the children had not participated in the program. The results of these analyses are presented by component code in Table 1. The component codes can be interpreted as follows: the first three digits specify reading or mathematics scores (608 = reading, 609 = math); the fourth digit indicates public or private school attendance (1 = public, 2 = private); the last digit specifies grade level grouping (2 = kindergarten, 3 = 1st-3rd grades, 4 = 4th-6th grades, 5 = 7th-9th grades, 6 = 10th-12th grades). It should be noted that test scores for kindergarten children are given in letter ranks rather than numerical scores, so there are no means or statistical tests for the component codes involving kindergarten children.

Table 1 indicates that for 13 of the 16 component codes, statistically significant differences were obtained between predicted and observed posttest means. The component code groupings where nonsignificant differences occurred had very small numbers of subjects. It is quite possible that if there had been more observations with accompanying increases in degrees of freedom,

Table 1

ANALYSIS OF TEST SCORE DATA BY COMPONENT CODE

Historical regression analysis comparing predicted posttest reading and mathematics scores on the Metropolitan Achievement Test; all means given in grade equivalents; dash indicates no mathematics program; xx indicates non-numerical data for kindergarten children; data grouped by component code.

	Predicted Posttest Mean		Observed Posttest Mean			
	Mean	N	Mean	N	F	p
Component Code						
60812	XX	19	XX	19		
60813	2.49	124	2.73	124	10.48	.01
60814	3.50	243	3.65	243	11.56	.01
60815	4.81	556	5.23	556	16.47	.01
60816	6.28	191	6.78	191	9.87	.01
60822	XX	6	XX	6		
60823	2.51	39	2.69	39	4.41	.01
60824	3.44	51	3.60	51	5.27	.01
60825	4.84	11	5.16	11	3.62	.05
60826	6.40	5	6.61	5	4.41	N.S.
60913	2.64	54	2.98	54	15.01	.01
60914	3.80	150	4.07	150	10.25	.01
60915	5.28	373	5.69	373	15.25	.01
60916	6.33	169	6.79	169	9.81	.01
60923	2.69	11	2.80	11	3.32	N.S.
60924	3.84	16	4.12	16	5.13	.01
60925	5.30	8	5.51	8	4.14	.05
60926	6.39	4	6.66	4	5.12	N.S.
60912	—					
60922	—					

significant differences could have been expected for these groups also.

The second analysis involved grouping the scores according to the length of time children had participated in the program. Three groupings were used: 1-3 months, 4-6 months, and 7-9 months. For each grouping a one-way analysis of variance was performed, comparing observed posttest scores with predicted posttest scores. The results are presented in Table 2.

Table 2 indicates that significant differences between predicted and observed means occurred for both reading and mathematics scores at every level of months in program. Further, it can be observed that the magnitude of the differences increases as months in program increase.

An analysis of the kindergarten scores was done by converting the letter scores into ranks and using the Wilcoxon matched-pairs signed-ranks test. Two such tests were performed, one for private school kindergarten children (component code 60822) and one for public school children (component code 60812). Both tests involved pre-reading scores, since there were no kindergarten children tutored in mathematics. The results of the tests were a t value of 1.74 for the private-kindergarten group (N.S.) and a t value of 2.69 for the public-kindergarten group ($p < .01$).

Site Visit Interview and Observation Schedule (Evaluation Objective #3)

A standard procedure was used for the site visits. The tutor was interviewed, the materials he or she used were recorded, and finally the tutor was observed in the actual tutorial session.

Table 2

ANALYSIS OF TEST SCORE DATA B GRAM

Historical regression analysis comparing predicted posttest reading and mathematics scores on the Metropolitan Achievement Test; all means given in grade equivalents; data grouped by months in program.

Months in Program	Predicted Posttest Mean		Observed Posttest Mean			
	Mean	N	Mean	N	F	p
(reading)						
1 - 3 Mo.	4.51	137	4.83	137	4.45	.01
4 - 6 Mo.	4.67	249	5.02	249	6.41	.01
7 - 9 Mo.	4.84	859	5.22	859	11.86	.01
(math)						
1 - 3 Mo.	4.65	86	5.13	86	4.17	.01
4 - 6 Mo.	4.89	159	5.19	159	5.24	.01
7 - 9 Mo.	5.15	540	5.67	540	9.88	.01

The results of the first responses to the schedule of questions given to 74 tutors were tallied, with the following results:

1. Characteristics of Population Served. All 74 tutors (100%) said that the population they served was defined by the Proposal. Fifteen tutors (20.3%) added that at least one of their students was emotionally disturbed.

2. Cross Reference to Other Programs. Sixty-three tutors (85.1%) knew of no other remedial program involving their students. Eight tutors (10.8%) noted that their students were involved in New York City High School Equivalency Programs. One tutor (1.3%) described a work-study program sponsored by H.E.W. in which students from N.Y.U. and CCNY worked with institutionalized children in counseling roles. One tutor (1.3%) said a student of his was in the College Bound program at the student's high school and one tutor (1.3%) said her students received help from a homework helper volunteer program sponsored by the institution.

3. Objectives. All of the tutors said that their approach to their work was defined by the objectives stated in the Proposal of the Program for Institutionalized Children.

4. Other Narrative Information.

a. Features that were outstanding contributors to the achievement of the objectives.

(1). One-to-one tutorial sessions. Thirty-six tutors (48.6%) stated that working with one student at a time was the single most important feature of the program.

(2). Rapport between student and tutor. Ten tutors

(13.5%) felt the most important contributor to success was the establishment of strong rapport between student and teacher.

(3). Cooperation of [illegible]itution or group home staff. Eight tutors (10.[illegible]at the working relationship with the institu[illegible]l or group home staff was the main contributor toward success of the program.

(4). Other features. The other features mentioned most frequently were: the freedom of the tutor to use the method he or she felt worked best with individual students (7 tutors, 9.4%); use of games, puzzles and other motivational devices (5 tutors, 6.7%); involvement of students to the point that they were helping other students (5 tutors, 6.7%); and the advantage of teaching children informally in a home setting, using a humanistic approach (3 tutors, 4.0%).

b. If project failed to achieve major objectives, give probable causes.

(1). Project not failing. Forty-six tutors (62.2%) felt strongly that the project was not failing.

(2). Exceptional children. Twelve tutors (16.2%) mentioned that they were failing with selected children who were psychotic, emotionally disturbed, brain damaged or recalcitrant in the tutorial situation. These tutors noted that many of their students had no homes or had been beaten or abandoned by their parents.

(3). Other causes for failure. The other causes

mentioned most frequently were: high turnover rate among students (7 tutors, 9.4%); problems in attendance (5 tutors, 6.7%); and the need for more tutorial sessions per week (4 tutors, 5.4%).

c. Unexpected outcomes and probable causes.

(1). No unexpected outcomes. Forty-one tutors (55.4%) did not observe any unexpected outcomes.

(2). Rapport. Twelve tutors (16.2%) mentioned the unexpectedly strong rapport that was developed with the children. These tutors felt themselves quite personally involved with the success of their students.

(3). Dramatic improvement. Eleven tutors (14.9%) cited dramatic increases in reading and/or mathematics performance which they attributed to their students' highly positive response to the one-on-one tutorial situation.

(4). Other unexpected outcomes. Other unexpected outcomes cited were: increased school attendance (5 tutors, 6.7%), positive changes in the students' self concepts (3 tutors, 4.0%), and the observation that hyperactive children are much more cooperative when teaching one-on-one (2 tutors, 2.7%).

d. Recommendations to improve or redesign program for next year's operation.

(1). Need for a diagnostic test. Eighteen tutors (24.3%) expressed dissatisfaction with the MAT as a diagnostic test. They felt that the evaluation of the

program should involve a test that would allow the tutors to evaluate a student's specific problems, rather than a test like the MAT that only provides gross differentiation of problem areas.

(2). Varied materials. Seven tutors (13.5%) suggested that the basis of the program's success was found in being able to change materials as rapidly as a student mastered or lost interest in the materials being worked on.

(3). More sessions per week. Eight tutors (10.8%) felt that the impact of the program would be increased with more tutorial sessions per week per student. In the larger institutions, students were seen for a one hour session once a week. The tutors felt that three such sessions per week would improve the success of the program.

(4). Other recommendations. Five tutors (6.7%) said they needed a more isolated space to work with their students. Four tutors (5.4%) required more cooperа-

tion from group home supervisors in scheduling tutorial sessions and in making sure students appeared for them. Four tutors (5.4%) requested more trips to serve as motivational devices.

e. Practical suggestions to a colleague in establishing a similar program.

(1). Obtain varied materials. Seventeen tutors (23.0%) recommended that the most important preparation a new tutor could make was the assembling of a variety of materials before beginning the tutorial session.

(2). Become acquainted with students. Sixteen tutors (21.6%) said that no tutoring could take place with many of the institutionalized children until a personal relationship was developed between tutor and student. The tutors said that such children tend to be distrustful of adults and need to learn to trust them before the students will commit themselves to learning.

(3). Flexible tutors. Thirteen tutors (17.6%) suggested that obtaining staff for tutoring should involve the hiring of tutors who were flexible and could adjust to the varied needs of children whose attention spans were limited and for whom learning was frequently interrupted by severe emotional problems.

(4). Other suggestions. Six tutors (8.1%) recommended that a learning situation should be established in which any step a child makes in learning is reinforced,

regardless of the child's actual level of performance. Six tutors (8.1%) said that it was important to do a precise diagnostic analysis of a student's problem areas in reading and/or mathematics before beginning the tutorial program. Five tutors (6.7%) said it was very important to begin with a student at his or her own level. Giving the student too much too fast almost guarantees failure, since the students' response tends to be to shut off any communication or attempt to learn. Five tutors (6.7%) felt that an orientation session for tutors is necessary in which the type of child to be tutored would be discussed as well as appropriate methods for conducting the tutorial session. Three tutors (4.0%) mentioned the importance of obtaining materials which were relevant to the cultural milieu of the children. Three tutors (4.0%) felt that new staff should be encouraged to develop an informal approach to the learning situation so as to differentiate the tutorial session from the child's school experience.

f. Integration of effective practices developed in project into regular school program.

(1) Problem area check list. All 74 tutors (100%) used a check list provided by the program coordinator. This was sent to the children's day school teachers who indicated areas in which the students were successful and areas in which they had problems. Twenty-

five of the tutors (33.8%) felt, however, that the forms were not particularly useful because the areas to be evaluated were too general or because the students "lost" the lists before they could be returned to the tutor.

(2). Constraints on homework help. Seven tutors (9.4%) felt their tutorial sessions and the student's work at school would be more integrated if the tutor was given the prerogative to help children with their homework on specific occasions. These tutors said that their students resented the stipulation that tutors could not help with homework and that this resentment severely weakened the rapport the tutors had established.

g. Adequacy of the facilities and materials. In 69 of the 74 sites visited (93.2%), the facilities were observed to be adequate. In five group homes (6.8%), tutors were assigned work spaces by the group home supervisors which were inadequate because the spaces were too public. These inadequate spaces were located in corners of larger living room areas which were frequented by children and adults not involved in the tutorial session. The traffic through the room and the distractions of the extra people in the room tended to disrupt the tutorial work. It is important to note that children who are extremely behind in reading and/or mathematics seem to be acutely aware of their inadequacy, and tend to be defensive about it. The defense that tutors most frequently observed was an "I don't care"

attitude. This attitude was broken down in the privacy of a successful tutorial session, but as soon as stu-dent's deficits in reading and mathematics were publicly observed by his or her peers, the attitude was reasserted. It is of extreme importance to the success of the program, therefore, that the tutorial session be conducted in as private a situation as possible.

The materials used by the tutors were adequate. Tutors frequently supplemented published materials like SRA kits and reading and mathematics book-workbook series with teacher made materials and with games and puzzles. Several of the mathematics tutors found that hand-sized, battery powered calculators were exceptionally good motivational devices for their students. Flash cards, projected materials, and projects constructed by students were also frequently employed by tutors to involve students in non-threatening learning experiences. Every tutor observed had more than enough material prepared for each tutorial session. Each tutor also had several alternative sets of material prepared in case students appeared to need a change in material during a given tutorial session.

Discrepancy Analysis

The implemented program does coincide with the program as described in the proposal and, for the most part, is servicing the needs of the target population - institutionalized children ranging from kindergarten through 12th grade who attend public or private

schools. There is a discrepancy, however, in a portion of this target population which is the result of the high turnover rate of children in four of the institutions. These four institutions serve as temporary shelters and as distribution centers for the children who are sent to them. The average stay for children in such institutions is from two weeks to two months. In the proposal, such an institution might be assigned support to provide the program to 20 children during the school year. The reality of the situation, however, is that the great majority of these twenty students will have left the institution within two months and will have been replaced by other students. Thus, on paper, the institution services 20 students per year while in fact 100 or 150 students may come in contact with the program for a much shorter length of time.

Recommendations from Last Prior Study

"a. There is a need for greater articulation between the tutorial sessions and the day school program that the children attend."[5]

"b. There is a need for a wider range of teaching materials."[6]

"c. There is a need for several assistant coordinators to be available to the tutors."[7]

The first recommendation has been implemented in the 1974-75 program through the use of the check list sent by tutors to the day school teachers. The check list allowed day school teachers to

---

5. Gottlieb, J. Evaluation Report: Program for Institutionalized Children, 1973-74, Function No. 09-4, 36-70. New York: Board of Education, Office of Educational Evaluation, p. 5.

6. Ibid, p. 5.

7. Ibid, p. 6.

indicate to the tutors the areas of weakness in reading and/or mathematics of their students. However, as has been noted in item 4.f.(1) of the analysis of the Site Visit Interview and Observation Schedule given above, the check list was not found to be satisfactory by 33.8% of the tutors.

The second recommendation has been implemented, primarily through the availability of funds this year for books, workbooks, projection devices, calculators, and games and puzzles. Also the ability of the tutors to create their own materials has broadened the range of materials used in the program.

The third recommendation has also been implemented. One special assistant coordinator has been hired this year to supervise tutors at the largest institution connected with the program. This coordinator has been quite successful in providing leadership for those tutors for whom he is responsible and in serving as a resource person for those tutors. In addition, the regular assistant coordinator of the project and four other part-time assistants hired specifically to perform service functions for the tutors, shared in the overseeing of the tutors' work and had regular conferences with the project coordinator.

CHAPTER IV: SUMMARY OF MAJOR FINDINGS, CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

Test Score Data

The analyses of the test score data indicate that the Program for Institutionalized Children, 1974-75, did increase the reading and/or mathematics ability through the children's participation in after school tutorial and small group sessions. Significant increases in observed mean scores, when compared to means predicted if the children had not participated in the program, were observed for 13 of the 16 component code groupings. For the two non-numerical sets of scores for the public kindergarten and private kindergarten component code groups, significant increases were observed in rank for the public kindergarten group.

When analyses were performed using time in program as a grouping variable, significant increases in mean scores were observed at every level. The magnitude of differences between predicted and observed means increased as a function of time in the program, suggesting that the impact of the program is cumulative - the longer a student is in the program, the greater are the chances for growth.

Site Visit Interview and Observation Schedule

The data from the Site Visit Interview and Observation Schedule also indicate that the program was successful. One-to-one tutorial sessions and rapport between student and tutor were felt by the tutor to be central to success of the program. Where failure occurred, it was most frequently attributed to emotional disturbances of children, many of whom had a history of abuse,

neglect and abandonment. The turnover rate of children in four of the institutions was also a factor which reduced the effectiveness of the program.

The tutors made the following main recommendations to improve the program for next year: (1) replacement of the MAT, (2) extension of the program to areas related to reading and mathematics, (3) more direct contact between tutors and day school teachers and (4) the availability of varied materials.

It is clear that the use of varied materials is also central to the success of the program since this was the most frequently cited piece of advice tutors said they would give to a colleague beginning a tutorial program. Almost as frequently given was the advice that new tutors first establish a personal relationship with their students before the actual tutorial sessions begin. Flexibility on the part of the tutors in devising work sequences was also felt to be important.

Conclusions

On the basis of the test score data and the interviews and observations, it can be concluded that the program is successful in servicing the needs of the target population. It is particularly relevant that only 11 of the 74 tutors interviewed knew of other remedial programs involving their students. None of these other programs was specifically designed to deal with problems in the basic areas of reading and mathematics.

Recommendations for Next Year's Operation

1. Given the large deficits observed for most of the institutionalized children in reading and mathematics, and the increases in

ability resulting from experience in the program, it is strongly recommended that the program be continued for next year. The ability of the tutors to establish strong rapport with their students appears to be integral to the program, since these institutionalized children have frequently had poor relationships with adults. The establishment of a strong relationship with the tutor seems to effect positively the attitudes of children toward adults, to strengthen the children's self-concepts through success experiences, and ultimately to raise the children's achievement levels.

2. The evaluator should choose a diagnostic test or a criterion referenced test to evaluate the program. Such a test would serve the dual function of an evaluation instrument for the evaluator and a diagnostic instrument for the tutors.

3. Some provision should be made in next year's program for children who, for any of a variety of reasons, do not receive a full year's experience in the program. Perhaps a special, ncated program could be devised for them in conjunction with the use of a diagnostic or criterion referenced test that would allow tutors to pinpoint specific deficits and to deal with them on a session by session basis.

4. Because of the importance given to the use of varied materials, it would seem helpful to establish a collection of resource materials for the tutors. Such a central collection would allow tutors to choose among the widest array of materials possible as well as to provide a place to file successful teacher made materials that might be of use to other tutors. At present the tutors do have

access to a special education resource center maintained by the Board of Education in Mid-Manhattan. Perhaps procedures could be worked out with this center to establish a collection of materials specifically designed to meet the needs of institutionalized children.

CHAPTER V: EXEMPLARY PROGRAM ABSTRACT

The Program for Institutionalized Children, 1974-75, operated in 98 sites (institutions and related group homes) in the New York Metropolitan area from September 1, 1974 through June 30, 1975. The following component code groupings showed statistically significant differences between observed posttest means and posttest means predicted on the basis of the growth expected if the children had not been involved in the program:

Reading, Activity Code 720 Public School Grades	Component Code	Mathematics, Activity Code 720 Public School Grades	Component Code
K	60812	K	(no program)
1-3	60813	1-3	60913
4-6	60814	4-6	60914
7-9	60815*	7-9	60915
10-12	60816	10-12	60916
Reading Private School Grades		**Mathematics Private School Grades**	
K	60822 (N.S.)	K	(no program)
1-3	60823	1-3	60923 (N.S.)
4-6	60824	4-6	60924
7-9	60825	7-9	60925
10-12	60826 (N.S.)	10-12	60926 (N.S.)

The factors which appeared most instrumental in producing the mean increases in measured abili[illegible]e [illegible] tutors in a one-to-one teaching situation and [illegible] rapport which tutors and students developed as a result of continuous contact of a supportative adult with a child in an informal learning situation.

* Exceeded one year's growth in reading.

APPENDIX A: M.I.R. FORM

Function No. 09-59636-74

Use Table 26, for Historical Regression Design (6-step Formula) for Reading and Mathematics.

26. Standardized Test Results

In the Table below, enter the requested assessment information about the tests used to evaluate th effectiveness of major project component/activities in achieving desired 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 F	Sub-Group
			Pre	Post	Pre	Post				Date	Mean		Date	Mean		
60812	720	MAT-71	F	G	Pri	Pri	22	12	19	9/74	--	score given in letter ranks. No numerical data.				
60813	720	MAT-71	F	G	El	El	140	13	124	9/74	2.17	2.49	5/75	2.73	10.48**	
60814	"	"	"	"	El	El	303	14	243	"	3.06	3.50	"	3.65	11.56**	
60815	"	"	"	"	Int	Int	706	15	556	"	4.09	4.81	"	5.23	48.47**	
60816	"	"	"	"	Int Adv	Int/ adv	225	16	191	"	5.92	6.28	"	6.78	9.87**	
60822	"	"	"	"	Pri	Pri	6	22	6	"	--	score given in letter ranks No numerical data.				
60823	"	"	"	"	El	El	46	23	39	"	2.14	2.25	5/75	2.69	4.41**	
60824	"	"	"	"	El	El	61	24	51	"	3.29	3.40	"	3.60	5.27**	

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 last two digits of the component code.

4/ Total number of participants included in the pre and posttest calculations.

5/ Provide data for the following groups separately: Neglected (code as N), Delinquent (code as D), and Handicapped (code as H). Place the indicated code letter in the last column to signify the subgroup evaluated.

**p <.01

*p <.05

26. Standardized Test Results (Continued)

Component Code	Activity Code	Test Used	Form Pre	Post	Total N	Group ID	Number Tested	Pretest Date	Pretest mean	Predicted Posttest Mean	Actual Posttest Date	Actual Posttest Mean	Obtained value of F	Sub-Group
60825	720	MAT-71	F	Int.	12	25	11	/74	4.37	4.84	5/75	5.16	7.62*	
60826	" " "	"	"	Int/Adv.	5	26	5	"	6.12	6.40	"	6.61	.41	
60913	" " "	"	"	E1	65	13	54	"	2.25	2.64	"	2.98	15.01**	
60914	" " "	"	"	E1	173	14	150	"	3.34	3.80	"	4.07	16.25**	
60915	" " "	"	"	Int	449	15	373	"	5.01	5.28	"	5.69	15.25**	
60916	" " "	"	"	Int/Adv	187	16	169	"	5.97	6.33	"	6.69	9.91**	
60923	" " "	"	"	E1	13	23	11	"	2.31	2.69	"	2.80	3.32	
60924	" " "	"	"	E1	19	24	16	"	3.50	3.84	"	4.12	5.13**	
60925	" " "	"	"	Int	8	25	8	"	5.11	5.30	"	5.51	4.14*	
60926	" " "	"	"	Int/	4	26	4	"	6.04	6.39	"	6.66	5.12	

** p <.01

* p <.05

APPENDIX B. OFFICE OF EDUCATIONAL EVALUATION - DATA LOSS (attach to MIR item #3) Function # 09-396 6-74

In this table all participant Loss information . In the MIR, item #30 in each activity must be accounted for. The component and activity codes used on this form, all participants 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) Grade Level	(2) Test Used	(3) Total N	(4) Number Tested/ Analyzed	(5) Participants Not Tested/ Analyzed #	(5) %	(6) Reasons students were not tested, or if were not analyzed	Number/ Reason
								1. Discharged, 2. Refused to take test, 3. Transferred, 4. Wrong test,	2/#1, 1/#2
6 0 8 1 2	7 2 0	2	MAT-71	22	1[illegible]	[illegible]		5. Placement, 6. emotionally unable, 7. A.W.O.L.	
								8. Entered program too late 9. Deceased	
6 0 8 1 3	" " "	13	"	140	124	16			5/#1, 2/#2 2/#3, 4/#4
									3/#8
6 0 8 1 4	" " "	4	"	303	243	60			19/#1,4/#2 6/#3, 10/#4
									1/#5,11/#6 2/#7,7/#8
6 0 8 1 5	" " "	15	"	706	556	150			54/#1, 11/#2, 14/#3
									21/#4, 2/#5, 26/#6,
									4/#7, 17/#8, 1/#9

(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.

OFFICE OF EDUCATIONAL EVALUATION - DATA LOSS FORM
(attach to MIR item #30) Function # 09-59636-74

In the 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	Number Tested	(5) Participants Not Tested/ Analyzed N	%	(6) Reason why students were not tested, or if tested, were not analyzed	Number/ Reason
6 0 8 2 6	7 2 0	16	MAT-71	225	[illegible]	34		.. Discharged 2. Refused to take test. 3. Transferred 4. Wrong test 5. Placement 6. Emotionally unable to 7. AWOL 8. Entered program too late	9/#1, 3/#2 6/#3, 2/#4 1/#5, 7/#6 1/#7, 5/#8
6 0 8 2 2	" " "	22	"	6	6	0			
6 0 8 2 3	" " "	23	"	46	[illegible]	7			3/#1, 1/#2, 1/#3, 1/#4 1/#8
6 0 8 2 4	" " "	24	"	61	[illegible]	10			4/#1, 1/#2 2/#4, 2/#6 1/#8
6 0 8 2 5	" " "	11		[illegible]	11	1			1/#1

(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 (e.g., MAT-70, SRAT-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.

OFFICE OF EDUCATIONAL EVALUATION - DATA LOSS FORM

APPENDIX B - p. 3 (attach to MIR, item #30) Function # 09-59636-74

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 9 1 3	7 2 0	13	MAT-71	65	54	11		1. Discharged 2. Refused to take test 3. Transferred 4. Wrong Test	2/#1, 1/#2 2/#3, 3/#4 2/#6, 1/#8
6 0 9 1 4	" " "	14	"	173	150	23		5. Placement 6. Emotionally unable 7. AWOL 8. Entered program too late	5/#1, 3/#2 3/#3, 4/#4 4/#6, 1/#7 3/#8
6 0 9 1 5	" " "	15	"	449	373	76			24/#1, 4/#2, 9/#3, 12/#4 1/#5, 15/#6 2/#7, 9/#8
6 0 9 1 6	" " "	16	"	187	169	18			3/#1, 2/#2, 3/#3, 3/#4 6/#6, 1/#7
6 0 9 2 3	" " "	23	"	13	11	2			1/#1, 1/#4

(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.

OFFICE OF EDUCATIONAL EVALUATION - DATA LOSS FORM

APPENDIX B - p. 4 (attach to MIR, item #30) Function # 09-59636-74

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 N	(5) %	(6) Reasons why students were not tested, or if tested, were not analyzed	Number/ Reason
6 0 9 2 4	7 2 0	24	MAT-71	19	16	3		1. Discharged 2. Refused to take test 3. Transferred 4. Wrong test 5. Placement 6. Emotionally unable 7. AWOL 8. Entered program too late	1/#1, 1/#4 1/#8

(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, SMAT-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 C

SITE VISIT INTERVIEW AND OBSERVATION SCHEDULE

PROGRAM FOR INSTITUTIONALIZED CHILDREN - 1974-75

1. Institution _____
2. Address _____
3. Person Interviewed _____
4. Date of Visit _____
5. Characteristics of Population served
6. Cross reference to other programs
7. Objectives (if different from original proposal)
8. Other narrative information
   a. Features that were outstanding contributors to achievement of objectives
   b. If project failed to achieve major objective(s), give probable causes
   c. Unexpected outcomes and probable reasons
   d. Recommendations to improve or redesign program for next year's operation
   e. Practical suggestions to colleague in establishing similar program (admin., staff)
   f. Integration of effective practices developed in project into regular school program
9. Materials
10. Observations