

DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 367 756

UD 029 777

AUTHOR Tajbaksh, Kian
 TITLE Capacity Building Special Alternatives Program
 Community School District 3. Final Evaluation Report,
 1992-93. OREA Report.
 INSTITUTION New York City Board of Education, Brooklyn, NY.
 Office of Research, Evaluation, and Assessment.
 PUB DATE 93
 CONTRACT T003E20073
 NOTE 32p.
 AVAILABLE FROM Office of Research, Evaluation, and Assessment, New
 York City Board of Education, 110 Livingston Street,
 Room 732, Brooklyn, NY 11201.
 PUB TYPE Reports - Evaluative/Feasibility (142)

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC02 Plus Postage.
 DESCRIPTORS Academic Achievement; Achievement Tests;
 Disadvantaged Youth; Elementary Education; *English
 (Second Language); *Ethnic Groups; Immigrants;
 *Limited English Speaking; Low Income;
 *Nontraditional Education; *Parent Participation;
 Program Evaluation; Second Language Instruction;
 Staff Development; Standardized Tests; Teaching
 Methods

IDENTIFIERS *Capacity Building; Elementary Secondary Education
 Act Title VII; Subject Content Knowledge

ABSTRACT

The Capacity Building Alternatives Program, an Elementary and Secondary Education Act Title VII-funded project in its first year of operation functioned at 8 schools, serving 139 students of limited English proficiency whose home language was Albanian, Chinese, Haitian, Polish, Russian, or Serbo-Croatian. Students targeted showed an achievement lag of more than one year in one or more content areas as measured by standardized achievement tests. The project provided English-as-a-Second-Language (ESL) instruction and content area instruction using an ESL methodology. Teacher staff development and parental participation were components of the program, and a number of activities included students and parents. The Capacity Building Special Alternatives Program met its objectives for English language development, mathematics, staff education, and using ESL content area-based instructional methodology. For lack of data, staff development in mathematics and parental involvement objectives in increased skill and knowledge and volunteerism were not evaluated. Increased evaluation data was a recommendation for program improvement. Five tables present evaluation findings. An appendix lists instructional materials used in the program. (SLD)

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

ED 367 756



OREA Report

Capacity Building Special Alternatives Program
Community School District 3
Special Alternatives Instructional Program Grant T003E2007
FINAL EVALUATION REPORT
1992-93

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION
CENTER (ERIC)

- This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.
- Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy.

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

*Robert Tobias -
NYC Public Schools*

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

4D029777

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

Capacity Building Special Alternatives Program
Community School District 3
Special Alternatives Instructional Program Grant T003E20073
FINAL EVALUATION REPORT
1992-93

Ms. Elma Azurdia, Project Director
300 West 96th St.
New York, NY 10025
(212)-678-2938



NEW YORK CITY BOARD OF EDUCATION

Carol A. Gresser
President

Irene H. Impellizzeri
Vice President

Victor Gotbaum
Michael J. Petrides
Luis O. Reyes
Ninfa Segarra-Vélez
Dennis M. Walcott
Members

Andrea Schlesinger
Student Advisory Member

Ramon C. Cortines
Chancellor

9/13/93

It is the policy of the New York City Board of Education not to discriminate on the basis of race, color, creed, religion, national origin, age, handicapping condition, marital status, sexual orientation, or sex in its educational programs, activities, and employment policies, and to maintain an environment free of sexual harassment, as required by law. Inquiries regarding compliance with appropriate laws may be directed to Mercedes A. Hesfield, Director, Office of Equal Opportunity, 110 Livingston Street, Room 601, Brooklyn, New York 11201, Telephone: (718) 935-3520.

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

The Capacity Building Special Alternatives Program, an Elementary and Secondary Education Act (E.S.E.A.) Title VII-funded project in its first year of operation, functioned at eight schools in Community School District (C.S.D.) 3 in Manhattan: P.S. 163, P.S. 84, P.S. 165, P.S. 199, P.S. 87, P.S. 75, P.S. 9, and I.S. 44. The project served 139 students of limited English proficiency (LEP), whose home language was Albanian, Chinese, Haitian, Polish, Russian, or Serbo-Croatian.

The project targeted non-Latino limited English proficient (LEP) students who showed an achievement lag of more than one year in one or more content areas as measured by standardized achievement tests. The project provided English as a second language (E.S.L.) and content area instruction using an E.S.L. methodology.

Teachers of participating students had the opportunity to attend weekly staff development meetings.

The project had an active parental component, including E.S.L. classes, educational field trips, and activities and workshops that involved students as well as parents.

The Capacity Building Special Alternatives Program met its objectives for English-language development, mathematics, ongoing education for staff, and using E.S.L. content area-based instructional methodologies. Because the project did not supply the required data, OREA was unable to evaluate the staff development objective for mathematics and science instruction or the parental involvement objectives for increased skill and knowledge and for becoming school volunteers.

The conclusions, based on the findings of this evaluation, lead to the following recommendation:

- Provide OREA with all required data so that it can evaluate objectives as stated.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

This report has been prepared by the Bilingual, Multicultural, and Early Childhood Evaluation Unit of the Office of Research, Evaluation, and Assessment.

Thanks are due to Dr. Kian Tajbakhsh for collecting the data and writing the report.

Additional copies of this report are available from:

Dr. Tomi Deutsch Berney
Office of Research, Evaluation, and Assessment
Board of Education of the City of New York
110 Livingston Street, Room 732
Brooklyn, NY 11201
(718) 935-3790 FAX (718) 935-5490

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	<u>PAGE</u>
I. INTRODUCTION	1
Project Context	1
Students' Characteristics	3
Project Objectives	5
Project Implementation	6
Parent and Community Involvement Activities	8
II. EVALUATION METHODOLOGY	9
Evaluation Design	9
Instruments of Measurement	10
Data Collection and Analysis	11
III. FINDINGS	13
Participants' Educational Progress	13
Former Participants' Academic Progress in English Language Classrooms	17
Overall Educational Progress Achieved Through Project	17
Case History	17
Staff Development Outcomes	18
Parental Involvement Outcomes	19
IV. SUMMARY, CONCLUSIONS, AND RECOMMENDATIONS	21
Achievement of Objectives	21
Most and Least Effective Components	21
Recommendations to Enhance Program Effectiveness	21
APPENDIX A Instructional Materials	22

LIST OF TABLES

		<u>PAGE</u>
TABLE 1	Number of Students in Capacity Building Special Alternatives Program by Site and Grade	3
TABLE 2	Students' Countries of Origin	4
TABLE 3	Pretest/Posttest N.C.E. Differences on the Language Assessment Battery, by Site	14
TABLE 4	Pretest/Posttest N.C.E. Differences on the Metropolitan Achievement Test and California Achievement Test, by Site	16
TABLE 5	Attendance Rates for Participating Students and Schoolwide	18

I. INTRODUCTION

The Capacity Building Special Alternatives Program was in its first year of funding as an Elementary and Secondary Education Act (E.S.E.A.) Title VII project.

PROJECT CONTEXT

The project operated at P.S. 9, P.S. 75, P.S. 84, P.S. 87, P.S. 163, P.S. 165, P.S. 199, and I.S. 44 in Community School District (C.S.D.) 3 in Manhattan. C.S.D. 3 served a diverse population of Latino, African-American, European-American, and Asian-American students.

Composition of the student body at the project schools was roughly similar to that of the district. Of the 720 students enrolled at P.S. 9 during the 1991-92 school year (the last year for which data were available), 39 percent were Latino, 32 percent African-American, 26 percent European-American, and 3 percent were Asian-American. Seventeen percent were limited English proficient (LEP), and 49 percent were eligible for free lunch, an indication of low income.

Of the 833 students at P.S. 75, 43 percent were Latino, 37 percent African-American, 18 percent European-American, and 2 percent were Asian-American. Sixteen percent were LEP, and 63 percent were eligible for the free-lunch program.

Of the 769 students at P.S. 84, 55 percent were Latino, 34 percent African-American, 9 percent European-American, and two percent were Asian-American. Twenty-three percent of these students were LEP, and 61 percent were eligible for the free-lunch program.

Of the 1,127 students at P.S. 87, 50 percent were European-American, 22 percent were Latino, 20 percent were African-American, and 8 percent were Asian-American. Six percent of the students were LEP, and 23 percent were eligible for free lunch.

Of the 758 students at P.S. 163, 48 percent were Latino, 37 percent African-American, 9 percent European-American, and 6 percent were Asian-American. Sixteen percent of these students were LEP, and 70 percent were eligible for the free-lunch program.

Of the 667 students at P.S. 165, 88 percent were Latino, 7 percent African-American, 4 percent Asian-American, and 1 percent were European-American. Forty-seven percent of these students were LEP, and 97 percent were eligible for free lunch.

Of the 511 students at P.S. 199, 34 percent were African-American, 32 percent were European-American, 32 percent were Latino, and 2 percent were Asian-American. Eight percent of the student body were LEP, and 60 percent were eligible for free lunch.

Of the 667 students at I.S. 44, 42 percent were African-American, 40 percent were Latino, 15 percent were European-American, and 3 percent were Asian-American. Almost eight percent were LEP and 61 percent were on the free-lunch program.

A consultant from the Office of Research, Evaluation, and Assessment (OREA) visited P.S. 84 and P.S. 165. Classrooms in both schools were clean and bright.

Students' writings and photos decorated the walls. Bulletin boards in the halls were colorful and appropriate to the season. Halls were quiet and well lit.

STUDENT CHARACTERISTICS

The project served a total of 139 LEP students in kindergarten through eighth grade. (See Table 1.) LEP status was indicated by Language Assessment Battery (LAB) scores at or below the 40th percentile. Male students numbered 75 (54 percent) and female 64 (46 percent).

TABLE 1

Number of Students in Capacity Building
Special Alternatives Program by Site and Grade

Site	KG	1st	2nd	3rd	4th	5th	6th	7th	8th	Total
I.S. 44							4	10	11	25
P.S. 9	3	1	2		2	13				21
P.S. 75	6	6	3	1	2					18
P.S. 84	6	3	2	4	1					16
P.S. 87		7	6	5	8					26
P.S. 163	3	2	1	1	1					8
P.S. 165		3	3		3					9
P.S. 199	3	6	4	2	1					16
Total	21	28	21	13	18	13	4	10	11	139

Participating students came from many different countries. (See Table 2.) Most students (71.9 percent) came from low-income families and were eligible for free lunch

TABLE 2
Students' Countries of Origin

Countries of Origin	Number of Students
United States	37
China	22
Russia	11
Korea	7
Brazil	6
India	6
Poland	5
Pakistan	4
Taiwan	4
Italy	3
Japan	3
Yugoslavia	3
Egypt	2
Hong Kong	2
Nigeria	2
Liberia	1
Vietnam	1
Yemen	1
Unreported	19
Total	139

Needs Assessment

Before instituting the program, C.S.D. 3 conducted an extensive needs assessment of targeted students, their families, and the educational staff who would serve them. The data obtained indicated three primary needs: (1) to train a cadre of 25 kindergarten through ninth grade regular teachers and paraprofessionals in E.S.L. instructional methodologies for the content areas and an enriched curriculum (especially in science and mathematics); (2) to teach English language skills to approximately 120 kindergarten through ninth grade non-Latino LEP students and to increase their academic skills in the content areas (especially science and mathematics); and (3) to train approximately 30 parents of kindergarten through ninth grade LEP pupils in areas such as E.S.L.; native language arts; high school equivalency; home-based remediation and enrichment; and basic, intermediate, and advanced conversational English.

PROJECT OBJECTIVES

Student Objectives

By the conclusion of the instructional period:

- one hundred and twenty kindergarten to ninth grade non-Hispanic LEP students will demonstrate 5 N.C.E. gains in English oral language, reading, and writing skills;
- one hundred and twenty kindergarten to ninth grade non-Hispanic LEP students will demonstrate 5 N.C.E. gains in the content areas of mathematics and science.

Staff Development

By the conclusion of the staff development period, 25 K to ninth grade teachers and paraprofessionals will engage in activities that will enable:

- twenty percent of trainees to enroll in and complete at least three college credits in E.S.L. courses as assessed by an examination of college records;
- eighty percent of the trainees to achieve scores of 90 percent or better on program-developed criterion referenced tests related to content area instruction in mathematics and science;
- eighty-five percent of the trainees to utilize E.S.L. content area-based instructional methodologies when working with target pupils as assessed by administrator and evaluator observation using program-developed checklists and by an examination of pre- and posttest scores on the New York City LAB test.

Parental Involvement

By the conclusion of the parent development period, 30 parents of kindergarten to ninth grade non-Hispanic LEP students will engage in activities that will enable:

- sixty percent of the parent participants to increase skills and knowledge in areas in which they took instruction, such as education; E.S.L.; native language arts; high school equivalency; computer learning; home-based remediation and enrichment for students; how to make instructional materials from household items; basic, intermediate, and advanced conversational English for adults; and citizenship education as assessed by program-developed questionnaires administered on a pre- and post-instructional basis and professional observations;
- five percent of the parent participants to master skills sufficient for them to work as effective school volunteers as assessed by principal observation.

PROJECT IMPLEMENTATION

During the 1992-93 school year, the project provided instructional and support services to 139 students and their families. The project's main goal was to promote LEP students' acquisition of English language skills.

The project also provided staff development and parental involvement activities

Materials, Methods, and Techniques

All project classes were taught using an E.S.L. methodology. In the lower grades, teachers used cooperative learning groups, whole language learning, and manipulative and hands-on activities.

For a list of instructional materials used in project classes, please see Appendix A.

Staff Qualifications

Title VII staff. The project's Title VII staff included a project director and a secretary, each of whom was funded 50 percent by Title VII and 50 percent by the district. Three E.S.L. training specialists and a senior school neighborhood worker were fully funded by Title VII. The former held master's degrees, and the latter had a bachelor's degree. The project director had a master's degree in E.S.L. and had communicative proficiency* in Spanish. She had five years of experience in teaching E.S.L.

The project director's responsibilities included the supervision and coordination of project activities, staff selection and training, and coordination of the project's evaluation. She assisted classroom teachers in the development and implementation of instructional activities, provided in-service activities and training to parents and teachers of participating students, and selected instructional materials. The school

*Communicative proficiency (CP) is defined as a non-native speaker's basic ability to communicate and interact with students in their native language.

neighborhood worker assisted in the dissemination of information and helped organize and conduct parental involvement activities.

Other staff. Nine classroom teachers participated in the project. The project did not provide information on funding for or qualifications of these teachers.

Staff development. Project teachers participated in a series of monthly and weekly activities. Workshops focused on the use of graphic organization in E.S.L. science instruction and the whole language approach.

Length of Time Participants Received Instruction

Students had a mean of 1.4 years (s.d. = 1.9) of education in a non-English-speaking school system and 2.5 years (s.d. = 2.0) of education in the United States. The median amount of time students participated in the project was 10 months.

PARENT AND COMMUNITY INVOLVEMENT ACTIVITIES

The project sponsored a wide variety of parent and community involvement activities that included weekly workshops, E.S.L. classes, and field trips. The workshops covered such topics as literature, library training, and the making of masks and books.

II. EVALUATION METHODOLOGY

EVALUATION DESIGN

Project Group's Educational Progress as Compared to That of an Appropriate Non-Project Group

OREA used a gap reduction design to evaluate the effect of bilingual language instruction on project students' performance on standardized tests. Because of the difficulty in finding a valid comparison group, OREA used instead the groups on which the tests were normed. Test scores are reported in Normal Curve Equivalents (N.C.E.s), which are normalized standard scores with a mean of 50 and a standard deviation of 21.1. It is assumed that the norm group has a zero gain in N.C.E.s in the absence of supplementary instruction and that participating students' gains are attributable to project services.

Applicability of Conclusions to All Persons Served by Project

Data were collected from all participating students. (There were no pretest data on students who entered the program late; therefore, posttest data for them will serve as pretest data for the following year.) Instruments used to measure educational progress were appropriate for the students involved. The LAB and the Metropolitan Achievement Test in Mathematics (MAT-Math) (replaced by the California Achievement Test [CAT] in spring 1993) are used throughout New York City to assess the growth of English and mathematics skills in populations similar to those served by the project.

INSTRUMENTS OF MEASUREMENT

OREA compared pre- and posttest scores on the LAB to assess the E.S.L. objective. To assess the mathematics objective, OREA compared pretest scores on the MAT-Math and posttest scores on the Concepts and Applications subtest of the CAT.

All students were tested at the appropriate grade level. The language of the LAB was determined by the test itself, and the MAT-Math and CAT were in English.

According to the publishers' test manuals, all standardized tests used to gauge project students' progress are valid and reliable. Evidence supporting both content and construct validity is available for the LAB. Content validity is confirmed by an item-objective match and includes grade-by-grade item difficulties, correlations between subtests, and the relationship between the performance of students who are native speakers of English and students who are LEP. To support reliability, the Kuder-Richardson Formula 20 (KR20) coefficients and standard errors of measurement (SEM) are reported by grade and by form for each subtest and total test. Grade reliability coefficients, based on LEP students on the English version, ranged from .88 to .96 for individual subtests and from .95 to .98 for the total test.

For the Math Concepts and Applications subtest of the CAT, content validity was determined by comparing the content descriptions and the test items with particular curriculum objectives. The KR20 was used as a measure of internal consistency. The SEM is also reported in order to indicate the range within which students' true scores are likely to fall. For the Math Concepts and Applications subtest given in

second through eighth grade, the number of items ranged from 42 to 50. KR20 coefficients ranged from 0.88 to 0.91; SEM ranged from 2.55 to 3.14 raw score units.

DATA COLLECTION AND ANALYSIS

Data Collection

To gather qualitative data, an OREA evaluation consultant carried out on-site and telephone interviews with the project director several times during the school year and also observed two classes on each of two visits. The project evaluator collected the data and prepared the final evaluation report in accordance with the New York State E.S.E.A. Title VII Bilingual Education Final Evaluation Report format, which was adapted from a checklist developed by the staff of the Evaluation Assistance Center (EAC) East in consultation with the Office of Bilingual Education and Minority Language Affairs (OBEMLA).

Proper administration of instruments. Qualified personnel received training in testing procedures and administered the tests. Test administrators followed guidelines set forth in the manuals accompanying standardized tests. Time limits for subtests were adhered to; directions were given exactly as presented in the manual.

Testing at twelve-month testing intervals. Standardized tests were given at 12-month intervals, following published norming dates.

Data Analysis

Accurate scoring and transcription of results. Scoring, score conversions, and data processing were carried out by the Scan Center of the Board of Education of the City of New York. Data provided by the Scan Center were analyzed in the Bilingual, Multicultural, and Early Childhood Evaluation Unit of OREA. Data collectors, processors, and analysts were unbiased and had no vested interest in the success of the project.

Use of analyses and reporting procedures appropriate for obtained data. To assess the significance of students' achievement in English and mathematics, OREA computed a correlated t-test on LAB, and MAT-Math/CAT N.C.E. scores. The t-test determined whether the difference between the pre- and posttest scores was significantly greater than would be expected from chance variation alone.

The only possible threat to validity of any of the above instruments might be that LAB norms were based on the performance of English Proficient (EP) rather than LEP students. Since OREA was examining gains, however, this threat was inconsequential—the choice of norming groups should not affect the existence of gains.

III. FINDINGS

PARTICIPANTS' EDUCATIONAL PROGRESS

The project carried out all instructional activities specified in its original design.

Participants' Progress in English

The evaluation objective for English-language development was:

- By the conclusion of the instructional period, 120 kindergarten to ninth grade non-Hispanic LEP students will demonstrate 5 N.C.E. gains in English oral language, reading, and writing skills.

There were complete pre- and posttest scores on the LAB for 105 students from grades one through eight. They showed a mean gain of 17.3 N.C.E.s (s.d. = 19.8), which was statistically significant ($p < .05$). (See Table 3.)

The project met its objective for English-language development.

LEP Participants' Academic Achievement

Instruction in the content area was entirely in English with an E.S.L. approach in all grades and for all subject areas.

An OREA evaluation consultant observed a social studies and mathematics class. The social studies class in P.S. 165 had seven third-grade students, and the class was studying multicultural material. The students prepared and practiced songs and dances from various parts of the world for an end-of-the-year presentation.

The atmosphere was relaxed and the walls of the room were covered with colorful posters produced commercially and by the students. The instructional

TABLE 3

Pretest/Posttest N.C.E. Differences on the Language Assessment Battery, by Site

Project Site	Total number of project students	Number of students for whom data were available	Pretest		Posttest		Difference		t value
			Mean	S.D.	Mean	S.D.	Mean	S.D.	
P.S. 9	21	14	13.2	15.0	30.4	20.5	17.2	20.8	3.09*
P.S. 75	18	12	22.4	13.7	34.4	24.3	12.0	24.9	1.67
P.S. 84	16	13	11.8	11.9	27.5	16.6	15.8	14.2	4.00*
P.S. 87	26	19	13.3	12.5	33.4	18.8	20.2	18.7	4.70*
P.S. 163	8	7	32.4	9.2	47.3	16.1	14.9	20.7	1.90
P.S. 165	9	7	17.7	7.9	28.0	11.4	10.3	15.7	1.74
P.S. 199	16	13	19.7	16.0	47.2	25.2	27.5	19.6	5.05*
I.S. 44	25	20	22.3	14.8	38.6	20.1	15.4	21.2	3.23*
Total	139	105	18.4	14.3	35.7	20.5	17.3	19.8	8.94*

* $p < .05$

- Overall and in five of the eight schools, students' gains on the LAB were statistically significant.

methodology was primarily cooperative learning, with students participating actively.

The teacher used a tape recorder to record and play back students' performances.

No paraprofessional was present.

The project's objective for content area subjects was:

- By the conclusion of the instructional period, 120 kindergarten to ninth grade non-Hispanic LEP students will demonstrate 5 N.C.E. gains in the content areas of mathematics and science.

MAT-Math pretest and CAT posttest scores were available for 31 students in grades 2 through 8. There was an overall gain of 8.9 N.C.E.s. (s.d.=14.0). It is probable that gains at particular sites were not significant because the number of tests per site was so small. (See Table 4.)

The only citywide science test is administered one time only and to students in the fourth grade, therefore a pretest/posttest analysis to show gains is not possible. The test is not used to assess individual student performance, but to evaluate programs.

The program met its content area objective for mathematics as evaluated by the MAT-Math/CAT, but OREA could not measure the science objective.

TABLE 4

Pretest/Posttest N.C.E. Differences on the
Metropolitan Achievement Test in Mathematics (MAT-Math) and
California Achievement Test (CAT)

Project Site	Total number of project students	Number of students for whom data were available	Pretest		Posttest		Difference		t value
			Mean	S.D.	Mean	S.D.	Mean	S.D.	
P.S. 9	21	4	35.0	9.1	51.3	14.8	16.3	9.6	3.38*
P.S. 75	18	1	45.0	--	41.0	--	-4.0	--	--
P.S. 84	16	4	34.0	25.3	45.0	20.9	11.0	14.3	1.54
P.S. 87	26	2	31.0	1.4	37.5	29.0	6.5	30.4	0.30
P.S. 163	8	2	28.5	5.0	51.5	23.3	23.0	18.4	1.77
P.S. 165	9	1	56.0	--	74.0	--	18.0	--	--
P.S. 199	16	1	70.0	--	74.0	--	4.0	--	--
I.S. 44	25	16	58.1	20.0	63.7	17.5	5.6	13.2	1.71
Total	139	31	48.4	21.0	57.1	19.2	8.9	14.0	3.55*

* $p < .05$

- At all sites but one, students showed a gain between pretest and posttest. Overall, this gain was significant.

FORMER PARTICIPANTS' ACADEMIC PROGRESS IN ENGLISH LANGUAGE CLASSROOMS

This was the first year of the project, so there were no former participants.

OVERALL EDUCATIONAL PROGRESS ACHIEVED THROUGH PROJECT

Grade Retention

The project did not propose any objectives for grade retention. Two project students (1.4 percent) were retained in grade this year.

Attendance

The project did not propose any objectives for attendance. The overall attendance for project students was 88.9 based on 134 students. (See Table 5.) In half the participating schools, the project students had higher attendance rates than the schoolwide rates. In those schools where the rates were lower for project students, they differed by no more than six percentage points.

Placement in Gifted and Talented Programs

No students were placed in specific programs for the gifted and talented.

CASE HISTORY

L., a student from Korea, was brought to the school by her father in the summer of 1992. She was shy and very quiet, but she was never absent. L. responded to the diversity of the student body. The program she was in helped her to improve her English-language skills, since it was the only language that students had in common and instruction in it was intensive. Between fall and spring, L. raised her LAB score by 13 percentile points.

TABLE 5

Attendance Rates for Participating Students and Schoolwide

Site	Attendance Rates	
	Project Students	Schoolwide
P.S. 9	93.8	91.7
P.S. 75	97.8	90.4
P.S. 84	86.0	90.0
P.S. 87	87.8	93.9
P.S. 163	90.5	89.6
P.S. 165	91.3	89.4
P.S. 199	90.9	91.3
I.S. 44	79.1	83.9

STAFF DEVELOPMENT OUTCOMES

- By the conclusion of the staff development period, 25 kindergarten to ninth grade teachers and paraprofessionals will engage in activities that enable 20 percent of trainees to enroll in and complete at least three college credits in E.S.L. courses as assessed by an examination of college records.

During the 1992-93 school year, 11 (44 percent) of the teachers completed three college credits in E.S.L. and bilingual education.

The project met its staff development objective for ongoing education.

- By the conclusion of the staff development period, 25 kindergarten to ninth grade teachers and paraprofessionals will engage in activities that enable 80 percent of the trainees to achieve scores of 90 percent or better on program-developed criterion referenced tests related to content area instruction in mathematics and science.

No test information was available to evaluate this objective.

OREA was unable to evaluate the staff development objective for mathematics and science instruction.

- By the conclusion of the staff development period, 25 kindergarten to ninth grade teachers and paraprofessionals will engage in activities that enable 85 percent of the trainees to utilize E.S.L. content area-based instructional methodologies when working with target pupils as assessed by administrator and evaluator observation using program-developed checklists and by an examination of pre- and posttest scores on the New York City LAB test.

All teachers attended the in-service staff development activities. Since teachers carried out all content area instruction using an E.S.L. methodology, teachers had successfully incorporated what they had learned through their training. Observations of project administrators and the OREA evaluation consultant support this. In addition, the significant ($p < .05$) gain shown by their students on the LAB indicates that teachers were effective in instilling English skills.

The program met its staff development objective for using E.S.L. content area-based instructional methodologies.

PARENTAL INVOLVEMENT OUTCOMES

- By the conclusion of the parent development period, 30 parents of kindergarten to ninth grade non-Hispanic LEP students will engage in activities that enable 60 percent of the parent participants to increase skills and knowledge in areas in which they took instruction such as: education; E.S.L.; native language arts; high school equivalency; computer learning; home-based remediation and enrichment for students; how to make instructional materials from household items; basic, intermediate, and advanced conversational English for adults; and citizenship education as assessed by program developed questionnaires administered on a pre- and post-instructional basis and professional observations;

- By the conclusion of the parent development period, 30 parents of K to ninth grade non-Hispanic LEP students will engage in activities that enable 5 percent of the parent participants to master skills sufficient for them to work as effective school volunteers as assessed by principal observation.

The project offered a wide variety of activities on a weekly basis for parents of participating students. Activities included E.S.L. classes, craft workshops, and field trips.

In order to assess parents' increased skills and knowledge, the project distributed questionnaires developed by C.S.D. 3. No completed questionnaires, however, were returned to OREA. The project also did not indicate how many parents became volunteers in the school.

OREA was unable to evaluate either parental involvement objective because it lacked the necessary data.

IV. SUMMARY, CONCLUSIONS, AND RECOMMENDATIONS

ACHIEVEMENT OF OBJECTIVES

The Capacity Building Special Alternatives Program met its objectives for English-language development, mathematics, ongoing education for staff, and using E.S.L. content area-based instructional methodologies. OREA was unable to evaluate the staff development objective for mathematics and science instruction, or the parental involvement objectives for increased skill and knowledge and for becoming school volunteers, because it lacked the required data.

Participating students showed academic progress. Of the 139 participating students in kindergarten through eighth grade, 137 were promoted to the next grade. The students showed gains in English language skills and mathematics as indicated by their gains on the LAB and MAT-Math/CAT.

Project services also benefited teachers, who attended college courses in E.S.L. instruction. In-service workshops proved useful to teachers and project staff in their project-related responsibilities.

MOST AND LEAST EFFECTIVE COMPONENTS

English-language instruction and staff development for E.S.L. content area-based instruction were two highly effective components of the program. Quantitative data, reports of observers, and the feedback from those administering the program attested to the strength shown in these areas.

RECOMMENDATION TO ENHANCE PROJECT EFFECTIVENESS

- Provide OREA with all required data so that it can evaluate objectives as stated.

APPENDIX A

Instructional Materials

Grade	Title	Author	Publisher	Date of Publication
4-8	All About the USA	M. Broukal & P. Murphy	Longman	1991
4-8	Tales of Courage, Tales of Dreams	J. Mundahl	Addison-Wesley Co.	1993
K-8	The New Oxford Picture Dictionary	E. Parwell	Oxford	1988
K-4	My Home In...	D. Bailey	Steck-Vaughn	1992
K-2	Rebus Treasury	Marzollo/Carson	Dial Books	1993