DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 340 799 UD 028 467

AUTHOR Donaldson, William S.
TITLE Summer Academic Skills Enhancement Program 1991. Private Industry Council of Franklin County Job Training Partnership Act. Final Evaluation Report.
INSTITUTION Columbus Public Schools, OH. Dept. of Evaluation Services.
PUB DATE 91
NOTE 92p.; For the 1990 report, see ED 327 608.
PUB TYPE Reports - Evaluative/Feasibility (142) -- Statistical Data (110)

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC04 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS Adolescents; American Indians; Asian Americans; *Black Students; Language Skills; Minority Groups; Program Evaluation; Reading Comprehension; *Remedial Programs; Secondary Education; *Skill Development; *Summer Programs; *Urban Youth; Vocational Education; White Students; Youth Employment; *Youth Programs
IDENTIFIERS Columbus Public Schools OH; Job Training Partnership Act 1982; Ohio; *Preemployment Courses

ABSTRACT

The Summer Academic Skills Enhancement Program was funded by the Private Industry Council (PIC) of Franklin County (Ohio) through the Job Training Partnership Act (JTPA) to provide JTPA clients with the reading comprehension and language mechanics skills required for employment in entry-level positions. The program was coordinated by the Department of Community Education of Columbus (Ohio) Public Schools. The 1991 program began with testing 172 youths aged 14 to 21 years referred by the PIC in May and June. Forty-five percent of the clients were females. Five percent of the clients were non-minority, 91 percent were black, 6 percent were Asian, and 1 client was American Indian. Remediation began in June with reading comprehension and language mechanics classes, as well as preemployment job skills. Fifty-three clients (31 percent) completed the program. Recommendations for program continuation include lowering the number of days of attendance required and redefining goals for posttest score gains. While many clients made significant gains in both areas, the criteria established in the evaluation for achievement gains were not fully met. In 1992, retention of black males should receive the highest priority. Also needed are strategies for attracting and retaining non-minority students. Student participation and achievement data are provided in 14 tables. An appendix contains student information forms and supplemental reports on participation. (SLD)

Private Industry Council of Franklin County
Job Training Partnership Act

FINAL EVALUATION REPORT
SUMMER ACADEMIC SKILLS ENHANCEMENT PROGRAM
1991

Written by:

William S. Donaldson, Ed.D.
Consultant to the Program

Under the Supervision of:

Richard A. Amorose, Ph.D.

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

Private Industry Council of Franklin County
Job Training Partnership Act

FINAL EVALUATION REPORT
SUMMER ACADEMIC SKILLS ENHANCEMENT PROGRAM
1991

Abstract

Program Description: The Summer Academic Skills Enhancement Program was funded by the Private Industry Council (PIC) of Franklin County through the Job Training Partnership Act (JTPA). The purpose of the program was to provide JTPA clients with the reading comprehension and language mechanics skills required for employment into entry-level positions. A total of 160 curriculum hours were used toward this end. This "Fast Track" program was conducted by the Department of Community Education (DCE), Columbus Public Schools.

Program enrollment was defined by the Private Industry Council. Anticipated were 150 PIC-referred clients. A total of 172 referred clients were pretested with the Comprehensive Test of Basic Skills (HU). These clients were enrolled into one of two remedial courses-of-study: Reading Comprehension (Houghton-Mifflin New Directions in Reading curriculum) or Language Mechanics (Houghton-Mifflin "whole language" grammar and composition series).

The 1991 program consisted of two segments: testing (May-June) and remediation (June-August). Performance objectives were stated for each of the two remediation programs: reading comprehension, language mechanics.

In addition to the two academic curricula addressed, pre-employment skills also were taught to clients. Using the MPC Educational Publishers' booklet Job Seeker's Guide, these skills were stressed as an integral part of each academic curriculum; i.e., employment skills instruction took place at scheduled times each week, where the instructional topic for the week was mandatory. Since 1985, DCE reports that 85% of its training-program completers have been job-placed.

Major Findings: Fifty-three clients achieved "program completion" status. This group represents about 31% of the 172 pupils enrolled in the 1991 Summer Program. Data collected during evaluation of program clients suggests that the number of completions could be increased significantly by reducing the attendance requirement from 75% (30 days) to about 60% (say, 23 days). Or, base completion solely on whether a pupil completes all pre- and posttests. Either way, the 1991 Summer Program would have had at the least 10-15 more "completions." This is significant because what is being proposed is an additional 20-25% more completions. Pupils enrolled for less than 30 days, even with perfect attendance, cannot become program completions.

"Enrollment," especially calculation of a percent attending 75% of the instructional days offered, is influenced by a large number of pupils who take the CTBS pretest and nothing else. While it may be correct to use the number of clients enrolled as the denominator for calculating "retention" data, it appears probable that the clientele served by this program is unlikely ever to reach an 80% retention factor. An alternative algorithm is worth investigating; or, a lower criterion value might be considered.

Pupils in the Regular Pretest Achievers (RPA) subset did not reach criterion level on any of the four stated Evaluation Objectives (1.1, 1.2, 1.3, 1.4). Since assessment in previous years yielded similar findings, it may be an opportune time to reflect on criterion levels used and weigh the use of alternative levels for 1992. Also, results for this group are surpressed due to the "ceiling effect" observed for the CTBS. Twenty-two instances of pupils scoring 12.0 grade-equivalents or higher on the CTBS pretest (thus, a 1.0 GE gain on the posttest becomes an impossibility) suggests that the definition of a program "completion" needs rethinking.

Pupils in the Low Pretest Achievers subset reached criterion level on two Evaluation Objectives (2.1 and 2.2). Since the potential for "gain" by this subset is greater than that for the RPA subset, a higher criterion standard may be advisable for 1992. Neither subset achieved the Employment Skills criterion level (1.4, 2.4). Program retention--in general--(3.1) fell below the standard set. Male/black retention (3.2) fell below the standard set. Non-minority recruitment (3.3) was even less responsive than last year.

Recommendations

1. It is recommended that considerable thought be given toward optimization of reading comprehension and language mechanics programs for Low Pretest Achievers clients, with particular emphasis given to techniques for improving employment skills posttest scores.

2. With the 1992 results now available for program and evaluation planning purposes, rethinking criterion levels appropriate for 1992 is recommended.

3. It is recommended that a new definition of "completion" be derived and that this definition be applied in 1992, in each instance where high pretest CTBS grade equivalent values so warrant.

4. It is recommended that program sponsors and managers test the viability of using a "completion" definition in the future which is either (a) not dependent on attendance, (b) is relaxed to, say, 60%, a level that would have captured most of the 22 pupils lost in 1991, or (c) allows for pupils enrolled for less than the full 39 days of instruction.

5. More emphasis should be given to helping clients attain an acceptable (38 or more) score on the ES posttest. Aside from the "completion" aspect of the program, these skills are vital to both job placement and continued employment.

6. Retention of male/black pupils should be given the highest priority for 1992.

7. Program planners for 1992 should structure effective, productive strategies for attracting and retaining non-minority pupils.

Private Industry Council of Franklin County
Job Training Partnership Act

FINAL EVALUATION REPORT
SUMMER ACADEMIC SKILLS ENHANCEMENT PROGRAM
1991

Program Description

The 1991 Summer Program consisted of two distinct phases: testing and remediation. The testing phase was designed to identify pre-test performance levels; remediation strategies were adopted to maximize the potential for improving clients' content mastery in two instructional areas: reading comprehension (six objectives); (b) language mechanics (five objectives). The proposed Program Design statement summarized these two phases as "Testing" and "Remediation". Underlying the remediation phase was a singular goal: provide JTPA clients with the academic skills necessary for "employment into entry level positions."

Referral and Selection

The target group for this program was defined as "JTPA eligible youths aged 14-21".

The selection process was initiated by a referral from the Private Industry Council (PIC). Referrals were tested and the Columbus Public Schools' Department of Community Education notified PIC regarding performance levels.

An anticipated 150 PIC-identified youth were to be pretested. All PIC referrals were enrolled to attend the eight-week remediation phase beginning in mid-June. The remediation phase was conducted at the North Education Center and emphasized prescriptive/individualized instructional strategies and materials.

Recruitment Methods: The Private Industry Council supplied (by way of the PIC-10 referral form) the Department of Community Education with the names of 172 eligible youth who were chosen or self-identified for participation in the Summer Academic Skills Enhancement Program ("Fast Track"). In April, the Department administered a CTBS battery to those youth. All 172 clients were selected by PIC for the "Fast Track" program. The department also assisted PIC officials with orientation and enrollment.

Testing

Commencing May 1, 1991 and through June 28, 1991, the Department of Community Education administered the Comprehensive Tests of Basic Skills (CTBS;1981), Form U, Level H reading comprehension, language mechanics, and mathematics computation subtests to 172 PIC-identified youth. The principal assessment activity for students enrolled in the Columbus City School District took place at students' home schools. For youth living outside the Columbus City School District or for youth referred after the testing period was closed, testing was administered by PIC personnel at a site designated by PIC management. The Department of Community Education supplied PIC staff with the test instruments and answer sheets.

The Department of Program Evaluation of the Columbus Public Schools scored completed answer forms and produced individual diagnostic reports and system summaries. All scores were norm-referenced. The Columbus evaluators used the TESTMATE microcomputer software system to scan, score, and report norm-referenced data.

The Department of Community Education, in concert with the Department of Program Evaluation selected Form U, Level H of the Comprehensive Tests of Basic Skills (third edition) as the most appropriate level of difficulty for the identified client group. The CTBS is a norm-referenced achievement test, the content categories of which were defined by examining current state and district curriculum guides, published texts and instructional programs, and criterion-referenced assessment instruments. Columbus evaluation professionals selected the reading comprehension, language mechanics, and mathematics computation subtests for administration to clients. Total time for actual testing was 93 minutes; test administration protocols added approximately 35 minutes to the testing session.

Reading. At the lowest levels, the reading comprehension test measures visual and sound recognition of letters, words, vowels, and consonants. Items measuring comprehension skills are related to sentences and stories. Reading comprehension items measure skills in understanding sentence meaning, passage details, character analysis, main ideas, generalization, written forms, and author techniques. (Houghton-Mifflin's New Directions in Reading)

Language Mechanics. These items measure the student's ability to identify the correct use of capital letters, periods, commas, exclamation points, question marks, quotation marks, colons, semicolons in sentences and in extended passages. (Houghton-Mifflin's "whole language" grammar and composition series)

Testing Methodology Used. The tests' designers used a three-parameter Item Response Theory to scale the CTBS and to develop norms. Application of IRT methodology provides a number of direct benefits to the user of CTBS U, including more accurate descriptions of client performance. Consultants from the educational community, represented by native American, Asian, Hispanic, and Black ethnic and cultural groups, reviewed all items for possible racial, ethnic, and gender bias. Consequently, the standardized instruments do not contain items that appeared statistically biased in item tryouts. In the standardization, the sample reflects ethnic minorities as they are represented in the general population.

Remediation

One hundred and seventy-two PIC-referred youth were enrolled in an eight-week summer prescriptive and individualized instructional program at the North Education Center as part of the Summer Youth Employment Training Program operated by the Private Industry Council. The instructional phase of the remedial program took place from June 17, 1991 through August 9, 1991. Those clients who successfully completed course work were eligible to receive 1.0 unit of academic credit for reading, or 1.0 unit of academic credit for language arts.

Clients attended daily classes in reading comprehension and language arts. Client instructional hours began at 8:10 a.m. and concluded at 11:50 a.m. Monday through Friday. (All training was delivered by instructors certificated by the State of Ohio.)

At the conclusion of the summer instructional phase, staff administered the CTBS (HU) to clients retained to that point. The Department of Program Evaluation analyzed data with appropriate statistical tests to determine whether the summer remedial treatment was effective in improving clients' basic academic skills.

The Department of Community Education chose instructional materials based on research findings that have correlated student learning with patterns of curriculum organization. Specifically, researchers discovered that highly structured instructional formats are most effective when working on basic skills competencies with lower achieving students. The following curricula were designed to achieve maximum mastery over a short time through rigorous instructional organization:

Reading Comprehension. The curriculum employed was Houghton-Mifflin's New Directions in Reading program, which has been designed as a reading comprehension achievement series for high school students who have not yet mastered reading comprehension skills. The three-part instructional plan consists of (a) preparation in vocabulary building, (b) enhancement of comprehension skills through guided reading, and (c) review and extension exercises to verify comprehension and provide skills reinforcement through immediate practice. The comprehension domain is the central focus of each instructional unit, and the curriculum stresses 10 comprehension skills: understanding punctuation, understanding word referents, using context to reveal word meanings, and to understand figurative language, noting important details, understanding sequence of events, recognizing the main idea of paragraphs, making inferences and drawing conclusions or predicting outcomes, understanding cause-effect relationships, understanding comparisons, and distinguishing between fact and opinion. In addition to quizzes for individual lessons, instructors administered both mid-level and end-of-level testing.

Language Mechanics. The language curriculum used Houghton-Mifflin's "whole language" grammar and composition series. This curriculum integrates grammar with reading and writing skills. Grammar units begin with the presentation of the basic lesson, and from that base they progress to vocabulary building activities. These activities are capped by exercises that assist students to make the crucial grammar-writing connection. Students then move to "checkup" activities that assess mastery levels attained. A cumulative review follows, which in turn is supplemented by enrichment work or differentiated additional practice (easy, average, or challenging). Reading and writing units commence with literature selections and are followed by activities that give students practice in using the three modalities of literature response: listening, speaking, and thinking (inferring/drawing conclusions). Composition skills are taught through the five-step writing process: pre-writing, drafting, revising, proofreading, and publishing (final drafting). Students master spelling skills using Houghton-Mifflin's spelling program, which supports a complete testing program in standardized test format.

Employment Skills

The Department of Community Education also addressed the issue of improving clients' employment potential. Because many clients do not have the non-academic basic skills essential if one is to secure a position, instruction in this important area was continued in the 1991 Summer Program. The Job Seeker's Guide curriculum by MPC Educational Publishers was used.

Employment skills were taught as an integral part of both academic curricula: (a) reading comprehension and (b) language mechanics. So, no matter which particular academic curriculum a client entered, employment skills also were emphasized. The objective was to improve job readiness of clients by improving pre-employment skills. A segment of instructional time in each class was alloted each week during which the instructor covered a specific employment-skills topic. These topics were covered during the remediation phase of the program:

1. Determining Your Strengths
2. Professional Development and Your Personal Qualities
3. Begin Your Job Search
4. Your Social Security Card and Other Preparation
5. Locating Job Possibilities
6. How to Prepare Resumes and Application Forms
7. Telephoning for an Interview
8. Understanding Application Forms and Dealing with Problems
9. Filling out Application Forms
10. Planning a Successful Interview
11. Job Applicant Rating Form
12. Performance and Success on the Job

Evaluation Design

Pretesting of program candidates was used to discern skills deficiencies. Then, clients were enrolled into either of two programs: Reading Comprehension or Language Mechanics. Program clients were then guided through the remediation phase as described above. Clients who completed the eight-week instructional program were then posttested to reveal pre/posttest change with respect to reading comprehension, language mechanics, and mathematics computation observed scores.

Because the Summer 1990 Program evaluation design resolved a student ID number problem successfully, this year care was taken to standardize the number-assignment process. The Department of Program Evaluation (DPE) pre-printed CTBS answer forms and prepared lists of students who were pretested for use by the summer Program Coordinator. Summer 1991 program personnel used these lists to code student numbers on all forms returned to the DPE for analysis. Thus, it again was possible this year to conduct analysis as intended, analyses based on attendance, where 30 days (75% of 39 enrollment days) of attendance was the cut-off point.

Completion

Three project-completion criteria were evaluated. To be considered a "completion," a client must:

1. attend 75% (N=30) of the 39 enrollment days; and

2. demonstrate a grade-equivalent gain of at least 1.0 on any one of the three CTBS subtests: Reading Comprehension, Language Mechanics, Mathematics Computation; and

3. demonstrate a score of at least 38 correct on either the pre- or posttest for Employment Skills.

Evaluation Objectives

Eleven evaluation objectives were stated in the DCE/CPS 1991 Summer Program proposal. These objectives were initiated by the DPE, following review of the 1990 program. It was suggested that these eleven objectives more accurately represent the program's potential for measuring clients' real and substantive "gain", that expectations for improving clients' CTBS and ES scores should be tempered by awareness of the wide range of clients' pretest scores and the likelihood of improvement therein.

Thus, evaluation objectives were stated for two groups: Regular Pretest Achievers (RPA, pretest grade-equivalent scores of 5.0 or more), Low Pretest Achievers (LPA, pretest grade-equivalent scores of less than 5.0). Also, objectives regarding Reading Comprehension and Language Mechanics were structured for accommodation of "age-grade placement" (the grade a client would be in without having been retained).

Age-Grade Placement

Selection into the RPA group was calculated to include pupils who scored higher on the CTBS pretest than those entered into the LPA group, but lower by at least 1.0 GE than students performing at grade-level. Thus, a client in the RPA group was known to be performing lower than would be expected routinely. The rationale used for structuring selection in this way was based on the not remarkable fact that these clients should be excellent targets for realizing the 1.0 GE gain on one of the three CTBS subtests.

So, a 9th-grade client scoring a 9.0 GE for Reading Comprehension would be at "age-grade." Conversely, a 9th-grade client scoring 8.0 GE for Reading Comprehension would be 1.0 behind age-grade. For Evaluation Objectives 2.1-2.3, analyses were based on clients scoring 1.0 or more lower than their respective age-grade placements.

1. Evaluation Objectives for "Regular Pretest Achievers" (RPA)

1.1 50% of the clients enrolled in the reading component who attend 75% of the program days and who have a CTBS pretest reading comprehension grade equivalent score between 5.0 and one less than their age-grade placement*, will show 1.0 grade equivalent gain on the posttest.

1.2 50% of the clients enrolled in the language component who attend 75% of the program days and who have a CTBS pretest language mechanics grade equivalent score between 5.0 and one less than their age-grade placement*, will show 1.0 grade equivalent gain on the posttest.

1.3 50% of the clients enrolled in the mathematics component who attend 75% of the program days and who have a CTBS pretest mathematics computation grade score equivalent between 5.0 and one less than their age-grade placement will show 1.0 grade equivalent gain on the posttest.

1.4 80% of the clients who attend 75% of the program days and who have a CTBS pretest grade equivalent score of 5.0 or more in their component area and who score below 75% on the pretest employment skills test, will score at or above 75% on the employment skills posttest.

*Age-Grade Placement is the grade the client would be in without retention in grade.

2. Evaluation Objectives for Low Pretest Achievers(LPA)

2.1 20% of the clients enrolled in the reading component who attend 75% of the program days and who have a CTBS pretest reading comprehension grade equivalent score less than 5.0, will show 1.0 grade equivalent gain on the posttest.

2.2 20% of the clients enrolled in the language component who attend 75% of the program days and who have a CTBS pretest language mechanics grade equivalent score less than 5.0, will show 1.0 grade equivalent gain on the posttest.

2.3 20% of the clients enrolled in the mathematics component who attend 75% of the program days and who have a CTBS pretest mathematics computation grade equivalent score less than 5.0, will show 1.0 grade equivalent gain on the posttest.

2.4 40% of the clients who attend 75% of the program days and who have a CTBS pretest grade equivalent score of less than 5.0 in their component area and who score below 75% on the pretest employment skills test, will score at or above 75% on the employment skills posttest.

3. Other Evaluation Objectives

3.1 75% of the clients enrolled will attend 75% of the program days.

3.2 80% of the male/black clients enrolled in the program will be retained through the posttesting phase of the project.

3.3 The clients served by the program will reflect the target population such that 25% of the clients will be non-minority.

Methodology

One hundred seventy-two prospective clients were pretested with the CTBS. One hundred sixty-eight ES pretest forms were administered. One hundred thirty-six CTBS posttest forms and 133 ES posttest forms were administered. Demographic and attendance data were recorded on revised Pupil Census Forms (PCF) for all youth pretested with the CTBS. File folder reports for all 172 youth pretested were computer-generated by the Department of Program Evaluation. These reports were customized to include demographic/attendance data and the results of each test taken by the pupil, and to record program-completion status. See the Appendix for examples of the reports provided by DPE.

Achievement data were scanned and scored using TESTMATE computer software. Employment skills data were scanned and scored using SCANTOOLS computer software. Demographic and attendance data were encoded by this consultant. Preliminary reports to program administration were provided each time new data were added to the datasets. These analyses were conducted using an IBM 9375 running CMS. This hardware and SAS 6.06 were used to analyze both CTBS and ES data, in terms of grade-equivalent change.

At CTBS pretesting (N=172), 78 (45%) were female and 94 (55%) were male. Regarding ethnicity, 9 (5%) were non-minority, 156 (91%) black, six (4%) were Asian, and one was American Indian.

At CTBS posttesting, including the 75% attendance requirement (30 out of 39 days), the sex ratio did not change markedly. One hundred and fifteen clients attended at least 30 days of instruction. Females (50, 44%) about equaled males (65, 56%), with respect to the proportion retained across pre- and posttesting.

The Evaluation Sample

To be included into the evaluation sample, a client must have attended at least 30 days of Summer Program Instruction. Since "completion" requires 75% attendance (30 of 39 enrollment days), given that achievement gain is--clearly--a function of being exposed to elements of a formal instructional process, it was determined that the evaluation sample--appropriately--would include only those clients who met this criterion.

For analysis, it was required that a client meeting the attendance criterion also must have pre- and posttest CTBS (at least one subtest pair) and ES (both) values. Therefore, only potential "program completions" were included in the analysis. A total of 107 clients met all conditions essential to be included in the evaluation sample.

Major Findings

The 107 clients analyzed as the evaluation sample were predominately black, split about 46%-54% female/male. A total of 94 black clients were analyzed; only 13 non-black clients are in the evaluation sample (six non-minority, six Asian, and one American Indian). As a group these 11 clients represent about 12% of the evaluation sample.

Separate analyses of CTBS and ES data were conducted for each of the evaluation criteria stated earlier. Because the evaluation sample--essentially--is black by ethnic group, further analyses using this variable--ethnicity--were not justified.

Program Completion Analysis

To be designated a program "completion," a client must: (a) attend 75% (30 days) of the enrollment period; (b) show a grade-equivalent gain of at least 1.0 on one or more subtests (pre- /posttest) of the CTBS; and (c) score at least 38 on the ES test, either pre- or posttest. The evaluation sample included 107 clients with data sufficient to test for program completion. (A client missing either the CTBS or ES posttest could not become a "completion," by PIC definition).

This completion-candidate group of 107 clients consisted of 49 (46%) females, 58 (54%) males, 94 (88%) blacks; of the black group, 46 (49%) were female and 48 (51%) were males. Seventy-six were enrolled in Reading Comprehension, and 31 in Language Mechanics. Thus, about 60% (76 of 127) of those enrolled in Reading Comprehension were completion candidates. Of the 45 enrolled in Language Mechanics, 76% (31 of 45) were completion candidates.

Fifty-three (50% of the evaluation sample) clients achieved completion status, 29 females and 24 males. Forty-nine of these 53 were black. Twenty-seven (59%) of black/female completion candidates did reach program completion status; 22 (46%) of black/males were completions. Of the 53 completions overall, 33 (62%) were in Reading Comprehension (RC); 20 (38%) were in Language Mechanics (LM). (See Tables 1 and 2)

The narrative in the remainder of the report references Tables 1-14. The following variable names are used in these tables.

Variable Name	Comments
ATTEND	Number of days of attendance.
ATT	Attend 30 days = YES, NO otherwise.
PROG	Instructional curriculum.
ETHGR	Ethnic group.
GERC1	Grade equivalent, Reading Comprehension prctest.
GERC2	Grade equivalent, Reading Comprehension posttest.
GELM1	Grade equivalent, Language Mechanics pretest.
GELM2	Grade equivalent, Language Mechanics posttest.
ESPRE	Employment Skills, pretest.
ESPOS	Employment Skills, posttest.
AGEGR	Age-Grade.
AGEGRPLA	Age-Grade placement.
RCG	Reading Comprehension gain; $\geq$1.0 GE = YES, NO otherwise.
LMG	Language Mechanics gain; $\geq$ 1.0 GE = YES, NO otherwise.
SEX	Gender; M=male, F=female.

Table 3 present statistics for the 107 pupils in the "potential completions" group. Comparison of values across the two completion subsets ("NO" and "YES") is informative. For example, less than one day separates the two subsets with respect to attendance days. And, consistently across the two tests (RC and LM), members of the NO subset score lower on both pre- and posttest measures. Moreover, a five-point gap in Employment Skills pretest values for the two subsets increases to more than seven points on the posttest. Also, the NO subset minimum value is 21 on the posttest, 36 minimum for the YES subset.

Evaluation Objectives for "Regular Pretest Achievers" (RPA)

1.1 50% of the clients enrolled in the reading component who attend 75% of the program days and who have a CTBS pretest reading comprehension grade equivalent score between 5.0 and one less than their age-grade placement, will show 1.0 grade equivalent gain on the posttest.

This RPA group had 27 pupils in it. These are PIC clients whose Reading Comprehension pretest GE score was between 5.0 and one less than age-grade placement; i.e., the upper bound indicated a cut-off point associated with one year of retention. So, although scoring at a pretest level higher than the LPA group (below), the CTBS/RC GE score was at least one unit below that expected for the client's age-group cohorts.

Ten of the 27 members of this group did achieve a posttest RC GE score at least 1.0 greater than the corresponding pretest value. (See Table 4) So, 37% (10 of 27) met this criterion.

This criterion was not reached.

1.2 50% of the clients enrolled in the language component who attend 75% of the program days and who have a CTBS pretest language mechanics grade equivalent score between 5.0 and one less than their age-grade placement, will show 1.0 grade equivalent gain on the posttest.

This RPA group had five pupils in it. Similar to E.O. 1.1, differing only in that Language Mechanics gain was of interest, the same selection conditions prevailed; i.e., five pupils met the enrollment criterion and had pretest LM scores between 5.0 GE and one less than age-grade placement.

Two (40%) of these five pupils had pre/posttest score gains of 1.0 GE or more. (See Table 5)

This criterion was not reached.

1.3 50% of the clients enrolled in the mathematics component who attend 75% of the program days and who have a CTBS pretest mathematics computation grade equivalent score between 5.0 and one less than their age-grade placement will show 1.0 grade equivalent gain on the posttest.

The 1991 Summer Program did not include a mathematics component.

1.4 80% of the clients who attend 75% of the program days and who have a CTBS pretest grade equivalent score of 5.0 or more in their component area and who score below 75% on the pretest employment skills test, will score at or above 75% on the employment skills posttest.

Twenty-nine pupils comprised the analysis group for RC. Of the 29, 62% (N=18) reached criterion. (See Table 6)

Twelve pupils were in the LM analysis group. Nine (75%) of the 12 reached criterion. (See Table 7)

Thus, the criterion-level (80%) for RC and LM was not reached. Taken as a whole, a total of 27 of 41 (66%) scored 38 or higher on the ES posttest.

This criterion was not reached.

Evaluation Objectives for Low Pretest Achievers(LPA)

2.1 20% of the clients enrolled in the reading component who attend 75% of the program days and who have a CTBS pretest reading comprehension grade equivalent score less than 5.0, will show 1.0 grade equivalent gain on the posttest.

Thirty-nine clients constituted the LPA Reading Comprehension group. Of the 39, 14 (36%) pupils achieved a 1.0 or more GE gain. (See Table 8)

This criterion was reached.

2.2 20% of the clients enrolled in the language component who attend 75% of the program days and who have a CTBS pretest language mechanics grade equivalent score less than 5.0, will show 1.0 grade equivalent gain on the posttest.

Three pupils were the LPA Language Mechanics analysis group, and all three pupils gained at least 1.0 GE in LM. (See Table 9)

This criterion was reached.

2.3 20% of the clients enrolled in the mathematics component who attend 75% of the program days and who have a CTBS pretest mathematics computation grade equivalent score less than 5.0, will show 1.0 grade equivalent gain on the posttest.

The 1991 Summer Program did not include a mathematics component.

2.4 40% of the clients who attend 75% of the program days and who have a CTBS pretest grade equivalent score of less than 5.0 in their component area and who score below 75% on the pretest employment skills test, will score at or above 75% on the employment skills posttest.

Thirty-nine clients constituted the Reading Comprehension LPA group. Thirty-six percent (N=14) scored 38 or more on the ES posttest and reached the criterion level. (See Table 10)

Three pupils were the Language Mechanics LPA group. One (33%) pupil met the standard. (See Table 11)

Taken as a whole, 15 of 42 (36%) pupils reached criterion level. (See Table 12)

Thus, the criterion level (40%) was not attained for the LPA group.

Other Evaluation Objectives

3.1 75% of the clients enrolled will attend 75% of the program days.

A total of 172 pupils were enrolled in the 1991 Summer Program. Of these, 115 (67%) attended the minimum of 30 instructional days. Eight of these pupils did not meet all conditions for entering the evaluation sample. (See Table 12)

This objective was not reached.

3.2 80% of the male/black clients enrolled in the program will be retained through the posttesting phase of the project.

Eighty-three male/blacks enrolled in the 1991 Summer Program. Forty-eight (58%) attended 30 or more days of instruction (pre- and posttest required, also). (See Table 13)

This criterion was not reached.

3.3 The clients served by the program will reflect the target population such that 25% of the clients will be non-minority.

Six (5%) non-minority pupils were in the evaluation sample. (See Table 14)

This criterion was not reached.

Summary/Recommendations

The 1991 Summer Academic Skills Enhancement Program did attain some of the evaluation objectives. Primarily, attained objectives (2.1, 2.2) related to the Low Pretest Achievers group (LPA). In fact, the 20% criterion is too low. A value of, perhaps, 40% success might be considered for 1992, the rationale being that special emphasis given to LPA-identified clients could prove effective. Since many potential-completion clients enter the program as members of this group, additional emphasis toward improving the instructional offerings for these clients should produce positive results; i.e., more end-of-term completions.

> It is recommended that considerable thought be given toward optimization of Reading Comprehension and Language Mechanics programs for LPA clients, with particular emphasis given to techniques for improving ES posttest scores.

Objectives for the Regular Pretest Achievers group (RPA) were not attained. In most instances, the observed percent was not distant from the criterion level. In some cases an additional positive case would have made the difference. It is suspected that use of 50% as a criterion level may be unrealistically high. Reconsideration of this value (50%) is recommended. It is a fact that the results reported herein represent the first use of these Evaluation Objectives.

> With the 1991 results now available for program and evaluation planning purposes, rethinking criterion levels appropriate for 1992 is recommended.

Central to both RPA group gain and the overriding issue of program completion, it is essential to consider a select group of 1991 clients, who scored 12.0 GE or more on the CTBS pretest. Why the interest in 12.0? Because anyone scoring at this level on the pretest cannot gain the 1.0 GE needed to be included in the Evaluation Sample, or to become a program completion. Clearly, for each such client (even if "gain" is evident, attendance at the 75% level, 38 or more on ES), the PIC program cannot count a completion. How serious is this issue?

Testing for the 1991 client group began with 172 valid pretests being scanned and evaluated. Of these, of course, are many "pupils" who will not attend 75% of the instructional days. Fifteen pupils attended less than 20 days in 1991. Fifty-seven pupils attended less than the required 30 days. Exactly 115 clients attended 30 or more days. So, effectively, sample and completion candidates come from this group of 115 pupils. Of these, eight pupils did not have full testing records (e.g., missed the ES posttest). Therefore, 107 is the real base for both the sample and determination of program completion.

This past summer 16 pupils had 22 CTBS pretest scores of 12.0 GE or higher. A full 12 pretests were at the maximum value possible- 12.9 GE. Six pupils were excluded from the completion group only due to this pretest GE condition.

It is recommended that a new definition of "completion" be derived and that this definition be applied in 1992, in each instance where high pretest CTBS GE values so warrant.

More so, the definition of enrollment is open to question, specifically regarding clients who do no attend 75% of the instructional days, but who do complete pre- and posttesting with both CTBS and ES instruments. For example, in 1991, 22 clients completed all CTBS and ES testing, but attended less than 30 days of instruction. The average number of days attended was 26, low of 18 and high of 29. Twelve of these pupils attended at least 27 days of instruction.

Of the 22 members under discussion, 19 met the 1.0 GE standard. Thirteen met the ES 38-or-more standard. Thirteen reached both standards. Other than the attendance criterion, these 13 are just as viable regarding program completion as were the 53 pupils who also met the 30-day standard.

Obviously, one intent of the program is to promote pupil attendance. This is not an indefensible objective. On the other hand, program impact--evident in 1991--is being discarded, perhaps unnecessarily. It is worthwhile to note that seven of the 172 pupils enrolled in 1991 actually were enrolled for less than 30 days. None of these pupils could make the Evaluation Sample or be a program completion, even with perfect enrollment.

It is recommended that program sponsors and managers test the viability of using a "completion" definition in the future which is either (a) not dependent on attendance, (b) is relaxed to, say, 60%, a level that would have captured most of the 22 pupils lost in 1991, and (c) allows for pupils enrolled for less than the full 39 days of instruction.

Numerous pupils failed to attain completion status, due to inadequate ES scores. In many cases, another 3-4 points on either the pre- or posttest ES would have produced a completion. And, in many of these cases both pre- and posttest scores were near the threshold (38 correct). So, it is not always a question of working with pupils who score extremely low on the ES pretest.

More emphasis should be given to helping clients attain an acceptable (38 or more) score on the ES posttest. Aside from the "completion" aspect of the program, these skills are vital to both job placement and continued employment.

Male/black retention improved--slightly--in 1991. However, proportionately, female/black pupils tend to be retained and to become program completions at a rate somewhat greater than that observed for male/blacks.

Retention of male/black pupils should be given the highest priority for 1992.

The number and proportion of non-minority clients enrolled continues to drop. It is evident that recruitment of these clients should be a concern to PIC and program managers. The 1992 Summer Program results should indicate planners' concern about non-minority recruitment.

Program planners for 1992 should structure effective, productive strategies for attracting and retaining non-minority pupils.

Table 1

PIC Data Analysis - EVALUATION SAMPLE 16:31 Thursday, October 24, 1991 21

Assess Merged Data with Respect to Evaluation Objectives
ATTEND>=30, Valid Posttest Scores, CTBS and ES
See the PIC Proposal, "7. Evaluation"

COMPLETION DATA Frequencies

Completion=NO

ATTEND	Frequency	Percent	Cumulative Frequency	Cumulative Percent
30	2	3.7	2	3.7
30.5	1	1.9	3	5.6
31	1	1.9	4	7.4
32	2	3.7	6	11.1
33	3	5.6	9	16.7
34	8	14.8	17	31.5
35	5	9.3	22	40.7
36	5	9.3	27	50.0
37	9	16.7	36	66.7
38	8	14.8	44	81.5
39	10	18.5	54	100.0

Attended 30 or More Days

ATT	Frequency	Percent	Cumulative Frequency	Cumulative Percent
YES	54	100.0	54	100.0

PROG	Frequency	Percent	Cumulative Frequency	Cumulative Percent
Reading Comprehe	43	79.6	43	79.6
Language Mechani	11	20.4	54	100.0

Table 2

PIC Data Analysis - EVALUATION SAMPLE 16:31 Thursday, October 24, 1991 35

Assess Merged Data with Respect to Evaluation Objectives
ATTEND>=30, Valid Posttest Scores, CTBS and ES
See the PIC Proposal, "7. Evaluation"

COMPLETION DATA Frequencies

Completion=YES

ATTEND	Frequency	Percent	Cumulative Frequency	Cumulative Percent
30.5	1	1.9	1	1.9
32	2	3.8	3	5.7
33	2	3.8	5	9.4
34	5	9.4	10	18.9
35	5	9.4	15	28.3
36	4	7.5	19	35.8
37	9	17.0	28	52.8
38	11	20.8	39	73.6
39	14	26.4	53	100.0

Attended 30 or More Days

ATT	Frequency	Percent	Cumulative Frequency	Cumulative Percent
YES	53	100.0	53	100.0

PROG	Frequency	Percent	Cumulative Frequency	Cumulative Percent
Reading Comprehe	33	62.3	33	62.3
Language Mechani	20	37.7	53	100.0

Table 3

PIC Data Analysis - EVALUATION SAMPLE 16:31 Thursday, October 24, 1991 47

Assess Merged Data with Respect to Evaluation Objectives
ATTEND>=30, Valid Posttest Scores, CTBS and ES
See the PIC Proposal, "7. Evaluation"

COMPLETION Statistics

Completion=NO

Variable	N	Nmiss	Mean	Std Dev	Minimum	Maximum	Range
ETHGR	54	0	2.13	0.73	1.00	5.00	4.00
ATTEND	54	0	35.90	2.58	30.00	39.00	9.00
GERC1	54	0	5.83	2.38	4.00	12.90	8.90
GERC2	54	0	6.22	2.60	4.00	12.90	8.90
GELM1	54	0	5.30	2.31	4.00	12.90	8.90
GELM2	54	0	5.71	2.72	4.00	12.90	8.90
ESPRE	54	0	29.24	6.71	15.00	43.00	28.00
ESPOS	54	0	34.11	6.30	21.00	47.00	26.00

Completion=YES

Variable	N	Nmiss	Mean	Std Dev	Minimum	Maximum	Range
ETHGR	53	0	2.04	0.44	1.00	4.00	3.00
ATTEND	53	0	36.73	2.22	30.50	39.00	8.50
GERC1	53	0	7.44	2.48	4.00	12.90	8.90
GERC2	53	0	8.60	2.51	4.70	12.90	8.20
GELM1	53	0	6.55	2.41	4.00	12.90	8.90
GELM2	53	0	7.44	2.63	4.00	12.90	8.90
ESPRE	53	0	34.96	4.86	19.00	42.00	23.00
ESPOS	53	0	41.74	3.09	36.00	48.00	12.00

Table 4

PIC Data Analysis - EVALUATION SAMPLE 16:31 Thursday, October 24, 1991 49

Assess Merged Data with Respect to Evaluation Objectives
ATTEND>=30, Valid Posttest Scores, CTBS and ES
See the PIC Proposal, "7. Evaluation"

EVALUATION OBJECTIVE 1.1 Frequencies

ATTEND	Frequency	Percent	Cumulative Frequency	Cumulative Percent
30	1	3.7	1	3.7
30.5	1	3.7	2	7.4
31	1	3.7	3	11.1
32	1	3.7	4	14.8
33	2	7.4	6	22.2
34	5	18.5	11	40.7
35	2	7.4	13	48.1
36	2	7.4	15	55.6
37	6	22.2	21	77.8
38	4	14.8	25	92.6
39	2	7.4	27	100.0

Attended 30 or More Days

ATT	Frequency	Percent	Cumulative Frequency	Cumulative Percent
YES	27	100.0	27	100.0

AGEGR	Frequency	Percent	Cumulative Frequency	Cumulative Percent
7	13	48.1	13	48.1
8	8	29.6	21	77.8
9	5	18.5	26	96.3
10	1	3.7	27	100.0

AGEGRPLA	Frequency	Percent	Cumulative Frequency	Cumulative Percent
6	13	48.1	13	48.1
7	8	29.6	21	77.8
8	5	18.5	26	96.3
9	1	3.7	27	100.0

Table 4 (cont.)

PIC Data Analysis - EVALUATION SAMPLE 16:31 Thursday, October 24, 1991 50

Assess Merged Data with Respect to Evaluation Objectives
ATTEND>=30, Valid Posttest Scores, CTBS and ES
See the PIC Proposal, "7. Evaluation"

EVALUATION OBJECTIVE 1.1 Frequencies

PROG	Frequency	Percent	Cumulative Frequency	Cumulative Percent
Reading Comprehe	27	100.0	27	100.0

GERC1	Frequency	Percent	Cumulative Frequency	Cumulative Percent
5	2	7.4	2	7.4
5.2	3	11.1	5	18.5
5.3	2	7.4	7	25.9
5.4	1	3.7	8	29.6
5.6	6	22.2	14	51.9
5.7	2	7.4	16	59.3
5.8	3	11.1	19	70.4
6	2	7.4	21	77.8
6.5	1	3.7	22	81.5
6.9	2	7.4	24	88.9
7.7	3	11.1	27	100.0

GERC2	Frequency	Percent	Cumulative Frequency	Cumulative Percent
4	1	3.7	1	3.7
4.3	1	3.7	2	7.4
4.7	2	7.4	4	14.8
4.9	1	3.7	5	18.5
5.2	1	3.7	6	22.2
5.6	2	7.4	8	29.6
5.7	2	7.4	10	37.0
5.8	1	3.7	11	40.7
6	2	7.4	13	48.1
6.2	3	11.1	16	59.3
6.5	2	7.4	18	66.7
7.3	1	3.7	19	70.4
7.7	1	3.7	20	74.1
8.1	1	3.7	21	77.8
8.3	2	7.4	23	85.2
8.5	1	3.7	24	88.9
8.7	1	3.7	25	92.6
8.9	1	3.7	26	96.3
9.1	1	3.7	27	100.0

Table 4 (cont.)

PIC Data Analysis - EVALUATION SAMPLE 16:31 Thursday, October 24, 1991 51

Assess Merged Data with Respect to Evaluation Objectives
ATTEND>=30, Valid Posttest Scores, CTBS and ES
See the PIC Proposal, "7. Evaluation"

EVALUATION OBJECTIVE 1.1 Frequencies

Gained at Least 1.0 GE in Reading

RCG	Frequency	Percent	Cumulative Frequency	Cumulative Percent
NO	17	63.0	17	63.0
YES	10	37.0	27	100.0

Table 5

PIC Data Analysis - EVALUATION SAMPLE 16:31 Thursday, October 24, 1991 53

Assess Merged Data with Respect to Evaluation Objectives
ATTEND>=30, Valid Posttest Scores, CTBS and ES
See the PIC Proposal, "7. Evaluation"

EVALUATION OBJECTIVE 1.2 Frequencies

ATTEND	Frequency	Percent	Cumulative Frequency	Cumulative Percent
33	1	20.0	1	20.0
35	1	20.0	2	40.0
37	1	20.0	3	60.0
39	2	40.0	5	100.0

Attended 30 or More Days

ATT	Frequency	Percent	Cumulative Frequency	Cumulative Percent
YES	5	100.0	5	100.0

AGEGR	Frequency	Percent	Cumulative Frequency	Cumulative Percent
7	1	20.0	1	20.0
8	3	60.0	4	80.0
9	1	20.0	5	100.0

AGEGRPLA	Frequency	Percent	Cumulative Frequency	Cumulative Percent
6	1	20.0	1	20.0
7	3	60.0	4	80.0
8	1	20.0	5	100.0

PROG	Frequency	Percent	Cumulative Frequency	Cumulative Percent
Language Mechani	5	100.0	5	100.0

Table 5 (cont.)

PIC Data Analysis - EVALUATION SAMPLE 16:31 Thursday, October 24, 1991 54

Assess Merged Data with Respect to Evaluation Objectives
ATTEND>=30, Valid Posttest Scores, CTBS and ES
See the PIC Proposal, "7. Evaluation"

EVALUATION OBJECTIVE 1.2 Frequencies

GELM1	Frequency	Percent	Cumulative Frequency	Cumulative Percent
5	1	20.0	1	20.0
5.6	3	60.0	4	80.0
6.7	1	20.0	5	100.0

GELM2	Frequency	Percent	Cumulative Frequency	Cumulative Percent
4	1	20.0	1	20.0
5.6	1	20.0	2	40.0
6.1	1	20.0	3	60.0
7.9	1	20.0	4	80.0
9.5	1	20.0	5	100.0

Gained at least 1.0 GE in Language

LMG	Frequency	Percent	Cumulative Frequency	Cumulative Percent
NO	3	60.0	3	60.0
YES	2	40.0	5	100.0

Table 6

PIC Data Analysis - EVALUATION SAMPLE 16:31 Thursday, October 24, 1991 56

Assess Merged Data with Respect to Evaluation Objectives
ATTEND>=30, Valid Posttest Scores, CTBS and ES
See the PIC Proposal, "7. Evaluation"

EVALUATION OBJECTIVE 1.4 Frequencies: Reading

ATTEND	Frequency	Percent	Cumulative Frequency	Cumulative Percent
30.5	1	3.4	1	3.4
31	1	3.4	2	6.9
32	1	3.4	3	10.3
33	2	6.9	5	17.2
34	6	20.7	11	37.9
35	1	3.4	12	41.4
36	3	10.3	15	51.7
37	5	17.2	20	69.0
38	6	20.7	26	89.7
39	3	10.3	29	100.0

Attended 30 or More Days

ATT	Frequency	Percent	Cumulative Frequency	Cumulative Percent
YES	29	100.0	29	100.0

AGEGR	Frequency	Percent	Cumulative Frequency	Cumulative Percent
7	17	58.6	17	58.6
8	8	27.6	25	86.2
9	4	13.8	29	100.0

AGEGRPLA	Frequency	Percent	Cumulative Frequency	Cumulative Percent
6	17	58.6	17	58.6
7	8	27.6	25	86.2
8	4	13.8	29	100.0

PIC Data Analysis - EVALUATION SAMPLE 16:31 Thursday, October 24, 1991 57

Assess Merged Data with Respect to Evaluation Objectives
ATTEND>=30, Valid Posttest Scores, CTBS and ES
See the PIC Proposal, "7. Evaluation"

EVALUATION OBJECTIVE 1.4 Frequencies: Reading

PROG	Frequency	Percent	Cumulative Frequency	Cumulative Percent
Reading Comprehe	29	100.0	29	100.0

GERC1	Frequency	Percent	Cumulative Frequency	Cumulative Percent
5	2	6.9	2	6.9
5.2	3	10.3	5	17.2
5.3	2	6.9	7	24.1
5.4	1	3.4	8	27.6
5.6	6	20.7	14	48.3
5.7	1	3.4	15	51.7
5.8	3	10.3	18	62.1
6.2	1	3.4	19	65.5
6.5	2	6.9	21	72.4
6.9	2	6.9	23	79.3
7.3	2	6.9	25	86.2
7.7	3	10.3	28	96.6
8.5	1	3.4	29	100.0

GERC2	Frequency	Percent	Cumulative Frequency	Cumulative Percent
4	1	3.4	1	3.4
4.3	1	3.4	2	6.9
4.7	1	3.4	3	10.3
4.9	1	3.4	4	13.8
5.2	1	3.4	5	17.2
5.6	1	3.4	6	20.7
5.7	2	6.9	8	27.6
5.8	1	3.4	9	31.0
6	2	6.9	11	37.9
6.2	3	10.3	14	48.3
6.5	2	6.9	16	55.2
7.7	2	6.9	18	62.1
8.1	1	3.4	19	65.5
8.3	3	10.3	22	75.9
8.5	3	10.3	25	86.2
8.7	1	3.4	26	89.7
8.9	1	3.4	27	93.1
9.1	2	6.9	29	100.0

Table 6 (cont.)

PIC Data Analysis - EVALUATION SAMPLE 16:31 Thursday, October 24, 1991 58

Assess Merged Data with Respect to Evaluation Objectives
ATTEND>=30, Valid Posttest Scores, CTBS and ES
See the PIC Proposal, "7. Evaluation"

EVALUATION OBJECTIVE 1.4 Frequencies: Reading

Gained at Least 1.0 GE in Reading

RCG	Frequency	Percent	Cumulative Frequency	Cumulative Percent
NO	16	55.2	16	55.2
YES	13	44.8	29	100.0

ESPRE	Frequency	Percent	Cumulative Frequency	Cumulative Percent
22	1	3.4	1	3.4
23	1	3.4	2	6.9
25	1	3.4	3	10.3
26	1	3.4	4	13.8
27	1	3.4	5	17.2
28	1	3.4	6	20.7
29	1	3.4	7	24.1
30	3	10.3	10	34.5
31	1	3.4	11	37.9
32	6	20.7	17	58.6
33	2	6.9	19	65.5
34	1	3.4	20	69.0
35	4	13.8	24	82.8
36	3	10.3	27	93.1
37	2	6.9	29	100.0

ESPOS	Frequency	Percent	Cumulative Frequency	Cumulative Percent
23	1	3.4	1	3.4
28	1	3.4	2	6.9
32	1	3.4	3	10.3
33	2	6.9	5	17.2
36	3	10.3	8	27.6
37	3	10.3	11	37.9
38	7	24.1	18	62.1
39	1	3.4	19	65.5
40	2	6.9	21	72.4
41	3	10.3	24	82.8
43	2	6.9	26	89.7
45	1	3.4	27	93.1
46	2	6.9	29	100.0

Table 7

PIC Data Analysis - EVALUATION SAMPLE 16:31 Thursday, October 24, 1991 60

Assess Merged Data with Respect to Evaluation Objectives
ATTEND>=30, Valid Posttest Scores, CTBS and ES
See the PIC Proposal, "7. Evaluation"

EVALUATION OBJECTIVE 1.4 Frequencies: Language

ATTEND	Frequency	Percent	Cumulative Frequency	Cumulative Percent
30.5	1	8.3	1	8.3
33	2	16.7	3	25.0
35	2	16.7	5	41.7
37	1	8.3	6	50.0
38	1	8.3	7	58.3
39	5	41.7	12	100.0

Attended 30 or More Days

ATT	Frequency	Percent	Cumulative Frequency	Cumulative Percent
YES	12	100.0	12	100.0

AGEGR	Frequency	Percent	Cumulative Frequency	Cumulative Percent
7	6	50.0	6	50.0
8	4	33.3	10	83.3
9	2	16.7	12	100.0

AGEGRPLA	Frequency	Percent	Cumulative Frequency	Cumulative Percent
6	6	50.0	6	50.0
7	4	33.3	10	83.3
8	2	16.7	12	100.0

PROG	Frequency	Percent	Cumulative Frequency	Cumulative Percent
Language Mechani	12	100.0	12	100.0

PIC Data Analysis - EVALUATION SAMPLE 16:31 Thursday, October 24, 1991 61

Assess Merged Data with Respect to Evaluation Objectives
ATTEND>=30, Valid Posttest Scores, CTBS and ES
See the PIC Proposal, "7. Evaluation"

EVALUATION OBJECTIVE 1.4 Frequencies: Language

GELM1	Frequency	Percent	Cumulative Frequency	Cumulative Percent
5	1	8.3	1	8.3
5.6	3	25.0	4	33.3
6.7	2	16.7	6	50.0
7.3	2	16.7	8	66.7
7.9	1	8.3	9	75.0
8.4	1	8.3	10	83.3
9.5	1	8.3	11	91.7
10.1	1	8.3	12	100.0

GELM2	Frequency	Percent	Cumulative Frequency	Cumulative Percent
4	1	8.3	1	8.3
5.6	1	8.3	2	16.7
6.1	1	8.3	3	25.0
6.7	1	8.3	4	33.3
7.9	3	25.0	7	58.3
8.4	1	8.3	8	66.7
9	1	8.3	9	75.0
9.5	1	8.3	10	83.3
10.1	1	8.3	11	91.7
12.9	1	8.3	12	100.0

Gained at Least 1.0 GE in Language

LMG	Frequency	Percent	Cumulative Frequency	Cumulative Percent
NO	7	58.3	7	58.3
YES	5	41.7	12	100.0

PIC Data Analysis - EVALUATION SAMPLE 16:31 Thursday, October 24, 1991 62

Assess Merged Data with Respect to Evaluation Objectives
ATTEND>=30, Valid Posttest Scores, CTBS and ES
See the PIC Proposal, "7. Evaluation"

EVALUATION OBJECTIVE 1.4 Frequencies: Language

ESPRE	Frequency	Percent	Cumulative Frequency	Cumulative Percent
27	1	8.3	1	8.3
31	2	16.7	3	25.0
34	2	16.7	5	41.7
35	2	16.7	7	58.3
36	2	16.7	9	75.0
37	3	25.0	12	100.0

ESPOS	Frequency	Percent	Cumulative Frequency	Cumulative Percent
34	1	8.3	1	8.3
36	1	8.3	2	16.7
38	2	16.7	4	33.3
39	1	8.3	5	41.7
40	3	25.0	8	66.7
41	1	8.3	9	75.0
42	2	16.7	11	91.7
44	1	8.3	12	100.0

Table 8

PIC Data Analysis - EVALUATION SAMPLE 16:31 Thursday, October 24, 1991 64

Assess Merged Data with Respect to Evaluation Objectives
ATTEND>=30, Valid Posttest Scores, CTBS and ES
See the PIC Proposal, "7. Evaluation"

EVALUATION OBJECTIVE 2.1 Frequencies

ATTEND	Frequency	Percent	Cumulative Frequency	Cumulative Percent
32	3	7.7	3	7.7
34	6	15.4	9	23.1
35	4	10.3	13	33.3
36	4	10.3	17	43.6
37	7	17.9	24	61.5
38	6	15.4	30	76.9
39	9	23.1	39	100.0

Attended 30 or More Days

ATT	Frequency	Percent	Cumulative Frequency	Cumulative Percent
YES	39	100.0	39	100.0

AGEGR	Frequency	Percent	Cumulative Frequency	Cumulative Percent
6	1	2.6	1	2.6
7	14	35.9	15	38.5
8	15	38.5	30	76.9
9	8	20.5	38	97.4
10	1	2.6	39	100.0

AGEGRPLA	Frequency	Percent	Cumulative Frequency	Cumulative Percent
5	1	2.6	1	2.6
6	14	35.9	15	38.5
7	15	38.5	30	76.9
8	8	20.5	38	97.4
9	1	2.6	39	100.0

Table 8 (cont.)

PIC Data Analysis - EVALUATION SAMPLE 16:31 Thursday, October 24, 1991 65

Assess Merged Data with Respect to Evaluation Objectives
ATTEND>=30, Valid Posttest Scores, CTBS and ES
See the PIC Proposal, "7. Evaluation"

EVALUATION OBJECTIVE 2.1 Frequencies

PROG	Frequency	Percent	Cumulative Frequency	Cumulative Percent
Reading Comprehe	39	100.0	39	100.0

GERC1	Frequency	Percent	Cumulative Frequency	Cumulative Percent
4	20	51.3	20	51.3
4.3	3	7.7	23	59.0
4.6	4	10.3	27	69.2
4.7	3	7.7	30	76.9
4.9	9	23.1	39	100.0

GERC2	Frequency	Percent	Cumulative Frequency	Cumulative Percent
4	13	33.3	13	33.3
4.3	1	2.6	14	35.9
4.6	2	5.1	16	41.0
4.7	2	5.1	18	46.2
4.9	2	5.1	20	51.3
5	2	5.1	22	56.4
5.2	3	7.7	25	64.1
5.3	4	10.3	29	74.4
5.4	1	2.6	30	76.9
5.6	1	2.6	31	79.5
5.7	2	5.1	33	84.6
6.2	2	5.1	35	89.7
6.5	1	2.6	36	92.3
6.9	1	2.6	37	94.9
8.1	1	2.6	38	97.4
8.9	1	2.6	39	100.0

Table 8 (cont.)

PIC Data Analysis - EVALUATION SAMPLE 16:31 Thursday, October 24, 1991 66

Assess Merged Data with Respect to Evaluation Objectives
ATTEND>=30, Valid Posttest Scores, CTBS and ES
See the PIC Proposal, "7. Evaluation"

EVALUATION OBJECTIVE 2.1 Frequencies

Gained at Least 1.0 GE in Reading

RCG	Frequency	Percent	Cumulative Frequency	Cumulative Percent
NO	25	64.1	25	64.1
YES	14	35.9	39	100.0

Table 9

PIC Data Analysis - EVALUATION SAMPLE 16:31 Thursday, October 24, 1991 68

Assess Merged Data with Respect to Evaluation Objectives
ATTEND>=30, Valid Posttest Scores, CTBS and ES
See the PIC Proposal, "7. Evaluation"

EVALUATION OBJECTIVE 2.2 Frequencies

ATTEND	Frequency	Percent	Cumulative Frequency	Cumulative Percent
34	1	33.3	1	33.3
37	1	33.3	2	66.7
39	1	33.3	3	100.0

Attended 30 or More Days

ATT	Frequency	Percent	Cumulative Frequency	Cumulative Percent
YES	3	100.0	3	100.0

AGEGR	Frequency	Percent	Cumulative Frequency	Cumulative Percent
7	1	33.3	1	33.3
8	2	66.7	3	100.0

AGEGRPLA	Frequency	Percent	Cumulative Frequency	Cumulative Percent
6	1	33.3	1	33.3
7	2	66.7	3	100.0

PROG	Frequency	Percent	Cumulative Frequency	Cumulative Percent
Language Mechani	3	100.0	3	100.0

PIC Data Analysis - EVALUATION SAMPLE 16:31 Thursday, October 24, 1991 69

Assess Merged Data with Respect to Evaluation Objectives
ATTEND>=30, Valid Posttest Scores, CTBS and ES
See the PIC Proposal, "7. Evaluation"

EVALUATION OBJECTIVE 2.2 Frequencies

GELM1	Frequency	Percent	Cumulative Frequency	Cumulative Percent
4	1	33.3	1	33.3
4.5	2	66.7	3	100.0

GELM2	Frequency	Percent	Cumulative Frequency	Cumulative Percent
5.6	1	33.3	1	33.3
8.4	1	33.3	2	66.7
9	1	33.3	3	100.0

Gained at Least 1.0 GE in Language

LMG	Frequency	Percent	Cumulative Frequency	Cumulative Percent
YES	3	100.0	3	100.0

Table 10

PIC Data Analysis - EVALUATION SAMPLE 16:31 Thursday, October 24, 1994 71

Assess Merged Data with Respect to Evaluation Objectives
ATTEND>=30, Valid Posttest Scores, CTBS and ES
See the PIC Proposal, "7. Evaluation"

EVALUATION OBJECTIVE 2.4 Frequencies: Reading

ATTEND	Frequency	Percent	Cumulative Frequency	Cumulative Percent
32	3	7.7	3	7.7
34	6	15.4	9	23.1
35	4	10.3	13	33.3
36	4	10.3	17	43.6
37	7	17.9	24	61.5
38	6	15.4	30	76.9
39	9	23.1	39	100.0

Attended 30 or More Days

ATT	Frequency	Percent	Cumulative Frequency	Cumulative Percent
YES	39	100.0	39	100.0

AGEGR	Frequency	Percent	Cumulative Frequency	Cumulative Percent
6	1	2.6	1	2.6
7	14	35.9	15	38.5
8	15	38.5	30	76.9
9	8	20.5	38	97.4
10	1	2.6	39	100.0

AGEGRPLA	Frequency	Percent	Cumulative Frequency	Cumulative Percent
5	1	2.6	1	2.6
6	14	35.9	15	38.5
7	15	38.5	30	76.9
8	8	20.5	38	97.4
9	1	2.6	39	100.0

Table 10 (cont.)

PIC Data Analysis - EVALUATION SAMPLE 16:31 Thursday, October 24, 1991 72

Assess Merged Data with Respect to Evaluation Objectives
ATTEND>=30, Valid Posttest Scores, CTBS and ES
See the PIC Proposal, "7. Evaluation"

EVALUATION OBJECTIVE 2.4 Frequencies: Reading

PROG	Frequency	Percent	Cumulative Frequency	Cumulative Percent
Reading Comprehe	39	100.0	39	100.0

GERC1	Frequency	Percent	Cumulative Frequency	Cumulative Percent
4	20	51.3	20	51.3
4.3	3	7.7	23	59.0
4.6	4	10.3	27	69.2
4.7	3	7.7	30	76.9
4.9	9	23.1	39	100.0

GERC2	Frequency	Percent	Cumulative Frequency	Cumulative Percent
4	13	33.3	13	33.3
4.3	1	2.6	14	35.9
4.6	2	5.1	16	41.0
4.7	2	5.1	18	46.2
4.9	2	5.1	20	51.3
5	2	5.1	22	56.4
5.2	3	7.7	25	64.1
5.3	4	10.3	29	74.4
5.4	1	2.6	30	76.9
5.6	1	2.6	31	79.5
5.7	2	5.1	33	84.6
6.2	2	5.1	35	89.7
6.5	1	2.6	36	92.3
6.9	1	2.6	37	94.9
8.1	1	2.6	38	97.4
8.9	1	2.6	39	100.0

PIC Data Analysis - EVALUATION SAMPLE 16:31 Thursday, October 24, 1991 73

Assess Merged Data with Respect to Evaluation Objectives
ATTEND>=30, Valid Posttest Scores, CTBS and ES
See the PIC Proposal, "7. Evaluation"

EVALUATION OBJECTIVE 2.4 Frequencies: Reading

Gained at Least 1.0 GE in Reading

RCG	Frequency	Percent	Cumulative Frequency	Cumulative Percent
NO	25	64.1	25	64.1
YES	14	35.9	39	100.0

ESPRE	Frequency	Percent	Cumulative Frequency	Cumulative Percent
15	1	2.6	1	2.6
16	1	2.6	2	5.1
18	2	5.1	4	10.3
19	2	5.1	6	15.4
20	1	2.6	7	17.9
21	2	5.1	9	23.1
22	1	2.6	10	25.6
23	2	5.1	12	30.8
24	2	5.1	14	35.9
25	3	7.7	17	43.6
26	2	5.1	19	48.7
27	1	2.6	20	51.3
28	1	2.6	21	53.8
30	3	7.7	24	61.5
31	4	10.3	28	71.8
32	3	7.7	31	79.5
33	2	5.1	33	84.6
34	3	7.7	36	92.3
35	2	5.1	38	97.4
37	1	2.6	39	100.0

Table 10 (cont.)

PIC Data Analysis - EVALUATION SAMPLE 16:31 Thursday, October 24, 1991 74

Assess Merged Data with Respect to Evaluation Objectives
ATTEND>=30, Valid Posttest Scores, CTBS and ES
See the PIC Proposal, "7. Evaluation"

EVALUATION OBJECTIVE 2.4 Frequencies: Reading

ESPOS	Frequency	Percent	Cumulative Frequency	Cumulative Percent
21	2	5.1	2	5.1
22	1	2.6	3	7.7
24	3	7.7	6	15.4
25	1	2.6	7	17.9
26	1	2.6	8	20.5
28	1	2.6	9	23.1
29	1	2.6	10	25.6
30	1	2.6	11	28.2
31	1	2.6	12	30.8
33	1	2.6	13	33.3
34	2	5.1	15	38.5
35	3	7.7	18	46.2
36	4	10.3	22	56.4
37	3	7.7	25	64.1
38	2	5.1	27	69.2
39	2	5.1	29	74.4
40	2	5.1	31	79.5
41	2	5.1	33	84.6
43	2	5.1	35	89.7
44	2	5.1	37	94.9
45	1	2.6	38	97.4
47	1	2.6	39	100.0

Table 11

PIC Data Analysis - EVALUATION SAMPLE 16:31 Thursday, October 24, 1991 76

Assess Merged Data with Respect to Evaluation Objectives
ATTEND>=30, Valid Posttest Scores, CTBS and ES
See the PIC Proposal, "7. Evaluation"

EVALUATION OBJECTIVE 2.4 Frequencies: Language

ATTEND	Frequency	Percent	Cumulative Frequency	Cumulative Percent
34	1	33.3	1	33.3
37	1	33.3	2	66.7
39	1	33.3	3	100.0

Attended 30 or More Days

ATT	Frequency	Percent	Cumulative Frequency	Cumulative Percent
YES	3	100.0	3	100.0

AGEGR	Frequency	Percent	Cumulative Frequency	Cumulative Percent
7	1	33.3	1	33.3
8	2	66.7	3	100.0

AGEGRPLA	Frequency	Percent	Cumulative Frequency	Cumulative Percent
6	1	33.3	1	33.3
7	2	66.7	3	100.0

PROG	Frequency	Percent	Cumulative Frequency	Cumulative Percent
Language Mechani	3	100.0	3	100.0

PIC Data Analysis - EVALUATION SAMPLE 16:31 Thursday, October 24, 1991 77

Assess Merged Data with Respect to Evaluation Objectives
ATTEND>=30, Valid Posttest Scores, CTBS and ES
See the PIC Proposal, "7. Evaluation"

EVALUATION OBJECTIVE 2.4 Frequencies: Language

GELM1	Frequency	Percent	Cumulative Frequency	Cumulative Percent
4	1	33.3	1	33.3
4.5	2	66.7	3	100.0

GELM2	Frequency	Percent	Cumulative Frequency	Cumulative Percent
5.6	1	33.3	1	33.3
8.4	1	33.3	2	66.7
9	1	33.3	3	100.0

Gained at Least 1.0 GE in Language

LMG	Frequency	Percent	Cumulative Frequency	Cumulative Percent
YES	3	100.0	3	100.0

ESPRE	Frequency	Percent	Cumulative Frequency	Cumulative Percent
33	1	33.3	1	33.3
37	2	66.7	3	100.0

ESPOS	Frequency	Percent	Cumulative Frequency	Cumulative Percent
37	2	66.7	2	66.7
45	1	33.3	3	100.0

Table 12

PIC Data Analysis - EVALUATION SAMPLE 16:31 Thursday, October 24, 1991 78

Assess Merged Data with Respect to Evaluation Objectives
ATTEND>=30, Valid Posttest Scores, CTBS and ES
See the PIC Proposal, "7. Evaluation"

EVALUATION OBJECTIVE 3.1 - Attendance

Attended 30 or More Days

ATT	Frequency	Percent	Cumulative Frequency	Cumulative Percent
YES	107	100.0	107	100.0

ETHGR	Frequency	Percent	Cumulative Frequency	Cumulative Percent
Non-Minority	6	5.6	6	5.6
Black	94	87.9	100	93.5
Asian	6	5.6	106	99.1
Indian	1	0.9	107	100.0

SEX	Frequency	Percent	Cumulative Frequency	Cumulative Percent
F	49	45.8	49	45.8
M	58	54.2	107	100.0

TABLE OF ATT BY ETHGR

ATT(Attended 30 or More Days) ETHGR

Frequency / Percent / Row Pct / Col Pct	Non-Minority	Black	Asian	Indian	Total
YES	6	94	6	1	107
	5.61	87.85	5.61	0.93	100.00
	5.61	87.85	5.61	0.93	
	100.00	100.00	100.00	100.00	
Total	6	94	6	1	107
	5.61	87.85	5.61	0.93	100.00

PIC Data Analysis - EVALUATION SAMPLE 16:31 Thursday, October 24, 1991 80

Assess Merged Data with Respect to Evaluation Objectives
ATTEND>=30, Valid Posttest Scores, CTBS and ES
See the PIC Proposal, "7. Evaluation"

EVALUATION OBJECTIVE 3.1 - Attendance

TABLE 2 OF ATT BY ETHGR
CONTROLLING FOR SEX=M

ATT(Attended 30 or More Days) ETHGR

Frequency / Percent / Row Pct / Col Pct	Non-Minority	Black	Asian	Indian	Total
YES	3	48	6	1	58
	5.17	82.76	10.34	1.72	100.00
	5.17	82.76	10.34	1.72	
	100.00	100.00	100.00	100.00	
Total	3	48	6	1	58
	5.17	82.76	10.34	1.72	100.00

Table 13

PIC Data Analysis - EVALUATION SAMPLE 16:31 Thursday, October 24, 1991 81

Assess Merged Data with Respect to Evaluation Objectives
ATTEND>=30, Valid Posttest Scores, CTBS and ES
See the PIC Proposal, "7. Evaluation"

EVALUATION OBJECTIVE 3.2 - Male/Black Retention

Attended 30 or More Days

ATT	Frequency	Percent	Cumulative Frequency	Cumulative Percent
YES	48	100.0	48	100.0

ETHGR	Frequency	Percent	Cumulative Frequency	Cumulative Percent
Black	48	100.0	48	100.0

SEX	Frequency	Percent	Cumulative Frequency	Cumulative Percent
M	48	100.0	48	100.0

TABLE OF ATT BY ETHGR

ATT(Attended 30 or More Days)

	ETHGR	
Frequency Percent Row Pct Col Pct	Black	Total
YES	48 100.00 100.00 100.00	48 100.00
Total	48 100.00	48 100.00

Table 14

PIC Data Analysis - EVALUATION SAMPLE 16:31 Thursday, October 24, 1991 82

Assess Merged Data with Respect to Evaluation Objectives
ATTEND>=30, Valid Posttest Scores, CTBS and ES
See the PIC Proposal, "7. Evaluation"

EVALUATION OBJECTIVE 3.3 - Non-Minority

Attended 30 or More Days

ATT	Frequency	Percent	Cumulative Frequency	Cumulative Percent
YES	107	100.0	107	100.0

ETHGR	Frequency	Percent	Cumulative Frequency	Cumulative Percent
Non-Minority	6	5.6	6	5.6
Black	94	87.9	100	93.5
Asian	6	5.6	106	99.1
Indian	1	0.9	107	100.0

SEX	Frequency	Percent	Cumulative Frequency	Cumulative Percent
F	49	45.8	49	45.8
M	58	54.2	107	100.0

TABLE OF ATT BY ETHGR

ATT(Attended 30 or More Days) ETHGR

Frequency / Percent / Row Pct / Col Pct	Non-Minority	Black	Asian	Indian	Total
YES	6	94	6	1	107
	5.61	87.85	5.61	0.93	100.00
	5.61	87.85	5.61	0.93	
	100.00	100.00	100.00	100.00	
Total	6	94	6	1	107
	5.61	87.85	5.61	0.93	100.00

Appendix

PUPIL CENSUS FORM

PIC STUDENT NAME _____ ROOM 323

PIC STUDENT NUMBER 000012 ETHNIC GROUP MEMBERSHIP (CIRCLE ONE)

SEX M GRADE 5 BIRTH DATE 5/17/76 1 - NONMINORITY (2 - BLACK)

TOTAL DAYS OF PROGRAM ATTENDANCE 33 DAYS. 3 - SPANISH SURNAME 4 - ASIAN

TOTAL DAYS OF PROGRAM ENROLLMENT 34 DAYS. 5 - AMERICAN INDIAN

INSTRUCTIONS FOR COMPLETING FORM

1. ENTER ROOM NUMBER.
2. ENTER GRADE (GRADE LAST YEAR).
3. VERIFY PREPRINTED VALUES FOR SEX AND BIRTHDAY.
   WRITE-IN CHANGES ABOVE PREPRINTED VALUES.
4. CIRCLE THE APPROPRIATE ETHNIC GROUP.
5. ENTER TOTAL DAYS OF ATTENDANCE BY THIS PUPIL.
6. ENTER TOTAL DAYS THIS PUPIL WAS ENROLLED IN THE SUMMER PROGRAM.
   (NOTE: DAYS OF ENROLLMENT MUST BE EQUAL TO OR GREATER THAN DAYS OF ATTENDANCE.)
7. IN THE GRAPHIC BELOW, USE AN "X" AS APPROPRIATE TO INDICATE BOTH "PROGRAM" AND "INSTRUCTIONAL-CONTENT AREA" FOR THIS PUPIL; E.G., A PUPIL IN THE STEP PROGRAM RECEIVING LANGUAGE MECHANICS INSTRUCTION SHOULD HAVE AN "X" IN THE ROW "STEP", UNDER THE COLUMN HEADING "LANGUAGE MECHANICS". USE AN "X" TO INDICATE EACH CONTENT AREA IN WHICH THIS PUPIL RECEIVES INSTRUCTION. A "X" MAY APPEAR IN MORE THAN ONE COLUMN BUT ONLY IN ONE ROW.

CONTENT AREA

PROGRAM	READING COMPREHENSION	LANGUAGE MECHANICS	MATHEMATICS COMPUTATION
FAST TRACK	_	X	_
STEP	_	_	_

(STUDENT FILE-FOLDER COPY - RUN DATE: 08/16/91)

PIC STUDENT NAME

PIC STUDENT NUMBER 95 ROOM 204

SEX M GRADE 7 BIRTH DATE 01/11/77

TOTAL DAYS OF PROGRAM ATTENDANCE 38.0 DAYS.

TOTAL DAYS OF PROGRAM ENROLLMENT 39 DAYS.

ETHNIC GROUP MEMBERSHIP

- NONMINORITY
X - BLACK
- SPANISH SURNAME
- ASIAN
- AMERICAN INDIAN

CONTENT AREA

PROGRAM	READING COMPREHENSION	LANGUAGE MECHANICS	MATHEMATICS COMPUTATION
FAST TRACK	X	_	_
STEP	_	_	_

TESTING RESULTS: C T B S

(GRADE EQUIVALENT VALUES)

	PRETEST	POSTTEST	CHANGE
READING COMPREHENSION	4.9	5.2	0.3
LANGUAGE MECHANICS	4.3	7.3	3.0
MATH COMPUTATION	7.3	8.0	0.7

E M P L O Y M E N T S K I L L S

(RAW SCORE VALUES)

PRETEST	POSTTEST	CHANGE
32	40	8

***** COMPLETION STATUS *****

CRITERION	STATUS
ATTENDANCE (30 DAY MIN.)	YES
CTBS GRADE-EQUIVALENT GAIN (GE 1.0)	YES
EMPLOYMENT SKILLS (75% PRE/POSTTEST)	YES
PROGRAM COMPLETION	YES

xit

DISTRICT VERIFICATION REPORT

OLUMBUS SCHOOLS
IC91 POS-CTB

COMPREHENSIVE TESTS
SPRING

SCHOOL NAME	TEACHER NAME	GRADE	TEST LEVEL	CODED COUNT	PROCESSED COUNT
			H	0	136
			U	0	136

BATCH 910023
TEST DATE: 08/06/91
RUN DATE: 08/09/91
PAGE 1

LUMBUS SCHOOLS

ADE

TEACHER VERIFICATION REPORT

COMPREHENSIVE TEST
PIC91 POS-CTB

STUDENT NAME	TEST LEVEL	STUDENT NUMBER	STUDENT CODE	BIRTH DATE	SEX	REF NO.
	H U	000000072	080691....	6/30/76	M	66
	H U	000000140	080691....	3/12/76	M	67
	H U	000000032	080691....	3/06/77	M	68
	H U	000000188	080691....	11/27/76	M	69
	H U	000000080	080691....	5/02/77	M	70
	H U	000000110	080691....	11/22/76	F	71
	H U	000000017	080691....	5/12/76	F	72
	H U	000000167	080691....	1/11/76	F	73
	H U	000000135	080691....	2/12/77	M	74
	H U	000000133	080691....	2/12/77	F	75
	H U	000000119	080691....	3/01/77	F	76
	H U	000000038	080691....	3/17/75	F	77
	H U	000000141	080691....	4/04/77	F	78
	H U	000000187	080691....	4/29/77	M	79
	H U	000000010	080691....	2/19/76	F	80
	H U	000000090	080691....	2/03/77	M	81
	H U	000000118	080691....	11/12/75	M	82
	H U	000000086	080691....	2/26/77	F	83
	H U	000000003	080691....	2/12/77	M	84
	H U	000000036	080691....	9/07/76	M	85
	H U	000000011	080691....	7/29/76	M	86
	H U	000000067	080691....	12/02/75	M	87
	H U	000000069	080691....	5/23/77	F	88
	H U	000000196	080691....	3/08/74	F	89
	H U	000000193	080691....	4/04/76	M	90
	H U	000000117	080691....	2/23/77	M	91
	H U	000000007	080691....	3/21/77	M	92
	H U	000000178	080691....	12/10/76	M	93
	H U	000000009	080691....	1/21/77	F	94
	H U	000000029	080691....	5/16/75	M	95
	H U	000000054	080691....	12/12/76	M	96
	H U	000000108	080691....	12/17/76	M	97
	H U	000000122	080691....	10/03/76	F	98
	H U	000000190	080691....	12/12/72	M	99
	H U	000000174	080691....	4/22/76	M	100
	H U	000000081	080691....	12/09/76	M	101
	H U	000000096	080691....	9/29/76	M	102
	H U	000000051	080691....	2/17/77	M	103
	H U	000000171	080691....	7/25/76	M	104
	H U	000000008	080691....	1/24/77	M	105
	H U	000000084	080691....	7/15/76	F	106
	H U	000000123	080691....	7/30/76	M	107
	H U	000000042	080691....	8/12/76	F	108
	H U	000000150	080691....	8/14/75	F	109
	H U	000000104	080691....	1/11/77	F	110
	H U	000000103	080691....	3/16/75	F	111
	H U	000000102	080691....	7/21/74	F	112
	H U	000000076	080691....	8/18/76	F	113
	H U	000000112	080691....	5/11/76	F	114
	H U	000000146	080691....	10/19/76	F	115
	H U	000000179	080691....	9/01/75	F	116
	H U	000000180	080691....	7/29/76	F	117
	H U	000000023	080691....	10/25/75	F	118
	H U	000000016	080691....	4/12/75	F	119
	H U	000000173	080691....	1/12/77	M	120
	H U	000000106	080691....	2/22/77	F	121
	H U	000000061	080691....	12/03/76	M	122
	H U	000000028	080691....	1/13/76	F	123
	H U	000000078	080691....	3/03/ 7	M	124
	H U	000000004	080691....	1/09/77	M	125
	H U	000000062	080691....	7/14/76	M	126
	H U	000000085	080691....	1/08/77	F	127
	H U	000000083	080691....	12/29/75	F	128

BATCH 910023
TEST DATE: 08/06/91
RUN DATE: 08/09/91
PAGE 2

:OLUMBUS SCHOOLS
RADE

CLASS LIST REPORT

COMPREHENSIVE TEST
PIC91 POS-CTB

TUDENT NAME / ODES A-J / ODES K-Q	LVL / FRM	VOC RDG CMP	SPL LNG MEC	LNG EXP	MTH CMP	MTH C&A	REF SKL	SCI	SOC STD	RDG TOT	LNG TOT	MTH TOT	TOT BTR
	NR	42	22		37								
	NA	45	30		40								
	SS	809	720		748								
	GE	12.9	9.0		12.9								
	OM	100	80		80								
	NR	21	10		10								
	NA	45	30		40								
	SS	713	642		698								
	GE	5.4	4.0		5.4								
	OM	17	0		0								
	NR	14	6		13								
	NA	45	30		39								
	SS	660	571		711								
	GE	4.3	4.0		6.4								
	OM	0	0		0								
	NR	43	25		34								
	NA	45	30		40								
	SS	823	741		740								
	GE	12.9	10.8		11.1								
	OM	100	80		80								
	NR	39	25		30								
	NA	45	30		40								
	SS	786	741		733								
	GE	9.9	10.8		8.9								
	OM	83	80		60								
	NR	9	15		16								
	NA	45	30		40								
	SS	563	680		717								
	GE	4.0	5.3		7.0								
	OM	0	40		0								
	NR	35	20		28								
	NA	45	30		40								
	SS	768	709		731								
	GE	8.9	7.9		8.5								
	OM	50	40		40								
	NR	35	14		22								
	NA	45	30		40								
	SS	768	673		725								
	GE	8.9	5.0		7.7								
	OM	83	20		0								
	NR	25	9		13								
	NA	45	30		40								
	SS	730	632		711								
	GE	6.0	4.0		6.4								
	OM	33	0		0								
	NR	20	20		8								
	NA	45	30		40								
	SS	708	709		679								
	GE	5.3	7.9		4.6								
	OM	0	20		0								
	NR	12	5		22								
	NA	45	30		40								
	SS	607	547		725								
	GE	4.0	4.0		7.7								
	OM	0	0		0								

NR=NUMBER RIGHT NA=NO. ATTEMPTED
SS=SCALE SCORE GE=GRADE EQUIV
OM=OBJECTIVES MAST

BATCH 910023
TEST DATE: 08/06/91
RUN DATE: 08/12/91
PAGE 2

OLUMBUS SCHOOLS

STUDENT MULTI-REFERENCED REPORT

COMPREHENSIVE TEST
LEVEL H U
PIC91 POS-CTB

RADE

	NR	NA	SS	GE	OM
EADING COMP	19	45	703	5.2	0
ANGUAGE MECH	19	30	703	7.3	20
ATH COMP	24	40	727	8.0	20

R=NUMBER RIGHT NA=NO. ATTEMPTED
S=SCALE SCORE GE=GRADE EQUIV
M=OBJECTIVES MAST

OBJECTIVE	RIGHT POSS	% CORRECT STD
EADING COMP		
PASSAGE DETAILS	6/9	67
CHARACTER ANALY	2/5	40
MAIN IDEA	2/5	40
GENERALIZATIONS	5/8	63
WRITTEN FORMS	2/9	22
WRITING TECHNIQ	2/9	22
SUBTEST AVG		42
ANGUAGE MECH		
PRONOUN/NOUN/AD	2/4	50
BEG WORDS/TITLE	3/5	60
PER/QUES/EXCL/C	4/7	57
QUOTATION MARKS	5/6	83
EDITING SKILLS	4/6	67
SUBTEST AVG		64
ATH COMP		
ADD DECIMAL/FRA	3/8	38
SUB DECIMAL/FRA	4/8	50
MULT DECIMAL/FR	4/6	67
DIVIDE DEC/FRAC	3/6	50
INTEGERS	3/4	75
SUBTEST AVG		53
TOTAL AVG		51

BATCH 910023-5 CODES A-J 000000095
TEST DATE: 08/06/91 CODES K-Q 080691....
RUN DATE: 08/12/91 PAGE 1

PIC Summer 91 Employment Skills Posttest Data
"NCR" is Number Correct - SORT by NAME

ME	SN	NCR
	095	40.00
	094	40.00
	050	41.00
	019	38.00
	138	46.00
	109	31.00
	160	39.00
	139	40.00
	036	44.00
	127	47.00
	074	34.00
	098	35.00
	145	31.00
	052	41.00
	191	46.00
	134	23.00
	068	46.00
	195	26.00
	194	38.00
	071	41.00
	058	22.00
	057	36.00
	130	43.00
	048	45.00
	168	36.00
	053	35.00
	183	33.00
	092	39.00
	189	37.00
	131	28.00
	020	39.00
	099	43.00
	153	25.00
	155	35.00
	129	41.00
	107	31.00
	027	42.00
	132	38.00
	164	46.00
	002	46.00

Prepared by
Program Evaluation on 12 Aug 91
page 1

Evaluate the Merged Dataset MERGDATA HWELL A

GE 12.0 Pretest Score Issue

Room Frequencies

ROOM=322

Attended 30 or More Days

ATT	Frequency	Percent	Cumulative Frequency	Cumulative Percent
NO	2	18.2	2	18.2
YES	9	81.8	11	100.0

Gained at Least 1.0 GE in Reading

RCG	Frequency	Percent	Cumulative Frequency	Cumulative Percent
NO	10	90.9	10	90.9
YES	1	9.1	11	100.0

Gained at Least 1.0 GE in Language

LMG	Frequency	Percent	Cumulative Frequency	Cumulative Percent
NO	8	72.7	8	72.7
YES	3	27.3	11	100.0

Gained at Least 1.0 GE in Math

MCG	Frequency	Percent	Cumulative Frequency	Cumulative Percent
NO	9	81.8	9	81.8
YES	2	18.2	11	100.0

Evaluate the Merged Dataset MERGDATA HWELL A

GE 12.0 Pretest Score Issue

Room Frequencies

ROOM=322

Scored 38 or More on Pre-/Posttest ES

ESP	Frequency	Percent	Cumulative Frequency	Cumulative Percent
NO	1	9.1	1	9.1
YES	10	90.9	11	100.0

Completion

COMPL	Frequency	Percent	Cumulative Frequency	Cumulative Percent
NO	5	45.5	5	45.5
YES	6	54.5	11	100.0

Evaluate the Merged Dataset MERGDATA HWELL A

GE 12.0 Pretest Score Issue

Mean Values by Room

ROOM=322

Variable	Label	N	Mean	Std Dev	Minimum	Maximum
GR		11	8.7	0.5	8.0	9.0
ETHGR		11	2.0	0.0	2.0	2.0
ATTEND		11	34.7	5.2	23.0	39.0
ENROLL		11	39.0	0.0	39.0	39.0
ATT	Attended 30 or More Days	11	0.8	0.4	0.0	1.0
PROG		11	2.0	0.0	2.0	2.0
GERC1		11	12.0	1.1	9.3	12.9
GERC2		10	11.5	1.6	9.1	12.9
RCG	Gained at Least 1.0 GE in Reading	11	0.1	0.3	0.0	1.0
GELM1		11	10.6	1.9	7.9	12.9
GELM2		10	10.8	1.8	7.3	12.9
LMG	Gained at Least 1.0 GE in Language	11	0.3	0.5	0.0	1.0
GEMC1		11	10.2	2.6	7.2	12.9
GEMC2		10	10.2	2.8	4.3	12.9
MCG	Gained at Least 1.0 GE in Math	11	0.2	0.4	0.0	1.0
ESPRE		11	39.8	1.7	37.0	43.0
ESPOS		10	45.2	1.4	43.0	47.0
ESP	Scored 38 or More on Pre-/Posttest ES	11	0.9	0.3	0.0	1.0
COMPL	Completion	11	0.5	0.5	0.0	1.0

Evaluate the Merged Dataset MERGDATA HWELL A

GE 12.0 Pretest Score Issue

Mean Values by Program

PROG=Reading Comprehension

Variable	Label	N	Mean	Std Dev	Minimum	Maximum
GR		1	9.0	.	9.0	9.0
ETHGR		1	4.0	.	4.0	4.0
ATTEND		1	39.0	.	39.0	39.0
ENROLL		1	39.0	.	39.0	39.0
ATT	Attended 30 or More Days	1	1.0	.	1.0	1.0
PROG		1	1.0	.	1.0	1.0
GERC1		1	4.7	.	4.7	4.7
GERC2		1	4.9	.	4.9	4.9
RCG	Gained at Least 1.0 GE in Reading	1	0.0	.	0.0	0.0
GELM1		1	7.3	.	7.3	7.3
GELM2		1	4.8	.	4.8	4.8
LMG	Gained at Least 1.0 GE in Language	1	0.0	.	0.0	0.0
GEMC1		1	12.9	.	12.9	12.9
GEMC2		1	12.9	.	12.9	12.9
MCG	Gained at Least 1.0 GE in Math	1	0.0	.	0.0	0.0
ESPRE		1	24.0	.	24.0	24.0
ESPOS		1	24.0	.	24.0	24.0
ESP	Scored 38 or More on Pre-/Posttest ES	1	0.0	.	0.0	0.0
COMPL	Completion	1	0.0	.	0.0	0.0

PROG=Language Mechanics

Variable	Label	N	Mean	Std Dev	Minimum	Maximum
GR		15	8.7	0.5	8.0	9.0
ETHGR		15	2.0	0.0	2.0	2.0
ATTEND		15	35.7	4.7	23.0	39.0
ENROLL		15	39.0	0.0	39.0	39.0
ATT	Attended 30 or More Days	15	0.9	0.4	0.0	1.0
PROG		15	2.0	0.0	2.0	2.0
GERC1		15	11.3	1.5	8.7	12.9
GERC2		14	11.4	1.5	9.1	12.9
RCG	Gained at Least 1.0 GE in Reading	15	0.3	0.5	0.0	1.0
GELM1		15	10.3	1.7	7.9	12.9
GELM2		14	11.1	1.7	7.3	12.9
LMG	Gained at Least 1.0 GE in Language	15	0.5	0.5	0.0	1.0
GEMC1		15	10.8	2.5	7.2	12.9
GEMC2		14	11.0	2.6	4.3	12.9
MCG	Gained at Least 1.0 GE in Math	15	0.1	0.4	0.0	1.0
ESPRE		15	39.7	1.5	37.0	43.0
ESPOS		14	43.7	2.8	39.0	47.0
ESP	Scored 38 or More on Pre-/Posttest ES	15	0.9	0.3	0.0	1.0
COMPL	Completion	15	0.7	0.5	0.0	1.0

Evaluate the Merged Dataset MERGDATA HWELL A

Look at ROOM and PROGRAM

Classroom Roster

ROOM=204

NAME	SN	BDAY	SEX	ETHGR	PROG	ENROLL	ATTEND	ATT	GERC1	GERC2	RCG	GELM1	GELM2	LMG	GEMC1	GEMC2	MCG	ESPRE	ESPOS	ESP	COMPL
	95	011177	M	2	Reading Comprehension	39	38.0	YES	4.9	5.2	NO	4.3	7.3	YES	7.3	8.0	NO	32	40	YES	YES
	94	112775	M	2	Reading Comprehension	39	37.0	YES	4.6	5.7	YES	4.0	4.8	NO	5.4	6.8	YES	30	40	YES	YES
	175	022277	M	2	Reading Comprehension	39	10.5	NO	4.7	.	NO	4.0	.	NO	5.0	.	NO	18	.	NO	NO
	98	092275	F	2	Reading Comprehension	39	32.0	YES	4.6	5.4	NO	4.0	4.0	NO	7.2	5.4	NO	34	35	NO	NO
	168	010577	F	2	Reading Comprehension	39	37.0	YES	4.9	4.7	NO	7.3	7.9	NO	6.1	6.8	NO	30	36	NO	NO
	177	012576	F	2	Reading Comprehension	39	11.0	NO	5.0	.	NO	4.0	.	NO	6.8	.	NO	31	.	NO	NO
	184	021676	M	2	Reading Comprehension	39	25.5	NO	5.2	4.0	NO	4.3	4.0	NO	4.3	6.6	YES	22	30	NO	NO
	41	041277	M	2	Reading Comprehension	39	38.0	YES	4.9	5.3	NO	4.0	4.0	NO	6.1	7.5	YES	37	38	YES	YES
	15	061876	F	2	Reading Comprehension	39	37.0	YES	5.4	6.5	YES	4.0	4.3	NO	6.1	7.2	YES	28	41	YES	YES
	88	040977	M	2	Reading Comprehension	39	24.0	NO	5.0	.	NO	4.0	.	NO	5.4	.	NO	25	.	NO	NO
	144	080275	F	2	Reading Comprehension	39	39.0	YES	4.7	6.9	YES	4.0	4.8	NO	5.4	11.7	YES	31	37	NO	NO
	55	071587	M	2	Reading Comprehension	39	33.0	YES	5.8	.	NO	4.0	.	NO	6.1	.	NO	19	.	NO	NO
	133	021277	M	2	Reading Comprehension	39	37.0	YES	5.0	6.2	YES	4.0	5.0	YES	5.8	6.8	YES	31	38	YES	YES
	152	060876	F	2	Reading Comprehension	39	29.5	NO	4.0	.	NO	4.0	.	NO	6.4	.	NO	8	.	NO	NO
	141	040177	F	2	Reading Comprehension	39	39.0	YES	4.6	5.6	YES	4.0	4.0	NO	6.4	5.8	NO	33	43	YES	YES
	86	022677	M	1	Reading Comprehension	39	30.5	YES	5.6	5.2	NO	4.0	4.0	NO	8.0	4.6	NO	35	36	NO	NO
	156	061677	F	2	Reading Comprehension	39	14.5	NO	5.3	.	NO	4.0	.	NO	4.6	.	NO	23	.	NO	NO
	178	121076	M	2	Reading Comprehension	39	36.5	YES	4.6	4.7	NO	4.0	4.0	NO	7.2	5.4	NO	.	29	NO	NO
	122	100376	M	2	Reading Comprehension	39	34.0	YES	4.9	5.2	NO	4.0	5.0	YES	5.8	5.0	NO	34	44	YES	YES
	151	090176	M	2	Reading Comprehension	39	14.0	NO	4.0	.	NO	4.0	.	NO	5.4	.	NO	26	.	NO	NO
	23	102575	F	2	Reading Comprehension	39	35.0	YES	4.9	6.2	YES	4.3	5.0	NO	4.3	7.2	YES	33	41	YES	YES
	128	080876	M	2	Reading Comprehension	39	36.0	YES	4.9	6.5	YES	4.8	7.3	YES	6.1	7.2	YES	30	44	YES	YES
	165	071876	M	2	Reading Comprehension	39	39.0	YES	4.6	4.0	NO	4.0	4.0	NO	4.3	6.8	YES	25	30	NO	NO
	148	051975	M	2	Reading Comprehension	39	36.0	YES	4.9	8.1	YES	4.0	4.3	NO	6.6	7.4	NO	34	39	YES	YES
	65	090575	M	4	Reading Comprehension	39	39.0	YES	4.7	4.9	NO	7.3	4.8	NO	12.9	12.9	NO	24	24	NO	NO

N = 25