

rec 19-04-78

Research And Evaluation

ED154949

DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH
COMMUNITY AND WELFARE
CHILDREN'S SERVICES
SECTION

OFFICE
OF
RESEARCH AND EVALUATION



austin independent school district

010467
ERIC
Full Text Provided by ERIC

rec 19-04-78

Research And Evaluation

ED154949

Handwritten notes

DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH
COMMUNITY HEALTH
EVALUATION CENTER
EDUCATION

OFFICE
OF
RESEARCH AND EVALUATION



austin independent school district

010467
ERIC
Full Text Provided by ERIC

Board of Trustees

M. K. Hage, Jr., President

Mrs. Barr McClellan, Vice President

Gustavo L. Garcia Secretary

Will D. Davis

DeCourcy Kelley

Jerry Nugent

Reverend Marvin C. Griffin

Superintendent of Schools

Dr. Jack L. Davidson

Assistant Superintendent, Division of Instruction and Development

Dr. Vance C. Littleton

Dr. Freda M. Holley

Coordinator, Office of Evaluation

1974-75

Final Evaluation Report

ESEA Title I Project

Thomas Brooks, Ph.D.
Project Evaluator

Vonda Kiplinger
Data Specialist

Wanda Washington
Process Evaluator

Virginia Olguin
Secretary

Juan Medrano
Process Evaluator

Approved:

Freda M. Holley
Freda M. Holley, Ph.D.
Coordinator of Research and Evaluation

June, 1975

Office of Research and Evaluation
6100 Guadalupe
Austin, Texas 78752

Publication Number: 106.52

Phone: 451-6481

ACKNOWLEDGEMENT AND DISCLAIMER

The project presented or reported herein was performed pursuant to a Grant from the Department of Health, Education and Welfare. However, the opinions expressed herein do not necessarily reflect the position or policy of the Department and no official endorsement by the Department should be inferred.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Table of Contents	Page
I. Abstract	1
II. Decision Questions	2
III. Project Description	5
IV. Context Description	24
V. Outcome Objectives	28
VI. Interrelationships	45

A limited number of copies of a Technical Report was also published as a separate volume.

ABSTRACT

This report presents results of the evaluation of Austin Independent School District's 1974-75 Title I program for providing supplemental services to educationally deprived students. Special reading instruction and support services were provided to students in sixteen elementary schools. Twelve of these schools comprised a component in which instruction was provided through reading laboratories; the other four schools were involved in a classroom-based program in which special assistance was provided to teachers in regular classrooms; a third program component was a special program designed to improve the vocabulary and general language skills of children in neighborhoods served by four Title I schools.

Major cognitive objectives for the program (i.e., improved reading achievement) were achieved in both elementary components for kindergarten, second, third, and fourth grade students, but not for first grade students. Although the conclusion must remain tentative until long-range studies of achievement gains can be completed, it does appear that over the short range observed this year, both the reading lab and the classroom based programs were effective at improving reading achievement. The pre-school program appeared to be affected by implementation problems such that objectives were clearly met at two schools, but not at the other two.

Levels of attainment of program objectives in non-cognitive areas were mixed. Self concepts of kindergarten students improved slightly, those of fourth grade students were higher this year than they were last year, but self concept test scores of third grade students did not change significantly from last year to this year. Attitudes toward school showed no significant improvement during the school year. Attendance rates were higher during the Spring of this year than they had been during the same period last year, but this change may be due to a lower incidence of late-winter illness and/or a district program to improve attendance. Teachers' perceptions of appropriateness of instructional materials and parent support for the learning endeavors of Title I students did not improve from Spring, 1974 to Spring, 1975.

Although evidence of effectiveness of the Title I program is not yet conclusive, there were no strong negative indications that the present reading programs are not working. It is hoped that studies of achievement gains of Title I students over periods greater than one year will provide clearer indications of the effects of the program.

DECISION QUESTIONS

INTRODUCTION

In proper context, decision questions are formulated by system and program staff, with technical assistance from evaluation staff, during the process of planning the implementation of a program. Evaluation serves the decision-making process by providing information relating to these decision questions and making recommendations concerning continuation, expansion, or modification of the program. Ultimate responsibility for making the decisions rests with the particular system and program staff members charged with this responsibility.

The process of formulating and answering decision questions for the AISD Title I Program during the 1974-75 school year was circumscribed by the fact that approval from the Texas Education Agency for Title I funding of an evaluation unit was not obtained until the school year had started. Adding to this original delay the time necessary for interviewing applicants for the position of Project Evaluator and the time necessary for the person selected to assemble his support staff, the Title I evaluation unit was not operational until the beginning of November. Due to this late start, the 1974-75 Title I evaluation was performed without the benefit of a comprehensive, formal evaluation design in which decision questions would have been spelled out. Thus the decision questions presented here are after-the-fact, and probably do not reflect the full range of questions which need to be answered. However, even though the information obtained was less than what would have been obtained with a full year of local evaluation, much information was obtained relating to some major decision questions. These decision questions and recommendations concerning them are presented in the following section.

A. SYSTEM-LEVEL QUESTIONS

1. Should the reading lab approach to remediation of Title I students' reading deficits be continued as presently implemented, modified, or discontinued?

RECOMMENDATION:

The reading lab approach to remediation of reading deficits should be continued without major modification.

BASIS FOR RECOMMENDATION:

With the exception of first grade, reading objectives for all grades were met or exceeded. In many cases, gains for Title I students approached or exceeded one month per month of instruction. Pending studies of long-term (one school year or more) gains of Title I students, it appears on the basis of what is known now, that the lab approach is successful at improving the reading skills of Title I students.

2. Should the Communication Skills approach to remediation of Title I students' reading deficits be continued as presently implemented, modified, or discontinued?

RECOMMENDATION

The Communication Skills approach to remediation of reading deficits should be continued without major modification.

BASIS FOR RECOMMENDATION

With the exception of first grade, reading objectives for all grades were met or exceeded. Average gains for students in this component tended to be about equal to those obtained by students in the reading lab component. Classroom observations comparing Communication Skills classrooms with regular classrooms in the other Title I schools showed significant and consistent differences in both teacher and student behaviors favoring the Communication Skills classes. Students in Communication Skills classrooms were less often inattentive and off task and were more often on task than students in classrooms in the other Title I schools. Teachers in Communication Skills classrooms spent more time with individual students and maintained a more positive emotional climate than teachers in the other Title I schools.

3. Should the Happy Talk program for improving language development of pre-school children in Title I areas be continued, modified, or discontinued?

RECOMMENDATION

If the AISD Title I program decides to implement pre-school during the 1975-76 school year, Happy Talk should be one of the alternative programs used. This recommendation is made with the stipulation that pre-program and in-service training for the project staff be done more intensively than was the case this year, and that project implementation be monitored through spot visits of the project coordinator and/or evaluation staff to the homes of participating children.

B. PROGRAM LEVEL QUESTIONS

1. Should the Title I program meet additional or different needs from those now being served?

RECOMMENDATION

Strong consideration should be given to meeting additional needs in at least three areas: (1) Pre-school education for Title I children; (2) elementary grade mathematics; and (3) expansion of the Title I program into eligible schools which are not currently receiving Title I services.

BASIS FOR RECOMMENDATION

Pre-school programs are consistently identified by parents and school staff as high priority concerns. In a survey conducted in June, 1975, principals of Title I schools ranked pre-school programs as the highest need priority. Mathematics programs for elementary grade students also are consistently identified as high priority needs, ranking just behind pre-school and elementary reading programs.

Expansion of the program into other schools should be considered since there are schools presently not receiving Title I services in which student achievement levels are lower than those in some schools presently receiving Title I services.

2. Should the manner in which Title I Aides are used be modified?

RECOMMENDATION

Aides should receive more in-service training; if aides need to be assigned to more than one teacher, they should be assigned to teachers at the same grade level, rather than to teachers at different grade levels.

BASIS FOR RECOMMENDATION

The need for more in-service training for aides was identified both by the principals of Title I schools and by the aides themselves.

In general, aides indicated a preference for assignment to a single teacher. Those who had been assigned to teachers at different grade levels indicated preferences for assignments to teachers at the same level.

III

PROJECT DESCRIPTION

PROGRAM DESCRIPTION

The ESEA Title I Program in the Austin Independent School District is a continuing program supported by funds from the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare through the U.S. Office of Education under the Elementary and Secondary Education Act. Activities for the 1974-75 school year were funded at a level of \$1,061,000 for the regular appropriation, plus \$105,000 unspent funds carried over from previous years, for a total of \$1,166,000 available for supporting program operation. The purpose of ESEA Title I is to provide for the special educational needs of educationally disadvantaged children in school attendance areas having high concentrations of children from low-income families. Title I programs are designed to be part of an overall compensatory education program involving the use of resources from a number of programs and agencies, and are expressly intended to provide supplemental assistance over and above the regular school program.

Participation of schools in the Title I program is determined on the joint basis of economic and educational deprivation. In the spring of each year, the principal at each elementary and secondary school in AISD is responsible for completing an economic survey of families which have children in his school, reporting the percentage of families which meet the low-income criteria. When these surveys are completed, the staff of the AISD Department of Development Programs compiles the results, ranking schools from the highest to the lowest percentage of economic deprivation and calculating the district average of percent economic deprivation. Any school which has a percentage of economic deprivation which is higher than the district average is eligible to receive Title I services. Schools which have a lower concentration of low-income families than the district average are not eligible and cannot receive Title I services.

Within the subgroup of schools which meet the economic criteria for Title I eligibility, it is not necessary that all eligible schools be served; in fact, federal guidelines for Title I programs are very clear that Title I services are to be concentrated in those areas with the greatest educational need, rather than spread thinly among all eligible schools. Thus the selection of the actual schools to be served from among those eligible is determined on the basis of educational need criteria. Each of the eligible campuses completes an educational survey, reporting the number of students at each grade level who meet the educational need criteria (usually, reading one or more years below grade level). This information, along with standardized test results and other available information, is used to determine the actual campuses and grade levels which can be served with the funds that are available.

Once the actual schools and grade levels to be served have been selected, the participation of individual students in the Title I program is determined on the basis of the student's meeting the individual eligibility requirement established for his grade level, and the availability of services on the campus.

In keeping with the intent of concentrating services on those with the greatest need, it is not necessary that all eligible children on a given campus receive Title I services. Rather, priority is given to those students with the greatest educational need, e.g., those whose reading levels are two or more years below grade level are served before those whose reading levels are one to two years below grade level. There are no economic criteria for eligibility of individual students. That is, a child in a Title I school who is reading one or more years below grade level may receive Title I services, regardless of whether his family's income is \$2,000 a year or \$20,000 a year.

The actual Title I program as implemented during the 1974-75 school year, was built around three basic components, each addressing the basic need of improving the basic communication skills of Title I students. Descriptions of these components are presented below.

COMPONENT I. COORDINATION FOR MORE EFFECTIVE LEARNING OF LANGUAGE SKILLS.

This component actually consisted of three distinct aspects: (1) A kindergarten program; (2) a reading program for first through fourth grade students; and (3) a support services program. These programs were run in 12 of the 16 schools which were served by Title I this year. The schools involved in this component and the grades served are indicated in Table 1.

Description of Specific Programs

Kindergarten. The kindergarten program emphasized two major areas: Oral language development and basic concepts development. Instructional concentration for oral language development was provided through the use of Title I Instructional Aides who assisted classroom teachers through individual and small group instruction with special materials designed to enhance the acquisition of oral language. Stress on development of basic concepts considered necessary for successful achievement in the first years of school was also provided through individual or small group activities involving identified Title I children.

Reading Program. The reading program in this component centered around a variety of lab-type approaches designed to provide diagnosis of specific reading problems, design appropriate learning experiences, and evaluate student progress at regular intervals. Children were scheduled into the reading labs in small or large groups according to individual needs and school or personnel limitations. The Learning Teacher Coordinator in charge of the lab was assigned the responsibility of diagnosing problems and developing individual plans for each student as well as providing direct instructional services. In many of the reading labs there were also special reading teachers and resource aides who provided direct reading instruction. As students in the lab needed less assistance, they were returned to the regular classroom with continuous follow-up services provided by the Learning Teacher Coordinator to insure that the individual plans were implemented.

Table 1

Schools, Grades, and Numbers of Students Served in
 Coordination for More Effective Learning of Language Skills
 Component

Number of Students Served By Grade

School	Grade Served	K	1	2	3	4	Ungraded	Spec. Ed.	Total Served
Allison	K-4	44	159	123	108	116			550
Becker	K-3	53	55	96	86			10	300
Campbell	K-4	69	51	77	62	66			325
Govalle	K-3	84	101	58	103				346
Maplewood	K-3						184		184
Matrews	K-3	12	8	14	16				50
Metz	K-4	76	67	88	93	94			418
Norman	K-3	23	48	36	44				151
Oak Springs	K-3	64	74	89	102				329
Palm	K-4	48	42	69	71	60			290
Rosewood	4					53			53
Sims	K-4	17	51	49	45	31			193
TOTAL		490	656	699	730	420	184	10	3189

The actual remedial and corrective systems employed in the reading labs varied considerably from school to school. Some labs used highly structured, commercially available, programs involving reading machines; others relied on structured printed material; still others used programs that were developed locally by Title I and regular school staff. More detailed description of the reading labs may be found in Appendix H.

Support Services. Guidance Counselors and Community Representatives were employed to provide support services to this instructional component. Counselors worked through a framework of five basic functions designed to assist Title I students in the development of skills necessary for adequate functioning in the social, educational, and vocational domains: (1) counseling; (2) consultation; (3) coordination; (4) communication; and (5) curriculum. The specific activities performed by counselors varied from campus to campus, with degrees of involvement with students, parents, and school staff.

Community Representatives acted as a liaison between home and school. With assistance from the counselor, Community Representatives worked with parents of Title I children in an effort to enhance parent participation in and support of the Title I program.

The pattern of Title I staffing for the component and the estimated cost are presented in Tables 2 and 3. The categories for costs presented in Table 3 may be explained as follows:

Teachers - Learning Teacher Coordinators and Special Reading Teachers

Instructional Related Personnel - Supervisor of Learning Coordinators, Supervisor of Instructional Aides, Evaluation Staff and Instructional Administrative Clerks

Instructional Aides - Self explanatory

Pupil Services Personnel - Counselors, Community Representatives, Supervisor of Counselors, Community Representatives.

Materials, Equipment, Supplies - Consumable/Non-consumable supplies, audio-visual equipment, books, etc.

Staff Development - Consultant fees for conducting pre-service and in-service workshops.

Miscellaneous - Printing, travel, telephones, etc.

Table 2

Title I Staffing Pattern for Coordination for More Effective Learning of Language Skills

School	Learning Coordinator	Reading Teacher	Instructional Aide	Guidance Counselors	Community Representatives	Total Instructional Staff	Total Support Staff
Allison	1	2	5	1	1	8	2
Becker	1	2	3	1	1	6	2
Campbell	1	2	4	1	1	7	2
Govalle	1	2	4	0	1	7	1
Maplewood	1	0	1	1	1	2	2
Mathews	1	0	1	0	0	2	0
Metz	1	2	3	0	1	6	1
Norman	1	0	0	1	1	1	2
Oak Springs	1	2	3	1	1	6	2
Palm	1	2	2	1	1	5	2
Rosewood	0	1	0	0	0	1	0
Sims	1	0	1	1	1	2	2
Total	11	15	27	8	10	53	18

Other staff for this component include:

- 1 Supervisor of Learning Coordinator (75% of time)
- 1 Supervisor of Instructional Aides
- 1 Supervisor of Counselors and Community Representatives (75% of time)
- 3 $\frac{1}{2}$ Instructional Administrative Clerks

Table 3.

Estimated Cost of Coordination for More Effective Learning of Language Skills Component

Type of Expenditure	Title I Funds Expended (Encumbered)	Other Funds Expended (Encumbered)	Total Funds
Salaries			
Teachers	\$ 296,652.04	\$	\$296,652.04
Instructional Related Personnel	59,590.46		59,590.46
Instructional Aides	119,956.16		119,956.16
Pupil Services Personnel	167,217.56		167,217.56
Materials, Equipment, and Supplies	79,665.35		79,665.35
Staff Development	3,321.50		3,321.50
Miscellaneous	18,770.66		
Total Funds Expended (Encumbered)	\$ 745,173.73	\$	\$745,173.73

Computation of Cost of Subcomponent Per Participant

Total Cost (All Funds)	=	Cost Per Participant
<u>Total Participants</u>		
Total Col. (e) <u>\$745,173.73</u>	=	\$ 239.53
Total Col. (a) <u>3111</u>		

COMPONENT II. COMMUNICATION SKILLS

Like the Coordination for More Effective Learning component, this component can be thought of as consisting of three distinct aspects: (1) A kindergarten program; (2) a first through fourth grade reading program; and (3) a support services program. In addition to regular Title I funding, the four schools involved in this component received Model Cities funds which were used to pay salaries of additional Instructional Aides. The schools involved in this component and the grades served are indicated in Table 4.

Description of Specific Programs

Kindergarten. Like the kindergarten program in the Coordination for More Effective Learning component, the Communication Skills kindergarten program used Instructional Aides to assist regular teachers in the enhancement of oral language development and basic skills acquisition. In addition, attention was given to listening comprehension, visual discrimination, and prewriting skills through the use of assessment instruments developed by the Educational Testing Service.

Reading Program. The first through fourth grade reading program in Communication Skills was classroom, rather than reading lab, based. Based on the philosophy that every teacher is a reading teacher, the Communication Skills Program provided training to teachers and aides, as well as assistance from the Learning Coordinator in planning classroom management strategies, developing classroom environments conducive to learning, and using all subject areas as content vehicles for the teaching of reading.

Support Services. The support service aspect of the Communication Skills component was essentially the same as that for the Coordination for More Effective Learning Component. Guidance Counselors and Community Representatives worked to improve social skills of Title I students and to enhance the relationship between home and school.

The pattern of Title I staffing and the estimated cost for this component are reported in Tables 5 and 6. The categories for costs in Table 6 are the same as those in Table 3.

COMPONENT III. HAPPY TALK

The Happy Talk component was closely related to the Communication Skills Program, in that it served children from the same four school neighborhoods, and shared project coordinators, Community Representatives, and Model Cities funds. The number of children served in this component is reported in Table 7.

Table 4

Schools, Grades, and Number of Students Served in Communication Skills Component

School	Grade Served	K	1	2	3	4	Ungraded	Spec. Ed.	Total Served
Blackshear	K-4	40	70	74	58	68			310
Brooks	K-4	47	71	62	58	74			309
Ortega	K-4	40	44	64	42	51			241
Zavala							258		258
TOTAL		124	185	200	158	193	258		1118

Table 5

Title I Staffing Pattern for Coordination for
Communication Skills Component

School	Learning Coordination	Reading Teacher	Instructional Aides	Guidance Counselors	Community Representatives	Total Instructional Staff	Total Support Staff
Blackshear	1	0	5	1	1	6	2
Brooke	1	0	4	1	1	5	2
Ortega	1	0	4	1	1	5	2
Zavala	1	0	5	1	1	6	2
TOTAL	4	0	18	4	4	22	8

Other Staff for this component include:

- 1 Communication Skills Supervisor (75% of time)
- 1 Supervisor of Learning Coordinator (25% of time)
- 1 Supervisor of Counselors and Community Representatives (25% of time)
- 1 1/2 Instructional Administrative Clerks

Table 6
Communication Skills

Type of Expenditure	Title I Funds Expended (Encumbered)	Other Funds Expended (Encumbered)	Total Funds
Salaries /	/ /	/ /	/ /
Teachers	\$ 44,810.54	\$	\$ 44,810.54
Instructional Related Personnel	29,028.78		29,028.78
Instructional Aides	70,617.35	49,000.00	119,617.35
Pupil Services Personnel	74,582.95		74,582.95
Materials, Equipment, and Supplies	22,111.15		22,111.15
Staff Development	628.00		628.00
Miscellaneous	6,639.74		6,639.74
Total Funds Expended (Encumbered)	\$ 248,418.51	\$ 49,000.00	\$ 297,418.51

Computation of Cost of Subcomponent
Per Participant

$\frac{\text{Total Cost (All Funds)}}{\text{Total Participants}} = \text{Cost Per Participant}$
$\frac{\text{Total Col. (e) } \$ 297,418.51}{\text{Total Col. (a) } 1143} = \$ 260.21$

Happy Talk is designed to help parents of pre-school children (age 2 to 4) work with their children to improve their language acquisition. The Community Representatives from each of the four schools, working with approximately 20 families each, made weekly visits to the Homes of participating children. On each visit, the Community Representatives would bring a toy and/or books to be left in the Home, and would demonstrate to the parent how the parent could use the toy or books in instructive play with the child. Training for the Community Representatives was provided by the Supervisor of Happy Talk at the beginning of the program and during weekly meetings held throughout the course of the program.

The staffing pattern and the estimated costs for this component are presented in Tables 8 and 9.

Table 7

Number of Children Served in Happy Talk Component

School	Number of Students
Blackshear	20
Brooke	19
Ortega	20
Zavala	19
Total	78

Table 8

Title I Staffing Pattern for Happy Talk Component

Schools	Community Representative
Blackshear	1 ($\frac{1}{2}$ time)
Brooke	1 ($\frac{1}{2}$ time)
Ortega	1 ($\frac{1}{2}$ time)
Zavala	1 ($\frac{1}{2}$ time)
Total	4

Other staff for this component include:

- 1 Supervisor of Happy Talk (25% of time)
- 1 Instructional Administrative Clerk (25% of time)

Table 9
Happy Talk

Type of Expenditure	Title I Funds Expended (Encumbered)	Other Funds Expended (Encumbered)	Total Funds
Salaries /	/ /	/ /	/ /
Teachers	\$ 0.00	\$	\$ 0.00
Instructional Related Personnel	5,405.01		5,405.01
Instructional Aides	158.00		158.00
Pupil Services Personnel	9,018.42		9,018.42
Materials, Equipment, and Supplies	385.50	10,000.00	10,385.50
Staff Development	62.50		62.50
Miscellaneous	842.75		842.75
Total Funds Expended (Encumbered)	\$15,872.18	\$ 10,000.00	\$ 25,872.18

Computation of Cost of Subcomponent
Per Participant

Total Cost (All Funds)	=	Cost Per Participant
<u>Total Participants</u>		
Total Col. (e) \$ <u>25,872.18</u>	=	\$ <u>331.69</u>
Total Col. (a) <u>78</u>		

EVALUATION DESCRIPTION

For reasons discussed above in the Decision Questions section, the 1974-75 evaluation of the Title I program was not performed within the framework of a comprehensive evaluation design based on the AISD CIPO evaluation model. Since the Title I program was well under way before the evaluation staff could become operational, the specific input and process objectives for the program could not be formulated. Outcome objectives for the program, although they had been established prior to the start of school by Title I administrative staff, were no longer appropriate by the time the evaluation staff was hired because of changes in the achievement testing schedule and because some of the objectives referred to instruments which were to have been developed by the evaluation staff. Thus these outcome objectives were rewritten by the Project Evaluator to reflect the necessary changes while still preserving the original intent. Because of the constraints imposed by limited time and resources, priority was assigned to collecting and analyzing data relating to the outcome objectives, while documenting inputs and processes through systematic observations and questionnaires in order to establish baseline information for the following year's evaluation. An overview of the outcome objectives and evaluation procedures for each of the three components is presented in Tables 10, 11, and 12.

Data Collection and Analysis Overview
 Coordination for More Effective Learning of
 Language Skills

Table 10

Objective	Instrument	Times and Methods of Data Collection	Persons Responsible for Collection	Analysis Techniques	Person Responsible for Analysis
(1) An average gain of .7 month grade equivalent per month of instruction in basic knowledge of vocabulary by 2-4 grade students	California Achievement Test (Vocabulary Subtest)	Pre-test - Oct., 1974 Post-test - Feb., 1975	Evaluators	Distribution Statistics	Evaluators
(1) a. First grade students will demonstrate basic knowledge of vocabulary by scoring an average grade equivalent within one month of that expected for students in eighth month of first grade.	California Achievement Test (Vocabulary Subtest)	Single administration, April, 1975	Evaluators	Distribution Statistics	Evaluators
(2) An average gain of .7 month grade equivalent per month of instruction in word and sentence comprehension in reading by 2-4 grade students	California Achievement Test (Comprehension Subtest)	Pre-test - Oct., 1974 Post-test - Feb., 1975	Evaluators	Distribution Statistics	Evaluators
(2) a. First grade students will demonstrate word and sentence comprehension in reading by scoring average grade equivalent within one month of that expected for students in eighth month of first grade.	California Achievement Test (Comprehension Subtest)	Single administration; April 1975	Evaluators	Distribution Statistics	Evaluators

Objective	Instrument	Times and Methods of Data Collection	Persons Responsible for Collection	Analysis Techniques	Person Responsible for Analysis
(3) An average 6 points gain in comprehension of basic concepts by Kindergarten students	Boehm Test of Basic Concept	Pre-test - Sept., 1974 Post-test - Jan., 1975	Evaluators	T-Test Correlated observations	Evaluators
(4) a. Significant increase in self-concept by students in third and fourth grades	Piers-Harris Self-Concept Scale	Pre-test - Nov., 1974 Post-test -	Evaluators	Distribution Statistics Analysis of Variance	Evaluators
(4) b. Significant improvement in attitudes toward school in third and fourth grades	School Sentiment Index	Pre-test - Nov., 1974 Post-test - April, 1975	Evaluators	Distribution Statistics Analysis of Variance	Evaluators
(4) c. Significant increase in self-concept by Kindergarten students	Primary Self Concept Test	Pre-test - Nov., 1974 Post-test - April, 1975	Evaluators	Groups X Trials Analysis of Variance	Evaluators
(5) Title I students will study in materials appropriate for their instructional level to a greater extent in Spring, 1975, than in Spring, 1974.	Teacher Questionnaire	April - May, 1975	Evaluator	One-tailed T-test	Evaluator
(6) Significant increase in amount of home support of learning endeavors of Title I students.	Teacher Questionnaire	April - May, 1975	Evaluator	One-tailed T-test	Evaluator
(7) 1% increase in attendance rates in at least 60% of Title I schools.	District Attendance Report	4th & 5th six-weeks periods	Evaluator	Computation of mean % of attendance	Evaluator

Data Collection and Analysis Overview

Communication Skills

Table 11

Objective	Instrument	Times and Methods of Data Collection	Persons Responsible for Collection		Person Responsible for Analysis
(1) An average gain of .7 month grade equivalent per month of instruction in basic knowledge of vocabulary by 2-4 grade students	California Achievement Test (Vocabulary Subtest)	Pre-test - Oct., 1974 Post-test - Feb., 1975	Evaluators	Distribution Statistics	Evaluators
(1) a. First grade students will demonstrate basic knowledge of vocabulary by scoring an average grade equivalent within one month of that expected for students in eighth month of first grade.	California Achievement Test (Vocabulary Subtest)	Single administration, April, 1975	Evaluators	Distribution Statistics	Evaluators
(2) An average gain of .7 month grade equivalent per month of instruction in word and sentence comprehension in reading by 2-4 grade students	California Achievement Test (Comprehension Subtest)	Pre-test - Oct., 1974 Post-test - Feb., 1975	Evaluators	Distribution Statistics	Evaluators
(2) a. First grade students will demonstrate word and sentence comprehension in reading by scoring average grade equivalent within one month of that expected for students in eighth month of first grade.	California Achievement Test (Comprehension Subtest)	Single administration, April 1975	Evaluators	Distribution Statistics	Evaluators

Objective	Instrument	Times and Methods of Data Collection	Persons Responsible for Collection	Analysis Techniques	Person Responsible for Analysis
(3) An average 6 points gain in comprehension of basic concepts by Kindergarten students.	Boehm Test of Basic Concept	Pre-test - Sept., 1974 Post-test - Jan., 1975	Evaluators	T-Test Correlated observations	Evaluators
(4) a. Significant increase in self-concept by students in third and fourth grades	Piers-Harris Self-Concept Scale	Pre-test - Nov., 1974 Post-test -	Evaluators	Distribution Statistics Analysis of Variance	Evaluators
(4) b. Significant improvement in attitudes toward school in third and fourth grades	School Sentiment Index	Pre-test - Nov., 1974 Post-test - April, 1975	Evaluators	Distribution Statistics Analysis of Variance	Evaluators
(4) c. Significant increase in self-concept by Kindergarten students	Primary Self Concept Test	Pre-test - Nov., 1974 Post-test - April, 1975	Evaluator	Groups X Trials Analysis of Variance	Evaluators
(5) Significant increase in amount of home support of learning endeavor of Title I students	Teacher Questionnaire	April - May, 1975	Evaluator	One tailed T-test	Evaluator

Table 12
Data Collection and Analysis Overview
Happy Talk

Objective	Instrument	Times and Methods of Data Collection	Persons Responsible for Collection	Analysis Techniques	Person Responsible for Analysis
(1) Title I students, aged 2-4, will demonstrate an increased knowledge of vocabulary	Peabody Picture Vocabulary Test	Individually administered Pre-test November, 1974 Post-test May, 1975	Supervisor of Happy Talk	Correlated observations t-test	Project Evaluator
(2) Title I students, aged 2-4, will demonstrate an increased control of syntax	Educational Testing Service Circus Test	Individually administered Pre-test November, 1974 Post-test May, 1975	Supervisor of Happy Talk	Correlated observations t-test	Project Evaluator
(3) Title I students, aged 2-4, will demonstrate an increased knowledge of basic concepts	AISD Kindergarten Screening Test	Individually administered Pre-test November, 1974 Post-test May, 1975	Supervisor of Happy Talk	Correlated observations t-test	Project Evaluator
(4) Parents' ratings of the time spent reading and playing with their children will show an increase of 20%	Parent Questionnaire	Pre-test November, 1974 Post-test May, 1975	Supervisor of Happy Talk	Correlated observations t-test	Project Evaluator
(5) Parental support (for the learning objectives of Project Happy Talk) will demonstrate a 10% improvement	Parent Questionnaire	Pre-test November, 1974 Post-test May, 1975	Supervisor of Happy Talk	Correlated observations t-test	Project Evaluator

23

IV

CONTEXT DESCRIPTION

The context is defined in the AISD's evaluation model as that portion of the program situation over which a program has no control. The context of the ESEA Title I Project is described here so that all data, conclusions, and recommendations which follow may be considered in relation to all the non-project variables existing simultaneously with project influences.

Demographic Data

Table 13 presents the general demographic data for the 16 Title I schools. All schools are below district averages for mean family income and above district averages for percentage of minority group students enrolled (with the exception of Mathews Elementary School).

Achievement Data

Student achievement levels for 1974-75 Title I Project elementary schools were below the expected achievement level as illustrated by the following data:

1. Fifty-four percent of first grade students in Title I schools had scores which were below the 50th percentile on the Metropolitan Readiness Test, administered in October, 1974.
2. Seventy-nine percent of second grade students in Title I schools had scores on the California Achievement Test, Level 2, Form A, administered in February, 1974, which were below the expected grade equivalent of 2.6.
3. Seventy-two percent of second grade students in Title I schools had scores on the California Achievement Test, Level 2, Form A, administered in February, 1975, which were below the expected grade equivalent of 2.6.
4. Eighty-five percent of fourth grade students in Title I schools had scores on the California Achievement Test, Level 3, Form A, administered in February, 1974, which were below the expected grade equivalent of 4.6.
5. Eighty-four percent of fourth grade students in Title I schools had scores on the California Achievement Test, Level 3, Form A, administered in February, 1975, which were below the expected grade equivalent of 4.6.

School Personnel

The ethnic composition of the professional staff in each Title I school is presented in Table 14. Generally, these faculties consist of a larger percentage of minority group members than the district as a whole. Their percentage of minority group faculty members is, however, generally lower than the percentage of minority group students in Title I schools.

Table 13 Enrollment 1974-75 (October, 1974)

School	Enrollment	Mex.-Amer.	Black	Other	% Economic Deprivation
Allison (K-4)	615	81%	15%	4%	85.58
Becker (K-3)	470	69%	12%	20%	79.56
Blackshear (K-4)	519	3%	97%	0	90.37
Brooke (K-4)	384	99%	.3%	1%	86.98
Campbell (K-4)	425	2%	97%	0	88.44
Govalle (K-3)	450	75%	21%	4%	91.68
Maplewood (K-3)	257	15%	77%	8%	84.83
Mathews (K-3)	177	23%	8%	69%	67.32
Metz (K-4)	463	98%	1%	1%	89.64
Norman (K-3)	208	0	100%	0	90.03
Oak Springs (K-3)	371	10%	89%	1%	92.63
Ortega (K-4)	404	39%	57%	4%	91.34
Palm (K-4)	327	98%	0	2%	96.41
Rosewood (4)	76	3%	97%	0	93.84
Sims (K-4)	397	9%	91%	0	88.58
Zavala (Nongraded)	447	90%	7%	3%	92.39
District	30460	24%	16%	60%	

Table 14 Ethnic Composition of Faculties (April, 1975)

School	Mex.-Amer.	Black	Other	Total Number of Teachers
Allison	17%	19%	64%	42
Becker	16%	24%	60%	43
Blackshear	10	38%	62%	29
Brooke	36%	12%	52%	25
Campbell	0	33%	67%	33
Govalle	29%	18%	52%	44
Maplewood	0	23%	77%	22
Mathews	0	28%	73%	14
Metz	34%	17%	49%	35
Norman	5%	42%	53%	19
Oak Springs	0	44%	57%	23
Ortega	21%	21%	58%	29
Palm	30%	16%	54%	30
Rosewood	0	55%	44%	9
Sims	3%	34%	62%	29
Zavala	40%	12%	48%	25
District	8%	18%	74%	

OUTCOME OBJECTIVES

The following pages briefly outline the stated objectives of the 1974-75 ESEA Title I Project. These objectives are stated separately for the schools in the Coordination for More Effective Learning of Language Skills program, in the Communication Skills program, and in the Happy Talk program.

For each individual objective, there is a detailed statement of that objective, a statement of the level of attainment for that objective, and an overview of the evidence relating to the level of attainment. The reader is referred to the appropriate Appendices which include more technical reporting of the data collected corresponding to each objective.

OBJECTIVES OF COORDINATION FOR MORE EFFECTIVE LEARNING OF LANGUAGE SKILLS COMPONENT

IV. COGNITIVE OBJECTIVES

1. IMPROVED KNOWLEDGE OF BASIC CONCEPTS

Title I Kindergarten students will demonstrate a comprehension of basic concepts by scoring an average 6 points gain between pre-post-test administrations of the Boehm Test of Basic Concepts.

LEVEL OF ATTAINMENT: Achieved

EVIDENCE:

The Boehm Test of Basic Concepts was administered to Title I Kindergarten children as a pre-test in September, 1974, and as a post-test in January, 1975. The average scores were 27.2 and 33.7, respectively. Thus, the average gain of .65 points in the four months of instruction between the two tests slightly exceeds the level specified in the outcome objective.

2. IMPROVED KNOWLEDGE OF VOCABULARY

Eligible Title I students in first grade who are served by the Title I instructional program will demonstrate a basic knowledge of vocabulary by scoring an average grade equivalent within one month of that expected for students in the eighth month of first grade as measured by a single administration of the California Achievement Test (Vocabulary Subtest) in April, 1975.

Eligible Title I students in second, third, and fourth grades who are served by the Title I instructional program will demonstrate a basic knowledge of vocabulary by scoring an average of .7 month grade equivalent gain per month of instruction, as measured by pre and post test administrations of the California Achievement Test (Vocabulary Subtest).

A. LEVEL OF ATTAINMENT: (First Grade) Not Achieved

EVIDENCE:

The California Achievement Test, Level 1, Form A, was administered to Title I first grade students in April, 1975. The average grade equivalent score for students in this component was 1.09, less than the level of 1.7 grade equivalents which was specified in the outcome objective.

B. LEVEL OF ATTAINMENT: (Second Grade) Achieved

EVIDENCE:

The California Achievement Test, Level 2 was administered to second grade Title I children as a pre-test in October, 1974, and as a post-test in February, 1975. The average grade equivalent scores in Reading Vocabulary for these children were, respectively, 1.17 and 1.74. The average gain of .57 grade equivalents in the four months of instruction between the two tests represents a gain of 1.4 grade equivalents per month of instruction, thus exceeding the level specified in the outcome objective.

C. LEVEL OF ATTAINMENT: (Third Grade) Achieved

The California Achievement Test, Level 2 was administered to the third grade Title I children as a pre-test in October, 1974, and as a post-test in April, 1975. The average grade equivalent scores in Reading Vocabulary for these children were, respectively, 1.92 and 2.50. The average gain of .58 grade equivalents in the six months of instruction between the two tests represents a gain of .97 grade equivalents per month of instruction, thus exceeding the level specified in the outcome objective.

D. LEVEL OF ATTAINMENT: (Fourth Grade) Achieved

The California Achievement Test, Level 3 was administered to Title I fourth grade children as a pre-test in October, 1974 and as a post-test in February, 1975. The average grade equivalent scores in Reading Vocabulary for these children were, respectively, 2.10 and 2.68. The average gain of .58 grade equivalents in the four months of instruction between the two tests represents a gain of 1.45 grade equivalents per month of instruction, thus exceeding the level specified in the outcome objective.

3. IMPROVED READING COMPREHENSION

Eligible Title I students in first grade who are served by the Title I instructional program will demonstrate a comprehension of words and sentences in reading by scoring an average grade equivalent within one month of that expected for students in the eighth month of first grade, as measured by a single administration of the California Achievement Test (Comprehension Subtest) in April, 1975.

Eligible Title I students in second, third, and fourth grades who are served by the Title I instructional program will demonstrate a comprehension of words and sentences in reading by scoring an average of .7 month grade equivalent gain per month of instruction, as measured by pre and post test administrations of the California Achievement Test (Comprehension Subtest).

A. LEVEL OF ATTAINMENT: (First Grade) Not Achieved

EVIDENCE:

The California Achievement Test, Level 1 Form A, was administered to the Title I first grade students in April, 1975. The average grade equivalent score for students in this component was 1.31, less than the level of 1.7 grade equivalents which was specified in the outcome objective.

B. LEVEL OF ATTAINMENT: (Second Grade) Achieved

The California Achievement Test, Level 2 was administered to the Title I children in the second grade as a pre-test in October, 1974, and as a post-test in February, 1975. The average grade equivalent scores in Reading Comprehension for these children were 1.47 and 1.86, respectively. The average gain of .39 grade equivalents in four months of instruction between the two tests represents a gain of .98 grade equivalents per month of instruction, thus exceeding the level specified in the outcome objective.



C. LEVEL OF ATTAINMENT: (Third Grade) Achieved

The California Achievement Test, Level 2 was administered to the Title I children in the third grade as a pre-test in October, 1974, and as a post-test in April, 1975. The average gain of .62 grade equivalents in the six months of instruction between the two tests represents a gain of 1.03 grade equivalents per month of instruction, thus exceeding the level specified in the outcome objective.

D. LEVEL OF ATTAINMENT: (Fourth Grade) Achieved

Level 3 of the California Achievement Test was administered to Title I children in the fourth grade as a pre-test in October, 1974, and as a post-test in February, 1975. The average grade equivalent scores in Reading Comprehension for these children were, respectively, 2.68 and 2.99. The average gain of .31 grade equivalents in the four months of instruction between the two tests represents a gain of .78 grade equivalents per month of instruction, thus exceeding the level specified in the outcome objective.

II. AFFECTIVE OBJECTIVES

1. IMPROVED SELF-CONCEPT

Title I eligible students in kindergarten will demonstrate improved self concepts, as indicated by a statistically significant gain for a random sample of students from Fall 1974 to Spring 1975 administrations of the Primary Self Concept Test.

Title I eligible students in third and fourth grades will demonstrate improved self concepts as indicated by statistically significantly higher mean scores on the Pier-Harris Self Concept Scale for random sample of students tested in Spring, 1975 than for students in the same grade tested in Spring 1974.

A. LEVEL OF ATTAINMENT (KINDERGARTEN): ACHIEVED

EVIDENCE:

The Primary Self Concept Test was administered to a random sample of kindergarten students in October, 1974, and in April, 1975. Average scores for the pre and post-test were, respectively, 11.22 and 11.87 out of a total possible 18 points. The pre-post difference did not quite attain the .05 level of statistical significance ($F = 3.68$ with 1 and 39 df, $p < .06$), but gains on two of the three subscales (Personal-Self Domain and Intellectual-Self Domain) were significant beyond the .05 level.

B. LEVEL OF ATTAINMENT (THIRD GRADE): NOT ACHIEVED.

EVIDENCE:

The Piers-Harris Self Concept Scale was administered to a randomly selected sample of approximately one half the population of Title I third grade students as a pre-test in November, 1974, and as a post-test in April, 1975. The analysis reported here used only the post-test data. A correlated observations t-test was performed on school means of Title I students in April, 1975, versus school means of Title I students in the third grade in April, 1974. The difference between the 1974 average of 55.07 and the 1975 average of 56.70 was not statistically significant ($t = 1.11$, $df = 14$, $p > .10$).

C. LEVEL OF ATTAINMENT (FOURTH grade): ACHIEVED

A similar analysis was performed for fourth grade students. The difference between the 1974 average of 54.16 and the 1975 average of 57.04 was statistically significant ($t = 3.87$, $df = 9$, $p < .01$).

Note: since the guidance component, to which this objective is addressed, was actually the same for both the Coordination for More Effective Learning and the Communication Skills components, the data for all 16 schools were pooled for this analysis.

2. IMPROVED ATTITUDES TOWARD SCHOOL

Title I eligible students in third and fourth grades will demonstrate improved attitudes toward school, as indicated by a statistically significant gain for a random sample of students from Fall 1974 to Spring 1975 administrations of the School Sentiment Index.

LEVEL OF ATTAINMENT: NOT ACHIEVED

EVIDENCE:

The School Sentiment Index was administered to identified Title I students in the third and fourth grades as a pre-test in November, 1974, and as a post-test in April, 1975. Average total scores for students in this component were 25.6 and 24.8, respectively, out of a total possible 37 points. A groups by trial analysis of variance based on class means revealed that the apparent loss was not statistically significant ($F = 3.37$ with 1 and 74 df , $p > .07$).

3. INCREASED ATTENDANCE RATES

Title I students, in at least 60% of the Title I schools, will demonstrate a 1% increase in attendance rate in Spring, 1975 over that of Spring, 1974.

LEVEL OF ATTAINMENT: ACHIEVED

EVIDENCE:

During the fourth six weeks period of 1974-75, attendance rates were at least one percent higher than in the corresponding period of 1973-74 in all 12 (100%) of the schools in this subcomponent; during the fifth six weeks period of 1974-75, attendance rates were at least one percent higher than in the corresponding period of 1973-74 in 8 of the 12 (67%) schools involved in this subcomponent.

4. APPROPRIATENESS OF INSTRUCTIONAL MATERIALS

Title I students will study in materials appropriate for their instructional level to a greater extent in Spring, 1975 than in Spring, 1974, as indicated by a statistically significant increase in ratings by classroom teachers from Spring 1974 to Spring 1975.

LEVEL OF ATTAINMENT: NOT ACHIEVED.

EVIDENCE:

Evidence relating to this objective is weak due to very low (10%) return rate on the questionnaires which were sent to teachers in May, 1975. For those who did complete the questionnaire, the average rating on the statement "The materials in which the Title I students in my classroom study are appropriate to their needs" was 3.45 (where 1 = Strongly Disagree and 5 = Strongly Disagree) in contrast to an average of 3.38 for teachers asked the same question on the Spring, 1974 Questionnaire. A t-test on the difference between Spring, 1975 and Spring, 1974 revealed no significant difference ($t = .92$, $df = 139$, $p > .10$).

5. IMPROVED HOME SUPPORT

The extent to which Title I students are supported in their learning endeavors by persons in their home will demonstrate a statistically significant improvement, as indicated by a gain in teachers' ratings from Spring 1974 to Spring 1975 and by number of volunteered hours recorded each week on the Community Representatives report.

LEVEL OF ATTAINMENT: NOT ACHIEVED

EVIDENCE:

For the reason stated immediately above, evidence relating to this objective is also very weak. The average rating on the statement "Home support for the learning endeavors of the Title I students in my classroom is very strong" was 2.24, in contrast to an average rating of 2.47 for Spring, 1974. A t-test on the difference between Spring, 1975 and Spring, 1974, revealed that the 1975 ratings were actually lower than the 1974 ratings ($t = -3.58, df = 140, p < .05$).

OBJECTIVES FOR COMMUNICATION SKILLS COMPONENT

I. COGNITIVE OBJECTIVES

1. IMPROVED KNOWLEDGE OF BASIC CONCEPTS

Title I Kindergarten students will demonstrate a comprehension of basic concepts by scoring an average of 6 points gain between pre-post test administrations of the Boehm Test of Basic Concepts.

LEVEL OF ATTAINMENT: ACHIEVED

EVIDENCE:

The Boehm Test of Basic Concepts was administered to Title I kindergarten students as a pre-test in September, 1974, and as a post-test in January, 1975. The average scores were 23.1 and 33.4, respectively. Thus, the average gain of 10.3 in the four months of instruction between the two tests considerably exceeds the level specified in the outcome objective.

2. IMPROVED KNOWLEDGE OF VOCABULARY

Eligible Title I students in first grade who are served by the Title I instructional program will demonstrate a basic knowledge of vocabulary by scoring an average grade equivalent within one month of that expected for students in the eighth month of first grade, as measured by a single administration of the California Achievement Test (Vocabulary Subtest).

Eligible Title I students in second, third, and fourth grades who are served by the Title I instructional program will demonstrate a basic knowledge of vocabulary by scoring an average of .7 month grade equivalent gain per month of instruction, as measured by pre and post test administrations of the California Achievement Test (Vocabulary Subtest).

A. LEVEL OF ATTAINMENT (FIRST GRADE): NOT ACHIEVED

EVIDENCE:

The California Achievement Test, Level 1, Form A, was administered to Title I first grade students in April, 1975. The average grade equivalent scores for students in this component was 1.40, less than the level of 1.7 grade equivalents which was specified in the outcome objective.

B. LEVEL OF ATTAINMENT (SECOND GRADE): ACHIEVED

EVIDENCE:

The California Achievement Test, Level 2 was administered to identified Title I children in the second grade as a pre-test in October, 1974, and as a post-test in February, 1975. The average grade equivalent scores in Reading Vocabulary for these children were 1.27 and 1.81; respectively. The average gain of .54 grade equivalents in the four months of instruction between the two tests represents a gain of 1.35 grade equivalents per month of instruction, thus exceeding the level specified in the outcome objective.

C. LEVEL OF ATTAINMENT (THIRD GRADE): ACHIEVED.

EVIDENCE:

The California Achievement Test, Level 3 was administered to identified Title I children in the fourth grade as a pre-test in October, 1974, and as post-test in February, 1975. The average grade equivalent scores in Reading Vocabulary for these children were 2.23 and 2.64, respectively. The average gain of .41 grade equivalents in the four months of instruction between the two tests represents a gain of 1.03 grade equivalents per month of instruction, thus exceeding the level specified in the outcome objective.

D. LEVEL OF ATTAINMENT (FOURTH GRADE): ACHIEVED

EVIDENCE:

The California Achievement Test, Level 2 was administered to identified Title I children in the third grade as a pre-test in October, 1974, and as a post-test in April, 1975. The average grade equivalent scores in Reading Vocabulary for these children were 2.01 and 2.54, respectively. The average gain of .57 grade equivalents in the six months of instruction between the two tests represents a gain of .88 grade equivalents per month of instruction, thus exceeding the level specified in the outcome objective.

3. IMPROVED READING COMPREHENSION

Eligible Title I students in first grade who are served by the Title I instructional program will demonstrate a comprehension of words and sentences in reading by scoring an average grade equivalent within one month of that expected for students in the eighth month of first grade, as measured by a single administration of the California Achievement Test (Comprehension Subtest) in April, 1975.

Eligible Title I students in second, third, and fourth grades who are served by the Title I instructional program will demonstrate a comprehension of words and sentences in reading by scoring an average of .7 month grade equivalent gain per month of instruction, as measured by pre and post test administrations of the California Achievement Test (Comprehension Subtest).

A. LEVEL OF ATTAINMENT (FIRST GRADE): NOT ACHIEVED

EVIDENCE:

The California Achievement Test, Level 1, Form A, was administered to Title I first grade students in April, 1975. The average grade equivalent score for students in this component was 1.53, less than the level of 1.7 grade equivalents which was specified in the outcome objective.

B. LEVEL OF ATTAINMENT (SECOND GRADE): ACHIEVED

EVIDENCE:

The California Achievement Test, Level 2 was administered to second grade Title I children as a pre-test in October, 1974, and as a post-test in February, 1975. The average grade equivalent scores in Reading Comprehension for these children were, respectively, 1.61 and 2.08. The average gain of .47 grade equivalents in the four months of instruction between the two tests represents a gain of 1.18 grade equivalents per month of instruction, thus exceeding the level specified in the outcome objective.

C. LEVEL OF ATTAINMENT (THIRD GRADE): ACHIEVED

EVIDENCE:

The California Achievement Test, Level 2 was administered to Title I children in the third grade as a pre-test in October, 1974, and as a post-test in April, 1975. The average grade equivalent scores in Reading Comprehension for these children were, respectively, 2.16 and 2.84. The average gain of .68 grade equivalents in the six months of instruction between the two tests represents a gain of 1.13 grade equivalents per month of instruction, thus exceeding the level specified in the outcome objective.

D. LEVEL OF ATTAINMENT: (FOURTH GRADE): ACHIEVED

EVIDENCE:

The California Achievement Test, Level 3 was administered to fourth grade Title I children as a pre-test in October, 1974, and as a post-test in February, 1975. The average grade equivalent scores in Reading Comprehension for these children were, respectively, 2.81 and 3.16. The average gain of .35 grade equivalents in the four months of instruction between the tests represents a gain of .88 grade equivalents per month of instruction, thus exceeding the level specified in the outcome objective.

II. AFFECTIVE OBJECTIVES

1. IMPROVED SELF-CONCEPT

Title I eligible students in kindergarten will demonstrate improved self concepts, as indicated by a statistically significant gain for a random sample of students from Fall 1974 to Spring 1975 administrations of the Primary Self Concept Test.

Title I eligible students in third and fourth grades will demonstrate improved self concepts as indicated by statistically significant higher mean scores on the Piers-Harris Self Concept Scale for a random sample of students tested in Spring 1975, than for students in the same grade tested in Spring 1974.

A. LEVEL OF ATTAINMENT (KINDERGARTEN): ACHIEVED

The test was administered to a random sample of kindergarten students in October, 1974, and in April, 1975. Average scores for the pre-and post-tests were respectively, 11.22 and 11.87 out of a total possible 18 points. The pre-post difference did not quite attain the .05 level of statistical significance ($F = 3.68$ with 1 and 39 df, $p > .06$), but gains on two of the three subscales (Personal-Self Domain and Intellectual Domain) were significant beyond the .05 level.

B. LEVEL OF ATTAINMENT(THIRD GRADE): NOT ACHIEVED

EVIDENCE:

The Piers-Harris Self Concept Scale was administered to a randomly selected sample of approximately one half the population of Title I third grade students as a pre-test in November, 1974, and as a post-test in April, 1975. The analysis reported here used only the post-test data. A correlated observations t-test was performed on school means of Title I students in April, 1975, versus school means of Title I students in the third grade in April, 1974. The difference between the 1974 average of 55.07 and the 1975 average of 56.70 was not statistically significant ($t=1.11, df=14, p>.10$).

C. LEVEL OF ATTAINMENT(FOURTH GRADE): ACHIEVED

EVIDENCE:

A similar analysis was performed for fourth grade students. The difference between the 1974 average of 54.16 and the 1975 average of 57.04 was statistically significant ($t=3.87, df=9, p<.01$).

Note: since the guidance component, to which this objective is addressed, was actually the same for both the Coordination for More Effective Learning and the Communication Skills components, the data for all 16 schools were pooled for this analysis.

2. IMPROVED ATTITUDES TOWARD SCHOOL

Title I eligible students in third grade and fourth grade will demonstrate improved attitudes toward school, as indicated by a statistically significant gain for a random sample of students from Fall 1974 to Spring 1975 administrations of the School Sentiment Index.

LEVEL OF ATTAINMENT: NOT ACHIEVED

EVIDENCE:

The School Sentiment Index was administered as a pre-test in November, 1974, and as post-test in April, 1975 to third and fourth grade Title I students. Average total scores for students in this component were 26.6, respectively, out of a total possible 37 points. A groups by trials analysis of variance based on class means revealed that there was no statistically significant difference between the pre- and post-test averages ($F = 2.43, with 1 and 27 df, p>.10$).

3. IMPROVED HOME SUPPORT

The extent to which Title I students are supported in their learning endeavors by persons in their homes will demonstrate a statistically significant improvement; as indicated by a gain in teachers' ratings from Spring 1974 to Spring 1975 and by number of volunteered hours recorded each week on the Community Representatives report.

LEVEL OF ATTAINMENT: ACHIEVED

EVIDENCE:

Evidence relating to this objective is weak due to a very low (40%) rate of return on the questionnaires which were sent to teachers in May, 1975. For those who did complete the questionnaire, the average rating on the statement "Home support for the learning endeavors of the Title I students in my classroom is very strong." was 2.24 (where 1 = Completely Disagree and 5 = Completely Agree) in contrast to an average of 2.47 for Spring, 1974. A t-test on the difference between the Spring, 1975 and the Spring, 1974 ratings revealed that the 1975 ratings were actually lower than the 1974 ratings ($t = -3.58$, $df = 140$, $p < .05$).

OBJECTIVES FOR HAPPY TALK COMPONENT

1. INCREASED VOCABULARY

Title I students, aged 2-4, will demonstrate an increased knowledge of vocabulary as measured by the Peabody Picture Vocabulary Test.

LEVEL OF ATTAINMENT: NOT ACHIEVED

EVIDENCE:

The Peabody Picture Vocabulary Test was administered to all pre-school participants prior to the beginning of the program in November, 1974, and the end of the program in May, 1975. For the 54 children who had valid scores on both pre and post tests, the average IQ scores were respectively, 74.7 and 78.6. A t-test for correlated observations indicated that this gain was not statistically significant ($t = 1.47$, $df = 53$, $p > .10$). However, separate t-tests for children from each of the four school neighborhoods indicated significant gains for two groups and no significant change for the other two. Thus, the objective was achieved for children from two of the neighborhoods, but not for children from the other two neighborhoods.

2. INCREASED CONTROL OF SYNTAX

Title I students, aged 2-4, will demonstrate an increased control of syntax from pre to post as measured by ETS Oral Language Production Test.

LEVEL OF ATTAINMENT: ACHIEVED

EVIDENCE:

The Educational Testing Service Circus Test was administered to all pre-school participants prior to the beginning of the program in November, 1974, and at the end of the program in May, 1975. The pre-test was generally too difficult for most of the younger children, as indicated by a lack of scorable test protocols from 49 of 78 (63%) children tested. For the 29 children who had valid scores on both pre-and post tests, the average scores on Part II of the test were 15.0 and 35.0, respectively. A t-test for correlated observations indicated that this gain was statistically significant ($t = 6.85$, $df = 28$, $p < .01$). Although separate t-tests did reveal that gains were significant at all four schools, differences among schools were substantial, and in the same order as for the Peabody Picture Vocabulary Test.

3. INCREASED KNOWLEDGE OF BASIC CONCEPTS

Title I students, aged 2-4, will demonstrate an increased knowledge of basic concepts by scoring a 10% gain on a pre-post test administration of the Kindergarten Screening Test.

LEVEL OF ATTAINMENT: ACHIEVED

EVIDENCE:

Evidence relating to this objective is limited, since only the post-test scores are available. Using normative data available from the standardization study of pre-school children for this instrument, which was conducted in May, 1974, it was found that the average score of 14.4 for Mexican-American children in Happy Talk was significantly higher than the average of 11.7 for Mexican-American children in the normative sample ($t = 12.51$, $df = 113$, $p < .01$), while the average of 12.7 for Black children in Happy Talk was not significantly different from the average of 13.5 for Black children in the normative sample ($t = 1.62$, $df = 49$, $p > .05$). In light of the fact that the Happy Talk group includes many children who are less than four years old, while the normative sample included only children who would be entering kindergarten in the fall, it does appear that performance of the Happy Talk participants is higher than what would normally be expected.

4. INCREASED PARENT TIME WITH CHILDREN

Parents' ratings of the time spent reading and playing with their children will show an increase from pre to post by 20% as measured by a Parent Survey.

LEVEL OF ATTAINMENT: DATA NOT AVAILABLE

A supplemental report will be submitted as soon as all Parent Questionnaires have been returned.

5. INCREASED PARENT SUPPORT OR LEARNING OBJECTIVES

Parental support (for the learning objectives of Project Happy Talk) will demonstrate a 10% improvement from Fall of 1974 to Spring of 1975 as determined by a Parent Survey.

LEVEL OF ATTAINMENT: DATA NOT AVAILABLE

A supplemental report will be submitted as soon as all Parent Questionnaires have been returned.

OVERVIEW OF OBJECTIVES

COMPONENT: COORDINATION FOR MORE EFFECTIVE LEARNING OF LANGUAGE SKILLS

OBJECTIVES	ACHIEVEMENT
IMPROVED KNOWLEDGE OF BASIC CONCEPTS	YES
IMPROVED KNOWLEDGE OF VOCABULARY (FIRST GRADE)	NO
IMPROVED KNOWLEDGE OF VOCABULARY (SECOND GRADE)	YES
IMPROVED KNOWLEDGE OF VOCABULARY (THIRD GRADE)	YES
IMPROVED KNOWLEDGE OF VOCABULARY (FOURTH GRADE)	YES
IMPROVED READING COMPREHENSION (FIRST GRADE)	NO
IMPROVED READING COMPREHENSION (SECOND GRADE)	YES
IMPROVED READING COMPREHENSION (THIRD GRADE)	YES
IMPROVED READING COMPREHENSION (FOURTH GRADE)	YES
IMPROVED SELF-CONCEPT (KINDERGARTEN)	YES
IMPROVED SELF-CONCEPT (THIRD GRADE)	NO
IMPROVED SELF-CONCEPT (FOURTH GRADE)	YES
IMPROVED ATTITUDE TOWARD SCHOOL	NO
INCREASED ATTENDANCE RATES	YES
MORE APPROPRIATE INSTRUCTIONAL MATERIALS	NO
GREATER HOME SUPPORT FOR LEARNING	NO

COMPONENT: COMMUNICATION SKILLS

OBJECTIVES	ACHIEVEMENT
IMPROVED KNOWLEDGE OF BASIC CONCEPTS	YES
IMPROVED KNOWLEDGE OF VOCABULARY (FIRST GRADE)	NO
IMPROVED KNOWLEDGE OF VOCABULARY (SECOND GRADE)	YES
IMPROVED KNOWLEDGE OF VOCABULARY (THIRD GRADE)	YES
IMPROVED KNOWLEDGE OF VOCABULARY (FOURTH GRADE)	YES
IMPROVED READING COMPREHENSION (FIRST GRADE)	NO
IMPROVED READING COMPREHENSION (SECOND GRADE)	YES
IMPROVED READING COMPREHENSION (THIRD GRADE)	YES
IMPROVED READING COMPREHENSION (FOURTH GRADE)	YES
IMPROVED SELF-CONCEPT (KINDERGARTEN)	YES
IMPROVED SELF-CONCEPT (THIRD GRADE)	NO
IMPROVED SELF-CONCEPT (FOURTH GRADE)	YES
IMPROVED ATTITUDE TOWARD SCHOOL	NO
GREATER HOME SUPPORT FOR LEARNING	NO

COMPONENT: HAPPY TALK

OBJECTIVES	ACHIEVEMENT
INCREASED VOCABULARY	NO
INCREASED CONTROL OF SYNTAX	YES
INCREASED KNOWLEDGE OF BASIC CONCEPTS	YES
INCREASED PARENT TIME	DATA NOT AVAILABLE
INCREASED PARENT SUPPORT	DATA NOT AVAILABLE

INTERRELATIONSHIPS

The basic premise of the AISD CIPO evaluation model is that there exist critical relationships among program context, inputs, processes, and outcomes such that the degree of attainment of outcome objectives is in large measure predictable from the context and the degree of implementation of inputs and processes. The relationships are not perfect, to be sure. Often a very well implemented program will not achieve the desired outcomes, and occasionally a program will achieve its outcome objectives with little or no evidence that the program actually existed. Nonetheless, the search for, and the validation of, interrelationships among program variables is one of the aspects of evaluation which has great potential for finding out why programs do or do not work and for suggesting modifications leading to their improvement.

Presented in this chapter are results of studies of interrelationships which have been completed to date. The search for interrelationships is a continuing one, involving not just data collected during one project year, but including multi-year investigations of program characteristics which lead to successful performance.

Relationships Between Achievement and Inputs

The first area of investigation involves the relationships among certain school-level variables and average student gains in reading achievement. In order to do this it was necessary to define some single measure of reading gain such that one measure would reasonably describe the gain for students in a given school. The measure to be used here is the average grade equivalent gain of Title I students on the CAT Reading Total scale across second and third grades. First grade achievement was not used because there was no pre-test against which to measure gains of students; fourth grade achievement was not used because Title I did not serve fourth grade in all schools, so that fourth grade achievement data were not available for all schools. The gains were averaged across the two grade levels in the 15 schools which served second and third grades in order to provide a single measure which might be more reflective of effects of the program at a given school than would gains for either grade separately.

The input variables used are the average Title I per pupil expenditure for each school and the ratio of Title I students to Title I instructional personnel of each campus. The per pupil expenditure is based on actual costs directly traceable to each school and does not include costs of program administration or evaluation. The ratio of students to instructional adults is based on the number of students served and the total number of Title I instructional staff, including Learning Coordinators, Reading Teachers, and Instructional Aides, but not Guidance Counselors and Community Representatives. The actual data are presented in Table 15.

The analysis consisted of computing Spearman rank correlation coefficients for each of the variables with each of the other variables. This statistic provides an indication of the extent to which two variables are related. Like the more commonly used Pearson Product-Moment coefficient, the Spearman Rank Correlation Coefficient has a possible range of -1.00 to +1.00, with zero indicating no relationship and values approaching +1.00 and -1.00 indicating strong positive and negative relationships, respectively. The Spearman Coefficient was used in this case because of the extreme values of both achievement gain and per pupil expenditure which occurred at Mathews School. The Pearson coefficient in this case would have resulted in a somewhat inflated estimate of the degree of relationship.

The ranks of the different schools on these different variables, and the rank correlation coefficients are reported in Table 16.

As indicated in Table 16, there are significant positive relationships between the achievement gain measure and the two input measures for these fifteen schools. That is, with more money spent per student, and with more instructional staff available per student, there were increasing achievement gains. Some caution must be exercised, however, since correlation does not necessarily mean causation. It is worthy of note, however, that there is a relationship between money spent in a school and achievement gains of the students served.

Relationships Between Outcomes and Processes

An area that may prove to be one of the most fruitful areas of investigation is that of the effects of classroom processes on students. Some limited studies in this area have been completed. A larger study of relationships between classroom process and achievement could not be completed due to delays in processing the spring test scores.

One study which has been completed involved obtaining correlations of the Systematic Classroom Observation Scale scores from Title I kindergarten classrooms with pre and post-test scores on the Boehm Test of Basic Concepts and the Primary Self-Concept Test. Unfortunately, no significant relationships between the observation and the outcome measures were found. The failure to find significant relationships may be due to a very small sample size. Complete observation and outcome data were available for only 30 kindergarten classrooms. Moreover, the time at which the different measures were taken may have attenuated the relationship.

Table 15

Average CAT Reading Total Score Gains for Second and Third Grades, Average Per Pupil Expenditures, and Ratio of Students to Title I Instructional Staff On Fifteen Campuses

School	Average Gain	Average Per Pupil Expenditures	Ratio of Students to Instructional Staff
Blackshear	.52	\$201	54/1
Brooke	.65	197	57/1
Ortega	.72	214	53/1
Zavala	.76	193	55/1
Allison	.57	192	56/1
Becker	.56	228	56/1
Campbell	.77	212	51/1
Govalle	.65	203	63/1
Maplewood	.61	204	111/1
Mathews	1.18	373	26/1
Metz	.58	180	68/1
Norman	.64	144	229/1
Oak Springs	.67	283	46/1
Palm	.74	229	59/1
Sims	.55	132	155/1

Note: Rosewood School does not appear in this table because it has no second or third grade.

Table 16

Ranks and Correlations Among Ranks of Schools on Average Reading Gain, Per Pupil Expenditure, and Student to Staff Ratio

School	Average Gain	Per Pupil Expenditure	Ratio of Students to Instructional Staff
Blackshear	15	9	5
Brooke	7	10	9
Ortega	5	5	4
Zavala	3	11	6
Allison	12	12	7.5
Becker	13	4	7.5
Campbell	2	6	3
Govalle	8	8	11
Maplewood	10	7	13
Mathevs	1	1	1
Metz	11	13	12
Norman	9	14	15
Oak Springs	6	2	2
Palm	4	3	10
Sims	14	15	14

Correlation of gain with expenditure = .53*

Correlation of gain with Student/Staff Ratio = .51*

Correlation of Expenditure with Student/Staff Ratio = .68**

*p < .05

**p < .01

The post-test on the Boehm was given in January, before observations of classrooms had started. Thus the criterion variable actually preceded the prediction variables in this case. Although it is hoped that further study will reveal some relationships between kindergarten classroom processes and students outcomes, there is nothing significant to report at this time.