DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 290 138 CS 009 033

AUTHOR Lore, Rosemary; Chamberlain, Ed
TITLE Language Development Component Developmental Reading Program: Final Evaluation Report.
INSTITUTION Columbus Public Schools, OH. Dept. of Evaluation Services.
PUB DATE Jul 87
NOTE 55p.; Some pages contain light, broken type.
PUB TYPE Reports - Research/Technical (143)

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC03 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS Communication Skills; *Compensatory Education; Computer Assisted Instruction; Functional Reading; Grade 9; Grade 10; High Schools; Individualized Instruction; Individualized Reading; Literacy; *Program Effectiveness; *Program Evaluation; Reading Difficulties; Reading Instruction; *Reading Programs; Reading Research; Reading Skills; *Remedial Programs
IDENTIFIERS Columbus Public Schools OH

ABSTRACT

Intended to assist underachieving high school pupils in improving their reading and communication skills, the Secondary Developmental Reading Program in the Columbus, Ohio Public Schools, emphasized literacy survival skills and reached 809 pupils in grades 9 and 10 in 13 senior high schools during the 1986-87 school year. The program used diagnostic testing to assess pupils' individual reading strengths and weaknesses, and provided individualized instruction to meet pupils' needs on a daily basis in a small group setting. Some program sites used computer-assisted instruction as well. Success of the program was judged by results of the "Comprehensive Test of Basic Skills" Reading Comprehension Subtest as pretest and posttest, and the General Inservice Evaluation Form, developed locally. Test results showed that none of the program's objectives were met--pupils with good attendance records did not improve their reading scores, nor did the target of 80% of program personnel evaluate the program as successful. The computer users scored no better than other groups on the achievement criterion. Recommendations included rescheduling the program, giving more attention to students' individual needs, and showing greater commitment to the program on the part of teachers and administrators at participating schools. (References and copies of the evaluation materials are appended.) (SKC)

Ohio Disadvantaged Pupil Program Fund

FINAL EVALUATION REPORT
LANGUAGE DEVELOPMENT COMPONENT
SECONDARY DEVELOPMENTAL READING PROGRAM

July 1987

Written by:

Rosemary Lore and Ed Chamberlain
Professional Specialists

Under the Supervision of:

Sharon Bermel
and
Richard A. Amorose, Ph.D.

Columbus, Ohio Public Schools
Department of Evaluation Services
Gary Thompson, Ph.D., Director

Ohio Disadvantaged Pupil Program Fund

FINAL EVALUATION REPORT
LANGUAGE DEVELOPMENT COMPONENT
SECONDARY DEVELOPMENTAL READING
1986-87

ABSTRACT

Program Description: The Secondary Developmental Reading (SDR) Program served 809 pupils in grades 9-10 in 13 senior high schools. Funding of the component was made available through the Ohio Disadvantaged Pupil Program Fund (DPPF).

The purpose of the SDR Program is to assist underachieving high school pupils in raising their reading and communication skills. Emphasis of the program is placed on literacy survival skills necessary to function in our word-oriented world.

Within the 1986-87 SDR Program eight teachers in eight senior high schools participated in a project which utilized Apple computers for computer assisted instruction/computer management system (CAI/CMS). The computers, software, and attendant services were contracted with the Prescription Learning (PL) Company of Springfield, Illinois. The regular treatment group had six teachers in five senior high schools.

Time Interval: For evaluation purposes, the Secondary Developmental Reading Program started on September 15, 1986 and continued through April 3, 1987. This interval of time gave 129 possible days of program instruction. Pupils included in the final pretest-posttest analysis must have attended at least 103 days (80%) during the time period stated above.

Activities: The program made use of diagnostic testing to assess pupils' individual reading strengths and weaknesses. Individualized instruction to meet pupils' needs was provided on a daily basis in a small group setting.

Program Objectives: The program had two objectives. Objective 1.1 stated that an evaluation sample will be comprised of pupils who score at or below the 36%ile on a selection test and are in attendance at least 80% of the instructional period. Pupils who attend 80% of the 6.5 month treatment period will show an average gain in reading of 1.0 NCE for each month, which is an average gain of 6.5 NCE's overall (6.5 months x 1.0 NCE). Objective 2.1 stated that program personnel will be provided at least two inservice sessions and that at least 80% of the personnel attending each session will rate the session as valuable in providing information that will assist them in carrying out their program responsibilities.

Evaluation Design: Objective 1.1 was evaluated through the administration of the Comprehensive Tests of Basic Skills (CTBS) Reading Comprehension subtest. Analyses of the data included comparison of pretest to posttest change scores in terms of grade equivalents, percentiles, and NCE's. Objective 2.1 was evaluated by means of the General Inservice Evaluation Form, a locally constructed instrument.

Major Findings/Recommendations: The information collected on the Pupil Census Forms indicated the program served 809 pupils for an average of 3.5 hours of instruction per week. The average daily membership in the program was 660.5 pupils. The average days of enrollment per pupil was 105.3 days and the average attendance per pupil was 86.8 days. The average number of pupils served per teacher was 47.2.

Objective 1.1, that pupils who attended 80% of the 6.5 month treatment period would show an average gain in reading of 1.0 NCE for each month, was not attained. There was a negative average change of -8.3 or -1.3 NCE/month.

Objective 2.1, that program personnel would be provided at least two inservice sessions and that at least 80% of the personnel attending each session would rate the session as valuable in providing information to assist them in carrying out their program responsibilities, was not attained because one of the two sessions was rated as valuable in carrying out component responsibilities by less than the requisite 80% of the participants. Furthermore, only one of the two sessions was available to all SDR teachers, the other session being specifically for CAI/CMS teachers. When a combined rating of both inservice sessions was computed, an overall average of 88.9% of the participants rated the inservice sessions as valuable in carrying out component responsibilities.

The CAI/CMS project was located in eight high schools. The computer assisted units served 486 pupils. Neither the CAI/CMS project group nor the group receiving regular program instruction attained the achievement criterion. The CAI/CMS group had a negative change of -9.2 NCE's in a 6.5 month period, while the regular group had a negative change of -6.7 NCE's.

A cost-benefit study indicated that cost per pupil was greater and NCE gains smaller in the CAI/CMS group than in the regular group. Based on average daily membership, the cost per pupil was $1180.76 in the CAI/CMS group and $894.37 in the regular group. Differences in NCE gains were noted above. However, CAI/CMS teachers served an average of 8.4 more pupils per teacher than in the regular group, based on average daily membership, and attendance was somewhat better in the CAI/CMS group.

The following program recommendations were made: (a) make the program an elective course for pupils with selection test scores below the 36th percentile; (b) provide more inservice, geared specifically to the high school level, with special stress on reading comprehension; (c) schedule time for cooperative planning between program and classroom teachers, to direct program instruction toward content area of pupil's greatest need; (d) study ways to increase parent involvement; (e) identify problems in the CAI/CMS part of the program and try to find solutions; (f) review selection procedures, correlation of course content to system's Course of Study, instructional methods, class size, and test content to determine why pupils are not showing desired growth; (g) school administrators and staff should take the responsibility of assuring an optimum testing environment by not scheduling unsuitable activities during testing weeks and adjusting class schedules to accommodate the length of the tests; (h) keep conditions for the pretest and for the posttest as comparable as possible; (i) conduct a study by giving ninth grade pupils the standard version of the posttest as well as the customized version, to determine comparability of resultant test scores; and (j) conduct an extensive review of the program to determine whether it should be continued in present form, modified, or discontinued.

Ohio Disadvantaged Pupil Program Fund

FINAL EVALUATION REPORT
LANGUAGE DEVELOPMENT COMPONENT
SECONDARY DEVELOPMENTAL READING PROGRAM

July 1987

Program Description

The Secondary Developmental Reading (SDR) program began in the Columbus Public Schools in the fall of 1971 as a component of the Ohio Disadvantaged Pupil Program Fund. The 1986-87 version of the SDR program was located in 13 Columbus senior high school buildings. Fourteen project reading teachers worked in these 13 schools with 809 pupils in grades 9-10 who scored at or below the 36th percentile on a standardized achievement test in reading used for selection purposes.

Within the 1986-87 SDR program eight teachers in eight senior high schools participated in a project which utilized Apple computers for computer assisted instruction/computer management system (CAI/CMS). The computer software, and attendant services were contracted with the Prescription Learning (PL) Company of Springfield, Illinois. In addition to providing a new technique to reading and language instruction, the use of CAI/CMS was intended to enable teachers to serve more pupils than would be possible in regular SDR classrooms. The use of CAI/CMS was also intended to be a cost-effective alternative to replacing badly worn conventional equipment. Of the 809 pupils in the SDR program, 486 received computer assisted instruction and 323 received regular SDR program instruction.

The purpose of the SDR program was to assist underachieving senior high pupils in raising their reading and communication skills. Emphasis of the program was placed on literacy survival skills necessary to function in our word-oriented world.

Features of the SDR program included the following:

1. Diagnostic testing to assess a pupil's individual reading strengths and weaknesses.
2. Individualized instruction tailored to meet the needs of pupils.
3. Small group instruction.
4. On-going evaluation of pupils to assess their reading needs.
5. Inservice meetings for teachers.

Evaluation Objectives

Objective 1.1 An evaluation sample will be comprised of pupils who score at or below the 36%ile on a selection test and are in attendance at least 80% of the instructional period. The average reading growth of pupils in the evaluation sample and participants in the Computer Assisted Instruction/Computer Management System (CAI/CMS) will be 1.0 normal curve equivalent (NCE) point for each month of instruction.

The program time period established for evaluation purposes was 129 days beginning September 15, 1986, and ending April 3, 1987. This time period (129 days divided by an average of 20 school days per month) is equal to 6.5 possible months of instruction. Analysis of pretest-posttest performance was contingent on pupil attendance for 103 days (80%) of the 129 day period.

Objective 2.1 To provide at least two inservice sessions to program personnel such that at least 80% of the inservice participants will rate each session as valuable in providing information that will assist them in carrying out their program responsibilities.

Evaluation Design

The evaluation design for the SDR program called for the collection of data in three areas.

1. Pupil Census Information

   The Pupil Census Form was developed for the purpose of collecting pupil demographic and participation data in the Secondary Developmental Reading Program (SDR). Project teachers maintained the Pupil Census Forms for all pupils throughout the school year or when the pupils left the program. Data collected on the Pupil Census Forms were the number of days the pupil was enrolled in the program, the number of days the pupil was in attendance, and the average number of hours per week the project teacher served the pupil. Other information collected included the pupil's grade and sex, identification of non-English speaking pupils, identification of any pupil who left the DPPF program because of qualifying for a special education program, and a question regarding a pupil's progress which required a subjective response from the project teacher. A copy of the Pupil Census Form can be found in the Appendix.

2. Standardized Achievement Test Information

   The purpose of the administration of the standardized achievement test was to collect pretest-posttest achievement data on all SDR program pupils to determine if Objective 1.1 was achieved. The standard achievement test used was the Comprehensive Tests of Basic Skills (CTBS), Reading Comprehension (CTB-McGraw Hill, 1981). The CTBS Reading Comprehension tests were administered on September 22 - September 26, 1986, and again on April 6-10, 1987. The following lists the form, subtest and test levels of the CTBS used for each grade level.

Grade	Subtest	Pretest	Posttest
9	Reading Comprehension	Level J Form U	Level J Form V*
10	Reading Comprehension	Level J Form U	Level J Form V

*Estimated by administration of customized Form V.

At posttest time, grade nine was administered a customized test which included items yielding criterion-referenced scores in addition to a customized form of the norm-referenced test. The customized tests were developed by Columbus Public Schools personnel in cooperation with CTB/McGraw Hill to match the Columbus Public Schools Graded Course of Study.

The achievement tests were administered as follows: Pretests for grades 9-10 were administered by program teachers. Posttests for grade 9 were administered as part of Districtwide Testing. Grade 10 was one of the exceptions to Districtwide Testing, and teachers of grade 10 pupils had to administer their own posttests. During Districtwide Testing, tests were administered by classroom teachers with program teachers serving as proctors in some classrooms. Pretesting occurred during the week of September 22 - September 26, 1986; posttesting occurred April 6-10, 1987.

3. Inservice Evaluation

The locally developed General Inservice Evaluation Form was designed to obtain teacher perceptions regarding each inservice session. The form was administered to participants at the close of inservice sessions. A modified version of the form was used for the orientation meeting of September 2, 1986, which was attended by regular SDR and CAI/CMS teachers. There was a total of two inservice meetings - one of which was available to regular SDR teachers and two of which were available to SDR teachers in the CAI/CMS project. The dates and topics of inservice sessions in the 1986-87 school year were as follows:

September 2, 1986	Opening Conference (All SDR teachers - all day program)
March 26, 1987	Introduction of "Newsroom" software (SDR-CAI/CMS teachers and selected regular and CAI/CMS elementary teachers)

Participants completed inservice evaluation forms for both of the above meetings. A copy of the General Inservice Evaluation Form and a copy of the modified version used in the orientation meeting are found in the Appendix.

In addition to the types of data specified in the evaluation design, process evaluation data were obtained in a series of on-site visits to regular SDR and CAI/CMS program classrooms by personnel from the Department of Evaluation Services. The purpose of these observations was to obtain teacher input regarding the program's functioning. Observations were conducted by Edward Chamberlain, project evaluator, in five of the eight (62.5%) SDR CAI/CMS units.

Data collected in the CAI/CMS observations included teacher responses to an interview instrument, CAI/CMS Evaluator's Visitation Log. Observations were made by Rosemary Lore, project evaluator, in two of the six (33.3%) regular SDR units. Data collected in the observations included teachers' responses to an interview instrument, Evaluator's Visitation Log. A copy of each of the observation instruments is found in the Appendix. Findings from these two instruments are summarized in this report. The full interim reports are on file at the Department of Federal and State Programs (Chamberlain, 1987b; Lore, 1987).

Major Findings

Due to the fact that the 1986-87 SDR program contained two treatment groups (regular instruction group and CAI/CMS group), data on enrollment/attendance and achievement testing are reported below in two ways. These data are first presented for the overall program regardless of treatment group. The second presentation compares the two treatment groups in regard to enrollment/attendance data and achievement test data.

In interpreting the pretest-posttest achievement data, the reader should be aware of the pupil selection process. Previous norm-referenced reading achievement data and staff recommendations were used to select and enroll pupils for the SDR program. To be eligible for the program (Objective 1.1) the pupil had to score at or below the 36th percentile on the selection test. Once the eligibility list was established, pupils were selected in order of their test scores with the lowest scoring pupils selected first. Following enrollment, pupils were pretested on the CTBS Reading Comprehension subtest, Level J Form U.

Pupil Census Information

During the 1986-87 school year the SDR program served 809 pupils. Of the 809 pupils, 736 (91.0%) were ninth-graders, and 73 (9.0%) were tenth graders. Of the 809 pupils, 430 (53.2%) attended the minimum number of days (103) to meet the 80% attendance criterion level contained in Objective 1.1. This was a decrease of 8.3% under last year's figure of 61.5%. A breakdown by grade level showed that 397 (53.9%) of the ninth-graders, and 33 (45.2%) of the tenth-graders met the attendance criterion. The average number of days of enrollment and attendance for program pupils was 105.3 and 86.8 respectively. The overall attendance rate for the program (total days of attendance divided by total days of enrollment) was 82.4%, as compared to 84.7% last year. The average daily membership was 660.5, which was an average of 47.2 pupils per teacher as compared to 53.3 pupils per teacher in last year's program. Table 1 contains the pupil attendance data.

Of the 809 pupils served by the program, teachers rated 253 (31.3%) as making much progress, 321 (39.7%) as making some progress, 144 (17.8%) as making little progress, and 91 (11.2%) as making no progress. This was measured by an item on the Pupil Census Form which required a subjective response from the project teachers, regarding their pupils' progress as they exited the SDR program.

The evaluation sample of 357 pupils consisted of those pupils who met three criteria: attended 80% (103) of the 129 program days, received both a pretest and a posttest with the CTBS, and were judged to be English speaking. Of the 357 pupils in the evaluation sample, 331 pupils were in grade 9 and 26 pupils were in grade 10.

Table 1

Number of Pupils Served; Averages for Days of Enrollment, Days of Attendance, Daily Membership and Hours of Instruction Per Week; and Pupils Attending 80% of Days Reported by Grade Level 986-87

Grade	Pupils Served	Girls	Boys	Average Days of Enrollment	Average Days of Attendance	Average Daily Membership	Average Hours of Instruction per Pupil per Week	Pupils Attending 80% of Days
9	736	310	426	106.6	87.8	608.4	3.5	397
10	73	40	33	92.0	75.8	52.0	3.5	33
Total	809	350	459	105.3	86.8	660.5	3.5	430

Standardized Achievement Test Information

The analyses of pretest-posttest achievement data provided minimums, maximums, averages or medians, and differences for derived scores by grade level. The derived scores used in the analyses were percentiles, grade equivalents, and normal curve equivalents. No raw score data are presented because pupils took a different form of the test at pretest and posttest times.

Table 2 contains pretest-posttest percentile data. The median percentile for the pretest was 27.0 at grade 9 and 16.0 at grade 10. The median percentile for the posttest was 13.0 at grade 9 and 19.5 at grade 10. These data indicate that neither grade approached a median percentile score of 36 at posttest time. Further analysis of pretest percentile distributions indicated that 113 (34.1%) of the ninth grade pupils in the sample scored above the 36th percentile on the pretest, even though they had previously qualified for the program on a selection test. Since the program serves mostly ninth grade, this represents 31.7% of the overall evaluation sample of 357 pupils.

Table 3 contains pretest-posttest grade equivalent data. The median grade equivalent score decreased from 7.6 to 7.3 at grade 9 but increased from 8.5 to 8.9 at grade 10.

The presentation of achievement data thus far has included results from the analyses of percentiles and grade equivalents. Both percentiles and grade equivalent scores provide comparative information but are not equal units of measure. Caution is advised in drawing conclusions about program impact from any of the scores above. Normal curve equivalents (NCE's) are generally considered to provide the truest indication of pupil growth in achievement, since they provide comparative information in equal units of measurement. Data for NCE's are presented in Table 4.

Objective 1.1 states that the evaluation sample would be composed of pupils who scored below the 36th percentile on the selection test and were in attendance 80% of the program's treatment period. In order to meet the attendance criterion the pupil had to attend at least 103 days of the 6.5 month (129 days) treatment period. To achieve Objective 1.1 the average growth in reading achievement of pupils in the evaluation sample had to be 1.0 NCE for each month of the treatment period, which is an average of 6.5 NCE's for the 6.5 month treatment period.

The overall NCE change for the program was -8.3 or an average of -1.3 NCE's for each of the 6.5 months of the treatment period. This negative change fell considerably short of the expected evaluation criterion of 1.0 NCE gained for every month the pupils were in the program. A negative change of -8.9 NCE's, or -1.4 NCE's per month, occurred in grade 9. In grade 10 there was a positive change of 0.2 NCE points, or 0.0 NCE's per month. The sample size at grade 10 was 26 pupils.

It should be noted that NCE scores are based on percentiles, which compare the pupil's performance in relation to the general population. No change in NCE score would indicate that pupils have progressed at their normal rate of growth over the school year. Even a small gain in percentile or NCE score would indicate that pupils have advanced over the school year at a greater rate than would be expected from their original position in relation to the general population. Table 5 contains data related to the changes in NCE scores for three ranges: (a) no improvement in NCE scores (0.0 or less), (b) some improvement in NCE scores (0.1 to 6.9), and (c) substantial improvement in NCE

Table 2

Minimum, Maximum, Median, and Standard Deviation
he Pretest and Posttest Percentiles
Reported by Grade Level
1986-87

Grade	Number of Pupils	Pretest				Posttest			
		Min.	Max.	Median Percentile	Standard Deviation	Min.	Max.	Median Percentile	Standard Deviation
9	331	5.0	77.0	27.0	16.2	1.0	99.0	13.0	18.6
10	26	3.0	62.0	16.0	16.7	1.0	80.0	19.5	19.9

Table 3

Minimum, Maximum, Median and Standard Deviation
of the Pretest and Posttest Grade Equivalents
Reported by Grade Level
1986-87

Grade	Number of Pupils	Pretest				Posttest			
		Min.	Max.	Median Grade Equivalents	Standard Deviation	Min.	Max.	Median Grade Equivalent	Standard Deviation
9	331	4.2	12.2	7.6	1.7	4.0	12.9	7.3	2.0
10	26	5.1	12.2	8.5	1.6	4.2	12.9	8.9	2.1

Table 4

Minimum, Maximum, Average, and Standard Deviation of the
Pretest and Posttest Normal Curve Equivalents (NCE)
Reported by Grade Level
1986-87

Grade	Number of Pupils	Pretest				Posttest				Average Change
		Min.	Max.	Average NCE	Standard Deviation	Min.	Max.	Average NCE	Standard Deviation	
9	331	15.0	66.0	37.4	11.0	1.0	97.0	28.5	15.5	-8.9
10	26	11.0	56.0	32.3	11.7	1.0	68.0	32.5	15.8	0.2
Total	357			37.0				28.8		-8.3

Table 5

Change Categories for NCE Scores
for Total SDR program
1986-87

	Pupils in Sample	No Improvement (0.0 or less)	Some Improvement (0.1 to 6.9)	Substantial Improvement (7.0 or more)
Grade 9				
Number of Pupils	331	266	26	39
% of Pupils		80.4%	7.9%	11.8%
Grade 10				
Number of Pupils	26	13	4	9
% of Pupils		50.0%	15.4%	34.6%
Totals				
Number of Pupils	357	279	30	48
% of Pupils		78.2%	8.4%	13.4%

scores (7.0 or more). The data indicate that 78 (21.8%) pupils made gains in NCE scores. This means that 21.8% of the pupils in the evaluation sample progressed at a rate that was greater than normal for them. More specifically, 48 (13.4%) made significant improvement and 30 (8.4%) made some improvement in NCE scores, while 279 pupils (78.2%) of the evaluation sample made no improvement, as evidenced by a gain of 0.0 or decrease in NCE score. In regard to grade level, 13 of 26 (50.0%) tenth grade pupils showed progress, while 65 of 331 (19.6%) of ninth grade pupils showed positive progress.

Tables 6-10 present comparisons between the group of pupils receiving computer assisted instruction/computer management system (CAI/CMS) in reading and the group receiving the regular program instruction. As indicated in Table 6, there were 486 pupils served by the CAI/CMS project and 323 pupils who received regular reading instruction. The CAI/CMS group averaged 8.8 more days of attendance per pupil with an overall average of 90.3 days as compared to 81.5 days for the regular group. The average number of days attended was greater for grade 9 than for grade 10 in the CAI/CMS group but greater for grade 10 than for grade 9 in the regular group. In the CAI/CMS group 276 of the 486 pupils served (56.8%) met the program attendance criterion by attending at least 103 days. In the regular treatment group the attendance criterion was met by 154 (47.7%) of the 323 pupils served. The evaluation sample of 357 pupils was comprised of 223 pupils in the CAI/CMS group and 134 pupils in the regular group. Achievement data for the two subpopulations of the program are presented in Tables 7-10.

Percentile score comparisons are presented in Table 7. In grade 9 the median percentile score regressed from 27.0 to 12.0 in the CAI/CMS group and from 31.0 to 15.0 in the regular treatment group. At grade 10 the median percentile progressed from 11.0 to 18.0 in the CAI/CMS group and also progressed from 22.0 to 25.0 in the regular treatment group.

Table 8 presents comparisons in terms of median grade equivalent scores. Positive changes occurred in grade 10 of both the regular treatment group and the CAI/CMS group but not in grade 9 of either CAI/CMS or the regular group. The median grade equivalent score decreased from 7.6 to 6.9 in grade 9 of the CAI/CMS group and from 8.0 to 7.6 in grade 9 of the regular group. A positive change occurred in grade 10, where the median grade equivalent score increased from 7.6 to 8.8 in the CAI/CMS group and from 8.8 to 9.1 in the regular group. In grade 10 the overall sample was smaller (26 pupils, 7.3%), while grade 9 comprised the bulk of the pupils (331 pupils, 92.7%).

As indicated earlier, NCE scores are generally considered to provide the most comparative information in equal units of measurement. Data for the two groups in terms of NCE scores are presented in Table 9. The data indicate that the average NCE change within the CAI/CMS group was -9.7 NCE points in grade 9, where there were 212 pupils in the sample, and 0.3 NCE points in grade 10, where there were 11 pupils in the sample. In the regular treatment group the 119 pupils in grade 9 had an average change of -7.6 NCE points, and the sample of 15 pupils in grade 10 had an average gain of 0.1 NCE point. Neither SDR group met the criterion of Objective 1.1 with a change of 6.5 NCE points, or 1.0 NCE points for each month of instruction. An overall comparison of the two treatment groups is obtained by examining the average NCE changes across grade levels. The average change for the CAI/CMS group was -9.2 NCE points over the 6.5 month treatment period. The regular treatment group did somewhat better with an average change of -6.7 NCE points in the same 6.5 month treatment period.

Table 6

Number of Pupils Served, Averages for Days of Enrollment, Days of Attendance, Daily Membership and Hours of Instruction Per Week, and Pupils Attending 80% of Days Reported by Grade Level for Pupils Receiving Reading Instruction with Computers (CAI/CMS Group) and Pupils Receiving Reading Instruction without Computers (Regular Group) 1986-87

Grade	Pupils Served	Girls	Boys	Average Days of Enrollment	Average Days of Attendance	Average Daily Membership	Average Hrs. of Inst. Per Pupil Per Week	Pupils Attending 80% of Days
CAI/CMS Group								
9	450	184	266	109.4	92.1	381.7	3.5	263
10	36	21	15	87.0	68.5	24.3	3.5	13
Total	486	205	281	107.8	90.3	406.0	3.5	276
Regular Group								
9	286	126	160	102.3	81.3	226.8	3.6	134
10	37	19	18	96.8	82.8	27.8	3.6	20
Total	323	145	178	101.7	81.5	254.5	3.6	154

Table 7

Minimum, Maximum, Median, and Standard Deviation
of the Pretest and Posttest Percentiles Reported by Grade Level
for Pupils Receiving Reading Instruction with Computers (CAI/CMS Group)
and Pupils Receiving Reading Instruction without Computers (Regular Group)
1986-87

Grade	Number of Pupils	Pretest				Posttest			
		Min.	Max.	Median Percentile	Standard Deviation	Min.	Max.	Median Percentile	Standard Deviation
CAI/CMS Group									
9	212	5.0	74.0	27.0	16.0	1.0	99.0	12.0	17.6
10	11	3.0	38.0	11.0	9.3	1.0	43.0	18.0	14.6
Regular Group									
9	119	5.0	77.0	31.0	16.6	1.0	94.0	15.0	20.0
10	15	8.0	62.0	22.0	17.9	8.0	80.0	25.0	22.3

Table 8

Minimum, Maximum, Median, and Standard Deviation
of the Pretest and Posttest Grade Equivalents Reported by Grade Level
for Pupils Receiving Reading Instruction with Computers (CAI/CMS Group)
and Pupils Receiving Reading Instruction without Computers (Regular Group)
1986-87

		Pretest				Posttest			
Grade	Number of Pupils	Min.	Max.	Median Grade Equivalents	Standard Deviation	Min.	Max.	Median Grade Equivalent	Standard Deviation
CAI/CMS Group									
9	212	4.2	11.8	7.6	1.7	4.0	12.9	6.9	1.9
10	11	5.1	9.4	7.6	1.1	4.2	10.0	8.8	2.3
Regular Group									
9	119	4.2	12.2	8.0	1.7	4.0	12.9	7.6	2.1
10	15	6.5	12.2	8.8	1.6	7.5	12.9	9.1	1.6

Table 9

Minimum, Maximum, Average, and Standard Deviation of the
Pretest and Posttest Normal Curve Equivalents (NCE) Reported by Grade Level
for Pupils Receiving Reading Instruction with Computers (CAI/CMS Group)
and Pupils Receiving Reading Instruction without Computers (Regular Group)
1986-87

Grade	Number of Pupils	Pretest				Posttest				Average Change
		Min.	Max.	Average NCE	Standard Deviation	Min.	Max.	Average NCE	Standard Deviation	
CAI/CMS Group										
9	212	15.0	64.0	37.1	11.1	1.0	97.0	27.4	15.0	-9.7
10	11	11.0	44.0	25.6	8.3	1.0	46.0	25.9	16.4	0.3
Total	223			36.5				27.3		-9.2
Regular Group										
9	119	15.0	66.0	38.0	11.0	1.0	83.0	30.4	16.1	-7.6
10	15	20.0	56.0	37.1	11.6	21.0	68.0	37.3	13.9	0.1
Total	134			37.9				31.2		-6.7

Table 10 compares the CAI/CMS and regular groups in regard to numbers and percents of pupils who evidenced no improvement, some improvement, and substantial improvement, as previously defined. The data indicate that 37 pupils (27.6%) of the regular group pupils made positive gains in NCE scores, while 41 pupils (18.4%) of CAI/CMS groups did so. Positive gains in the regular group included 24 pupils (17.9%) who made substantial improvement and 13 pupils (9.7%) who made some improvement. Positive gains in the CAI/CMS group included 24 pupils (10.8%) making substantial improvement, and 17 pupils (7.6%) making some improvement.

Inservice Evaluation Information

Objective 2.1 stated that program personnel would be provided at least two inservice sessions and that at least 80% of the personnel attending each session would rate the session as valuable in providing information that would assist them in carrying out their program responsibilities. A total of two inservice meetings was provided by the Department of Federal and State Programs. All SDR teachers were given the opportunity to attend the orientation meeting of September 2, 1986, but the meeting of March 26, 1987, was limited to CAI/CMS teachers. A modified version of the General Inservice Evaluation Form was used for the orientation meeting while the other inservice meeting was assessed using the regular General Inservice Evaluation Form.

Analysis of teachers' ratings to individual inservice meetings indicated that 71.4% of the teachers attending the overall program meeting of September 2, 1986, either agreed or strongly agreed that the meeting was valuable in assisting them in their program. The one other inservice meeting was held for SDR-CAI/CMS teachers and received favorable ratings by 100% of the participants.

Objective 2.1 states that program personnel will be provided at least two inservice sessions such that at least 80% of the inservice participants will rate each session as valuable in providing information that will assist them in carrying out their program responsibilities. Although there were two inservice meetings provided, as per the criterion of the objective, it should be noted, again, that only one meeting (orientation) was provided to all program personnel; the other was provided for SDR-CAI/CMS teachers. The 80% criterion was not attained since one of the two inservice meetings received favorable ratings by less than 80% of the participants, at 71.4%.

Table 11 contains a summary of the combined teacher ratings for both of the inservice programs. In this combined rating, 88.9% of the participants agreed or strongly agreed that the information in the meetings would assist them in their program. Ratings were based on the following five-point scale:

1 = Strongly Disagree
2 = Disagree
3 = Undecided
4 = Agree
5 = Strongly Agree

Table 10

Change Categories for NCE Scores for Total SDR Program Reported by Grade Level for Pupils Receiving Reading Instruction with Computers (CAI/CMS Group) and Pupils Receiving Reading Instruction without Computers (Regular Group)
1986-87

	Pupils in Sample	No Improvement (0.0 or less)	Some Improvement (0.1 to 6.9)	Substantial Improvement (7.0 or more)
CAI/CMS Group				
Grade 9				
Number of Pupils	212	177	15	20
% of Pupils		83.5%	7.1%	9.4%
Grade 10				
Number of Pupils	11	5	2	4
% of Pupils		45.5%	18.2%	36.4%
Total				
Number of Pupils	223	182	17	24
% of Pupils		81.6%	7.6%	10.8%
Regular Group				
Grade 9				
Number of Pupils	119	89	11	19
% of Pupils		74.8%	9.2%	16.0%
Grade 10				
Number of Pupils	15	8	2	5
% of Pupils		53.3%	13.3%	33.3%
Total				
Number of Pupils	134	97	13	24
% of Pupils		72.4%	9.7%	17.9%

Table 11

Average Response and Percent of Response
For Reactions to Inservice Statements

Statements	Number Responding	Average Response	Percent SA (5)	A (4)	U (3)	D (2)	SD (1)
1. I think this was a very worthwhile meeting.	18	4.3	61.1	22.2	5.6	11.1	0.0
2. The information presented in the meeting will assist me in my program.	18	4.3	55.6	33.3	0.0	11.1	0.0
3. There was time to ask questions pertaining to the presentation.	17	4.5	64.7	29.4	0.0	0.0	5.9
4. Questions were answered adequately.	16	4.4	68.8	18.8	6.3	0.0	6.3

Open-ended comments on the General Inservice Evaluation Form asked participants to comment about the most and least valuable parts of the meetings and about information they would like to have covered in future meetings. The evaluation reports on individual sessions have been forwarded to the Department of State and Federal Programs and are available on request.

In regard to the most valuable parts of the inservice meetings, teachers liked the exhibits and materials session of the orientation meeting. They also liked meeting with experienced program teachers and meeting new program teachers. The March 26 inservice which featured hands-on experience with the "Newsroom" computer software was popular. For the question dealing with the least valuable part, teachers felt that the orientation meeting didn't meet the needs of secondary labs (they said sessions were geared to elementary and middle schools). In addition, they felt that there was not enough time for viewing exhibits and materials. Four of the suggestions for future meetings dealt with the desire to have meetings that deal specifically with secondary programs, with one teacher saying: "If sessions are not to be addressed to high school level, let us use the time for ordering materials." Four other suggestions for inservice were for more programs to help students develop writing skills, two were for inservice about computer lab materials suitable for high school level, and two were for new computer software inservice.

It is concluded that the second criterion of Objective 2.1 was not attained, because one of the two meetings was rated as valuable in carrying out component responsibilities by less than the requisite 80% of the participants. The other remaining meeting, however, was favorably rated by 100% of the participants. When a combined rating of both inservice meetings was computed, an overall average of 88.9% of the participants rated the inservice sessions as valuable in carrying out program responsibilities.

School Visitation Information

In addition to the types of data specified in the evaluation design, process evaluation data were obtained by means of on-site visits. Five CAI/CMS teachers and two of the regular SDR teachers were interviewed during the school year during visits by project evaluators. These visits occurred in March 1987.

A locally developed instrument, the CAI/CMS Evaluator's Visitation Log, was used in interviewing teachers in the CAI/CMS portion of the program. The interviews dealt with general program concerns, as well as items specific to the CAI/CMS setting. The interview sample consisted of five of the eight CAI/CMS teachers in the program.

Although some technical difficulties had occurred with computers, nearly all had been satisfactorily resolved. Teachers reported that there was no problem obtaining printed materials to go with their program. The materials are promptly supplied by Prescription Learning Company. Computer effectiveness for diagnosis and instruction was rated on a five-point scale, with average ratings of 3.8 for diagnosis and 4.2 for instruction.

Teachers gave testing procedures an average rating of only 2.4 on a five-point rating scale. The chief problem with testing, as perceived by CAI/CMS teachers, was the difference between testing conditions in pretest and posttest administrations. Although the pretest is given by the program teacher in the lab, the posttest for grade 9 is administered in a larger group as part of Districtwide Testing. There was also a feeling that standardized tests do not tell the whole story of pupil progress.

Program goals and objectives perceived by CAI/CMS teachers included the 40 skills objectives around which the Prescription Learning program is centered, raising the pupil's reading level, and getting pupils to enjoy reading. Establishment of classroom policies and rules, use of reward systems, and organized work schedules were among the techniques used by teachers to maximize the use of learning time. Teachers reported that they convey their expectations for learning and behavior verbally to the pupils, and that praise and encouragement are used to provide recognition and feedback to the pupils. Various methods and materials were cited as helpful in teaching reading comprehension. Materials mentioned by teachers included Prescription Learning materials, newspapers, and the Barnell-Loft Specific Skills Series. The most frequently mentioned tools for diagnosis were those provided by Prescription Learning Company.

In the regular SDR visitations, the locally developed instrument, Evaluator's Visitation Log, was centered around questions designed to gather information about the major facets of the SDR program. There were open-ended questions covering such aspects of the program as goals and objectives and coordinating with the regular classroom teacher. Twelve rating scales were used to gather information suitable to the use of descriptors. Some highlights of the responses to the open-ended questions in the interviews follow: Teachers' major goals and objectives are to increase pupils' comprehension levels as much as possible; use informal and formal assessment to diagnose pupils' strengths and weaknesses so that they can prescribe a program for them; use varied materials and methods for teaching comprehension so that pupils don't get bored; make maximum use of learning time through discipline, goal setting, clear directions, and daily routines. Teachers let pupils know they had high expectations for them by "telling them," and giving them challenging work; providing feedback and recognition by giving praise and tangible rewards;

monitoring student progress by conferring with classroom teachers and grading papers. Teachers expressed concern about not having more inservice - regular SDR teachers had only one meeting, which they felt did not address their concerns. They spoke of the difficulty of coordinating their programs with the classroom teachers because of lack of common conference times and location of rooms. Another area of concern was the poor response of parents to teachers' attempts at involvement.

Additional questions were rating scales and dealt with the importance of coordinating instruction with the classroom teacher, communication with classroom teachers, parent responses to program teachers' efforts at program involvement, environmental temperature and noise level, selection procedures, scheduling, testing procedures, evaluation feedback, facilities, space, and materials. Teachers were asked to rate these facets of their programs on a five-point rating scale where the lowest descriptors (Unimportant, Very Poor, Inadequate) were rated as "1" and the highest descriptors (Very important, Very Good, Very Adequate) were rated as "5." Facets receiving a rating of "3" or higher were: selection procedures (3.5), scheduling (4.0), evaluation feedback (4.5), communication with classroom teachers (3.0), environmental temperature (3.0), and facilities (3.0). There was great concern about parent response to program teachers' efforts at program involvement (1.5) and concern about the environmental noise level (1.5). A copy of the Evaluator's Visitation Log appears as part of the Appendix.

Cost-Benefit Analysis Information

The program evaluation included one further analysis not in the original evaluation design: a cost-benefit analysis (Chamberlain, 1987a) comparing the CAI/CMS group and the regular group. This analysis is summarized in Table 12. Costs included in the analysis included teacher salaries and the contract cost for Prescription Learning Laboratory Reading Labs. Normal supplies and incidental costs were not known in regard to the two groups but were assumed to be evenly distributed. Any error of cost estimate resulting from unknown costs would probably be in the direction of underestimating the cost for the Regular group, since most instructional materials for the CAI/CMS group were included in the Prescription Learning Laboratory contract costs. The cost-benefit analysis indicated that the cost per pupil was $286.39 more per pupil in the CAI/CMS group than in the regular treatment group when computed on average daily membership. However, the use of computers enabled CAI/CMS teachers to serve an average of 8.4 more pupils per teacher than in the Regular group (based on average daily membership).

In the CAI/CMS group 56.8% of the pupils served attained the program's attendance criterion, compared to 47.7% of pupils in the regular treatment group who met the attendance criterion. The evaluation sample, which depends heavily on attainment of the attendance criterion, was comprised of 45.9% of all pupils served in the CAI/CMS group compared to 41.5% of all pupils served in the regular treatment group. As noted earlier, there was a negative change in NCE scores in both groups. The average change for the regular group was -6.7, while the NCE change for the CAI/CMS group was -9.2.

Summary

The Secondary Developmental Reading Program is an individualized learning program designed to assist secondary pupils who are having reading problems. During the 1986-87 school year, 14 project teachers working in 13 senior high schools served a total of 809 pupils in grades 9-10.

Table 12

Cost-Benefit Analysis for 1986-87 Secondary Developmental Reading Program
Comparing Group Receiving Computer Assisted Instruction/Computer
Management System (CAI/CMS) and Group Receiving Regular Program Instruction

Program	Number of Teachers	Program Cost		Average Daily Membership		Cost Per Pupil	Percent of Pupils Meeting Attendance Criterion	Ratio of Sample to Pupils Served	Average NCE Gain
		Total	Per Teacher	In Program	Per Teacher				
SDR-PLL (grades 9-10 with CAI/CMS)	8	479,390.08	59,923.76	406.0	50.8	1180.76	56.8%	45.9%	-9.2
SDR (grades 9-10 Regular group)	6	227,617.56	37,936.26	254.5	42.4	894.37	47.7%	41.5%	-6.7

The program had two objectives. Objective 1.1 stated that pupils who attended 80% of the 6.5 month treatment period would show an average gain in reading of 1.0 NCE for each month, which is an average gain of 6.5 NCE's overall (6.5 months x 1.0 NCE). This objective was not attained. The program showed an overall negative change of -8.3 NCE points for the 6.5 month treatment period, or -1.3 NCE's per month. In grade 10, the NCE gain was 0.2 NCE for the treatment period, or 0.0 NCE per month. The negative change in grade 9 was -8.9 NCE's for the treatment period, or -1.4 NCE's per month.

Teacher perceptions of pupil progress, as measured by an item on the Pupil Census Form, suggested that they felt there was more pupil progress than test scores indicated. Of the 809 pupils served by the program, teachers rated 253 (31.3%) as making much progress, 321 (39.7%) as making some progress, 144 (17.8%) as making little progress, and 91 (11.2%) as making no progress.

Objective 2.1 stated that program personnel would be provided at least two inservice meetings and that at least 80% of the personnel attending each meeting would rate the meeting as valuable in providing information that would assist them in carrying out their program responsibilities. There was a total of two inservice meetings provided by the Department of Federal and State Programs. Regular and CAI/CMS program teachers were given the opportunity to attend the orientation meeting. The other meeting was for CAI/CMS teachers. One of the meetings was rated as valuable in carrying out program responsibilities by more than the requisite 80% of participants. However, objective 2.1 was not attained because one of the two sessions was rated as valuable in carrying out component responsibilities by less than the requisite 80% of the participants.

Program teacher interviews during school visitation process evaluation indicated that teachers were concerned about the paucity of inservice meetings. Regular SDR teachers had only one meeting, which they felt did not address their concerns. Also, teachers spoke of the difficulty of coordinating their programs with the classroom teachers because of lack of common conference times and location of rooms. Another area of concern was the poor response of parents to teachers' attempts at involvement. There was a perception among CAI/CMS teachers that the ninth grade posttest was given under less favorable conditions than was the pretest.

The CAI/CMS project was located in eight high schools. The computer assisted units served 486 pupils, while 323 pupils were served in the Regular group. Neither the CAI/CMS project group nor the group receiving regular program instruction attained the achievement criterion. The CAI/CMS group had a negative change of -9.2 NCE's in a 6.5 month period, while the Regular group had a negative change of -6.7 NCE's.

During process evaluation teachers expressed a belief that one cause for the poor NCE growth of SDR pupils was differences in test administration (pretest-small group; posttest-large group). It should be noted that in 1984-85, the first year the CTBS was adopted as the pretest and posttest instrument, SDR pupils did not meet criterion - even when program teachers controlled the testing environment. In that year SDR pupils made an overall average negative change of -2.5 NCE points.

A cost-benefit study indicated that cost per pupil was greater and NCE gains smaller in the CAI/CMS group than in the Regular group. Based on average daily membership, the cost per pupil was $286.39 more in the CAI/CMS group than in the

Regular group. The Regular group made a negative average NCE change of -6.7, while the CAI/CMS group made a negative average change of -9.2. However, CAI/CMS teachers were able to serve an average of 8.4 more pupils per teacher than in the Regular group, based on average daily membership. Attendance also was somewhat better in the CAI/CMS group than in the Regular group as judged by the percent of pupils attaining the program's attendance criterion of attending 80% of the days in a 6.5 month treatment period. The percent of pupils attaining this attendance criterion was 56.8% in the CAI/CMS group, as compared to 47.7% in the Regular group.

During the 1986-87 school year, the Secondary Developmental Reading Program experienced problems in several areas.

1. Pupil achievement: In terms of NCE scores, 78.2% of the pupils in the sample showed no improvement; 8.4% showed some improvement but did not attain the achievement criterion of 1.0 NCE per month; and 13.4% met the achievement criterion.

2. Pupil attendance: The average pupil was enrolled in the program 105.3 days but attended only 86.8 days. The overall attendance rate (total days of attendance divided by total days of enrollment) was 82.4%, which averages out to an absence rate of .88 day per week. Part of the problem appears to be that the average pupil was not enrolled in the program long enough to expect meeting the requisite number of days of attendance (103 days) to attain the attendance criterion.

3. Inservice: The program had two inservice meetings this year, as per Objective 2.1. However, only one meeting was available to all program teachers, and this meeting did not attain a positive rating by the requisite 80% of program teachers.

4. Coordination of program with classroom teacher: Process evaluation indicated that program teachers had difficulty coordinating their programs with the classroom teachers because of lack of conference times and location of rooms.

5. Parent involvement: Process evaluation indicated low parent response to program teachers' efforts at encouraging parent participation in the program.

Recommendations

Since the Secondary Developmental Reading Program is to be continued for he 1987-88 school year, consideration should be given to the following:

1. The program should become an elective course for those pupils who scored at or below the 36th percentile on a selection test. All eligible pupils should be approached and made aware of the program opportunity. Pupils would receive one-half credit for the year contingent on their fulfillment of a signed contract to attend 80% of the program days, and upon the program teacher's judgment of pupil effort.

2. More inservice should be provided for program personnel, and should be geared specifically to the high school level. Methods of teaching reading comprehension should be especially stressed in the inservice.

3. Coordination of program instruction with classroom instruction should be facilitated by time for communication between program and classroom teachers at regularly scheduled meeting times. Program instruction should be directed toward success in the content area where the pupil needs the most help.

4. New ways for encouraging parent involvement need to be studied. Efforts such as having evening meetings, visiting homes, or rewards such as door prizes might be some possible approaches. An inservice where teachers could "brainstorm" might be fruitful in generating creative solutions to this problem.

5. Further expansion of the CAI/CMS project is not warranted at this time until greater effectiveness can be demonstrated. If the CAI/CMS program is to continue at the high school level, a careful review of the present program is indicated. Problem areas should be identified, and solutions proposed. Positive aspects of the program should also be identified. One approach that is suggested would be to form a focus group comprised of all eight CAI/CMS teachers.

6. Review selection procedures, correlation of course content to system's Course of Study, instructional methods, class size, and test content to determine why pupils are not showing desired growth.

7. School administrators and staff should take the responsibility of assuring an optimum testing environment by not scheduling unsuitable activities during testing weeks and by adjusting class schedules to accommodate the length of the tests.

8. Conditions for the pretest and for the posttest should be as comparable as possible with all examiners trained to give the tests per instructions in the Examiners' Manuals. Pupils should not be tested in groups larger than recommended by the testing company.

9. A study should be made to assess the comparability between the standard and customized versions of the ninth grade test. The study could be conducted as part of Districtwide Testing, using a representative sample of the district's ninth grade population.

10. Extensive review of this program should be continued in regard to policies and procedures, selection, scheduling, attendance patterns, test administration, and achievement test scores. The review should determine whether the model for the program should be continued in its present form, modified, or discontinued.

References

CTB/Mc-Graw-Hill Staffwriters. Comprehensive Tests of Basic Skills. Monterey, California: CTB/McGraw-Hill, 1981.

Chamberlain, E. Cost-benefit analysis for 1986-87 ECIA Chapter 1 and State DPPF Programs comparing groups receiving regular program instruction and groups receiving computer assisted instruction/computer management system (CAI/CMS). Supplemental Cost-Benefit Study, Columbus Public Schools, 1987.

Chamberlain, E. Process evaluation data from teacher interviews in CLEAR and SDR program units using computer assisted instruction/computer management system. Interim Evaluation Report, Columbus Public School, 1987.

Lore, R. T. Report of school visitation to regular CLEAR and SDR classrooms, 1986-87. Interim Evaluation Report, Columbus Public Schools, 1987.

APPENDIX

COLUMBUS PUBLIC SCHOOLS - Columbus, Ohio PUPIL CENSUS FORM

TEACHER NUMBER | PROGRAM CODE

LAST NAME | FIRST NAME | M I | SEX | TEACHER NUMBER

SCHOOL | H R | GRADE

USE A NUMBER 2 PENCIL. ERASE COMPLETELY WHEN MAKING CORRECTIONS.

STUDENT | SCHOOL | GRADE | SEX

MALE ○

FEMALE ○

TOTAL DAYS OF PROGRAM ENROLLMENT 1 2 3

TOTAL DAYS OF PROGRAM ATTENDANCE 4 5 6

HOURS OF INSTRUCTION PER WEEK

WAS THIS A "NON-ENGLISH SPEAKING" STUDENT?

YES * NO *

DID THIS PUPIL BECOME QUALIFIED FOR A SPECIAL ED. PROGRAM?

YES * NO *

HOW DID YOU FEEL THIS PUPIL PROGRESSED WHILE IN YOUR PROGRAM?

MUCH PROGRESS * SOME PROGRESS * LITTLE PROGRESS * NO PROGRESS *

NCS Trans Optic 08 8153 32

1986-87
Teacher Census Form

Social Security Number __ __ __-__ __-__ __ __ __

Name_____ Program Code_____

School Assignment_____ Cost Center _____

Circle only the program you are in:

ECIA Chapter 1 Programs:
(1) ADK
(2) CLEAR-Elementary (1-5)
(3) CLEAR-Elementary-CAI (4-5)
(4) CLEAR-Middle School (6-8)
(5) CLEAR-Middle-CAI (6-8)

DPPF Programs:
(6) SDR (9-10)
(7) SDR-CAI (9-10)
(8) HSCA
Other (Specify)_____

[a]Number of Years of Teaching Experience_____

[b]Number of Years of Title I/Chapter 1 Teaching Experience_____

[c]I am certified in reading as indicated by the subject area on my teaching certificate.

_____Yes _____No

Highest College Degree Received_____

Full-Time Employee_____
or
Part-Time Employee_____

- -

[a]Total all years of experience, including those which may have occurred outside of the City of Columbus. Please include present school year.

[b]1. For every full year taught in Title I/Chapter 1 give yourself 10 months experience. Please include the present school year.

2. For every summer term you taught in Title I give yourself two months experience.

3. Add in any miscellaneous experience, a part-year perhaps.

4. Add the totals for 1, 2, and 3 and divide by 10. Place the resulting quotient in the blank for question b above.

[c]Certification is defined as having one of the following:

1. reading specified on Bachelor degree.

2. reading specialist certificate.

3. M.A. in reading as a subject.

GENERAL INSERVICE EVALUATION FORM

Inservice Topic:_____

Presenter(s):_____

Date: _____ (e.g., 03/05/86)

Session: _____a.m. and/or _____p.m.

Circle only the program you are in:

ECIA Chapter 1 Programs:
(1) ADK
(2) CLEAR-Reading Recovery
(3) CLEAR-Elementary (1-5)
(4) CLEAR-Elementary-CAI
(5) CLEAR-Middle School (6-8)
(6) CLEAR-Middle School-CAI

DPPF Programs:
(7) SDR (9-10)
(8) SDR-CAI
(9) HSCA
Other (Specify)_____

Circle the number that indicates the extent to which you agree with statements 1-4.

	Strongly Agree	Agree	Undecided	Disagree	Strongly Disagree
1. I think this was a very worthwhile meeting.	5	4	3	2	1
2. The information presented in this meeting will assist me in my program.	5	4	3	2	1
3. There was time to ask questions pertaining to the presentation.	5	4	3	2	1
4. Questions were answered adequately.	5	4	3	2	1

5. What was the most valuable part of this meeting?_____

_____

6. What was the least valuable part of this meeting?_____ _____

_____

7. What additional information or topics would you like to see covered in future meetings?_____

_____

_____

EVALSRVCS/P502/GENINSFRM

ECIA CHAPTER 1
ORIENTATION INSERVICE EVALUATION FORM
September 2, 1986

Circle only the program you are in:

ECIA Chapter 1 Programs:
(1) ADK
(2) CLEAR-Elementary (1-5)
(3) CLEAR-Elementary-CAI (4-5)
(4) CLEAR-Middle School (6-8)
(5) CLEAR-Middle-CAI (6-8)

DPPF Programs:
(6) SDR (9-10)
(7) SDR-CAI (9-10)
(8) HSCA
Other (Specify)_____

Circle the number that indicates the extent to which you agree with statements 1-4, in rating the overall day of inservice.

	Strongly Agree	Agree	Undecided	Disagree	Strongly Disagree
1. I think this was a very worthwhile inservice.	5	4	3	2	1
2. The information presented in this inservice will assist me in my program.	5	4	3	2	1
3. There was time to ask questions pertaining to the presentations.	5	4	3	2	1
4. Questions are answered adequately.	5	4	3	2	1

Circle the number that indicates how you would rate each of the following portions of today's inservice in regard to interest and usefulness of presentations.

	Superior	Excellent	Good	Fair	Poor
5. Large Group Session					
a. Interest	5	4	3	2	1
b. Usefulness	5	4	3	2	1
6. Commercial Exhibits					
a. Interest	5	4	3	2	1
b. Usefulness	5	4	3	2	1
7. Mini-session with main speaker					
a. Interest	5	4	3	2	1
b. Usefulness	5	4	3	2	1

	Superior	Excellent	Good	Fair	Poor
8. Chapter 1 mini-session					
a. Interest	5	4	3	2	1
b. Usefulness	5	4	3	2	1
c. Clarity of instructions	5	4	3	2	1
9. Evaluation Presentation					
a. Interest	5	4	3	2	1
b. Usefulness	5	4	3	2	1
c. Clarity of instructions	5	4	3	2	1

10. What was the most valuable part of this meeting?_____

_____

11. What was the least valuable part of this meeting?_____

_____

12. What additional information or topics would you like to see covered in future meetings?

_____

_____

_____

Columbus Public Schools

ECIA Chapter 1 and DPPF-SDR Programs

EVALUATOR'S VISITATION LOG

____	CLEAR-Elem (1-5)
____	CLEAR-Mid (6-8)
____	SDR (9-10)

School_____ Date _____

Program Teacher _____Evaluator_____

A. Questions 1-11 (Open-ended Comments)

1. Does your program have goals and objectives? Explain.

_____

_____

2. What diagnostic test(s) or methods do you use?_____

_____

_____

3. How have the results of the diagnostic test(s) or methods been helpful in adjusting your approach to instruction? _____

_____

_____

4. What instructional methods and materials have you found particularly effective in improving reading comprehension?_____

_____

_____

5. What do you do to promote the maximum use of academic learning time? (Time on Task)_____

6. How do you let pupils know that you have high expectations for their learning and behavior?_____

7. How do you give recognition and provide feedback to pupils? What seems to work best?_____

8. How do you monitor student progress?_____

9. Did your pupils make as much progress in reading last year as you had hoped? If yes, why; if no, why not?_____

10. In what way has current research and/or inservice been helpful in your approach to instruction? _____

11. What, if anything, do you regularly do to coordinate your program with the reading program the pupils receive from their classroom teacher?

Circle the number that indicates the extent to which the program teacher agrees.

B. Questions 12-23 (Rating Scale)

12.	Importance of Coordinating Instruction with Classroom Teacher	Very Important 5	4	3	2	Unimportant 1
13.	Communication with Classroom Teachers	Very Good 5	4	3	2	Very Poor 1
14.	Parent Response to Your Efforts at Program Involvement	Very Good 5	4	3	2	Very Poor 1
15.	Environmental Temperature	5	4	3	2	1
16.	Environmental Noise Level	5	4	3	2	1
17.	Selection Procedures	Very Adequate 5	4	3	2	Inadequate 1
18.	Scheduling	5	4	3	2	1
19.	Testing Procedures	5	4	3	2	1
20.	Evaluation Feedback	5	4	3	2	1
21.	Facilities	5	4	3	2	1
22.	Space	5	4	3	2	1
23.	Materials	5	4	3	2	1

C. Question 24 (Yes No)

24. Do you have any Pupil Census Forms or Add Forms you would like to give me today?

Columbus Public Schools

ECIA Chapter 1 and DPPF-SDR Programs

CAI/CMS EVALUATOR'S VISITATION LOG

1.Type of school (check one):

_____Elementary
_____Middle School
_____High School

Type of computer

____Apple
____PET
____Dolphin
____Other_____

Company Servicing Computers

____Prescription Learning
____Houghton-Mifflin
____Other_____
____None

2. Computer Technical Difficulties

	Frequency of Occurrence			Were the Problems Resolved Satisfactorily		
	Seldom or Never	Occasionally	Frequently	Yes	No	Partially
a. Minor difficulties	_____	_____	_____	___	___	____
b. Major difficulties	_____	_____	_____	___	___	____

3. Are there any problems getting printed materials that go with the program?_____

_____

_____

4. Does your program have goals and objectives? Explain. _____

_____

_____

EVALSRVCS/P506/VISITCAI

5. How important is it to coordinate instruction with the classroom teacher?

Very Important				Unimportant
5	4	3	2	1

6. What, if anything, do you regularly do to coordinate your reading program with the reading program the pupils receive from their classroom teacher?_____

_____

_____

7. In general, how would you rate the degree of communication between you and the classroom teacher?

Very Good				Very Poor
5	4	3	2	1

8. In general how would you rate parent response to your efforts at parent involvement?

Very Good				Very Poor
5	4	3	2	1

9. How would you rate the following?

	Very Adequate				Inadequte
Selection Process	5	4	3	2	1
Scheduling	5	4	3	2	1
Testing Procedures	5	4	3	2	1
Evaluation Feedback	5	4	3	2	1
Facilities	5	4	3	2	1
Space	5	4	3	2	1
Materials	5	4	3	2	1
Computer Effectiveness					
1. For Diagnosis	5	4	3	2	1
2. For Instruction	5	4	3	2	1
	Very Good				Very Poor
Environmental Temperature	5	4	3	2	1
Environmental Noise Level	5	4	3	2	1

10. What do you do to promote the maximum use of academic learning time (Time on Task)?

11. How do you let pupils know that you have high expectations for their learning and behavior?

12. How do you give recognition and provide feedback to pupils?

13. What instructional methods and materials have you found particularly effective in improving reading comprehension?

14. Did your pupils make as much progress in reading last year as you had hoped? If yes, why; if no, why not?

15. What diagnostic test(s) or methods do you use? _____

16. How have diagnostic test(s) or methods been helpful in adjusting your approach to instruction? _____

17. How do you monitor student progress? _____

18. In what way has current research and/or inservice been helpful in your approach to instruction? _____

19 Do you have any Pupil Census Forms or Add Forms you would like to give me today?

CHAPTER 1 AND DPPF TESTING OBSERVATION SCALE

Observer_____ School_____ Date_____

Time of Day_____ _____Day of Week_____Number of Students_____

Program_____ Grade_____Test_____

Testing Environment

Use the following key to rate the conditions of the testing environment.

VG = Very Good
G = Good
A = Acceptable
P = Poor
VP = Very Poor

Lighting in the testing area	VG	G	A	P	VP
Space for each student	VG	G	A	P	VP
Sound or noise level	VG	G	A	P	VP
Temperature	VG	G	A	P	VP

Type of Room: Classroom_____ Library____ Lunchroom____

Other_____

Test Directions

How were the directions given? Read by Proctor_____ Written on the Board_____

Other_____

1. Audibleness of the instructions	VG	G	A	P	VP
2. Extent to which proctor provided for students' questions	VG	G	A	P	VP
3. The clarity of proctor(s) answers to students' questions	VG	G	A	P	VP
4. Clarity of directions for marking answer	VG	G	A	P	VP
5. Extent to which proctor followed directions in the examiner's manual	VG	G	A	P	VP
6. Attitude of the proctor toward the testing process	VG	G	A	P	VP
7. Accuracy of the procedure for timing the test	VG	G	A	P	VP

Testing Materials

During the testing session the following materials were available:

1. A test booklet for each pupil with answer sheet where applicable — Yes___ No___ NA___

2. A copy of the test booklet for demonstration purposes — Yes___ No___ NA___

3. Teacher's Directions — Yes___ No___ NA___

4. A pencil with eraser for each pupil, plus extras to cover breakage — Yes___ No___ NA___

5. A stopwatch, or a watch or clock with a second hand, to be used for timing the tests — Yes___ No___ NA___

6. A "Testing--Do Not Disturb" sign for the door — Yes___ No___ NA___

7. A paper or cardboard place marker, approximately 2" x 4" for each pupil, plus extras (required for kindergarten, suggested for grades 1-3) — Yes___ No___ NA___

During the Tests:

1. Proctor circulated continuously around the room monitoring students — Yes___ No___ NA___

2. Proctor limited assistance to mechanical aspects of marking answers, clarifying directions, and finding right place on answer sheet — Yes___ No___ NA___

3. Were there interruptions or disturbances during the testing period. If yes, please specify (what and how many times):_____ _____ — Yes___ No___ NA___

_____

_____

_____