

DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 213 806

UD 022 156

TITLE Follow Through Resource Center: Public School 243.  
 Final Evaluation Report, 1980-1981.

INSTITUTION New York City Board of Education, Brooklyn, N.Y.  
 Office of Educational Evaluation.

SPONS AGENCY Office of Education (DHEW), Washington, D.C.

PUB DATE [81]

NOTE 37p.

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC02 Plus Postage.

DESCRIPTORS Administrator Attitudes; \*Adoption (Ideas);  
 Elementary Education; \*Information Dissemination;  
 \*Information Utilization; \*Inservice Education;  
 Institutes (Training Programs); \*Models; \*Resource  
 Centers; Teacher Attitudes; Teacher Workshops

IDENTIFIERS Bank Street College of Education NY; Project Follow  
 Through; \*Project Follow Through Resource Center  
 NY

ABSTRACT

This final evaluation report examines the activities of the P.S. 243 Follow Through Resource Center in Brooklyn, New York during the 1980-81 school year which was established to disseminate and demonstrate the Bank Street Follow Through model. The report includes an evaluation of training and implementation of the Bank Street model at two adopting sites and a description of follow-up activities at prospective adopting schools. The objectives of the evaluation were to determine: (1) the extent of local and national dissemination of program information; (2) the number and effectiveness of demonstration workshops at the center and inservice training workshops at adopting sites; and (3) the extent to which components of the model have been implemented by participating teachers. The evaluation concludes that the P.S. 243 Follow Through Resource Center more than adequately fulfilled its obligations during the school year. Appendices include a program implementation checklist, an interview schedule for inservice participants, a participant evaluation form, and an evaluation process summary.

(JCD)

\*\*\*\*\*  
 \* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made \*  
 \* from the original document. \*  
 \*\*\*\*\*

ED213806

FINAL EVALUATION REPORT  
Project Number: 5001-48-17712

FOLLOW THROUGH RESOURCE CENTER  
PUBLIC SCHOOL 243  
1980-1981

Project  
Director: Marjorie McAllister

Prepared By The  
ANCILLARY SERVICES EVALUATION UNIT  
Sharon Walker, Manager  
Lila Lasky, Ed.D., Consultant

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION  
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION  
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION  
CENTER ERIC

This document has been reproduced as  
received from the person or organization  
originating it.

Minor changes have been made to improve  
reproduction quality.

Points of view or opinions stated in this docu-  
ment are those of the individual contributor and do not  
necessarily represent those of ERIC.

NEW YORK CITY PUBLIC SCHOOLS  
OFFICE OF EDUCATIONAL EVALUATION  
RICHARD GUTTENBERG, ADMINISTRATOR

UD 022 156

A SUMMARY OF THE EVALUATION  
FOR THE  
1980-1981 PUBLIC SCHOOL 243 FOLLOW THROUGH RESOURCE CENTER

The Follow Through Resource Center located at Public School 243 in Brooklyn was established in 1977 to disseminate information about the Bank Street Follow Through model. The major goal of the Bank Street Follow Through model is the "prevention of early childhood failure," and the Resource Center is charged with disseminating information and demonstrating the program, providing in-service training for teachers at two pre-identified adoption sites, insuring that teachers at adopting sites are implementing the core elements of the program, and identifying new sites as prospective adopters.

The P.S. 243 Follow Through Resource Center more than adequately fulfilled its obligations during 1980-1981. Highlights of the findings reported in the comprehensive report are listed below.

- \*Resource Center staff conducted 36 meetings; conferences and awareness workshops were attended by 4,371 participants; and the staff sent out 1,398 mailings.

- \*Participants' ratings of awareness workshops and in-service training sessions were overwhelmingly positive. Ninety-eight percent of the participants sampled rated the awareness workshops highly, and all of the teachers who received in-service training rated its quality as excellent.

- \*Although full implementation of the program has yet to be achieved, a majority of teachers at the two targeted adopting sites have at least partially implemented all of the components of the Bank Street model.

- \*The seven projected adoptions for 1981-1982 brings the total number of schools using the Bank Street Follow Through model to 32, including a number of adoption sites outside of the New York City area.

The recommendations made in the comprehensive evaluation report focus on helping the Resource Center staff effectively serve the many schools which have adopted the Bank Street Follow Through model. They are summarized below.

- \*Identification of a turn-key trainer at each site which has been served for two or more years will allow the Resource Center staff to concentrate their training efforts on newer adoptions.

\*Arranging for parents at adopting schools to visit the P.S. 243/parent involvement room and meet with parents already familiar with the program should lead to increased parent involvement at adopting sites.

\*An exemption from the National Diffusion Network would allow the Resource Center to lessen its responsibility for the nationwide dissemination of information about the program, and concentrate on providing training at the 32 adoption sites already established.

\*Keeping services to adopting schools within a closer geographic radius would allow the Resource Center not only to reduce costs, but also to maintain its high standards of excellence. (At present, a number of adopting sites are located as far away as New Orleans, Louisiana.)

## TABLE OF CONTENTS

	Page
INTRODUCTION	1
I. PROGRAM DESCRIPTION	2
II. EVALUATION PLAN	4
Evaluation Plan	4
Assessment Procedures	4
III. FINDINGS	6
Dissemination	6
Demonstration	7
In-Service Training	10
Implementation	13
New Adoptions	16
IV. CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS	17
V. APPENDICES	21
-Program Implementation Checklist	22
Interview Schedule for In-Service Participants	25
Participant Evaluation Form	26
Evaluation Process Summary	28

## LIST OF TABLES

	Page
Table 1 - Summary of Dissemination/Demonstration Activities	6
Table 2 - Summary of Awareness Workshops Evaluations	8
Table 3 - Number of Teachers Reporting Implementation of Components of Model	14
Table 4 - New and Projected Adoptions	16

## INTRODUCTION

The Follow Through Program in New York City is part of a federally funded, nation-wide project designed to extend the exemplary education practices of Headstart and other preschool programs into the early elementary school grades. Follow Through models, based on the designs of different sponsoring institutions, were replicated at sites throughout the country in the late 1960's. Based on the evaluation of pupil achievement at these sites, the United States Office of Education validated 21 programs as successful and worthy of replication. One of two validated programs in New York City is at Public School 243, District 16, Brooklyn, known as the "Weeksville School". The staff at P.S. 243 applied for and received an Office of Education grant to establish a Resource Center to disseminate information about its program. The Resource Center was initially funded for the 1977-1978 year; subsequent awards were made for the next three years.

This report addresses the activities of the center during 1980-1981, the fourth year of its operation. It assesses the effectiveness of efforts to disseminate the P.S. 243 Follow Through model and arrangements made to demonstrate the program. It contains an evaluation of training and implementation of the model at two of the sites which have adopted the model for at least two years. A description of follow-up activities at prospective adopting schools and the number of new adoptions are also included.

## I. PROGRAM DESCRIPTION

The P.S. 243 Follow Through Resource Center is located on the second floor of a modern elementary school in the Redford Stuyvesant section of Brooklyn. The Center's arrangement and activities reflect the philosophy of the Follow Through model designed by its sponsoring institution, the Bank Street College of Education.

A major goal of the Bank Street Follow Through model is the "prevention of early school failure." Diagnostic teaching and an integrated curriculum are two of its characteristics. Classroom environments contain learning and interest centers where children can engage both in self-initiated activities and directed instruction. In order to facilitate learning, a team of teachers, paraprofessionals, and parent volunteers circulate in the room and work with individuals as well as with small and large groups of children. The language arts, mathematics, and other curriculum experiences allow children to explore and discover concepts related to the social studies core. Central to this core is the use of the community as a classroom. Since the arts are considered integral elements of the curriculum, children are given frequent opportunities to engage in creative and expressive arts activities. Continuous support for the teaching team is provided through staff development activities. The involvement of "parents as partners" in children's learning also plays an important role in the program.

The checklist used by teachers to follow their progress in im-



plementing the program includes the following areas. (A more complete description is contained on the sample list in Appendix 1.)

- setting up learning environment areas
- using the language experience approach
- developing and extending reading skills
- developing the social studies component
- organizing the classroom

The New York City Board of Education, through the Early Childhood Unit within the Division of Curriculum and Instruction, administers the Follow Through Program and the Resource Center through the city-wide Follow Through coordinator. Resource Center activities are administered directly, however, by the project team supervised by the principal and the school's Follow Through coordinator. The project consists of the center facilitator, a demonstration training specialist, an education associate, and an office aide. Teachers, paraprofessionals, office staff, as well as a staff nurse, social worker, and senior neighborhood worker are considered part of the Resource Center team as well.

Two adjacent rooms on the second floor of the school are the hub of the resource center activities. The first, the dissemination unit, is the office and exhibit area. The second is used as a conference room and for awareness workshops and training sessions. Another adjoining room is also used for media presentations. The parent involvement rooms, school mini-museum, staff development room, as well as classrooms on each grade level, are used for demonstration purposes.

## II. EVALUATION PLAN

### Evaluation Objectives

Five evaluation areas are listed in the plan for the 1980-1981

Resource Center activities: The objectives for these areas are:

- To determine whether information about the program was disseminated at least twice locally and nationally.
- To determine whether the Center gave a minimum of five awareness presentations and to describe participant evaluations of such presentations; in addition, to ascertain the percentage of responses to requests for follow-up activities.
- To determine whether at least three training sessions were conducted at each of two pre-identified adoption sites and to ascertain whether at least 75 percent of the participants had favorable responses to the training.
- To determine whether 75 percent of the teacher participants at the two adopting sites have implemented some of the components of the model.
- To determine whether two new sites have been identified as prospective adopters.

### Assessment Procedures

The examination of records at the Resource Center yielded information related to the time, location, and number of participants at the various presentations made by the Center team. Review of the Center's final report provided similar data about activities at new adopting sites as well as information about other meetings and conferences in which members of the team were involved.

The evaluator reviewed printed materials which the Center staff had developed for dissemination and training purposes, and forms which had been developed to determine participants' satisfaction with awareness and follow-up workshops. A random sample of

these evaluation forms was analyzed.

Information concerning satisfaction with training techniques was obtained during interviews with participating teachers and administrators. Information about implementation of the components of the program was obtained both during interviews and at the time of observational visits to classrooms at adopting schools. Additional information about implementation was obtained from teachers' and trainer's checklist forms. (Samples of the implementation checklists and interview schedule are presented in Appendices 1 and 2.)

While analysis of the forms led to the quantification of data for objectives related to demonstration, training, and implementation, qualitative findings were also obtained during informal discussions with Resource Center staff members and with teachers being trained at the two selected adopting sites. Such discussions also served to clarify certain aspects of the Center's activities. Year-end interviews of the Resource Center staff, the P.S. 243 Follow Through coordinator, and the city-wide Follow Through coordinator yielded additional information about accomplishments in each of the areas of the evaluation.

### III. FINDINGS

The materials prepared for dissemination were: awareness brochures describing the program, curriculum guides, articles in journals and newsletters, papers presented at meetings and conferences, radio and TV spots and interviews, and a film program. These materials were disseminated through mailings, workshops, telephone contacts, conferences, meetings, and media outreach. Table 1 presents the tallies for the various dissemination activities of the Resource Center.

TABLE 1

Summary of Dissemination/Demonstration Activities

Activity	Numerical Tally by Location		
	On-Site	Off-Site	TOTAL
Meetings, Conferences, Awareness Workshops	13	23	36
Participants	543	3,753	4,371
Materials Distributed	618	3,893	4,513
Mailings	-	-	1,398
Radio, TV, Newspaper	N/A	N/A	9

At the Resource Center, which is the dissemination unit, the conference room and the parent involvement room contained broad arrays of materials describing this Follow Through model. Photographs, brochures, and blow-ups of newspaper articles were attractively mounted and arranged in the rooms. Staff-developed curriculum materials and teacher or parent-made items were available for visitors to examine.

Commercially produced materials and examples of children's work sent by adopting schools were also displayed and made available for examination.

During the 1980-1981 year, the Resource Center staff developed two new guidebooks for parents, How Parents Can Support Children's Learning and Parents and Children. These, together with their language and social studies guides, and the Talking Horse, (a collection of children's writings) complete the curriculum series which the staff has developed to date. These materials will be used primarily in training workshops, and will become a part of the permanent display in the dissemination unit as well.

Extensive telephone contacts and public relations efforts made by the project facilitator constituted a major part of the dissemination activities for the year. The facilitator's attendance at a wide variety of meetings, her participation in radio and TV interviews, and her articles and speeches drew requests for information from 11 New York City schools and from schools located in 20 states.

### Demonstration

Demonstration activities of the Resource Center consisted of awareness workshops and follow-up in-depth workshops for the staff members of prospective adopting sites. In order to evaluate participants' responses to the workshops, one third of the completed workshop evaluation forms (randomly selected) were analyzed. To simplify tabulation, the participants' responses to descriptive phrases were translated into numerical values on a scale of 1 to 4.

Thirty-four awareness workshops were given by Resource Center staff in 1980-1981, ten on-site and 24 off-site. Evaluation forms were returned by 156 of the 210 participants in these workshops, and 52 of the responses were sampled. Teachers, administrators, parents, and college students were among those who submitted forms after awareness workshops. In addition, at some off-site presentations, the sponsoring sites used their own evaluation forms which were not forwarded to the Resource Center. Table 2 shows that reactions to the awareness workshops were overwhelmingly positive.

TABLE 2

Summary of Awareness Workshops Evaluations

Ratings	DIMENSIONS		
	Consistency with Workshops Objectives	Organization of Workshops	Effectiveness of Workshop
4 (high)	46	47	48
3	5	4	3
2	0	0	0
1 (low)	1	1	1

In addition, Resource Center staff conducted 83 follow-up in-depth awareness and training workshops; 26 on-site and 57 off-site. Ninety of the 123 participants in these workshops returned evaluation forms, and 30 of these were analyzed. Of the 30 respondents to the workshops, 20 rated the sessions very high (4) on all three dimensions -- consistency with workshop objectives, organization of workshop, and effectiveness of workshop -- with one participant rating the sessions high (3).

According to the project facilitator, it was impossible for the Center staff to meet the vast number of requests for follow-up demonstrations and/or training for this model. Monitoring of existing adoptions engaged the efforts of the Center team extensively. The exact percentage of follow-up activities in response to requests could not be determined, although it was reported to be more than 50 percent.

The evaluation forms used for the awareness presentations and the follow-up in-depth sessions were identical, except that the staff added to the latter an option to suggest the content of additional workshops. A sample of the form is appended to this report (see Appendix 3).

With the exception of requests for "more time", and "earlier in the year", the responses on most of the awareness workshops evaluation forms reflected the generally positive reactions of participants to the presentations. Among the comments were:

--"I was so impressed by what I saw."

--"It was a marvelous experience."

--"The program makes a lot of sense. I am looking forward to using these techniques in my classroom."

--"The parent involvement makes your school lovely."

Some of the participants commented that they would have liked to have read some material about the model before coming to the workshop.

Comments on the evaluation forms submitted after in-depth sessions were equally laudatory:

--"I learned effective ways to rearrange my classroom."

--"This was stimulating for both parents and teachers."

--"It added to my knowledge about teaching."

Participants suggesting additional content asked for more information related to discipline problems, record keeping, and science. And, once again, they asked for "more time."

### In-Service Training

The evaluation for the 1980-1981 year was also concerned with (a) the frequency of training activities at two adopting sites and the reactions of the participants to these activities, and (b) the impact of this training on implementation of the Bank Street model at these sites. To reflect the diversity of adopting sites, the two sites chosen for review were a public elementary school in Brooklyn, New York, and a parochial elementary school in Waterbury, Connecticut. Observations were conducted in eight classrooms in the public school (kindergarten-grade 2) and in five classrooms in the parochial school (kindergarten-grade 4). The teachers were interviewed informally once and more formally a second time.

In order to determine the frequency of training, the evaluator reviewed the technical assistance data contained in the final report of the Resource Center. A tally of these data indicates that the members of the Resource Center team conducted thirteen individual and/or group training sessions at the local public school and five such sessions at the out-of-town parochial school. The Resource Center staff was able to give more support to the public school because of its closeness to P.S. 243. The lengthy trip to the parochial school in Connecticut required that staff members remain at least overnight in order to make the training cost-effective.



The eight public school teachers and five parochial school teachers all agreed that the quality of training was excellent and that the trainers' personal qualities were outstanding. Seven of the 13 respondents said that they preferred individual conferences following classroom observation, four preferred hands-on group workshops, and two preferred a combination of group and individual training.

Nine of the 13 teachers agreed that more training for special problems and topics was needed. Three said that they would like more training for record keeping, two expressed a desire for more opportunity to observe at P.S. 243, and two said they would like trainers to model teaching in actual classrooms. Three of the teachers said they liked the training for use of curriculum materials best, but needed more materials to use. Three teachers expressed a need for help in getting parents involved.

Comments made by public school teachers about the quality of training they received include those listed below.

--"They (trainers) helped me organize my class to become self-sufficient and self-directed."

--"The trainers gave me many ideas in the post-observation conferences."

--"We're delighted. They (trainers) gave us many great ideas."

Some concerns of the public school teachers were:

--"The trainers sometimes expect more than we can give of ourselves."

--"I would have liked to have a year of training before beginning."

--"I would like help with making task cards and self-correcting games."

Parochial school teachers made the following comments, among others:

--"This training was very valuable. I would have been teaching the whole class at once. Now I have options."

--"The trainers have been so supportive, and I feel much more secure about the room arrangement now."

--"The trainers have really helped me with record keeping. The trainers have been catalysts here."

--"I liked the painting workshop best. I'm glad I participated in the training."

Concerns of the parochial school teachers included:

--"Some of their ideas work better than others. I still need more math materials."

--"I would like to see a demonstration of teaching spelling phonetically."

--"Why don't they help us with using ditto?"

Both groups of teachers appeared to feel a need for more materials which would support individual pupil activities. The teachers at the parochial school, who seemed to have more limited prior training in the field of early childhood education, appeared to have changed their methods more extensively during the year. They also appeared more introspective than the public school teachers about their teaching strategies. Additional assistance was requested by the kindergarten teachers in both settings.

During interviews with the school administrators, it was found that they shared the same generally positive feelings about

the training expressed by the teachers. Letters from principals of other schools mirror these attitudes.

### Implementation

A review of notes taken during observations indicated that all thirteen participants had implemented or had initiated at least three of the program components. The components most evident were room arrangement, strategies, use of the language experience approach, and integration of social studies themes with the reading program. Pervasive implementation of the language experience approach was apparent in the displays of children's writing and the use of charts or labels to designate interest areas and activities. Some of the participants were eager to share samples of their pupils' work as examples of the progress which had taken place.

Table 3 is based on a tally of teacher responses on implementation checklists and indicates the average number of strategies within components of the Bank Street model which had been fully implemented as of May, 1981. In most cases where full implementation was not indicated, the teachers checked the box indicating that they were working on a particular strategy or had partially implemented it.

TABLE 3

Average Number of Strategies Implemented by Teachers for  
Each Component of Model

Components of Model	Number of Recommended Strategies	Average Number of Strategies Implemented	
		Public School Teachers*	Parochial School Teachers**
Environmental Arrangement	8	2.6	0.5
Language Experience Approach	5	1.8	1.4
Extending Reading Skills	4	1.0	1.0
Integrated Curriculum	5	1.8	0.6
Classroom Organization	5	3.0	1.6

\*N=8  
\*\*N=5

During the interviews with the 13 teacher-participants, the evaluator was able to obtain further information about implementation of the model. A review of interview responses and an examination of implementation checklists indicated that, while the extent of implementation differed from teacher to teacher, the three components of the model observed in the classrooms had indeed been initiated by each teacher.

Among the comments made by public school teachers were:

--"Integrated learning has become the way now, rather than just basal readers."

--"I've really changed my orientation to teaching reading. Now, I use the language experience approach."

--"I feel that this program has legitimized my block corner."

--"We're having a super time with this program. We never spent as much time sharing ideas and talking to each other about reading."

Concerns of public school teachers include:

--"I need more help. I find the planning and record keeping harder than before."

--"I need an aide for longer than 45 minutes a day."

--"Even though this is an excellent program, we need more materials. We have been spending our own money because of budget cuts."

--"I need help in controlling my class. Some of the children get out of hand."

In the interviews, the parochial school teachers had many positive comments to make about the program. Among them:

--"This has been a real growth process for me. The whole philosophy of the school is now more realistic."

--"I feel free to allow the children to learn from their mistakes."

--"It used to be a struggle to get these kids to talk. Now they really express themselves. I am so pleased with their writing too."

--"I see a big change in the children, but I still have a lot to learn."

Among the concerns voiced by parochial school teachers were:

--"I really need an assistant all the time."

--"I still need help with arranging small group activities for social studies."

--"Sometimes the children really seem happier in a whole group."

--"I need to find ways to keep children at independent activities."

The Resource Center's final report lists ten new adopting schools for the 1980-1981 year, and seven projected adoptions for 1981-1982. A breakdown of the locations of these sites is contained in Table 4.

TABLE 4

New and Projected Adoptions

Location and Type of School.	Adoptions	
	1980-1981	1981-1982 [Projected]
New York City		
Public Schools	1	-
Day Care Centers and Parochial Schools	4	2
Outside New York City		
Public Schools	3	5
Parochial Schools	2	-
<b>TOTALS</b>	<b>10</b>	<b>7</b>

The seventeen adoptions, added to a prior fifteen, brings the total number of schools to be served to thirty-two. According to the project facilitator, many of the new out-of-town adoptions are located in New Orleans, Louisiana, and this distance creates problems related to the cost effectiveness of continued training support. Therefore, a process of training "turn-key" trainers with the school districts has been undertaken.

#### IV. CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

The Public School 243 Follow Through Resource Center more than adequately fulfilled its obligations during 1980-1981. A review of the data demonstrates the effectiveness of the Center staff's activities. Information about the Bank Street Follow Through model was disseminated through a variety of channels, which resulted in an expanded audience. The continued active attention paid to public relations efforts by the Center facilitator appeared to enhance diffusion. The team's accomplishments in producing additional guidebooks for parents were noteworthy.

Evaluations of awareness presentations and follow-up in-depth workshops were consistently positive. The data also indicate that more than 75 percent of the teacher trainees at the observed adoption sites had favorable responses to the training. Because of the extreme popularity of this Follow Through model, it was difficult to meet all requests for follow-up presentations. However, the team did meet more than 50 percent of the requests.

Training activities were scheduled and carried out more times than projected. Although the staff was unable to provide as extensive an amount of training at the out-of-town site as at the local public school, the quality of the service at both sites was evaluated highly by both teachers and administrators. Despite the more limited background of the teachers at the Connecticut site, the report of the facilitator noted continued progress by the pupils this year. The general consensus of trainees was that they profited most from being observed in their classrooms and participating in post-observation conferences with trainers. The interviews and implementation checklists pointed to the fact that the program's components have been or are being implemented at both sites. The teachers' responses

during interviews also indicated that they have observed positive changes in the children's behavior and in their involvement in academically related activities. More parent involvement appears necessary at both sites.

Efforts in relation to the achievement of new adoptions were noteworthy. Considerably more new adoptions were achieved than the number projected or required. The staff's earnest dedication to the merits of the model and their ability to modify their training techniques to meet individual needs served to interest other schools in adoption. In addition, the cooperation of the principal, the community school board, the local Parent Advisory Council, and the city-wide Follow Through coordinator helped in the dissemination of information concerning the Bank Street Follow Through model. Their support and assistance also enabled paper work to move through necessary levels of authority swiftly. The Center team managed to organize each facet of its responsibilities successfully and should be complimented on its continued progress.

In light of the successful accomplishment of program objectives, it is strongly recommended that the Public School 243 Follow Through Resource Center be refunded for the coming year.

Because of the extraordinarily large number of adoptions which the Center has achieved, it is suggested that a turn-key trainer or trainers be identified at each site which has been served for two years or more, so that the staff of the Center can proceed with training at newer adoptions. Careful job descriptions for these personnel would appear essential so that teachers will accept them as readily as they have accepted the original trainers.



In order to increase parent participation at adopting sites, Center staff may want to arrange for parents at adopting schools to visit the P.S. 243 parent involvement room or to meet with parents already familiar with the program, perhaps at workshops arranged by the senior neighborhood worker. It is recommended that the training staff distribute evaluation forms to which the teachers can respond anonymously. This procedure may help the staff in monitoring their work more effectively during the year.

In the event that funding is continued for next year, it is recommended that the Resource Center facilitator continue her efforts to become involved in training. The increased number of adoptions would appear to necessitate such action.

Since the P.S. 243 Center has achieved so many adoptions, it is recommended that the staff attempt to obtain an exemption from the National Diffusion Network, so that the Resource Center not be as heavily responsible for the nationwide dissemination of information and concentrate its energies on its present adoptions.

In order to maintain the high standards of excellence, it is suggested that the Resource Center staff explore the possibility of keeping service within a closer geographic radius.

It is recommended that the Center staff continue its fine record keeping procedures, and in the event that training is transferred to others, that the staff share these procedures with other trainers.

In light of the projected federal budget cuts, it is recommended that the Center team look to the strengths of existing staff members in order to close the gap which personnel cuts may create.

The Center's efficient and cooperative procedures which have made it function so successfully are a testament to good human relations practice and it is strongly urged that they be continued.

APPENDIX

**THE WEEKSVILLE SCHOOL/BANK STREET COLLEGE  
 \* FOLLOW THROUGH RESOURCE CENTER  
 PROGRAM IMPLEMENTATION CHECKLISTS**

The following checklists have been designed to assist you in describing the progress of program implementation in your classroom.

Your candid responses will not only give us a quick overview of how adoption is progressing, but will help us know what areas you feel we can work on together to improve implementation. Please feel free to add any anecdotal reports you wish and/or any items to the checklist.

WORKING ON THE LEARNING ENVIRONMENT.

Areas for exploration, individual learning and group sharing.

	Working on this	More fully achieved	Accomplished
block area (table blocks and accessories)			
Math Center			
Library			
Creative Writing center			
Dramatic play (house-keeping, store, costume)			
Expressive media (paints, clay, collage)			
Music			
Science center/cooking			





INTERVIEW SCHEDULE USED OR IN-SERVICE PARTICIPANTS

1. Would you please describe the type(s) of training you received?
2. Which type did you find most useful?
3. Was this training adequate?
4. If you could have additional training, which type would you wish to have?
5. How you would evaluate the trainer's approach to her work?
6. About which of the core elements did you receive the most helpful training?
7. Which element(s) of the Bank Street model do you like best?
8. Which element(s) were you able to implement?
9. Which element(s) do the pupils appear to like best?
10. Have you notice any changes in your pupils since your implementation, or differences from previous groups?
11. What has been the extent of parent participation?

P. S. 243 FOLLOW THROUGH RESOURCE CENTER

Participant Evaluation Form

1. How did you find out about the Public School 243 Resource Center?

- Publication, Media ( )
- National Diffusion Network ( )
- Educational Programs That Work ( )
- Newsletters, announcements ( )
- Other ( ) - please indicate \_\_\_\_\_

2. Was the information presented or content useful to you?

- | Not at All | Somewhat | No<br>Opinion | Yes | Absolutely |
|------------|----------|---------------|-----|------------|
| ( )        | ( )      | ( )           | ( ) | ( )        |

3. Were the presentations clear and easily understood?

- | Not at All | Somewhat | No<br>Opinion | Yes | Absolutely |
|------------|----------|---------------|-----|------------|
| ( )        | ( )      | ( )           | ( ) | ( )        |

4. What activities did you find most informative and helpful with regard to describing the Follow Through Program & Resource Center?

(example: slide presentation, data presentation, staff development, parent involvement panel)

\_\_\_\_\_  
\_\_\_\_\_  
\_\_\_\_\_  
\_\_\_\_\_

5. Do you wish further contact with the Resource Center Staff for additional information and/or possible adoption of program components?

- Yes                      No                      Undecided

Name \_\_\_\_\_

Address \_\_\_\_\_

Filiation \_\_\_\_\_



6. Check the appropriate box that indicates position held.

School Administrator ( )

School Board Member ( )

Teacher ( )

Parent ( )

Other - ( ) - please indicate \_\_\_\_\_

EVALUATION PROCESS SUMMARY

ACTIVITY	OBJECTIVES	METHODS	SITES	DATES
<u>A. Dissemination</u>	To determine whether information about the program was distributed at least two times locally	Examined print materials, records, logs; interviewed staff.	P.S. 243 Res. Center, Board of Education.	Dec-May 1980-81
<u>B. Demonstration</u>	To determine whether the Center gave at least five awareness presentations and to describe participant evaluations of such presentations; in addition, to ascertain the percent of responses made to requests for follow-up activities.	Examined Res. Center records, agendas of workshops, attendance sheets, participant eval. forms. Sampled one third of forms, translating responses into values on 1-4 scale.	P.S. 243 Resource Center	Jan-June 1981
<u>C. Training</u>	To determine whether at least three training sessions were conducted at each of two pre-identified adoption sites and to ascertain whether at least 75 percent of participants had favorable reactions to training.	Reviewed Center records, made informal observations, interviewed teacher-participants at adoption sites.	P.S. 289K Berkeley Waterbury, Conn.	Mar-May 1981
<u>D. Implementation</u>	To determine whether 75 percent of the trained teachers at the two sites have implemented some components of the model.	Made observations in classrooms, interviewed teachers, reviewed implementation checklists, interviewed Res. Ctr. staff.	P.S. 289 Berkeley Sch  P.S. 243 Res. Ctr.	Mar-June 1981
<u>E. New Adoptions</u>	To determine whether two new sites have been identified as prospective adopters.	Interviewed Resource Center staff, reviewed final report.	P.S. 243 Resource Center	June 1981