

DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 373 135

UD 030 046

AUTHOR Parker, Jennifer  
 TITLE Citywide Programs/District 75. E.C.I.A. Chapter 1, Part B Institutional Facilities Program. Summer 1993. OER Report.  
 INSTITUTION New York City Board of Education, Brooklyn, NY. Office of Educational Research.  
 PUB DATE 6 Jul 93  
 NOTE 34p.  
 AVAILABLE FROM Student Progress Evaluation Unit, Office of Research, Evaluation, and Assessment, 110 Livingston Street, Room 734, Brooklyn, NY 11201.  
 PUB TYPE Reports - Evaluative/Feasibility (142)  
 EDRS PRICE MF01/PC02 Plus Postage.  
 DESCRIPTORS Career Education; \*Child Neglect; Computer Uses in Education; \*Delinquency; Disadvantaged Youth; Elementary School Students; Elementary Secondary Education; \*Institutionalized Persons; Program Evaluation; Public Schools; \*Remedial Instruction; Secondary School Students; \*Supplementary Education; Teaching Methods; Urban Schools  
 IDENTIFIERS \*Education Consolidation Improvement Act Chapter 1; \*New York City Board of Education

ABSTRACT

The Chapter 1, Part B, Institutional Facilities Program of the New York (New York) public schools was fully implemented in summer 1993, providing supplementary career education, academic remediation, and daily living skills instruction for approximately 500 students at 15 institutions for neglected and delinquent children. Eighty-two percent of the students mastered 80 percent or more of their individual short-term objectives, surpassing the program goal. Descriptive evaluation of the program indicates that most teachers emphasized individual instruction and included small group instruction. Teachers generally developed instruction to meet the individual needs and interests of students. Program strengths include cooperative and supportive staff, successful use of computers and software, specialized programming for students, and excellent rapport between teachers and students. No major program weaknesses were observed, although some improvements have been suggested, especially in the areas of improved planning and the use of computer resources. Seven tables present evaluation findings. (SLD)

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

ED 373 135



# OER Report

Citywide Programs/District 75

E.C.I.A. Chapter 1, Part B

Institutional Facilities Program

Summer 1993

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

R. Tobias  
NYC Public School

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

10030046

ERIC  
Full Text Provided by ERIC

UP

**Citywide Programs/District 75**

**E.C.I.A. Chapter 1, Part B**

**Institutional Facilities Program**

**Summer 1993**



## **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*

**Harvey Garner**  
*Interim Chancellor*

7/6/93

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. Nestfield, Director, Office of Equal Opportunity, 110 Livingston Street, Room 601, Brooklyn, New York 11201, Telephone: (718) 935-3320.

Citywide Programs/District 75  
E.C.I.A. Chapter 1, Part B  
Institutional Facilities Program

SUMMARY

- The Chapter 1, Part B, Institutional Facilities program was fully implemented in summer 1993. During the six-week session, approximately 500 students received supplementary career education, academic remediation, and daily living skills instruction.
- Eighty-two percent of the students mastered 80 percent or more of their individual short-term objectives, surpassing the program goal that 80 percent of students would master 80 percent of their objectives. Over 76 percent of students mastered all of their attempted objectives.

The summer 1993 E.C.I.A. Chapter 1, Part B, Institutional Facilities program staff included one coordinator, four supervisors, and 42 teachers for 15 institutions for neglected and delinquent children. All program sessions were scheduled Monday through Friday, during various after-school hours. Teachers provided daily instructional sessions of three 45-minute periods. Teachers provided individualized occupational and academic instruction, based on each student's diagnosed strengths and weaknesses as measured by curriculum inventories.

OREA's descriptive evaluation of the program, based on interviews, surveys of staff, and observations of classes, indicated that the program was fully implemented. Most teachers emphasized individual instruction and also included small group instruction. Only a few teachers emphasized whole group approaches. Teachers generally developed instruction to meet the individual needs and interests of students. Teachers' goals emphasized improving academic and daily life skills among students.

This is the second year of implementation of the program's transition in leadership and vision. This transition has included congruence (Chapter I instruction complementary to day school instruction with a largely academic/occupational/career emphasis); use of individualized reading diagnostic inventories; replacement of the Life Skills Curriculum with the Essential Learning Outcomes Curriculum; and creation of a computer database for payroll, attendance, agencies, sites, and students.

OREA's evaluation reflected the following program strengths: a cooperative and supportive agency staff; use of computers, software, and training; special programming (such as ENACT--a theater arts group); excellent

rapport between teachers and students; and materials and equipment generally available and sufficient. Students showed various academic accomplishments, including improving academic skills, passing exams, college acceptance, grade promotion, and the development of positive attitudes concerning personal growth, education, and work careers.

OREA's evaluation did not reveal any major weaknesses in the program, although supervisors and staff did suggest several improvements to the program. Teachers expressed various problems concerning personal needs and habits of students and lack of support of agency staff which the program has limited capacity and resources to control although they do effect program success. Some teachers expressed concern about agency staff not being involved in motivating students to attend instructional sessions; the personal problems of students, such as bad eating habits, transitional placement in the institutions, and behavioral and emotional problems. Other problems the program has greater ability to affect concern the lack of information about students' day school attendance and performance; the lack of computers, software, and training at some sites; the need for more curriculum choices, such as instruction related to daily life and parenting skills; and the extensive use of time teachers are required to spend on non-instructional matters such as paperwork and ordering materials and supplies.

Based on the findings of this evaluation, OREA recommends that the program:

- encourage more planning and instructional sessions for teachers, supervisors, and agency staff. Since the IFP is limited in affecting the degree of agency staff involvement then such planning and instructional sessions would, at minimum, facilitate the sharing of ideas on a range of issues such as difficulties teachers may have dealing with students' emotional and behavioral problems, and the involvement of agency staff in student instruction;
- introduce computer equipment (including software) and computer education at more sites to serve the needs of both regular and special education students;
- expand curriculum inventories to include additional academic instruction, information regarding the availability of materials and other resources, and instruction related to daily life and parenting skills. Continue to include program offerings in the arts (such as ENACT). Teacher training should include more topics such as transitional occupational skills, computer training, and behavioral management;
- encourage and provide incentives to teachers and supervisors to continue in the program, since a high staff retention rate seems to contribute to program success;

- allot teachers a designated time (or more time overall) to handle non-instructional matters such as paperwork, selecting and ordering materials, and making contacts with students' day school. This would help prevent teachers from having to use instructional time that should be devoted to students.

## ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

This report was prepared by the Office of Research, Evaluation, and Assessment (OREA), the Student Progress Evaluation Unit (S.P.E.U.) under the direction of Dr. Henry Solomon. Jennifer Parker served as project coordinator. Data were collected by Dr. Renee Schmerler, Sandra Parris, Abe Strum, and Jennifer Parker and analyzed by Jennifer Parker and Abe Strum. The report was written by Jennifer Parker. Carol Meyer, senior editor, provided ongoing editorial support.

Additional copies of this report are available by writing to:

Dr. Henry Solomon  
Student Progress Evaluation Unit  
Office of Research, Evaluation, and Assessment  
110 Livingston Street - Room 734  
Brooklyn, New York 11201  
(718)-935-3782



## TABLE OF CONTENTS

	<u>PAGE</u>
I. INTRODUCTION	1
II. PROGRAM IMPLEMENTATION	5
III. PROGRAM OUTCOMES	15
IV. CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS	18

## LIST OF TABLES

	<u>PAGE</u>
Table 1: Students Served by Institution	6
Table 2: Program Implementation: Teacher Survey Results	7
Table 3: Materials, Training and Patterns of Communication: Teacher Survey Results	10
Table 4: Teacher Interviews	11
Table 5: Supervisor Survey Results	13
Table 6: Percentages of Objectives Mastered	16
Table 7: Program-Related Student Accomplishments	17

## I. INTRODUCTION

This report presents the Office of Research, Evaluation, and Assessment's (OREA's) evaluation of the summer 1993, E.C.I.A. Chapter 1, Part B, Institutional Facilities program. Citywide Programs/District 75 of the Division of Special Education (D.S.E.) designed and administered the program to provide instruction to neglected and delinquent children and adolescents residing in group homes and diagnostic centers. In summer 1993, the program was in its twenty-fourth year of implementation, and served approximately 500 children and adolescents in 15 institutions.

### PROGRAM DESCRIPTION

The program is designed to help students develop academic, vocational, and social skills so that they become productive citizens. This year's mandated program objective, as in previous years, was that 80 percent of the students would achieve 80 percent of their instructional objectives, as measured by OREA- and program-designed curriculum inventories. This exceeds the state criterion that 75 percent of the students achieve 75 percent of their instructional objectives.

This is the second summer that the Institutional Facilities Program (IFP) has carried out its transition in leadership and focus. In 1992, Chapter I instruction was modified to be complementary to day-school instruction, with a largely academic/occupational/career emphasis in order to achieve a level of congruence between mainstream and program students' modes of instruction. This process serves as a link between the core classroom and support programs like this one.

Other changes implemented during this transition phase included the use of individualized reading diagnostic inventories, replacement of the Life Skills Curriculum with the Essential Learning Outcomes (ELO) Curriculum, and creation of a computer data base for payroll, attendance, agencies, sites, and shared students.

The following presents the Institutional Facilities program instructional objectives, which have not changed since the implementation of the congruence focus.

### INSTRUCTIONAL OBJECTIVES

#### Academic Attainment

1. To improve overall achievement in reading, writing, and mathematics.
2. To improve student achievement by linking the core classroom program and the support programs.
3. To assist students in organizing and budgeting their time efficiently for the completion of their school tasks.
4. To help residents develop strategies needed for completion of assignments and to foster methodologies for improving study skills.
5. To provide students with additional instructional time in order that they be better prepared for the following types of examinations:  
  
Standardized reading and mathematics examinations  
School-made class, mid-term, and final examinations  
Regents Competency Tests  
Proficiency Examinations  
Regents Examinations  
PSATs  
SATs  
Other Achievement Tests
6. To assist students having difficulties with specific subjects.

## Career Building

1. To provide such activities as encouraging introspection, gathering of information, and self-discovery so as to enable students to relate tentative career plans to their education, training, and future employment.
2. To help students gain an understanding of the personal characteristics and qualities needed to be successfully employed.

## Social Skills

1. To assist students in acquiring the knowledge, motivation, and abilities needed to carry out responsibilities related to family life, social relationships, marriage, and future parenthood.

## PROGRAM EVALUATION

OREA assessed the educational approaches used by teachers, the quality of support provided by agency staff, and student mastery of individualized objectives.

### Evaluation Questions

In order to carry out this assessment, OREA evaluated responses to the following specific questions:

#### Program Implementation

- What were the characteristics of participating students?
- What were the characteristics, training activities, and communication patterns of program staff?
- What format, activities, curriculum inventories, materials, and settings were used for instructional purposes?

#### Program Outcomes

- Did the program meet its mandated goal that 80 percent of the students would meet 80 percent of their attempted instructional objectives, as measured by the curriculum inventories?

## Evaluation Activities

- Teachers used OREA-designed student data retrieval forms (D.R.F.'s) to record student progress. The D.R.F.'s were either submitted to the program coordinator or mailed directly to OREA at the end of the summer. OREA received 492 D.R.F.'s.
- OREA-developed surveys were sent to all of the teachers to record teacher perceptions of the extent of program implementation and effectiveness, instructional materials used, staff collaboration, and staff development. Thirty-three (79 percent) of 42 teachers responded to the surveys.
- OREA developed teacher interview forms for consultants to use during site visits to record teacher perceptions of the program. This included general implementation and instructional format, activities, and materials; teachers' rapport with site staff; and teachers' recommendations for future program cycles. Fourteen teachers were interviewed.
- Evaluators used OREA-designed site observation forms to record a description of the instructional setting, teaching methods, and lesson content. Several sites in all five boroughs were visited.

## Data Analysis

OREA evaluators conducted a content analysis of program implementation information gathered in the teacher interviews and classroom observations, and a quantitative analysis of student characteristics and achievement information collected from the student D.R.F.'s, teacher surveys, staff surveys, and supervisor surveys.

## REPORT FORMAT

Chapter II describes program implementation, and Chapter III describes program outcomes. Chapter IV presents OREA's conclusions and recommendations. This report relies largely on tables to present the data.

## II. PROGRAM IMPLEMENTATION

### SITES AND CHARACTERISTICS OF STUDENTS

Table 1 lists the 15 institutional sites and the number of students at each site for whom D.R.F.'s were received. Each institution was composed of a number of residential sites. Program students included children and adolescents who were juvenile offenders in detention centers prior to judicial placement, pregnant teenagers in maternity centers awaiting the birth of their children, and students residing in public and private residential homes and institutions. The number of students at each institution ranged from 8 to 106, with an average of 31 students. The ages of students ranged from 5 to 21. Fifty-two percent were male and 48 percent were female.

### TEACHERS' PERCEPTIONS

#### Survey

Table 2 presents survey data related to teachers' perceptions of student/staff and facility characteristics, teaching objectives, instructional approaches, program strengths and weaknesses, and teachers' suggestions for improvements.

As indicated in the 1992-93 report, data regarding the length of time teachers have been in the program indicate a high rate of teacher retention over the years. On average, teachers have been teaching for 15 years and have been in the program for nearly six years, about the same as last summer. High retention may in general reflect on teachers' overall satisfaction with the program.

TABLE 1  
STUDENTS SERVED, BY INSTITUTION\*  
(N = 471)

Institution	Number of Students	Percent
Abbott House	16	3.4
Catholic Child Care	23	4.9
Catholic Guardian Society	8	1.7
Center for Children and Family	33	7.0
Child Welfare Administration	106	22.5
Dept. of Juvenile Justice	14	3.0
Division for Youth	17	3.6
Edwin Gould Services	29	6.2
Good Shepherd Services	48	10.2
Jewish Board Family and Children Services	29	6.2
Inwood House	24	5.1
Louise Wise Services	10	2.1
New York Foundling Hospital	23	4.9
Spofford Juvenile Center	77	16.3
St. Dominic's Home	14	3.0
<b>Total:</b>	<b>471</b>	<b>100.0</b>

Data were not reported for one institution: Rosalie Hall.  
Data missing for 21 cases.

Source: Student Data Retrieval Forms



TABLE 2  
Teacher Survey: Program Implementation  
(N = 33)

Student/Staff and Facility Characteristics	Instructional Goals	Instructional Approaches and Classroom Activities	Aspects of Program that Contributed to Success and Failure	Most Innovative Aspects and Suggestions for Improvements
<p><b>Students</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Total number: Approximately 500 received instruction. OREA received 493 Data Retrieval Forms.</li> <li>Number at each institution: Average = 34 students. Range = 8-106 students.</li> <li>Sex: Male = 52% Female = 48%</li> <li>Daily attendance: Average = 8.25 students</li> </ul> <p><b>Program Staff</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Consisted of one program coordinator, 4 supervisors, and 42 teachers.</li> <li>Experience: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>As a teacher: 14.5 years</li> <li>In Special Educ.: 8 years</li> <li>In IEP: 5.5 years</li> <li>At same site: 1.7 years</li> </ul> </li> </ul> <p><b>Survey participants</b> -number: 33</p> <p><b>Facilities*</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Classroom, 14 teachers (40%)</li> <li>Dining room, 10 teachers (29%)</li> <li>Living room, 4 teachers (11%)</li> <li>Office, 3 teachers (9%)</li> <li>Church Chapel, 1 teacher (3%)</li> <li>Library, 1 teacher (3%)</li> <li>Closet, 1 teacher (3%)</li> <li>Conference room, 1 teacher (3%)</li> <li>* 2 teachers provided more than one response.</li> </ul> <p>• Adequacy of facilities was rated 4.5 on a scale of 1-5</p>	<p><b>Teachers</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>To improve academic skills n=7</li> <li>Pre-vocational education (World of Work) n=6</li> <li>To improve and reinforces life skills, responsibilities and choices (parenthood, career, sexual interpersonal relations, money) n=5</li> <li>Socio-emotional skills development n=3</li> <li>To meet individual needs (n=3)</li> <li>To maintain student interest n=1</li> <li>To bridge gap between summer and fall programs n=1</li> <li>Test preparation n=1</li> <li>To provide adequate learning environment n=1</li> <li>To provide emotional support (n=1)</li> </ul>	<p><b>Most effective classroom approaches</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Individual instruction n=19</li> <li>Small group instruction n=16</li> <li>Whole class/large group instruction n=5</li> <li>All (n=4)</li> </ul> <p><b>Least effective classroom approaches</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Whole class/large group instruction n=12</li> <li>Mixing boys and girls (n=1)</li> <li>None (n=1)</li> </ul> <p><b>Most effective classroom activities</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Hands-on activities n=13</li> <li>Reading and math activities n=8</li> <li>Writing projects n=7</li> <li>Use of computers n=4</li> <li>Use of audiovisual equipment n=2</li> <li>Discussions n=2</li> <li>Taking trips n=1</li> <li>Other n=1</li> </ul>	<p><b>Successful Aspects</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Cooperative and supportive agency staff n=14</li> <li>ENACT n=2</li> <li>Taking trips n=1</li> <li>Using incentives to motivate students n=1</li> <li>Comfortable physical setting n=1</li> <li>Participation and help of CIT n=1</li> <li>Use of computers n=1</li> <li>Supportive supervisor n=1</li> <li>Good rapport with students n=1</li> <li>Program achievement</li> <li>-Overall, 82% of students reached or exceeded 80% of their attempted objectives</li> <li>Materials</li> <li>Sufficiency and availability of materials was rated 4.2 on a scale of 1-5</li> <li>Agency staff contact</li> <li>-teachers rated degree of rapport as excellent (4.8 on a scale of 1-5)</li> <li>Training and program support</li> <li>-teachers rated the training as useful (4.0 on a scale of 1-5)</li> <li>-teachers rated institutional supervisor support as very useful (4.0 on a scale of 1-5)</li> <li>-teachers rated workshops/special staff contact as useful (4.0 on a scale of 1-5)</li> </ul> <p><b>Failure</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Nothing n=1</li> <li>Students' bad eating habits n=1</li> <li>Lack of staff cooperation n=1</li> <li>Transitional placement of students n=1</li> </ul>	<p><b>Most innovative aspects</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Computer instruction n=4</li> <li>Use of particular materials (audio-visual, high interest, etc.) n=4</li> <li>ENACT n=3</li> <li>Comfortable physical environment n=2</li> <li>One-on-one instruction n=2</li> <li>Cooperation and input by staff on students needs n=2</li> <li>Working with counselors n=1</li> <li>Flexibility of Essential Learning Outcome n=1</li> <li>Open house n=1</li> <li>Good supervision n=1</li> <li>Versatility of program n=1</li> </ul> <p><b>Suggestions for Improvement</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Staff should be more involved with motivating students to attend instructional sessions n=4</li> <li>Need more computer equipment and software and computer education n=3</li> <li>More trips n=2</li> <li>More stable population n=2</li> <li>More information regarding students' day school experience n=2</li> <li>Should have appointments with students after tutoring n=1</li> <li>Better physical environment n=1</li> <li>More one-on-one instruction n=1</li> <li>Teacher should be involved in student/caseworker sessions n=1</li> <li>Need more access to facilities, i.e. copy machine n=1</li> <li>More daily life and mothering skills n=1</li> <li>Budget for rewards (gifts, pizza, etc.) n=1</li> <li>No need for improvement n=6</li> </ul>

Adequacy of facilities was given a rating of about 4.5\*, slightly higher than last summer. Instruction mainly took place in classrooms (40 percent), dining rooms (29 percent), and living rooms (11 percent). Teachers' instructional goals emphasized pre-vocational education and the improvement of academic and daily life skills. The most effective classroom approach for implementing these goals was reported to be individualized instruction. The least effective was whole class or group instruction. Effective classroom activities, according to the teachers, included reading and math activities, writing projects, and the use of computers.

In general, teachers' perceptions of the program's implementation were very positive. Materials and equipment were largely sufficient and available, receiving a rating of 4.2. The degree of rapport between agency staff and teachers was rated as excellent (4.8). Training and program support were viewed by teachers as extremely helpful. Usefulness of training, supervisor support, and workshop/special staff contact were each rated highly (4.0).

Teachers indicated several innovative aspects of the program, including computer instruction, use of such materials as audiovisual equipment and high interest materials, and involvement in the arts (such as with ENACT, a theater arts group). Suggestions for program improvement stressed the need for more computer equipment and software, and increased computer education. Teachers also suggested that agency staff be more involved with motivating students to attend instructional sessions. Without providing a solution, some teachers expressed concern about the instability and transient nature of the

---

\* All ratings mentioned in this report are based on a scale of 1 (most negative category) to 5 (most positive category).

population, which contributed to their difficulties in dealing with behavioral and emotional problems of students.

Table 3 summarizes the instructional materials and equipment used, and the patterns of staff communication. The most effective materials and equipment were reported to be basic reading and reference materials, workbooks and worksheets, computers and computer software, and audio-visual equipment. The sufficiency and availability of materials were rated highly (4.2). Teacher training and program support were also rated very positively. Suggestions for new training topics included behavior management, computer training, vocational education and training, and obtaining better or more resources. Teachers recommended that ELO's or curriculum inventories be expanded to include basic academic instruction and information regarding the availability of materials.

In terms of staff communication, the most frequently discussed topic with agency staff was behavior/classroom management, followed by attendance, motivational and scheduling problems with students, and student progress and evaluation. Teachers rated the degree of rapport between teachers and agency staff very highly (4.8). Rapport was reported to be generally very positive. Agency staff were available and cooperative and provided encouragement to students.

### Teacher Interviews

Interviews with 14 teachers reinforced much of the teacher survey findings, as indicated in Table 4. For instance, overall goals were reported to be the

TABLE 3  
Teacher Survey  
Program Materials, Training, and Patterns of Communication  
(N = 33)

Instructional Materials/Equipment		Training	Staff Communication	
Most effective materials/ equipment	Recommendations for new materials		Issues discussed during contact with agency staff	Teacher/Agency Rapport
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● Basic reading and reference materials (books, texts, newspapers, dictionaries) n=15</li> <li>● Computers and computer software n=7</li> <li>● Workbooks/workheats n=7</li> <li>● Audiovisual equipment n=6</li> <li>● Teacher-made materials n=2</li> <li>● World of work materials n=2</li> <li>● Games n=2</li> <li>● Maps n=1</li> <li>● Arts materials n=1</li> <li>● Tests n=1</li> <li>● Basic math materials n=1</li> <li>● Variety of materials n=1</li> <li>● Copy machine n=1</li> <li>● Other n=2</li> </ul> <p><u>Sufficiency/Availability</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● Rated 4.2 on a scale of 1-5</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● Computers/word processors/software n=12</li> <li>● Audiovisuals n=2</li> <li>● Reading materials (books and texts) n=2</li> <li>● Classroom aids (globes, calculators, maps, charts, etc.) n=2</li> <li>● Office supplies (copy machine) n=1</li> <li>● Math materials (n=1)</li> <li>● Particular materials based on <u>level</u> of student n=1</li> <li>● Art specialist to do art enrichment with class n=1</li> <li>● Other n=5</li> <li>● None n=4</li> </ul> <p><u>Recommendations for alterations in ELO's or curriculum inventories</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● None n=10</li> <li>● Materials availability n=2</li> <li>● Basic academic skills instruction n=2</li> <li>● Inventory test in academic areas n=1</li> <li>● ELO should be written by skill/not grade n=1</li> <li>● Foreign language n=1</li> <li>● Health issues (HIV/AIDS) n=1</li> <li>● Vocational and communication training n=1</li> </ul>	<p><u>Usefulness of Training</u></p> <p>Rated 4.0 on a scale of 1-5.</p> <p><u>Suggestions for More Training Topics</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● No changes needed n=7</li> <li>● Behavior management/ student motivation n=2</li> <li>● Computer training n=1</li> <li>● Vocational education n=1</li> <li>● Obtaining better/more resources n=1</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● Behavior/ classroom management n=9</li> <li>● Attendance/ scheduling/ motivation to participate n=8</li> <li>● Student progress/ evaluations n=6</li> <li>● Goals n=3</li> <li>● Personal/ social/home problems n=2</li> <li>● Needs of individual students n=2</li> <li>● Materials n=2</li> <li>● General discussion of students n=2</li> <li>● Background of student n=2</li> <li>● Student academic problems n=1</li> <li>● Administrative n=1</li> <li>● Planning trips n=1</li> <li>● Responsibilities n=1</li> <li>● House maintenance (cleanliness) n=1</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● Generally positive n=8</li> <li>● Agency staff were available and cooperative n=3</li> <li>● Agency staff were supportive and provided encouragement to students n=3</li> <li>● Did not deal with them n=1</li> <li>● Teachers rated degree of rapport with agency staff as excellent (4.8 on a scale of 1-5)</li> </ul> <p><u>Contact with specialized IFP staff</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● Computer specialist n=3</li> <li>● Social workers n=3</li> <li>● Guidance counselor n=2</li> <li>● Facility Education Director n=2</li> <li>● Theater group (ENACT) n=1</li> <li>● Nurses n=1</li> <li>● Other n=1</li> </ul> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● 10 teachers reported having had contact with specialized IFP staff. 21 reported not having had contact with specialized IFP staff. 4 did not respond to this question.</li> </ul>

TABLE 4  
Teacher Interviews  
(N = 14)

Teachers' Overall Goals	Instructional Approaches/Methods Used to Accomplish Goals	Nature of Ongoing Supervision	Most Positives Aspects of Program	Suggestions for Improvements
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● Improve reading and math skills (n = 13)</li> <li>● Daily life skills (n = 11)</li> <li>● Improve behavior and self-esteem (emotional needs) n = 8</li> <li>● Enhance motivation for staying in school n = 6</li> <li>● Vocational and career guidance n = 5</li> <li>● Pass exams n = 3</li> <li>● Congruence with day school n = 2</li> <li>● Role modeling n = 1</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● <u>Student(s)-Teacher Ratio</u></li> <li>● Individual instruction n = 13</li> <li>● Small group instruction n = 10</li> <li>● Hands-on n = 6</li> <li>● Computers n = 4</li> <li>● Large group instruction n = 3</li> <li>● <u>Activities</u></li> <li>● Use of particular materials (journals, teacher-made, textbooks, audiovisual) (n = 10)</li> <li>● Role playing (n = 4)</li> <li>● Writing process n = 1</li> <li>● Calculator n = 1</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● Needs, goals, and progress of students n = 12</li> <li>● Observation of instruction n = 11</li> <li>● Lesson preparation n = 9</li> <li>● Paperwork and procedures n = 9</li> <li>● Training in use of materials n = 4</li> <li>● Problem solving n = 1</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● Good rapport and cooperation between students and teachers (n = 11)</li> <li>● Teaching life skills (n = 7)</li> <li>● Developing students' academic skills (n = 6)</li> <li>● Agency support (n = 6)</li> <li>● Kids given another chance n = 1</li> <li>● Materials are readily available n = 1</li> <li>● Bridges gap between home and school n = 1</li> <li>● Team work n = 1</li> <li>● Good relations between day school teachers and IFP teachers n = 1</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● More allocation of instructional materials n = 4</li> <li>● More curriculum choices n = 3</li> <li>● No improvements needed n = 3</li> <li>● Need more computers n = 2</li> <li>● Need more access to school records n = 1</li> <li>● More recreational activities, such as trips n = 1</li> <li>● More funds are needed n = 1</li> <li>● More time needed .or paperwork n = 1</li> <li>● Need more space n = 1</li> </ul>

improvement of basic academic skills, such as reading and math, and enhancement of daily life skills.

In regard to instructional approach, all but one of the teachers interviewed reported working with students on an individual basis. Most of them (10) also reported using a small group approach to instruction. Only a few (3) reported instructing students in a large group setting.

The nature of the supervisors' role was cited by most teachers as ensuring the needs, goals, and progress of students. Supervisors were also reported by most teachers to regularly observe instructional sessions. In general, supervisors were involved in lesson preparation, paperwork and procedures, and training in the use of materials.

The most positive aspects of the program as cited by the teachers in interviews included the good rapport and cooperation between students and teachers. Teachers also believed that developing students' academic and daily life skills was a beneficial aspect of the program. Suggestions for improvement included having more computers, software and training, the allocation of more instructional materials, more curriculum choices such as instruction related to daily life and mothering skills, and the designation of more time to handle non-instructional matters such as paperwork and ordering materials and supplies.

### Supervisors' Perceptions

Table 5 reports on the information gathered from a survey of two (out of four) program supervisors. On average, these supervisors had nearly 12 years of supervisory experience in Special Education, and six years in IFP.

TABLE 5  
Supervisor Survey (n = 2)

Supervisors' Overall Goals	Implementation of Program and Activities	Staffing and Training	Substance/Topics of Training and Staff Contacts	Agency Staff Contact	Materials/ Equipment/ Supplies	Success of and Innovative Elements of the Program
<p><u>Goals</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>To insure good teacher/agency relations n = 1</li> <li>To supervise instructional activity according to handbook of objectives n = 1</li> </ul> <p><u>Rating</u></p> <p>Degree to which overall goals were achieved was rated an average 5.0 (on a scale of 1-5)</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>To observe student/teacher relationships n = 2</li> <li>To monitor paperwork n = 2</li> <li>To resolve problems among agency, teachers, students, and BOE staff n = 2</li> <li>To ensure appropriate instruction n = 1</li> <li>To check lessons n = 1</li> <li>To check attendance n = 1</li> </ul> <p><u>Rating</u></p> <p>Degree to which activities and methods were implemented was rated 5.0 (on a scale of 1-5)</p>	<p><u>Frequency of contact with teachers</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Weekly site visits (n = 2)</li> </ul> <p><u>Training of supervisors</u></p> <p><u>Rating</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Sufficiency of staffing was rated an average of 5.0 (on a scale of 1-5)</li> </ul> <p><u>Kind of training</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Record keeping n = 1</li> <li>Staff expectations n = 1</li> <li>Facilities n = 1</li> <li>Procedures n = 1</li> </ul> <p><u>Usefulness of training received by supervisors</u></p> <p>4.0 (on a scale of 1-5)</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Books/Supplies n = 1</li> <li>Agency/teacher relationships n = 1</li> <li>Program operation and guidelines n = 1</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Contact was made with the agency staff (n = 2)</li> </ul> <p><u>Rating</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Quality of working relationship with agency staff was rated excellent (an average 5.0 on a scale of 1-5)</li> </ul> <p><u>How relationship could be enhanced</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The relationship was excellent--no changes needed n = 2</li> </ul>	<p><u>Rating</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Appropriateness of equipment and supplies to students was rated an average 4.0 (on a scale of 1-5)</li> </ul>	<p><u>Rating</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Success of program was rated an average 4.5 (on a scale of 1-5)</li> </ul> <p><u>Innovative elements</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Computers work very well with students n = 1</li> <li>No innovations n = 1</li> </ul> <p><u>Was program fully implemented?</u></p> <p>YES n = 2</p>

\* Personal background: Supervised special education an average of 11.5 years (n = 2); Supervised in IFP an average of 5.5 years (n = 2)

Supervisors' reported goals included supervising instructional activities according to the handbook of objectives, and insuring good teacher/agency relations. Supervisors rated the degree to which overall goals were achieved very highly (5.0). Supervisors' activities included ensuring appropriate instruction, monitoring paperwork, and resolving problems among staff, students, and teachers. Supervisors rated the degree to which activities and methods were implemented very highly (5.0).

Training of teachers by supervisors was rated as useful (4.0). Topics covered included agency/teacher relationships, materials, and program operation and guidelines. The usefulness of the training received by supervisors in preparation of their roles was rated positively at 4.0.

The supervisors generally agreed that the quality of the working relationship with agency staff was excellent, rating this a 5.0. Materials and equipment were rated satisfactory (4.0). Staffing was generally sufficient, being rated a 5.0.

Overall success of the program received a 4.5 rating. Supervisors reported that the program was fully implemented as planned, and that the use of computers was an innovative aspect of the program that worked well with students. Few other innovations were reported.



### III. PROGRAM OUTCOMES

Table 6 lists the percentages of objectives mastered by the total sample population. Data indicated that more than 82 percent of the students mastered 80 percent or more of their individual objectives, and over 76 percent of the students mastered all of their attempted individual objectives.

Table 7 presents particular student accomplishments. Overall, 823 accomplishments were reported.\* They included particular accomplishments such as obtaining employment, passing exams, completing high school, and getting accepted to college, as well as general attitudinal changes such as developing positive values concerning personal and educational issues. The development of positive attitudes concerning education, work, and careers, as well as improved self-esteem and interpersonal relationships, represented 40 percent of the student accomplishments reported. Nearly 35 percent of all student accomplishments reported concerned improved academic skills and other academic accomplishments.

---

\* This suggests that each student for whom data were reported by the teachers could have had multiple accomplishments.

TABLE 6  
 Percentages of Objectives Mastered  
 (N = 483)

Percent Mastery	Number of Students	Percent of Students	Cumulative Number of Students	Cumulative Percent
100	368	76.2	368	76.2
90-99	12	2.5	380	78.7
80-89	18	3.7	398	82.4
60-79	44	9.1	442	91.5
0-59	36	7.5	478	99.0
0	5	1.0	483	100.0
Total	483			

Source: Student Data Retrieval Forms

- Over 82 percent (398) of the students mastered 80 percent or more of their individual objectives.
- Over 76 percent (332) of the students mastered all of their attempted individual objectives.

TABLE 7  
PROGRAM-RELATED STUDENT ACCOMPLISHMENTS  
(N = 823--accomplishments recorded)

PROGRAM-RELATED GOAL	STUDENTS	
	Number	Percentage
<b>A. VOCATIONAL/ACADEMIC ACHIEVEMENTS</b>		
Obtained off-site employment	10	1.2
Obtained on-site jobs	14	1.7
Promoted a grade in day school	12	1.5
Passed other academic exam	6	.7
Other academic accomplishments	122	14.8
Accepted to college program	9	1.1
Passed regents exam	5	.6
Entered or re-entered high school	9	1.1
Obtained on-site jobs	14	1.7
Completed GED	5	.6
Completed high school	1	.1
Passed licensing exam	5	.6
Improved academic skills	159	19.3
<b>B. STUDENT ATTITUDINAL CHANGES</b>		
Developed positive values concerning self-esteem and interpersonal relationships	177	21.5
Developed positive values concerning education, work, careers	175	21.3
Accomplished other program-related attainments	100	12.2

Source: Teacher surveys

- Over 40 percent of all student accomplishments reported by teachers were the development of positive values concerning education, work, careers, self-esteem, and interpersonal relationships.
- Nearly 35 percent of all student accomplishments concerned improved academic skills and other academic accomplishments.

#### IV. CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

##### CONCLUSIONS

Information obtained by the Office of Research, Evaluation, and Assessment revealed that the state-mandated goal of 75 percent of students achieving 75 percent of their objectives was met. The more stringent program goal of 80 percent of students achieving 80 percent of their objectives was also met. Overall, more than 82 percent of the students reached or exceeded 80 percent of their attempted objectives, and over 76 percent of the students achieved all of their attempted objectives.

Analyses of survey and interview data indicated that most instruction took place in classrooms, and that teachers worked with students individually and in small groups. Program goals included improving students' academic skills and daily life skills, and providing prevocational training. Various activities were implemented in pursuit of these goals, including hands-on activities, writing projects, and the use of computers. Teachers and supervisors emphasized that computers were very successful in facilitating implementation of the program's educational goals, and recommended that more computers, computer equipment, software packages, and computer training be provided. Instructional materials and equipment, in general, were sufficient and available. Rapport among teachers, supervisors, and agency staff, as well as between students and teachers, was reported as generally positive.

Very few weaknesses in the program were indicated by teachers and supervisors. However, some teachers expressed various concerns. Some of these concerned personal problems and habits of students and lack of agency staff cooperation and involvement which the IFP has limited control over in terms of resources and program structure. For example, in teacher surveys, teachers reported concern about staff not being involved in motivating students to attend instructional sessions; personal problems of students which get in the way of instruction, such as transitional placement in the institutions; and behavioral and emotional problems.

Teachers expressed other concerns that IFP has better capacity to address. In teacher interviews, teachers indicated the need for more information about students' day school attendance and performance; more curriculum choices, such as instruction related to daily life and parenting skills; and the designation of more time to spend on non-instructional matters such as paperwork and ordering materials and supplies. In both teacher surveys and teacher interviews, teachers indicated the need for more computers, software, and training.

### RECOMMENDATIONS

Based on the findings of this evaluation, OREA recommends that the program:

- encourage more planning and instructional sessions for teachers, supervisors, and agency staff. Since the IFP is limited in affecting the degree of agency staff involvement then such planning and instructional sessions would, at minimum, facilitate the sharing of ideas on a range of issues such as difficulties teachers may have dealing with students' emotional and behavioral problems, and the involvement of agency staff in student instruction;

- introduce computer equipment (including software) and computer education at more sites to serve the needs of both regular and special education students;
- expand curriculum inventories to include additional academic instruction, information regarding the availability of materials and other resources, and instruction related to daily life and parenting skills. Continue to include program offerings in the arts (such as ENACT). Teacher training should include more topics such as transitional occupational skills, computer training, and behavioral management;
- encourage and provide incentives to teachers and supervisors to continue in the program, since a high staff retention rate seems to contribute to program success;
- allot teachers a designated time (or more time overall) to handle non-instructional matters such as paperwork, selecting and ordering materials, and making contacts with students' day school. This would help prevent teachers from having to use instructional time that should be devoted to students.