DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 373 868	PS 022 490

AUTHOR	Quay, Lorene C.; Kaufman-McMurrain, Marsha
TITLE	Georgia Prekindergarten Program Evaluation.
PUB DATE	1 Sep 93
NOTE	301p.; Parts of Appendix D may not reproduce clearly.
PUB TYPE	Reports - Evaluative/Feasibility (142) -- Tests/Evaluation Instruments (160)
EDRS PRICE	MF01/PC13 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS	*Community Programs; Family Programs; *Low Income Groups; Parent Attitudes; Parent Participation; Pilot Projects; *Preschool Children; Preschool Curriculum; *Preschool Education; *Preschool Evaluation; Program Effectiveness; *Program Evaluation
IDENTIFIERS	*Georgia Prekindergarten Program

ABSTRACT

This report is an evaluation of the Georgia Prekindergarten Program established during the 1992-93 school year. The program aimed to enhance community services, family well-being, and developmental and educational opportunities for 4-year-olds, targeting children who were eligible for public assistance or referred by a social service agency. Twenty pilot programs were selected for funding. This evaluation, intended to provide information to guide decisions about future directions for the program, has two objectives: first, to describe the overall program, the children and families, and the educational and family services; and second, to assess broad, long-term effects on community, family, and child well-being. Chapter 1 describes the seven program sites in the evaluation sample. Chapter 2 describes the children and their developmental levels, and attendance and attrition in the program. Chapter 3 describes the families participating in the program and their evaluations of the program. Chapter 4 describes the education component of the programs at each site: (1) the service delivery system; (2) each curriculum model selected; (3) results of teacher interviews; (4) the classroom environment; (5) teacher assessment of students; (6) teacher characteristics and training; and (7) parent involvement. Chapter 5 describes the family service workers and their role in the program and training. Chapter 6 describes the community-based coordinating councils and their views of the sample programs. Chapter 7 presents a summary, review, and implications of the evaluation. Case studies are included in chapters 2, 4, and 5. Appendices include the pilot program guidelines and survey instruments used. (TM)

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

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

ED 373 868

GEORGIA PREKINDERGARTEN

PROGRAM EVALUATION

presented to the

Division of Research, Evaluation, and Assessment

Office of Instructional Services

Georgia Department of Education

September 1, 1993

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

Darlene
Minore

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

Lorene C. Quay, Ph. D.

Principal Investigator

Marsha Kaufman-McMurrain, Ph. D.

Project Director

Department of Early Childhood Education

Georgia State University

Atlanta, GA 30303

PS 022490

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

Georgia Prekindergarten Evaluation

Project Staff

Darlene Minore, M. S., Senior Graduate Research Assistant

Sherry Howard, M. S., Administrative Specialist

Ashley Calvert, B. A., Graduate Research Assistant

Don Steele, M. Ed., Graduate Research Assistant

Sally Peavy, M. Ed., Graduate Research Assistant

Ramona Hassan, Administrative Assistant

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

The Georgia Prekindergarten Evaluation Project staff members would like to thank a number of people for their involvement throughout this project year. Foremost, we want to gratefully acknowledge the invaluable assistance we have received from our Project Officer, Dr. Jess Elliott, from the Division of Research, Evaluation, and Assessment of the Georgia Department of Education. Dr. Elliott has offered substantive and constructive counsel on all phases of the evaluation. We also thank Betty Carithers from the Early Childhood Education Program of the Georgia Department of Education for her helpful input.

We express our gratitude to all of the prekindergarten directors, teachers, paraprofessionals, family services coordinators and parents at our seven evaluation sites. Although they are too numerous to name individually, we thank them all because we could not have conducted our work without their patience and cooperation. Special among this group are the people who served as our Advisory Group, Dr. Christine Ehrenberg, Barbara Reed, Dr. Sherry Gibney Sherman, and Patsy Thomas. They and their designees, Carol Denton, Jan Stephens, and Willadene White gave us crucial advice on the evaluation procedures and instruments.

Three individuals served as formal consultants to the project and their work must be acknowledged with sincere appreciation: Dr. Christine Ehrenberg served as our qualitative research consultant; Dr. Walter Hodges was our curriculum analyst; and Dr. William Swan shared his expertise on interagency collaboration.

We are grateful to Tamara Ard, Director of Training and Curriculum Design for the Georgia Academy, who made the Foundations and Collaboration Training evaluations and other training materials available to us. What a nice example of interagency cooperation!

Our colleagues from the Department of Early Childhood Education at Georgia State University, especially Dr. Brenda Galina and Dr. Gary Weld, also deserve recognition. We genuinely value their support.

Finally, we offer our heartfelt thanks and best wishes to the children and parents of Georgia's Prekindergarten Program. We look forward to following the impact of this program in future years.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Introduction

GEORGIA PREKINDERGARTEN PROGRAM AND EVALUATION

14

The Program 14

The Evaluation 15

Plan of the Report 16

Chapter 1

THE SAMPLE

17

Table 1: Description of Sample Sites 19

Chapter 2

CHILDREN

23

CHILD CHARACTERISTICS 23

- Gender and Age 23
- Ethnicity and Primary Language 24
- Table 2: Children in the Population and the Sample at the Seven Sites 25
- Table 3: Ethnicity Breakdown of All Children in the Sites 26
- Table 4: Primary Language Spoken by the Children 27
- Health 24

DEVELOPMENTAL LEVELS 28

Table 5: Means, Standard Deviations, Ranges, and Minimum and Maximum Age and IQ Equivalence Scores for the Developmental Profile 31

Table 6: Means, Standard Deviations, Ranges, and Minimum and Maximum Differential Scores for the Developmental Profile 34

ATTENDANCE 33

Table 7: Total Number of Days Children Could Attend at each Site 36

Table 8: Frequency and Percent of Children Absent from School 37

Table 9: Frequency and Percent of Child Absences 39

ATTRITION 35

CASE STUDIES 41

Chapter 3

FAMILIES

44

FAMILY CHARACTERISTICS 44

Family Configuration 44

Table 10: Adult Configuration of the Families 45

Table 11: Adults in the Household 47

Table 12: Children in the Household 48

Educational Level 46

Table 13: Highest Educational Levels Achieved by Mothers 49

Table 14: Highest Educational Level Achieved by Fathers 51

Employment 50

Table 15: Mothers' Employment Status 52

Table 16: Fathers' Employment Status 53

Table 17: Mothers' Occupational Levels 55

Table 18: Fathers' Occupational Levels 56

Income from Wages and Federal Assistance 57

Table 19: Sources of Wages in the Household 58

Table 20: Number of Wage Sources in the Household 59

Federal Assistance 57

Table 21: Sources of Federal Assistance 60

Table 22: Number of Federal Assistance Sources in the Household 61

PARENTS' EVALUATIONS OF THE EDUCATIONAL COMPONENT, THE FAMILY SERVICES COMPONENT, AND COMMUNITY AGENCIES 62

The Instructional Component 63

Contributors to Positive Gains Made by the Children 63

Affective Aspects in the Relationship between Teachers and Parents 64

Parental Relationships with Prekindergarten Staff Members 66

Parent Involvement with the Educational Process 66

The Family Services Component 67

Community Social Services 69

Parental Perceptions of Health Department Services 69

Parental Perceptions of Department of Family and Children Services 70

Disrespect for Parental Time 70

Disrespect for the Person Seeking Assistance 71

The Lack of Confidentiality 71

Exceptions to the Negative Perceptions Held by the Majority 71

Parental Perceptions of Public Housing Services 72

Parental Perceptions Regarding Legal Services 72

Parental Involvement in Continuing Education 73

Job Training and Placement for Prekindergarten Parents 73

Implications of the Findings 74

Chapter Four

THE EDUCATIONAL COMPONENT
76

Section 1: Description of the Sample Sites 77

Section 2: Curriculum Reviews 79

The Creative Curriculum 79

The High/Scope Curriculum 82

A Foundation for the Future: The Georgia State University Child Development Center Curriculum (Foundations) 85

The Home Instruction Program for Preschool Youngsters (HIPPY) 87

The Portage Project 89

Section 3: Teacher Interpretations 91

INTERVIEWS 91

RESULTS 92

Child Gains 93

Materials 94

The Teacher's Role 94

Helping the Children Learn 94

Teachers' Views of the Impressions Observers Would Get 95

Parent's Role 95

Schedule 96

Assessment 96

Section 4: Classroom Features 96

Table 23: Percentage of Classrooms Having the Characteristics Listed on the Classroom Checklist 98

Section 5: Teacher Assessment of the Children 97

Table 24: Site Administered Developmental Assessment 102

TEACHER CHARACTERISTICS 101

Table 25: Characteristics of Lead Teachers 103

Table 26: Characteristics of Assistant Teachers 106

Section 6: Teacher Training 105

Table 27: Number of Teachers Receiving Training 108

Section 7: Parent Involvement 109

Table 28: Parent Involvement Activities in Center–Based Classrooms 111

Table 29: Parent Education Activities, Site A 113

Table 30: Parent Education Activities, Site B 114

Table 31: Parent Education Activities, Site C1 115

Table 32: Parent Education Activities, Site C2 117

Table 33: Parent Education Activities, Site C3 118

Table 34: Parent Education Activities, Site D 119

Table 35: Parent Education Activities, Site E 120

Table 36: Parent Education Activities, Site F 121

Table 37: Parent Education Activities, Site G 126

Table 38: Program Staff's Evaluation of Parent Activities (Content) 127

Table 39: Program Staff's Evaluation of Parent Activities (Time of Day) 128

Table 40: (Program Staff's Evaluation of Parent Activities (Planning Advice)139 129

Section 8: Case Studies 130

Chapter Five

THE FAMILY SERVICES COMPONENT
133

FAMILY SERVICES WORKERS 133

The Position of the Family Services Workers 133

Table 41: Administrating Responsibility for Family Service Workers at each Site 134

The Characteristics of the Family Services Workers 137

Table 42: Characteristics of Family Services 138

Goals and Activities of Family Services Workers 137

Table 43: Responses to the Family Services Questionnaire 139

Family Services Record 141

Table 44: Health and Medical Services 143

Table 45: Mental Health Services 144

Table 46: Nutrition and Food 145

Table 47: Housing 146

Table 48: Utilities 147

Table 49: Clothing and Furniture 148

Table 50: Education 149

Table 51: Job Training 150

Table 52: Transportation 151

Table 53: Additional Services 152

HOME VISITS 153

Table 54: Mean Number of Home Visits by Family Services Workers to Sample Children 154

TRAINING OF FAMILY SERVICES WORKERS 153

Table 55: Number of Family Services Workers Receiving Training 155

CASE STUDIES 157

Chapter Six

THE COORDINATING COUNCIL 159

THE COORDINATING COUNCIL QUESTIONNAIRE 160

Coordinating Council Questionnaire, Section I for Chairs 1160

Table 56: Responses of Coordinating Council Chairs to Part I of the Coordinating Council Questionnaire 161

Coordinating Council Questionnaire, Section I for Members 162

Table 57: Responses of Coordinating Council Members to Part I of the Coordinating Council Questionnaire 163

Table 58: Coordinating Council Responses to "Has the Focus of the Coordinating Council Changed Since the Prekindergarten Program Started? If so, in what way? 166

Table 59: Coordinating Council Responses to: "Has the Mission of the Coordinating Council Changed? If so, in what way?" 167

ERIC
Full Text Provided by ERIC

Table 60: Coordinating Council Responses to "Has the Structure of the Coordinating Council Changed? If so, in what way?" 168

Coordinating Council Questionnaire, Section II, Chairs and Members 165

Table 61: Percentages in each response category for Coordinating Council Chairs and Members 169

Table 62: Means and Standard Deviations of the Response Categories for Coordinating 173

Conclusions 178

EVALUATION OF TRAINING IN COLLABORATION 178

Chapter 7

SUMMARY, REVIEW, AND IMPLICATIONS
180

Summary 180

THE CHILDREN 180

THE FAMILIES 182

THE EDUCATIONAL COMPONENT 185

THE FAMILY SERVICES COMPONENT 190

THE COORDINATING COUNCIL 191

Discussion 193

Appendix A: Pilot Program Guidelines

Appendix B: Data Collection Forms

Appendix C: Foundations Training Evaluations

Appendix D: Collaboration Training Evaluations

INTRODUCTION

THE GEORGIA PREKINDERGARTEN PROGRAM AND EVALUATION

THE PROGRAM

For the 1992–93 school year the Georgia Department of Education requested proposals from any school system or child care agency in the state which wished to apply for funding for a prekindergarten pilot program for four–year–olds. The target population for the program had to be children from families who are income eligible for public assistance or who are referred by a social service agency. Although general programmatic guidelines and criteria were clearly stated, applicants were afforded the opportunity to tailor their educational and social services approaches to meet the needs of their communities. From all the proposals submitted, twenty pilot programs were selected for funding. The pilot Program Guidelines issued by the Georgia Department of Education appear in Appendix A.

The Georgia Prekindergarten Program is designed to be comprehensive. It includes efforts to enhance community services, family well–being, and developmental and educational opportunities for 4–year–old children. The program has two major thrusts. One is to provide educational experiences for both the children and their families. The other is to support families in meeting their other needs and to increase the responsiveness of community agencies to families and children.

One goal is to provide the children with sound educational programs. Prekindergarten projects are to provide experiences in the physical, social, self–help, and intellectual areas of development. One purpose of such broad experiences is to enhance children's feelings of well-being, desire for learning and achievement, and opportunities for immediate and later success. Prekindergarten projects must also provide family educational programs and encourage family participation in school activities. It is predicted that parent involvement at this early stage will lead to continued involvement throughout the child's academic career.

Each project is also required to have a family services coordinator whose major tasks are to help families identify needs, acquire services, and become empowered toward increasing self-sufficiency. Each project must have a coordinating council composed of representatives of various social services agencies and other community groups. The purpose of the council is to facilitate collaboration among agencies for the enhancement of service availability, accessibility, and effectiveness.

THE EVALUATION

The goal of the evaluation is to provide information to guide decisions about future directions for Georgia's Prekindergarten Program. An advisory group, comprised of local program personnel, provided important counsel in establishing the nature and substance of the evaluation design.

The evaluation has two specific objectives. One is to describe the overall program: the children and families; the educational and family services components of the program; and the coordinating council. Community, family, and child intervention is described in such a way that it can be replicated in new sites and in other states. To provide this description, procedures and measuring instruments had to be developed. This was the undertaking of the first year of the evaluation, and this report presents the procedures used and the results obtained. Another objective is to assess broad outcomes; that is, to evaluate the long-term effects of the program on community, family, and child well-being. This aspect of the evaluation must take place in future years, since time is required for changes to be revealed.

To describe the program many procedures were used. Several visits were made to each site. Classrooms were visited; and discussions were held with program directors, teachers, family service coordinators, other members of the professional staff, and parents. In this way information was obtained about the physical facilities, goals, activities, perceived program needs, and staff and family feelings about the program. In addition, many instruments were developed and administered, existing records were surveyed, and demographic data were collected. See Appendix B for all instruments except the Developmental Profile II, which is a protected assessment instrument.

PLAN OF THE REPORT

This report is presented in chapters relating to the areas of the program that are described. Chapter One describes the sites in the evaluation sample; Chapter Two describes the children; Chapter Three, the families; Chapter Four, the educational component; Chapter Five, the family services component, and Chapter Six, the coordinating council. Chapter Seven presents a summary and discussion. Because the purpose of the evaluation is to assess the program statewide, most of the information concerning the children, families, and coordinating councils is combined from all the sites and reported for the group. When, for the sake of clarity, information is presented by site, the sites are identified only by randomly assigned letters. The specific letters designating sites are frequently changed so that the sites cannot be identified.

CHAPTER ONE

THE SAMPLE

A sample of seven programs (sites) was selected from the 20 pilot programs for in–depth description and evaluation. This sample was selected by the Georgia Department of Education to reflect the diversity in the program. The seven sites were selected for the sample because they:

a. represent the diversity which characterizes the 20 sites, including rural/urban and different ethnic groups;

b. represent different geographical areas of the state;

c. include each service delivery model (home–based, center– based, and combination of home– and center–based);

d. include representation of each type of grantee agency (school system and child care agency);

e. have comparable nonparticipants who could be selected as members of a comparison group in the following years.

The seven selected sites were:

a. Bibb County Schools

b. Decatur City Schools

c. North Fulton Child Development Association

d. Glynn County Schools

e. Lamar County Schools

f. Ninth District Opportunity, Inc. (Banks, Dawson, and White Counties)

g. Youth Empowerment Systems, Inc. (Clarke County Schools).

The original plan was to select 100 families and children from these sites for in-depth study, with the number in the sample from each site proportional to the number of families and children in the program at that site. However, the number in the sample was increased from 100 to 135 children, so that an effective sample could be maintained after attrition. Eight children left the program before completing the school year. Because they withdrew at various stages of data collection, the numbers in the sample were not equal for all variables.

Table 1 describes the sites in terms of the administrative agency, program type (service delivery models used), number of children served, date the program began, number of classrooms in each center-based program and number of contact days per week and hours per day for the children in the classrooms or the parents in the home-based programs.

Although the sites were similar in many ways, there was much diversity among them in the characteristics of the families and children served, the mode of delivering services, and the features of the larger community in which they were located. It seemed necessary for the programs to differ if they were going to be effective. The staff in each program felt certain that they had devised the best program to fit the local community. They were enthusiastic about what they were doing, and their enthusiasm seemed to be contagious and to affect those whom they were serving. They highly commended the Georgia Department of Education for permitting the diversity, for allowing them to tailor their programs to their situations. To illustrate both similarities and differences among the sites, a brief description of each selected site is presented below. The characteristics described are based on written information supplied by the site and

TABLE 1

DESCRIPTION OF SAMPLE SITES
(SUMMARY)

SITE	PROGRAM TYPE	NUMBER OF CHILDREN SERVED	FIRST DATE OF SERVICE	NUMBER OF CLASSES	LENGTH OF SERVICE	
					DAYS/wk	HRS/day
BIBB COUNTY PUBLIC SCHOOLS	Center	29	10/19/92	2	5	4
DECATUR CITY SCHOOLS	Center	16	10/27/92	1	5	6.5
GLYNN COUNTY BOARD OF EDUCATION	Center Home Combined	110 (Total)	10/5/92	2 N/A	5 1	8 1 - 2
LAMAR COUNTY SCHOOLS	Center	27	10/12/92	2	3	4.5
NINTH DISTRICT OPPORTUNITY INC.	Center Home	60 (Total)	10/5/92	2 N/A	5 1	6 1
NORTH FULTON CHILD DEVELOPMENT CENTER*	Center	25	9/14/92	3	5	7
YOUTH EMPOWERMENT SYSTEMS, INC.	Center	54	10/26/92	4	5	6

* Some of the prekindergarten children are integrated with other children in the center.

direct observations made by Evaluation Project staff. The site identification letters (A – G) are randomly assigned to the seven sample sites.

SITE A: This urban grantee is a small local school system with one prekindergarten classroom located in an elementary school directly across the hall from a Head Start classroom. This site chose a parent from the community to be its family services coordinator. The rationale is that a paraprofessional from the target community will have credibility with the prekindergarten families, making it easier to offer and coordinate services. The director is the Assistant Superintendent. The building principal is also involved in overseeing the daily classroom operations.

SITE B: The grantee for this urban site is a local school system with its two classrooms located in Housing Authority community rooms, making them very convenient to the public housing residents served by this program. This site is unique among the sample sites in having a professional family services coordinator who is employed by the Georgia Department of Family and Children Services (DFCS) and released to the prekindergarten program full time. The program director is also the Elementary Curriculum Director.

SITE C: This rural school system program has a portable classroom located on the grounds of the local elementary school. The prekindergarten program serves 2 groups of 15 children, each with 10 "eligible" children and 5 "non–eligible" children. "Eligible" children are those whose families receive some type of federal assistance or who have been referred by a social service agency. All children attend 2 and 1/2 days per week. The lead teacher and the assistant teacher also serve the family services function, spending half of their time in each role.

The program director at this site is the elementary school principal who shares much of the program supervision with the lead teacher.

SITE D: This urban site is also sponsored by a local school system. It has two prekindergarten classrooms in a newly renovated wing of a school system facility. In addition to the prekindergarten program, the buildings on this campus house a Head Start program, a middle school alternative program, and a Special Needs 4–year–old program. This site also has a home–based program which teaches parents activities to present to their children. There are actually three program types at this site: center–based, home–based, and combined. That is, one group of children participates in a center–based program only; one group participates in a home–based program only; and one group participates in both programs. One family services coordinator works with the families having children in the center–based model; the parent educators have the dual role of teaching and providing family services for the home–based families. Additionally, a coordinator for the home–based program works with the parent educators. The program director is also the Director of Early Childhood Education for the county school system.

SITE E: This prekindergarten grantee is an urban community agency, but the program is administered by the local school system. There are four prekindergarten classrooms served by this site, with two housed in elementary schools and two in community center recreation facilities. The family services coordinator is a professional social worker and this program also has a PEACH worker assigned specifically to work with the families. The program director is the school system's Director of Grants and Research.

SITE F: This rural grantee is a community agency operating prekindergarten services in three different counties. Two of the counties have center–based programs located in elementary school buildings; the other county has a home–based model. A distinguishing characteristic of this grantee is that it also operates the Head Start program in its district. The family services delivery system follows the Head Start model where each center has a family services worker who reports to the center director. For the home–based program the home visitors serve the family services function. The director of the prekindergarten program is also the Head Start Director for this local community agency.

SITE G: This urban site is sponsored by a community agency and is unique among the sites in that it has a high percentage of limited–English–speaking families. One classroom at this site is led by a bilingual teacher and most of the children in that class are from predominantly Spanish–speaking families. Some children in the prekindergarten program are being served in two other preschool classrooms. The family services coordinator works with the entire population of families at the community center. The program director is the Director of the grantee agency.

CHAPTER TWO

CHILDREN

This section of the Evaluation Report is about the children in the prekindergarten program. Several procedures were used to obtain information on their physical characteristics, developmental levels in several areas, attendance at school, and withdrawal from the program. These procedures, along with the results, are described in this section. To illustrate the impact of the program on specific children, case studies are included at the end of the section.

CHILD CHARACTERISTICS

A form for obtaining information on families and children was developed and used at the selected sites. Data were recorded about the following characteristics of each child from the sample families: age; gender; ethnicity; primary language; health, physical, and nutritional status; date of screening for health-related problems on the Early Periodic Screening and Diagnostic Test (EPSDT); results of the EPSDT (specification of any abnormality); chronic disorders; medication use; date of Diphtheria, Pertussis, Polio, and Tetanus (DPPT) immunization; and date of Measles, Mumps, and Rubella (MMR) immunization.

Gender and Age

Age and gender were obtained for the total population of children in the 7 selected sites. The total number of children in the seven sites was 321, including 161 boys and 160 girls. In the sample of children there were 68 boys and 67 girls. Upon entering the program all children, except 1, were 4 years of age. Most programs began in October or November, and the average age of the children upon entrance was 55.8 months. One child was older, 76 months of age. This child was permitted to enter the program because he still was not ready for kindergarten, even though he had attended it for a year. The school recommended that he stay out and mature for an additional year. The prekindergarten program admitted him, and the teacher reported that he was flourishing and ready to excel in kindergarten by the end of the prekindergarten year.

Ethnicity and Primary Language

The tables on the next pages present information on ethnicity and language. Table 2 shows the percentage of children in each ethnic group both in the total population of children at the seven sites and in the sample. It can be seen that, overall, the majority of the children is African-American; the next largest group is white; and smaller percentages are Hispanic and "other." Table 3 presents the total number of boys and girls in each ethnic group by site. Table 4 presents the primary language of the children. Although the primary language of the vast majority of children is English, at one center it is Spanish.

Health

Early Periodic Screening and Diagnostic Testing was provided by the local branch of the Department of Health for most children after they entered the program. Because one site was told that the wait for this examination would be at least a year, the program director arranged to have the Georgia State University School of Nursing conduct these examinations. Although all children were given the EPSDT either just prior to or after entering the program, it was difficult for the Evaluation Project to obtain a release of the health information from the Health Department offices. However, several of the sites were able to obtain such a release and to supply the information, resulting in data being obtained for 85 of the 135 sample children. For this subsample of children health problems were found in several areas. Dental problems occurred in 9.4% of the children. Eye disorders were found in 1.5% of

TABLE 2

CHILDREN IN THE POPULATION AND THE SAMPLE AT THE SEVEN SITES

ETHNICITY	ALL CHILDREN (Seven Sites)		SAMPLE CHILDREN (Seven Sites)	
	Frequency	Percent	Frequency	Percent
African American	186	57.9	86	63.7
White	107	33.4	38	28.1
Hispanic	17	5.3	6	4.4
Other	11	3.4	5	3.7
TOTAL	321	100	135	99.9

TABLE 3

ETHNICITY BREAKDOWN OF ALL CHILDREN IN THE SITES

ETHNICITY	SITE A		SITE B		SITE C		SITE D		SITE E		SITE F		SITE G		TOTAL
	Boys	Girls	Boys	Girls	Boys	Girls	Boys	Girls	Boys	Girls	Boys	Girls	Boys	Girls	
AFRICAN AMERICAN	41	32	9	7	1	1	1	1	11	16	30	20	8	8	186
WHITE	17	17	4	7	28	29	0	2	1	1	0	1	0	0	107
HISPANIC	0	1	0	0	0	0	5	11	0	0	0	0	0	0	17
OTHER	1	1	0	0	1	0	2	3	0	0	1	2	0	0	11
TOTAL	59	51	13	14	30	30	8	17	12	17	31	23	8	8	321

TABLE 4

PRIMARY LANGUAGE SPOKEN BY THE CHILDREN

(N = 135)

LANGUAGE	PERCENT
ENGLISH	94.8
SPANISH	3.7
ASIAN	.7
OTHER	.7

the children. Speech, allergy, kidney, and orthopedic problems each were diagnosed in 2% of the children. Children for whom these problems were diagnosed were referred for treatment. In addition, 18% of the children had previously been diagnosed as having chronic health problems, and 4% were taking continuing medication for chronic conditions.

Because the prekindergarten program is likely to be responsible for assuring the immunizations of children in the program, dates were obtained to determine whether children were immunized before or after they began the program. The vast majority of children received both the Diphtheria, Pertussis, Tetanus (DPT) and the Measles, Mumps, and Rubella (MMR) immunizations after registering for or entering the program. Dates of the last MMR immunization (the most important one at this age) indicated that only 9.6% of the children had received it prior to August 1, 1992. From August 1 to October 1, 1992, about the time of the beginning of most programs, an additional 13.4% received this immunization. In most cases the parents were advised that the children would need it in order to attend prekindergarten. After October 1, the remaining 77% of the children received this immunization. These data indicate that the program was influential in obtaining immunizations for most of the children.

DEVELOPMENTAL LEVELS

The evaluation includes a description of the developmental characteristics of this year's 4–year–old population. Given the rapid growth and development of young children through their early years, it will be important for the Evaluation to follow the children's progress during the primary grades. For descriptive purposes the children's physical, self–help, social, academic, and communication development was assessed this year using the Developmental Profile II[1]. A number of validation studies reported in the Manual indicate that correlations between this test and the Stanford–Binet range from .63 to .85 when the teacher interview procedure for obtaining information about the child is used. Test–retest reliability computed on a group of 35 teachers yielded an agreement of 89%. Internal consistency coefficients for the 5 scales ranged from .78 to .83.

---

[1] Alpern, G., Boll, T., & Shearer, M. (1992). Developmental profile II manual. Los Angeles: Wester Psychological Services.

The Developmental Profile II can be administered by directly testing the child or by interviewing a parent or teacher. The Evaluation Project elected to use the interview procedure because it is less intrusive for the children. The teachers were interviewed in all center–based programs. In the home–based programs, the parents were interviewed.

Because the teachers needed time to become familiar with each child and also because the Evaluation did not begin until January, 1993, the Developmental Profile II was administered to the teachers well after the program began. Most tests were administered during the early months of 1993.

For each area of development the test yields two scores, the age score and the differential score. The age score indicates that the child is functioning at the level of a typical child of a particular chronological age, and it may be either below or above the child's actual chronological age. For example, a child having an age score of 48 months in a particular area is said to be functioning like a typical 48–month–old child, even though the tested child might be chronologically older or younger than that age. The differential score is the difference between the age score and the chronological age. If, for example, the same child is actually 44 months old, her differential score in this particular area would be approximately +4, computed by subtracting 44 (chronological age) from 48 (age score). In addition to the age and differential scores in each area of development, the test yields an IQ Equivalence score. Although this score is interpreted by the authors to be much like the Stanford–Binet IQ, it is based on the Academic Scale and therefore suggests a rate of academic development only. It is important to note that such scores for children of this age are imprecise, and, at best can only be used to describe groups. As Berk[2] indicated, "Preschool IQ's do not predict school–age scores as well as later measures" (p. 330).

Table 5 presents the means, standard deviations, ranges, and minimum and maximum age scores in months in the five areas of development: physical, self help, social, academic, and communication. In addition, this table shows the same statistics for the IQ Equivalence score. Because the mean scores differed substantially among the sites, the range of means for the sites is also included in the table. The first row in Table 5 presents the statistics for the chronological age at the time of testing. As shown, the average age of the children at the time the test was administered was 61 months, with a standard deviation of 4.63 months and a range of 33 months.

It can be seen from Table 5 that the mean age score in all areas except self–help was lower than the mean chronological age, indicating that the average developmental age of the children in 4 of the 5 areas was below that of the typical child of the same chronological age. However, the large standard deviations and ranges show that there are great individual differences among the children in all areas. While some children were functioning considerably below their chronological age level, others were functioning considerably above.

---

[2] Berk, L. E. (1989). Child Development, Boston: Allyn & Bacon.

TABLE 5

MEANS, STANDARD DEVIATIONS, RANGES AND MINIMUM AND MAXIMUM AGE AND IQ EQUIVALENCE SCORES FOR THE DEVELOPMENTAL PROFILE*

(N = 127)

AREA	MEAN	STANDARD DEVIATION	RANGE	MINIMUM	MAXIMUM	RANGE OF SITE MEANS
CHRONOLOGICAL AGE	61	5	33	50	83	58 to 66
PHYSICAL AGE	59	18	78	22	100	42 to 78
SELF HELP AGE	70	22	193	14	207	54 to 87
SOCIAL AGE	59	18	80	20	100	49 to 70
ACADEMIC AGE	53	16	62	20	82	43 to 72
COMMUNICATION AGE	52	17	151	14	165	43 to 58
IQ EQUIVALENCE	88	25	110	32	142	70 to 122

* Age scores are reported in months. All scores are rounded to the nearest whole number.

The average self help age score of this group of children was well above that of the typical child of the same chronological age. The difference between this score and the scores in the other areas may indicate that these children have had special opportunities to develop self-help skills but have lacked these opportunities to develop skill in other areas. This suggests that experiences in the other areas of the kind that are provided by the prekindergarten program may well be beneficial in enhancing the development of these children.

The means of the IQ equivalence scores ranged from 70 to 122. As described earlier, this is an academic scale only. The mean score of 122 was found in a rural site which had only 8 children in the sample. Although this mean score was considerably out of line with the scores from the other sites, these children were observed by the evaluators, even before the test results were known, to appear more physically and socially mature than their counterparts at other sites. Also, this location has had a high level of social services coordination for many years and appears to be considerably advanced in comparison to the other sites in this respect. That may (or may not) account for the higher levels of performance in these children. However, even at this site where the average IQ equivalence score was above average and the children scored above their chronological age level in the other areas, they were slightly below their chronological age level in communication. This suggests that they need the kind of language experiences that the prekindergarten program provides.

As described earlier, the differential score is obtained by subtracting the child's chronological age from his or her age score. Thus, the differential score provides an estimate of the number of months difference between the child's actual chronological age and his or her functional age. A negative score would suggest that a child is functioning below, and a positive score, that she is functioning above her chronological age.

Table 6 presents the means, standard deviations, ranges, and minimum and maximum differential scores for each area of development. It can be seen that on the average the children are functioning more than 9 months above their chronological age in self-help skills. They are only 1 month below in social development and 2 months below in physical development. Their greatest needs for "catching up" to their chronological age level are in the areas of academics and communication.

Caution must be observed in interpreting the scores. It was pointed out earlier that these tests are very imprecise for children of this age. As Berk[3] pointed out, "Before the age of 5 or 6, IQ should be regarded as largely an indicator of present ability and not as a dependable, enduring measure" (p. 331). The same statement can be made about the age and differential scores.

ATTENDANCE

To evaluate attendance patterns, the attendance record was obtained for each child in the sample who was in a center-based program. The number of days that children could attend was not equal at the sites. For one reason, programs started and ended at different times during the school year. For another reason, the programs varied in the number of days per week that children could attend. For example, in one program each child was scheduled to attend only three times a week. This program was able to serve a larger number of children by having two

---

[3] Ibid.

TABLE 6

MEANS, STANDARD DEVIATIONS, RANGES, AND MINIMUM AND MAXIMUM DIFFERENTIAL SCORES* FOR THE DEVELOPMENTAL PROFILE (IN MONTHS)

AREA	MEAN AGE DIFFERENTIAL SCORE	STANDARD DEVIATION	RANGE	MINIMUM	MAXIMUM	RANGE OF SITE MEANS
PHYSICAL DIFFERENTIAL	-2	18	76	-39	37	-20 to 17
SELF HELP DIFFERENTIAL	9	18	120	-40	80	-5 to 28
SOCIAL DIFFERENTIAL	-1	18	85	-45	40	-13 to 12
ACADEMIC DIFFERENTIAL	-7	16	85	-45	40	-19 to 13
COMMUNICATION DIFFERENTIAL	-9	14	68	-40	28	-22 to (-).87

* All scores are rounded to the nearest whole number.

different groups of children attend two and one–half days each. Table 7 presents the total number of days that each site was in session for an individual child could attend the program at each site, from the beginning of the school year until June 1, 1993.

Table 8 presents the frequency, percent, and cumulative percent of children in the sample who were absent at each number of days from 1 through 66, regardless of the number of days the program was in session. It was reported that the child who was absent 66 days had actually withdrawn from the program, but he was maintained on the roll because assurance of his withdrawal could not be obtained.

Because of the differences among sites in the number of program days, absences were computed using the same scale for all sites. Thus, each child's percentage of absences was computed by dividing the number of days absent by the number of possible school days that a child could attend. Omitted from the analysis were the eight children who clearly withdrew from the program before the school year ended. Table 9 presents the number, percent, and cumulative percent of children who were absent for a particular percentage of the days that they could possibly attend. Attendance patterns for most children appeared normal, but some children were chronically absent.

ATTRITION

To determine the amount and reasons for attrition, a record was kept of the number of children in the sample who withdrew from the program and the reasons for their withdrawal. Eight sample children withdrew during the year. The reasons were:

(1) Two children withdrew because they moved from the area served by the program.

TABLE 7

TOTAL NUMBER OF DAYS CHILDREN COULD ATTEND SCHOOL AT EACH SITE

SITE	NUMBER OF DAYS
A	150
B	118
C 1	151
C 2	140
D	168
E	139
F	139
G	134
AVERAGE OF ALL SITES	143

TABLE 8

FREQUENCY, PERCENT, AND CUMULATIVE PERCENT OF CHILDREN ABSENT FROM SCHOOL

NUMBER OF DAYS ABSENT	FREQUENCY	PERCENT	CUMULATIVE PERCENT*
1	3	3.2	3.2
2	7	7.5	10.8
3	8	8.6	19.4
4	2	2.2	21.5
5	7	7.5	29.0
6	1	1.1	30.1
7	4	4.3	34.4
8	5	5.4	39.8
9	1	1.1	40.9
10	2	2.2	43.0
11	4	4.3	47.3
12	4	4.3	51.6
13	1	1.1	52.7
14	3	3.2	55.9
15	4	4.3	60.2
16	6	6.5	66.7
17	1	1.1	67.7
18	3	3.2	71.0

* The cumulative percent in column 4 indicates the percentage of children whose absences were equal to or fewer than the number of days indicated in column 1.

(Table Continues)

(TABLE 8 CONTINUED)

NUMBER OF DAYS ABSENT	FREQUENCY	PERCENT	CUMULATIVE PERCENT
19	4	4.3	75.3
20	1	1.1	76.3
21	1	1.1	77.4
22	2	2.2	79.6
24	1	1.1	80.6
25	3	3.2	83.9
26	2	2.2	86.0
28	1	1.1	87.1
29	1	1.1	88.2
31	1	1.1	89.2
32	1	1.1	90.3
35	1	1.1	91.4
39	1	1.1	92.5
42	2	2.2	94.6
45	2	2.2	96.8
53	1	1.1	97.8
56	1	1.1	98.9
66	1	1.1	100.0

TABLE 9

FREQUENCY, PERCENT, AND CUMULATIVE PERCENT OF CHILD ABSENCES

PERCENT OF DAYS ABSENT*	FREQUENCY	PERCENT	CUMULATIVE PERCENT
1 %	3	3.2	3.2
2 %	8	8.6	11.8
3 %	9	9.7	21.5
4 %	6	6.5	28.0
5 %	4	4.3	32.3
6 %	6	6.5	38.7
7 %	3	3.2	41.9
8 %	6	6.5	48.4
9 %	3	3.2	51.6
10 %	5	5.4	57.0
11 %	5	5.4	62.4
12 %	5	5.4	67.7
13 %	5	5.4	73.1
14 %	4	4.3	77.4
15 %	3	3.2	80.6
16 %	2	2.2	82.8

*Number of days absent divided by number of days program was in session.

(Table Continues)

(TABLE 9 CONTINUED)

PERCENT OF DAYS ABSENT*	FREQUENCY	PERCENT	CUMULATIVE PERCENT
17%	1	1.1	83.9
18%	1	1.1	84.9
19%	2	2.2	87.1
20%	1	1.1	88.2
21%	1	1.1	89.2
22%	1	1.1	90.3
24%	1	1.1	91.4
26%	1	1.1	92.5
27%	1	1.1	93.5
30%	1	1.1	94.6
31%	2	2.2	96.8
39%	2	2.2	98.9
46%	1	1.1	100.0

* Number of days absent divided by number of days program was in session.

(2) Two children withdrew because of logistical problems such as lack of transportation to the program site or conflicts with the mother's work schedule.

(3) Two children withdrew for unknown reasons. These two children simply discontinued, and the family services coordinator was unable to communicate with the parents concerning the reason for their withdrawal.

(4) Two children withdrew because their mothers were not satisfied with the program. Both of these mothers felt that the prekindergarten program should be more academic.

CASE STUDIES

To illustrate the impact of the prekindergarten program on specific children, anecdotal accounts of individual accomplishments were collected from the prekindergarten staff. Anecdotes reported by parents will be presented later. Below are some highlights using fictitious names.

Case Study I

"Joe" began the prekindergarten year very withdrawn and shy. He would not speak or cooperate and, at first, all he wanted to do was sit in his chair. If the teachers tried to encourage him to move out of his chair or if someone new came into the room, Joe would crawl under the table. After a few weeks of encouragement, Joe moved closer to the group; but if the other children moved, he would stay seated in the same place. By December he joined the group and participated in some of the activities. By the end of the year his teacher reported that Joe was a "whole different child," joining in regularly, speaking out in the group, and even talking to new people coming into the room. She attributes Joe's progress to much encouraging, waiting, and taking things one step at a time.

Case Study II

"James" had reportedly been "kicked out" of two preschool programs for unmanageable behavior before coming to the prekindergarten program. According to the family services coordinator at this site, James' family had a number of problems; and he had been exhibiting seriously inappropriate behavior. He has, however, "done a beautiful job" in the prekindergarten setting. The family services coordinator believes that the structured environment, positive reinforcement for appropriate behavior, and love he received have enabled him to succeed.

Case Study III

"Denise" was described as painfully shy by her teacher who reported that Denise virtually followed her around for several months. Denise was reluctant to play with the other children but gradually "came out" as the year progressed. When the teacher met with the mother to tell her how much improvement Denise had made, the mother began to cry. She told the teacher that before the prekindergarten program began, she had taken her daughter to the doctor for a checkup; and the doctor had told her that Denise was "very slow", would always be very slow, and the mother should resign herself to making plans for some type of special education for her. The mother reported that she was very relieved to see how much her child had blossomed during the prekindergarten year. Denise now enjoys books and counting things. The mother is much more hopeful about her daughter's potential.

Case Study IV

"Teresa" is a young child who began the prekindergarten year having severe emotional outbursts including running out of the room, screaming, throwing things, and spitting. The prekindergarten teacher reported that she and the parents worked together to use common strategies to help Teresa get her behavior under control. They sometimes had to hold Teresa from behind to keep her from hurting herself or others and talk to her calmly as they did so. She was offered "unconditional support" and encouragement. Over a period of months Teresa began to stop her own anger, gain control and say "OK, I'm all right now." The teacher wonders what would have happened if Teresa had begun kindergarten without this program.

CHAPTER THREE

FAMILIES

A major focus of the prekindergarten program is the families. Therefore, an important task of the evaluation was to describe the families: their characteristics, their evaluation of the educational and family services components of the prekindergarten program, and their evaluation of community services. Their participation in parent activities provided by the prekindergarten program will be described in later chapters. The procedures for studying the families and the resulting information that was obtained are the subject of this chapter.

FAMILY CHARACTERISTICS

As described in the previous chapter on children, a form was developed to secure demographic information on families and children. This form was used to obtain data on the following characteristics of each sample family at the 7 selected sites: the type of adult configuration in the household, number of adults in the household, number of children in the household, mothers' and fathers' educational levels, employment status, occupational levels, the families' sources of wages and income, and the families' sources of federal assistance. These data are presented in the tables throughout this chapter.

Family Configuration

Table 10, which presents the adult configuration of the sample families' homes, shows that approximately 40% of the sample children lived in a two–parent household, while 1/3 of them lived in a single–parent household with their mothers. Only one child lived in a home where the single parent was a father. Approximately 1/4 of the sample children resided in a multi–adult household, with the most common configuration being mother and grandmother.

TABLE 10

ADULT CONFIGURATION OF THE FAMILIES

TYPE OF ADULT CONFIGURATION	FREQUENCY	PERCENT
TWO PARENT	53	39.3
SINGLE MOTHER	45	33.3
SINGLE FATHER	1	.7
MULTI-ADULT*	33	24.5
FOSTER PARENT	2	1.5
UNREPORTED**	1	.7
TOTAL	135	100.0

* Most common configuration is mother and grandparents.

** Unreported indicates that this information was not available from sample child's file.

Table 11, which presents the number of adults living in the households, indicates that from one to six adults lived in these homes. Although a mother and father dyad was the most common occurrence in the two-adult households, other configurations included mother and grandmother and mother and some other relative or friend. A third of the sample children lived in a single-parent household, and 15% of the households included more than two adults.

Table 12 presents the number of children (including the sample child) living in the family households. It is important to note that these children may or may not be siblings. Almost 12% of the sample children were the only children in their homes. The most frequent number of children living together in a household was 2, with that configuration occurring in more than 1/3 of the homes. Approximately 20% of the households had three children living together and another 20% had four. The remaining 10% had five or more children living together.

Educational Level

Table 13 presents the highest level of education that was completed by the mothers of the sample children. However, data were unavailable for approximately 30% of the mothers. It can be seen that almost 40% of the mothers reported that they did not graduate from high school. On the other hand, 27% of them reported that they did graduate from high school, and another 5% had either attended college or had graduated from college. These figures suggest that a major focus for prekindergarten personnel might be to make parents aware of opportunities to pursue GED preparation and continuing education programs. In informal situations some high school graduates expressed an interest in attending college. At least one prekindergarten program presented a local college admissions officer as the speaker at a parent education workshop.

TABLE 11

ADULTS IN THE HOUSEHOLD

NUMBER OF ADULTS	FREQUENCY	PERCENT
1	46	34.1
2*	69	51.5
3	13	9.6
4	2	1.5
5	2	1.5
6	2	1.5
UNREPORTED**	1	.7
TOTAL	135	100.0

* This number included any configuration of two adults (e.g. mother-father, mother-grandmother, mother-aunt).

** Unreported indicates that this information was not available from sample child's file.

TABLE 12

CHILDREN IN THE HOUSEHOLD

NUMBER OF CHILDREN*	FREQUENCY	PERCENT
1	16	11.9
2	49	36.3
3	27	20.0
4	29	21.5
5	5	3.7
6	4	3.0
7	3	2.2
UNREPORTED**	2	1.5
TOTAL	135	100.0

* Includes the sample child.

** Unreported indicates that this information was not available from sample child's file.

TABLE 13

HIGHEST EDUCATIONAL LEVELS ACHIEVED BY MOTHERS

EDUCATIONAL LEVEL	FREQUENCY	PERCENT
LESS THAN HIGH SCHOOL	52	38.5
HIGH SCHOOL GRADUATE	37	27.4
SOME COLLEGE	4	3.0
COLLEGE GRADUATE	3	2.2
UNREPORTED*	39	28.9
TOTAL	135	100.0

* Unreported indicates that this information was not available from sample child's file.

Table 14 presents the highest level of education that was completed by the sample children's fathers. Most of the fathers for whom this information was available had at least a high school diploma. However, data were unavailable for approximately 70% of the fathers. One explanation for this is that many households did not have fathers present. Because this is likely to be a select group of fathers, composed mostly of those fathers in two–parent households, this finding cannot be generalized to the other fathers.

Employment

Table 15 presents the sample mother's current employment status and shows that data were unavailable for approximately 14% of the mothers. One–third of the mothers reported that they work. A compelling observation made by mothers, and presented later in this chapter, was that working mothers are penalized by both the prekindergarten program and social service agencies. A frequent lament was that working parents who earn a few dollars above the income eligibility limit for public assistance subsidies are automatically excluded from the prekindergarten program. In interviews presented later in this chapter the mothers recommend opening prekindergarten admission to these families.

Table 16 presents the sample father's current employment status. Of the fathers for whom data were available, the vast majority were employed, with only 5% indicating that they were unemployed. However, it is important to note that the data were unavailable for a large percentage of the fathers. Again, this is likely to be a select group of fathers, composed mostly of those fathers in a two–parent household, and the results cannot be generalized to fathers for whom the data were unavailable.

TABLE 14

HIGHEST EDUCATIONAL LEVELS ACHIEVED BY FATHERS

EDUCATIONAL LEVEL	FREQUENCY	PERCENT
LESS THAN HIGH SCHOOL	16	11.9
HIGH SCHOOL GRADUATE	20	14.8
SOME COLLEGE	1	.7
COLLEGE GRADUATE	3	2.2
GRADUATE DEGREE	1	.7
DATA UNAVAILABLE*	94	69.6
TOTAL	135	100.0

* Data are unavailable on a large number of fathers because many children had no father in the household.

TABLE 15

MOTHERS' EMPLOYMENT STATUS

EMPLOYED	FREQUENCY	PERCENT
NO	74	54.8
YES	42	31.1
UNREPORTED	19	14.1
TOTAL	135	100.0

* Unreported indicates that this information was not available from the sample child's file.

TABLE 16

FATHERS' EMPLOYMENT STATUS

EMPLOYED	FREQUENCY	PERCENT
NO	7	5.2
YES	50	37.0
DATA UNAVAILABLE*	78	57.8
TOTAL	135	100.0

* Data are unavailable on a large number of fathers because many children had no father in the household.

The actual jobs of the parents were classified according to the Hollingshead–Redlich Occupational Scale[4]. The definitions of occupational level provided by this scale, with examples from jobs actually held by sample parents are: unskilled laborer (e.g., poultry processing plant worker, janitor), semi–skilled laborer (e.g., teacher's aide), skilled laborer (e.g., dental hygienist, carpenter), semi–professional (e.g., bookkeeper), and minor professional (e.g., minister). An additional occupational level of the Hollingshead–Redlich Occupational Scale is major professional, but the sample did not include a parent in this category. For this report an additional category, "never worked", was added to the tables so that parents who have not defined an occupational level for themselves could be counted.

Table 17 presents the occupational levels of the sample children's mothers. Data were unavailable for over 15% of the mothers. Half of the mothers reported that they have never worked outside the home and approximately 25% work in unskilled labor positions. These figures indicate that there is a need for the prekindergarten program to assess job training needs with their families and to make parents aware of employment and job training opportunities where appropriate.

Table 18 presents the occupational levels of the sample children's fathers. Most fathers for whom data were reported held unskilled jobs. Again, data were unavailable on a large percentage of fathers. These data on fathers provide further confirmation that assistance may be needed in locating opportunities for employment or job training.

---

[4] Hollingshead, A.B. & Redlich, F.E. (1958). Social and mental illness. New York: John Wiley Press.

TABLE 17

MOTHERS' OCCUPATIONAL LEVELS

OCCUPATIONAL LEVEL*	FREQUENCY	PERCENT
NEVER WORKED	67	49.6
UNSKILLED	33	24.4
SEMI-SKILLED	4	3.0
SKILLED	9	6.7
SEMI-PROFESSIONAL	1	.7
UNREPORTED**	21	15.6
TOTAL	135	100.0

* Occupations were categorized according to the Hollingshead-Redlich Occupational Scale.

** Unreported indicates that this information was not available from the sample child's file

TABLE 18

FATHERS' OCCUPATIONAL LEVELS

OCCUPATIONAL LEVEL*	FREQUENCY	PERCENT
NEVER WORKED	6	4.4
UNSKILLED	28	20.7
SEMI-SKILLED	11	8.1
SKILLED	7	5.2
SEMI-PROFESSIONAL	1	.7
MINOR PROFESSIONAL	2	1.5
DATA UNAVAILABLE**	80	59.3
TOTAL	135	100.0

* Occupations were categorized according to the Hollingshead-Redlich Occupational Scale.

** Data are unavailable on a large number of fathers because many children had no father in the household.

Income from Wages and Federal Assistance

Table 19 presents the sources of wages in the household. This table shows which members of the household—mothers, fathers, or other household members—earn wages. Nearly 1/3 of the mothers, and more than 1/3 of all fathers contribute wages to the household. In the households which include other adults, roughly 1/5 of the other household members earn wages. Table 20 presents the number of different wage sources for the sample families. One–third of the families received no income from earned wages, while almost 1/2 of the families received wages from at least one source. This source could be either the mother, father, or any other adult household member. The single working mother was by far the most common source of the household's wages. Approximately 1/5 of the sample households had two sources of income, most often a combination of wages earned by a mother and a father.

Federal Assistance

Entrance into the state prekindergarten program requires that families be eligible for some type of public assistance or that the child be referred to the program by a social service agency. Table 21 presents the various sources of federal assistance received by the sample families. Approximately 40% received Aid to Families with Dependent Children (AFDC), nearly 1/3 received assistance from the Women, Infants, and Children nutrition program (WIC), almost 1/2 received food stamps, and roughly 1/3 received Medicaid. Many families received assistance from more than 1 source. Table 22 presents the number of federal sources from which the families obtained assistance. More than 1/3 of the households did not receive any form of federal assistance, while approximately 18% received assistance from one source (most commonly food stamps or WIC), approximately 17% obtained assistance from two sources (most commonly

TABLE 19

SOURCES OF WAGES IN THE HOUSEHOLD

POSSIBLE CONTRIBUTORS	ARE WAGES CONTRIBUTED?					
	YES		NO		UNREPORTED	
	Frequency	Percent	Frequency	Percent	Frequency	Percent
MOTHER	42	31.1	74	54.8	19	14.1
FATHER	50	37.0	7	5.2	78	57.8
OTHERS LIVING IN HOME	28	20.7	104	77.0	3	2.2
TOTAL	118	87.3	187	145.6	100	73.3

TABLE 20

NUMBER OF WAGE SOURCES IN THE HOUSEHOLD

NUMBER OF WAGE SOURCES	FREQUENCY	PERCENT
NO SOURCE OF WAGES	45	33.3
ONE SOURCE	64	47.4
TWO SOURCES	24	17.8
THREE SOURCES	2	1.5
TOTAL	135	100.0

TABLE 21

SOURCES OF FEDERAL ASSISTANCE

FEDERAL SERVICES	RECEIVES		UNREPORTED*	
	Frequency	Percent*	Frequency	Percent*
AFDC**	56	41.5	4	3.0
WIC***	39	28.9	4	3.0
FOOD STAMPS	65	48.1	4	3.0
MEDICAID	40	29.6	4	3.0

* The frequencies do not correspond to the sample size, and the percents do not total 100 because some families received assistance from more than one source.

** Aid to Families With Dependent Children

*** Women, Infants, and Children

TABLE 22

NUMBER OF FEDERAL ASSISTANCE SOURCES PER HOUSEHOLD

NUMBER OF SOURCES*	FREQUENCY	PERCENT
NO FEDERAL ASSISTANCE	49	36.3
ONE SOURCE	24	17.8
TWO DIFFERENT SOURCES	23	17.0
THREE DIFFERENT SOURCES	26	19.3
FOUR DIFFERENT SOURCES	13	9.6
TOTAL	135	100.0

* Sources include Aid to Families with Dependent Children (AFDC); Women, Infants, and Children Nutrition Program (WIC); Food Stamps, and Medicaid.

AFDC and food stamps), approximately 20% received assistance from three sources (most commonly AFDC, food stamps, and medicaid), and approximately 10% of the sample families secured assistance from all four sources.

PARENTS' EVALUATIONS OF THE EDUCATIONAL COMPONENT, THE FAMILY SERVICES COMPONENT, AND COMMUNITY AGENCIES

Parents' evaluations of the prekindergarten program were obtained through focused group interviews. Parents' perceptions and opinions were solicited in three areas: (1) the instructional component of the program; (2) the family services component of the program; and (3) the social service resources in their community.

The evaluators, two Georgia State University faculty members, conducted the interviews. On two occasions a member of the Division of Research, Evaluation, and Assessment of the Georgia Department of Education attended the meetings. No persons associated with the prekindergarten program were permitted to be present, except in one case where a Spanish–speaking translator was needed. Participants in the focus groups were parents, relatives, and guardians of children who were in the prekindergarten program during the 1992–1993 school year. The meetings were held at each of the 7 prekindergarten sites in buildings where parents were accustomed to attending functions. Because all parents who had children in the prekindergarten program were invited, the meetings were not limited to the sample parents. The parents talked freely and openly; and following the discussions, they declared that they had enjoyed being "listened to." A total of 84 parents participated.

Discussions were structured in such a way that they always included an evaluation of the educational program, the performance of the family services workers employed by the prekindergarten program, and the services provided by the community in the following areas: health and medical, mental health, nutrition and food, housing, utilities, clothing and furnishings, education, job training, employment services transportation, legal assistance, and any other topic the parents wished to discuss.

The interviews were audio–taped, and the tapes were transcribed. All precautions recommended for the conduct of qualitative research were observed. Prior to the parent meetings, consultation had occurred with a trained and experienced qualitative researcher who provided guidelines for the conduct of the interview. After all meetings were completed, this researcher performed a qualitative analysis of all the discussions, using the complete audio tapes and transcriptions. Her findings are summarized in the following paragraphs.

The Instructional Component

Two key concepts emerged during the discussions of the instructional component. The first concerns program characteristics which parents viewed as contributors to gains made by the children. The second relates to the affective aspects of the instructional program.

Contributors to Positive Gains Made by The Children

Parents in all sites, including the home–based model, shared the belief that several common characteristics of the teachers contributed to gains made by their children. Specific examples are evidenced in the statements: "teachers love and respect the children"..."teachers openly display their love and affection for the children"..."the teacher really listens to the children"..."the teachers help the children learn to value their own culture" (and to understand the culture of others)..."the teachers allow them to do things for themselves." Many more statements reflect their beliefs that the children reacted very positively to school because of the warmth, acceptance, and encouragement of the teachers in the prekindergarten programs.

An example of teacher acceptance was given by a Hispanic father whose daughter was no longer embarrassed when he spoke Spanish instead of English. She had gained an appreciation of Spanish as a part of her cultural identity. The father believed that this change, which was important to him, had occurred because of the teachers' acceptance of and respect for diversity among children in the program.

There were many similarities among parents concerning the value they placed on specific skills the children had gained. Parents throughout the sites repeatedly mentioned their joy in watching their children become more independent, cooperative, self-initiated, outgoing, verbal, confident, observant, interactive, inquisitive, persistent at problem-solving, mature, and competent at "real life skills."

Parents often reported that they had expected their children to learn the "ABC's" and "123's" by a more traditional drill approach. Several shared that they had originally been skeptical of the "developmentally appropriate approach" which looked more like play to them. However, they observed as the year progressed that their children were learning those skills but "were also learning many more valuable things" in a way that made learning both fun and meaningful to them. Several parents stated that their children had become very different during this year and that they now felt "better about the child being ready to start a full day program in kindergarten."

Affective Aspects in the Relationship between Teachers and Parents. Parents consistently cited two affective dimensions which had the greatest influence on their own attitudes. The first

ERIC

was the sense of acceptance by the teachers in the program. In all center–based sites parents who participated in the interviews felt welcomed in the classrooms. The attitudes they valued are illustrated by the statements: "opinions of children and their parents are respected"..."parents are always welcomed in the classroom"..."it made me feel good to be able to stay in her class"..." you're treated with respect"..."I always feel welcome to just drop in." Many other statements conveyed parental appreciation for their feelings of acceptance in the classroom.

The second affective dimension which was consistently noted by parents was the trust which existed between themselves and the teachers. The parents expressed extremely positive feelings for the teachers which apparently were enhanced by the fact that the teachers were able to schedule time to communicate privately with them by phone, note, letter, and face–to–face contact. The trust parents placed in the teachers is exemplified by such statements as: "I never worry when my child is with ____(teacher)"..."she (the teacher) always follows up on what she says she will do"..."she knows your child as well as you do"..."the teacher calls frequently or sends notes"..."I could tell them (the teachers) anything and not worry about it getting out (being shared)."

In many cases the teacher was the person parents would be most likely to approach if they wanted to discuss a personal issue. The parents viewed the teachers as trustworthy and concerned. An important contributor to this trust appeared to be the openness in the classrooms. Parents spoke of the teachers in terms of respect and friendship: "she always makes me feel welcome"..."if she says she is going to do something, she does it"..."you can drop in, but she'll put you right to work"..."she has time to talk to you"..."she's helping me get into technical school"... "there is nothing I wouldn't tell Ms.____".

Parental Relationships with Prekindergarten Staff Members

Parents demonstrated positive attitudes toward the program and all staff members associated with it. There were no cases of negative events involving parents and prekindergarten personnel. One might suggest that the parents were hesitant to share negative feelings. However, the evidence which negates this suggestion is the openness with which they criticized other community services charged with providing services to Georgia's 4–year–olds and their families.

Parent Involvement with the Educational Program

Although most of the sites reported low or inconsistent involvement of parents in traditional parent meetings or workshops (when parents were invited or required to attend a "talk"), the parents who had participated considered these programs valuable. Topics they found interesting included nutrition, discipline, women's health issues, and child development. They pointed out that attendance was generally poor or inconsistent.

In one site which had a contractual agreement regarding parent participation, a working parent stated that the requirement to attend so many meetings (because of the fear of having her child removed from the program) placed a burden on working parents. She suggested the number of meetings be reduced to accommodate parents who are trying to work and/or go to school.

An event cited frequently as contributing to parent involvement was field trips which included parents and, in some cases, other family members. Many parents suggested that the best time to have a parent meeting might be before, during, or after a field trip. One parent summarized this sentiment by pointing out that "many parents who attend field trips won't go to any other kind of meeting!" One site did use the time before and during field trips for parent meetings. As a result, over fifty per cent of the children had family members in attendance.

Several other positive examples of how field trips contribute to parent involvement included "sharing experiences with your child—it gives you something (exciting) to talk about;" "seeing how the teachers use positive discipline;" "having experiences you never had as a child;" and "giving teachers, families, and children a time to be together for a fun time of sharing." In several sites the family services coordinator also participated in the field trips.

Parents were directly asked if offering child care for their younger children during parent meetings would increase parent participation. Parents in sites which did not offer child care thought that more parents might attend if child care were available. However, comments from parents in programs which did offer child care did not conclusively support this assumption.

The Family Services Component

Parents' evaluations of the family services component of the prekindergarten program were designed to determine whether: parents would seek out the family services coordinator if they needed help, and whether they view her as being able to help. At all sites parents expressed positive attitudes toward the family services coordinator. In several sites the parents named the family services worker as the person they would approach with a family need. Several parents reported that the family services coordinator had been beneficial in helping them meet a need. Parents' attitudes were reflected in remarks such as "(family services coordinator) is really nice... she will help you any way she can..." Although parents did not discuss the role of the family services coordinator to the extent that they discussed the role of the teacher, it was evident that they felt supported by both.

Parents did share some concerns about someone coming into their homes and asking personal questions. Several reinforced the idea that many parents "have strong feelings about people (caseworkers) coming to their homes and getting into their business." "(They feel like) that's my business, don't be messing in my business." Several parents even made recommendations about the appropriate dress for people who want to be accepted into their homes: "If you dress in those suits and expensive clothes, people peek out and see you (and don't feel comfortable letting you in)." Another parent finished the thought, "if she would put on jeans and a shirt, parents would feel differently." Parents appeared sensitive to having a "caseworker" in their homes and "their business."

Similar concerns were not as evident in their discussions of teachers becoming involved in more personal issues. Further research would be necessary to determine conclusively why parents might feel this way. Many parents in the focus groups cited negative experiences with previous caseworkers from other agencies which could create a stumbling block in establishing the initial relationship with a family services worker from the prekindergarten program.

Two groups, working parents and immigrants, felt they were unable to get much help from prekindergarten staff members. In both cases these parents clearly excused the prekindergarten staff for their inability to find services, since the services they need are not available. They viewed the prekindergarten staff as caring but the "system" (social agencies) as lacking concern for their needs.

An additional concern was that when parents work at low paying jobs their families can get less assistance (medical, dental, material) than families who are unemployed. One working parent summarized their position: "there is more concern and support for those who sit home and get help than for the ones that are trying to help themselves." In other words, "working parents who are trying are penalized." One group, who expressed very positive attitudes toward their family services worker and teachers, stated that "if you are eligible for DFCS services, they can help; but they can only obtain services if a person is eligible for them."

The second group who felt their access to services was beyond the scope of the prekindergarten program was immigrant parents. They thought their families were penalized because of their status. One father pointed out that penalizing the children (making kindergarten entrance difficult, for example) would only hurt the country and individual communities. He cited demographic projections which document the fact that Hispanics are the most rapidly increasing population in America. These parents expressed the belief that the prekindergarten program has been extremely supportive and responsive to their needs and concerns. However, there was equal evidence of concern about the level of support and understanding they would receive in public schools.

Community Social Services

When parents discussed community services, the plight of ineligibility for services faced by working parents again emerged as a key concern. Although it is important to remember the impact this topic had on discussions, further comments related to this concern will not be repeated in this chapter.

Parental Perceptions of Health Department Services

There appeared to be two conflicting responses to questions regarding the effectiveness and availability of health services. Some parents felt very positive and were comfortable using health services, while others were equally negative and uncomfortable. A comparison of the two responses yielded an interesting finding. The determining factor seemed to be the effective use of an appointment system rather than a "sign-in and wait" system. In the communities where health services were viewed more positively, the use of appointments served two purposes: it made them feel more like they were in a doctor's office than an agency, and it gave them the feeling that their time was valued as much as that of the "professionals." Parents who had experienced waiting times of one to three hours under the old "sign in and wait system" were particularly impressed by the appointment system.

One exception to this pattern existed. Parents in one community with an appointment system still experienced long waits. Although the data are insufficient to draw a positive conclusion, this may be an individual case of ineffective implementation of the appointment system.

Parental Perceptions of Department of Family and Children Services

Most parents regarded the Department of Family and Children Services (DFCS) as taking an adversarial rather than a supportive position. Negative perceptions centered around three issues: disrespect for parental time, disrespect for the person seeking assistance, and the lack of confidentiality. A few parents reported exceptions to the majority perception. These will be discussed in further detail following the discussion of the majority perception.

Disrespect for Parental Time. Parents were consistently vocal about the feeling that the DFCS professionals displayed disregard for the value of parental time. Case after case was presented citing long waits to see caseworkers ..."while they are sitting in their offices." Particularly offensive to parents was the necessity of taking time off from work (which for many was difficult and costly) and then having to sit for unreasonable amounts of time in the DFCS waiting room. Some parents believed that being understaffed and overextended created the appearance of not caring. Others stood firm in their belief that it reflected a deeper lack of respect for the client.

Disrespect for the Person Seeking Assistance. Parents provided many examples which they felt supported their assertion that there was a pervasive disrespect for clients. The following remarks are representative of their discussions: "...It's who you know"..."They look down on you"... "They don't bother to return your calls" ..."They make you feel like you are the scum of the earth"... "They treat you like you are looking for a handout."

The Lack of Confidentially. Many of the parents provided examples of seeking assistance and having the information they shared confidentially become common knowledge in their communities and neighborhoods. Although there was no proof that the information had come from the DFCS caseworker or the department, parents attributed the characteristic of being untrustworthy to the caseworker and DFCS in general. The intensity of hostility was consistent across individuals who shared common experiences. Such sentiments are reflected in their comments: "I don't trust them" ..."I would never go there"..."When they know who you are (that you work with the prekindergarten program and aren't there as a client), they treat you differently."

Exceptions to the Negative Perceptions Held by the Majority. Two specific exceptions to the negative pattern of attitudes were evident. First, one prekindergarten pilot program had a DFCS caseworker assigned to the prekindergarten program on a full-time basis. This family services coordinator was viewed as a parent advocate and as a powerful, positive resource for parents. The parents felt she worked closely with the Board of Education to assist them in any way possible.

The second exception was parental perceptions of workers for Positive Employment and Community Health (PEACH). Parents reported many positive attributes of the PEACH program and did not appear to experience feelings of disrespect or disregard from the PEACH workers. In many communities the limited availability of PEACH funds for eligible parents on waiting lists and the lack of availability to parents already working in low paying jobs were the only two negative aspects of the PEACH program and PEACH caseworkers.

Parental Perceptions of Public Housing Services

Parents did not have a great deal to say about housing. At one site the parents of the 4–year–olds reportedly had been given priority in selection from the waiting list. The parents felt this had helped them and felt it was good to have all the prekindergarten children living in an area close to the classroom. In contrast, parents in another program felt that selection of students should not be restricted on the basis of living in a "certain area." Parents in several of the focus groups pointed out two limitations related to public housing. First, waiting lists are long for units which have more than one or two bedrooms. Second, many working parents cannot qualify for public housing and must live in less adequate housing.

Parental Perceptions Regarding Legal Services

None of the parents interviewed had approached the prekindergarten teachers or family services workers about legal issues. A few had attempted to obtain services through "legal aid (assistance)" and had been ineligible for services based on income or the nature of their legal needs. For example, they were seeking advice regarding divorce issues or a financial suit, problems outside the authority of legal assistance. None of the parents identified prekindergarten family services workers or teachers as potential resources in obtaining legal assistance.

Parental Involvement in Continuing Education

Community PEACH coordinators were credited in several sites as the local resource for information about and support in continuing education. When the PEACH coordinator was actively involved in the 4-year-old program, non-working parents discussed the assistance they had received or been made aware of in a very positive manner. They mentioned several ways in which they had been helped: child care, job training, tuition, transportation, and funds for continuing education. As noted in many other instances, working parents found themselves excluded from eligibility for assistance through any state or federally funded agency. In one district the PEACH coordinator had been able to move parents participating in the prekindergarten program to the front of the PEACH waiting list.

Family services coordinators and teachers were also cited as resources for parents interested in continuing their educations. Three parents in one site attributed the assistance they had received in returning to school to the teacher/family services workers in the prekindergarten project. In addition, a home-based site had family educators who were returning to college. Although the program was not responsible for their decision to return, it enabled them to pursue their educational goals while working. Parents who did not make direct reference to an individual were asked if they thought the prekindergarten staff might help them. The overwhelming consensus among interviewed parents was affirmative.

Job Training and Placement for Prekindergarten Parents

A common theme among parents in small districts was the impact of the limited job market in their communities upon their opportunities to participate in meaningful job placement programs. The tone in larger districts was somewhat more positive. Some parents had received child care assistance from PEACH, facilitating their job opportunities. In one prekindergarten program a parent had received assistance in placing her child in an after-school program. In addition, parents in several sites received assistance from the prekindergarten program in transporting their children to private day care facilities where PEACH funds paid for after-school care.

Implications of the Findings

Following are some suggestions for applying these findings to future program planning and implementation. As with any study, replication and recursive interviewing would provide richer data and more conclusive results.

The findings demonstrate that parents are sensitive to negative public perceptions and believe that these perceptions result from the identification of the prekindergarten program as being for "poor kids and their families." It is important to the parents that they not be viewed as non-working, uneducated people ("welfare clients"). This underscores the importance of family services coordinators' being sensitive to this concern as they develop their approaches to working with families.

The parents recommend that this program not be limited to or promoted as a program for low-income children and "uneducated and non-working" parents. Alternative ways of including children who are not "eligible" under the current prekindergarten guidelines may preclude the "labeling" of participating children and their families. Parents also thought that children should not be penalized by being ineligible for the program because their parents are above the income limit.

The findings also indicate that many families with children in the prekindergarten program work. These parents consistently reminded researchers that prekindergarten personnel could be of little assistance to them because they were ("barely") over the limits of economic eligibility for services. This raises questions about ways to assist "working poor families."

The findings suggest that field trips which included family members were an effective tool for both involving and training parents. This may have implications for funding these activities as part of the parent involvement component of the prekindergarten program.

CHAPTER FOUR

THE EDUCATIONAL COMPONENT

The educational component of the prekindergarten program focuses on both children and parents. In center–based programs the major focus is the children although parent involvement is an important feature. The parents in home–based programs are involved more intensively than those in the center–based programs because a significant part of the educational program is conducted in their homes. The Georgia Department of Education requested each prekindergarten applicant to specify the curriculum to be used both with the children in the center–based and the parents in the home–based programs. The grantees had the option of choosing a published curriculum or generating their own.

Because this chapter contains a large amount of material it is presented in 8 sections. Section 1 describes each sample site in terms of the location of the classrooms, the service delivery system, and the curriculum selected. Section 2 is a review of each curriculum model. Section 3 presents descriptions and results of teacher interviews concerning their understanding and implementation of the curricula and other aspects of their teaching. Section 4 presents an objective description, based on an observation check list, of the classroom environment. Additional sections present information on teacher assessment of children, teacher characteristics, the training which the Department of Education provides the teachers, parent involvement, and case studies describing the impact of the educational component.

Section 1

Description of the Selected Sites

The sites vary in the ways in which they deliver child and parent education. Some of the sites offer only center-based programs whereas others deliver the educational experiences through either a home-based approach or a combination of both types of delivery systems. In the center-based models, each classroom has a lead teacher and an assistant teacher serving approximately 20 children. In one home-based model the teacher visits the home and works with the parents and children together. In the other, the teacher works with the parents who, in turn, conduct the lesson with the children.

The classroom-based models which the sites initially selected to use were: The Creative Curriculum of Diane Trister Dodge, Teaching Strategies, Inc.; The High/Scope Curriculum of The High/Scope Educational Research Foundation; and A Foundation for the Future, the curriculum developed at the Lanette L. Suttles Child Development Center, Georgia State University. The home-based models selected were Home Instruction Program for Preschool Youngsters (HIPPY) and The Portage Project curriculum. Although in their proposals all programs designated a curriculum to use, many revised their curriculum selections as the year progressed. The educational delivery mechanisms and the curriculum selected are described below for each site in the evaluation sample.

Site A, which includes 3 rural counties, provides a center-based program for children in 2 of the counties and a home-based program in the other. In addition, parents in all 3 counties are expected to attend workshops and meetings. Each of the center-based programs has 1 classroom of prekindergarten children. In the home-based program, 2 teachers serve approximately 20 children and their families. This site initially selected the High/Scope curriculum for the center–based program and the Portage curriculum for the home–based component.

Site B is an urban site with a home–based program, a center–based program, and a combination home– and center–based program. In the center–based program there are two classrooms in a facility that also houses a Special Needs 4–year–old class. In the home–based model there are approximately 75 families served by 6 parent educators whose own children are also in the program. The home–based curriculum consists of 30 weekly sessions, half of which are conducted in the homes and the other half in a group setting. The parent educators are trained and supervised by a program coordinator. Additional parent education activities are scheduled for all prekindergarten families to attend at the same time. This site selected the Creative Curriculum for the center–based and the Home Instruction Program for Preschool Youngsters (HIPPY) for the home–based program.

Site C is an urban center–based site with one prekindergarten classroom in a community center facility. This site has a predominantly limited English speaking population and the prekindergarten classroom has a bilingual teacher. In addition, this site assigns approximately 9 other prekindergarten project children to two classes in the center attended by children who are not in the prekindergarten program. English and Spanish languages pervade the child and adult activities at this site. This site initially chose to use a locally developed curriculum.

Site D is an urban center–based site with one classroom in an elementary school which also houses a Head Start classroom. This site initially selected the Georgia State University Curriculum: A Foundation for the Future.

Site E is a rural site with one classroom in a portable building on the premises of the local elementary school. This program serves two groups of approximately 15 children with each group attending 2 and 1/2 days per week. This site initially selected the Creative Curriculum.

Site F is an urban site with two classrooms in Housing Authority community buildings. The location of the classrooms makes them very convenient to the public housing residents they serve. This site initially selected the Creative Curriculum.

Site G is an urban site with four classrooms, two in elementary schools and two in community recreation department facilities. This site requires its parents to participate regularly in parent education/involvement activities. The curriculum initially chosen at this site was the Creative Curriculum.

Section 2

Curriculum Reviews

The review of each curriculum model initially selected by the sites is based on available written materials. Each model is reviewed using an outline covering major components typically found in a curriculum description. This outline includes history, philosophy, theory; goals and objectives; materials and equipment needed; classroom environment (both physical and social-psychological); teacher, child, and parent roles; schedule; and child assessment.

The Creative Curriculum

History, Philosophy, Theory. The Creative Curriculum was first published by Diane Trister Dodge in 1979. Dodge built the model based on her own experiences with the aim of creating a realistic and practical curriculum firmly anchored in child development theory. The model consistently links activities and objectives with the theoretical principles of Erik Erikson, Jean Piaget, and Abraham Maslow. It was written in reaction to the heavily teacher–directed, test–item driven, content–oriented curricula, which Dodge sees as dominating American schools and preschools.

The author believes strongly in the impact of the learning environment on children's behavior and learning. Consequently, the model emphasizes the importance of room arrangement and organization, a rich variety of materials and equipment, and the need to provide children with a broad repertoire of experiences.

Goals and Objectives. The Creative Curriculum includes both long range goals and short term objectives in its description. The long range goals are, first, that children come to see themselves as capable learners and, second, that they successfully negotiate the developmental milestones of healthy emotional growth.

Specific objectives relate to developing competence in the following skill areas: gross and fine motor, social, problem–solving, logical thinking, verbal communication, and beginning reading and writing. The author encourages teachers to use make–believe play and multi–sensory experiences to develop these skills.

Materials and Equipment. In general, the materials and equipment used in this model must be safe, durable, multi–purpose, and cost effective. The specific items are determined by the 8 or 10 "interest areas" that Dodge prescribes. The need to furnish these areas appropriately dictates which equipment to buy.

Classroom Environment. The classroom environment is arranged to accommodate all 10 of the interest areas, plus a whole–group area, and places for a child to be alone. The 10 interest areas include: blocks, house, table toys, art, sand/water, library, music/movement, outdoor, cooking, and computer. The Creative Curriculum suggests items for each of the interest areas but does not specify how the items must be used.

Teacher's Role. The teacher's role with respect to child management focuses on prevention rather than reaction to misbehavior. More specifically, the model emphasizes planning ahead, watching for restlessness, avoiding pitfalls of unclear instructions, allowing plenty of time, and allowing children choices. When misbehavior does occur the teacher is encouraged to look for the reasons for it, to focus on the behavior not the person, to help the child understand the consequences, to explain the choices, to encourage problem solving, and to avoid dwelling on mistakes.

The teacher's primary responsibilities are to individualize instructional opportunities, to provide materials related to the interests of individual and groups of children, to allow choices, encourage talking/discussion, to ask open–ended questions, to use writing with children while saying and pointing to the words as they are written, and to encourage children to write notes to the teacher and the other children. By participating in the interest area activities with the children, the teacher models how to engage in socio–dramatic play, to solve problems, and to work cooperatively.

Child's Role. The child is central in this model. The Creative Curriculum expects the children to lead and the teacher to support, model, guide, and facilitate the children's activities. Child–centered play and games are crucial to children's learning. A unique feature of this model is the deliberate inclusion of children with disabilities.

Parent's Role. The parent role in this program is significant. Parents are encouraged to volunteer in the classroom, to support the activities in each of the interest areas at home, and to become actively engaged in teaching their children.

Schedule. The schedule for the Creative Curriculum follows guidelines, but flexibility is encouraged. Balance is the most important principle upon which the schedule is based. The "balance principle" applies to active and quiet activities; large, small, and individual groupings; indoor and outdoor; child selection and teacher direction. The second principle underlying scheduling is the necessity for routines. It is important to have routines for coming and going, meals and snacks, sleep and rest, self-help and personal hygiene, clean-up, and transition. Consistency and clarity, the third principle, includes using pictures to illustrate the schedule, giving notice before change is to occur, allowing sufficient time, assigning tasks, and allowing for modifications.

Child Assessment. Child assessment is accomplished by two methods, a Checklist implemented twice per year and the ongoing development of a portfolio of each child's work and accomplishments. There is also considerable emphasis on initial developmental screening at the beginning of the year in order to better individualize the program for each child.

The High/Scope Curriculum

History, Philosophy, Theory. The High/Scope Curriculum emerged from the concerns of David Weikart who designed The Perry Preschool Project for children living in the low-income inner-city area for which it was named. The High/Scope Curriculum was derived from the work of Jean Piaget and is based on the belief that children's cognitive development is guided by their natural proclivities to construct their own understanding of the world. According to this model, nature takes precedence over nurture in cognitive development.

Goals and Objectives. In the High/Scope Curriculum, the role of the school is to support and stimulate rather than to teach, tutor, or instruct in the more traditional mode. More specifically, an overriding goal is to motivate children by following their natural interests to discover and understand how their world works. The objectives of the High/Scope Curriculum focus on five cognitive processes: classification, seriation, number, spatial relations, and temporal relations.

Classroom Environment. This model says much about the physical environment for learning. There must be space for storage which is visible and accessible to the children and space to display their work. In addition, there must be space for movement, building, sorting, creating, constructing, experimenting, and pretending. Necessary work areas include blocks, house, art, quiet, construction, music/movement, sand/water, animal/plant, and outdoor play.

Materials and Equipment. This model strives to provide a rich environment of things purchased, scavenged, salvaged, or recycled rather than a particular fixed list of equipment and materials. Some suggested materials include: actual cooking items; manipulatives to take apart and put together; objects for filling and emptying; and props for dramatic play, with appropriate labels and descriptive pictures.

Teacher's Role. A teacher in the High/Scope Curriculum model must be committed to the framework upon which it is built. The teacher must be culturally sensitive and accepting and maintain comfort and security in the classroom. The teacher should also be able to set limits, give child–oriented reasons for those limits, and follow–up directions with commands and action when necessary.

At the same time the teacher must support children by joining in at their level, keeping the children's purpose in mind, giving positive physical contact where appropriate, talking with children, and encouraging child–child talk. Adult talk in front of children is viewed as counter–productive.

The teacher is a facilitator of problem–solving activities and must constantly ask "How do we provide experiences for children that incorporate their interests?" The teacher is a cultural–linguistic model, a resource, and a helper when children cannot make choices. Finally, the teacher implements a "plan–do–review" cycle which is the critical process that clearly distinguishes a High Scope classroom from most others.

Child's Role. The plan–do–review process requires that even the youngest children participate in planning their activities, doing the work that has been planned, and reviewing that work in some representational form such as talk, write, show, role play, draw, or sketch. An important part of this process is that the children do as much as they can for themselves.

Parent's Role. The parent role in the High/Scope model is to be receptive to home visits by the teaching staff, to teach their children the activities learned in the home visits, to learn about child development and the curriculum model, and to attend parent–staff meetings.

Schedule. The daily schedule in a High/Scope classroom is not as flexible as in some others because the plan–do–review cycle must be carried out routinely. Planning is done early morning, followed by a significant period of time for carrying out the plans, which is then followed by a period of recall, review, evaluation, and representation. In addition, there is time set aside for small group learning, outside time, and circle time.

Assessment. The High/Scope model utilizes two formal assessment mechanisms. The first is the High/Scope Child Observation Record for Preschool and Kindergarten (COP) which is used by teachers across time. The second is the Parent Interview and Assessment Schedule which summarizes parents' input regarding their children's education.

A Foundation for the Future: The Georgia State University Child Development Center Curriculum (Foundations)

History, Philosophy, Theory. Georgia State University offers child care for students' children and some faculty and staff. In recent years the Center's program has won accreditation from the National Association for the Education of Young Children. Patsy Terry, director, led the staff in writing the curriculum and in preparing the center for accreditation.

Theoretically speaking, this curricula is based on two major ideas—that every individual has intrinsic worth and that a child's potential develops through both maturation and experience. In this model nature and nurture are interactive and of equal importance. The nature side is seen in children's play being crucial to learning and in the encouragement of active learning, initiative, exploration, and experimentation. On the nurture side, imitation and observation are important learning tools, and positive reinforcement is a major teaching device. The socio–emotional component is supported through an "anti–bias" curriculum emphasizing mutual trust through respect for individuals of all ethnic, cultural, and economic backgrounds.

Goals and Objectives. The goals and objectives revolve around the categories of affective, physical, cognitive, and fine arts. The affective objectives include the development of self–

knowledge, self-care, self-acceptance, self-expression, self-management, adult-interaction, peer-interaction, and environmental-interaction. The physical objectives include attaining fine motor, gross motor, and body awareness skills.

Cognitive objectives are similar to those in the High/Scope Curriculum model and include classification, seriation, number, space, time, language, science, and computer. The fine arts objectives are built around music, movement, and visual arts and are subdivided into awareness, imitation, improvisation, and evaluation. Objectives are developmentally sequenced in each of the four domains, with each of the objectives accompanied by a sample activity. The fact that objectives are so explicit suggests that this model is highly skill-oriented. Compared to other curriculum model descriptions reviewed for this project Foundations is clearly the most literal/explicit in tying objectives to developmental level and activity.

Materials and Equipment. Appropriate materials and equipment are referred to in the activity notes accompanying each specific objective and from the "Discussion" pages accompanying each domain at each developmental level. Young Children in Action[5], a major resource for the High/Scope Curriculum model, and Mathematics Their Way[6] are both recommended resources.

Classroom Environment. The Discussion pages indicate that the environment should be rich with materials but no compact list of items is provided. Similarly, specific criteria for arranging the environment are not included.

---

[5] Hohmann, M., Banet, B., & Weikart, D. (1983). Young children in action. Ypsilanti, MI: High/Scope Press.

[6] Baratta-Lorton, M. (1976). Mathematics Their Way. Reading, MA: Addison-Wesley Publishing Company.

Teacher's Role. Teachers are expected to positively reinforce appropriate behavior to manage the children. Teachers are also encouraged to implement the "PIE" cycle of Planning, Implementing, and Evaluating. This cycle is to be used to support the Unit Approach advocated as the basic organizing structure for the content of the curriculum. The Unit Approach depends on themes such as seasons, body parts, farm life, holidays, and a large number of other topics.

Child's Role. Foundations is not explicit with regard to the role of the child.

Schedule. The Schedule suggested for preschoolers in Foundations includes child-selected play; large group language, movement, and music activities; small group cognitive, fine motor, science, art, and computer activities; and outdoor play. The criteria for routines and transitions are included in the descriptions of the schedule activities.

Assessment. Assessment is managed in three ways—Classroom Assessment Checklist (daily, formative), Individual Assessment Checklist (quarterly, summative), and Anecdotal Records (situation appropriate, formative). The Classroom Assessment Checklist is to be completed by the teacher for each domain of objectives each day.

The Home Instruction Program for Preschool Youngsters (HIPPY)

History, Philosophy, Theory. The Home Instruction Program for Preschool Youngsters (HIPPY) consists of a series of educational activities taught to parents by trained paraprofessionals whose own children are also in the program. HIPPY was developed in Israel in 1968–1969 during the period of intense focus on intervention with educationally disadvantaged children. The National Council of Jewish Women Research Institute for Innovation in Education at the Hebrew University of Jerusalem supported a team led by Avina D. Lombard and including Helene Levy, Sara Lior, and Diana Aldaruki in the research and development for HIPPY.

In 1984 HIPPY was imported to the United States. Currently, a large number of HIPPY related programs are being implemented across the United States and in other countries around the world. In 1991 the HIPPY curriculum was reformatted for HIPPY. The HIPPY model provides the structure needed for parents to become their children's first teacher, thus empowering them to become a stronger and more positive force in their own and their children's lives.

Goals and Objectives. HIPPY aims to empower parents, employ them in visiting and teaching other parents, and make the program economically feasible. The long–range goal of HIPPY is to prepare children for school; and its major objectives for the children relate to developing visual discrimination, eye–hand coordination, spatial perception, auditory discrimination, tactile discrimination, concept development, and logical thinking.

Materials and Equipment. HIPPY provides the basic activity sheets and blocks needed for each day of the 30–week program. It also specifies some typical household items to use with the activities. (Alternative instructions are provided in the event that these items are not available.)

The activities are sequenced and change from simple to more complex as the year progresses. The activities are designed to assure that parents and children experience considerable success in their implementation.

Environment. HIPPY is essentially implemented in homes and thus the environment varies physically. The intent with respect to the psychological environment, however, is to build a trusting, positive, collegial relationship between parent and paraprofessional and to encourage a positive and trusting relationship between parent and child.

Teacher's Role. The paraprofessional's role is to help parents become competent in teaching their own children. The task is both to motivate and teach parents. Role playing the activities with the parent as child and then with the paraprofessional as child is the major technique. The paraprofessionals practice the activities with their own children before they teach the other parents.

Schedule. The paraprofessionals visit each home every second week and the parents attend a small group meeting for their activities on the alternate weeks. This gives both the one–on–one experience and a group–community building experience for the parents. It also builds leadership skills among the paraprofessionals.

Assessment. It is not clear from the materials available what child assessment is included in HIPPY.

The Portage Project

History, Philosophy and Theory. The Portage Project was one of the early intervention projects of the 1960's "War on Poverty." The curriculum has been particularly useful as a home instruction program because the individualized tasks are clear, the materials are easy to prepare or find, and the activities can be implemented by paraprofessionals. The Portage Project curriculum is heavily influenced by the behaviorist/learning theory tradition. Thus, the objectives address specific, observable skills to be taught.

Goals and Objectives. The curriculum components include infant stimulation, socialization, language, self–help, cognitive development, and motor development. In all six areas the behaviors are taught through target objectives leading to a terminal goal.

Materials. The curriculum materials include a behavior checklist, a card file listing methods for teaching each behavior, and a manual explaining how to use the checklist and card file. Materials needed for the activities must be made or provided by the user.

Class Environment. The Portage curriculum is designed for individualized instruction and is used in the home–based program at the prekindergarten site that uses it. The home environment provides the setting in which the parent educator, the parent, and the child work together.

Teacher's Role. The teacher's role is to be positive and to provide success opportunities for the child by coaching, modeling, and breaking down material into simple steps. The teacher uses the checklist to determine appropriate objectives for the child. She then selects the activities from the card file that match these objectives and secures the necessary materials.

Child's Role. In the Portage curriculum, the child is seen as the recipient of the activities which the adults have planned and selected. Motivation is assured by the child's successfully completing these activities.

Schedule. Weekly home visits are part of this model. At the site implementing the Portage Curriculum, the first four visits are for assessment purposes. During subsequent visits the parent educator reviews previous checklists, shows the mother how to do new activities, reads a short story to the child, and completes an art activity with the child. Although the child is included, the focus of the parent educator's attention is teaching the parent to work with her child. The parent educator leaves 1 to 3 activity cards for the parent to use with the child during the week.

Assessment. Assessment is accomplished by recording the child's achievements on the behavior checklist. All six curriculum domains are included on the checklist and they cover skills from infancy through preschool. Results are used in planning and as a record of the child's developmental progress.

Section 3

Teacher Interpretations

INTERVIEWS

Nine teachers representing the seven sites were interviewed about the curricula and the educational experiences occurring in their classrooms. One lead teacher represented the center-based program at each of the 7 sites. Two teachers represented the two home-based programs. This section summarizes the teachers' responses to the following questions:

1. Describe briefly the curriculum that you are using in your program?
2. What are the most important things that you want the children to gain as a result of being in your program?
3. What kinds of materials and equipment are essential for your program?
4. Briefly describe your job as a teacher in this program?
5. Describe how you go about teaching, or helping the children learn (something that the teacher has mentioned in any of the first four questions)?
6. What would a parent or observer see if she watched the children for a considerable period of time? What would the children be doing? How would they be acting? What is their responsibility?
7. What role do the parents play in your program?
8. Briefly describe the schedule of a typical day in your classes?

9. How will you know that the program is helping the children in the way that you want to help them? or, How will you convince an outsider that what you are doing is helping the children?

RESULTS

Four teachers reported that they are using the Creative Curriculum and 3 of those 4 reported that they were also learning about and supplementing their programs with the High/Scope Curriculum. Three other teachers predominantly use the High/Scope Curriculum. One of these 3 teachers combines High/Scope with Head Start curriculum guidelines and another combines High/Scope with the Georgia State University Child Development Center Curriculum. High/Scope dominates the curricular models being used since it appears either as the major thrust or the secondary thrust in 6 of the 7 classroom oriented programs reviewed. In the two home-based programs, 1 teacher is implementing HIPPY and another is implementing the Portage Project curriculum.

Two themes emerge when teachers describe the Creative Curriculum model. The first idea is that it is important to have different learning areas in the classroom. The second is the importance of giving children choices of what they want to do. Descriptions of this model were relatively brief and were usually followed by the teachers discussing the fact that they were in High/Scope training and that they were adding ideas from High/Scope to the model they had originally adopted. One teacher spent almost thirty minutes in a very detailed, organized, and enthusiastic description of her combination of ideas from both the Creative Curriculum and the High/Scope Curriculum.

Clearly, no teacher in this program is satisfied with the idea that any one of these models define the whole of what they do with children. One teacher educated in Developmental Therapy at the University of Georgia views the emphasis on trust, autonomy, self-esteem, and early developmental stages as being the most important message in the Creative Curriculum.

Teachers liked the freedom to supplement their curriculum models. One added Spanish language for her majority Spanish-American students. Another liked the fit between her previous training and the two curricula with which she was working, Creative Curriculum and High/Scope.

According to the teachers, the most notable features of the High/Scope model are its plan-do-review cycle, the emphasis on active learning, and its key experiences. One teacher described what the interviewer was sensing from most of the teachers' descriptions. She said that High/Scope simply had a little more "oomph." The interviewer's interpretation of this comment is that the teachers felt the High/Scope model offers depth that is missing in the other curricula.

Child Gains

The teachers' responses to Question 2, "What do you want the children to gain?" clustered around the theme of social-emotional development. Only one teacher emphasized preparation for school and one other teacher put academics at the bottom of her list. The teachers' goals for the children are that they have positive social behavior, exhibit a can-do attitude, get along with others, become self-initiators with self-control, are emotionally safe, have mutual respect, enjoy books, are happy, and feel good about themselves and about school.

One teacher wanted the parents to learn new skills in helping their children learn. Not surprisingly, this teacher was home-based.

Materials

The teachers were enthusiastic about the materials that these models required them to have. The materials are predominantly manipulative objects, many having multiple uses. It seemed that for the first time in many of their experiences they felt they had sufficient materials for the active learning approach which each of them follows.

The Teacher's Role

Question 4 was intended to ascertain how the teacher interacts with the children, how she views herself as teacher, helper, consultant, decision-maker, and so on. The teachers described their roles as listening and communicating, reading aloud a great deal, playing detective to assess the children's needs and interests, bringing in objects to interest the children, setting up the environment, providing support, maintaining anecdotal records, and not "pushing" or "forcing" children to do what they (the teachers) "want" them to do. In general the teachers perceive themselves as facilitators, participant-observers, and leaders whose task is to set the standards and then "let the children loose."

Helping the Children Learn

The most difficult question for the teachers was number 5 in which they were asked to describe how they go about teaching or helping children learn. The techniques mentioned were to reinforce, not to push, to talk casually, to work their way into the children's play, to seize every natural (as opposed to forced or engineered) opportunity to provide visual and auditory stimulation, to repeat songs and stories, to review previous activities, to work with children individually, and to use role playing (particularly characteristic of the home visiting paraprofessionals). The teachers favor indirect approaches that encourage exploration, rather than direct, targeted attacks on specific concepts, skills, or ideas.

Teachers' Views of the Impressions Observers Would Get

When asked what parents, or observers, would see and hear if they were to visit their classrooms the teachers responded in a variety of ways including activity, joie de vivre, "busy noise," variety (children not in groups but in different stations around the room), and adults interacting with children (not sitting back watching them). These descriptions coincide with the philosophy and suggestions of the model builders and appear to be the scenarios that these teachers would have liked to have had supported when they taught in other settings.

Parent's Role

Parent roles were described in a range from minimal (nothing required) to substantial (specific requirements and much detailed involvement). Two of the teachers described parent roles in the traditional "come visit" and "chaperon" mode. The teachers in the two home-based programs were certain that the parent's role is to be the child's first teacher, and they were eager to prepare the parents to handle that role competently. Two center-based teachers reported that parents play a large part in their programs. In these programs there are expectations, demands, and requirements for the parents written into the contracts with the state. They send home books, newsletters, and children's work; and two teachers call parents on a regular basis. Some parents must commit a specific number of hours per week, send materials to school, read to their children, send written suggestions of what they want their children to learn, and help their children make things. In one community there is a PACT, Parents and Children Together, which meets on a regular basis.

Schedule

Question 8 was specifically directed to the schedule issue. The teachers can and do describe their schedules with an eye to fine detail. The elements of the schedules reveal evidence of the program's philosophy, goals, and objectives. Several schedules reported by the teachers reveal many brief time blocks, rather than long, uninterrupted time segments as required in the High/Scope model and implied in the Creative Curriculum. Thus, the length of the time periods in the actual schedules are frequently shorter than the curriculum models would imply.

Assessment

The teachers report that evaluation of their efforts with the children is largely through their own observations. They see the children doing better in such areas as cooperation, self expression, eagerness to see visitors, group cohesion, and self control. In addition, parents tell the teachers of changes they have observed, and several teachers reported that they maintain anecdotal records.

In summary, it is apparent that these teachers are enthusiastic about the Georgia PreKindergarten Program. They report an eagerness to learn more about the High/Scope model, specifically, and to build their own style of providing for active learning in general.

Section 4

Classroom Features

A checklist was used to describe the characteristics of the classrooms. A professor of Early Childhood Education at Georgia State University observed one representative classroom at each site and checked the presence or absence of features described on the checklist. It should be noted that the items on the checklist were intended to be inclusive of the possible features of a prekindergarten classroom. The checklist was not designed to suggest that all classrooms should have all features. Table 23 presents this checklist and the percentage of classrooms having the features described. It can be seen from Table 23 that all classrooms had most of the features. All had art, manipulatives, puzzles, blocks, home living, listening, and a large group gathering area. A few classrooms did not have a science center. Almost 1/2 of the classrooms had an identified writing center, nearly 1/3 had a music center, and 1 classroom had a computer for the children. In 43% of the classrooms, the teachers' views of the children were obstructed by furniture if they were in certain parts of the room.

The classroom teachers were interviewed concerning their satisfaction with and impression of the facilities. Most were very satisfied with the classroom and the building in which it was located. However, the teachers' impressions of the playgrounds were: very satisfied (29%), satisfied (14%), mediocre (14%), and very dissatisfied (43%). This tends to substantiate objective observations that some playgrounds were not adequate.

Section 5

Teacher Assessment of the Children

One task of the evaluation was to ascertain whether the teachers or others in the programs were systematically assessing the children's development and, if so, how the information was being used. To provide this information the teachers responded to a questionnaire which asked (1) do you use any child assessment procedures, (2) if so, name or describe these child assessment procedures, (3) give the dates the child assessment procedures are administered, and

TABLE 23

PERCENTAGE OF CLASSROOMS HAVING THE CHARACTERISTICS LISTED ON THE CLASSROOM CHECKLIST

CLASSROOM CHARACTERISTICS	PERCENTAGE
Children have access to available materials.	100
Children have privacy if desired.	100
Centers have adequate space for several children.	100
Children can play in centers with a minimum of interference from others engaged in other activities.	86
Storage areas are clearly identified and labeled.	100
Similar activities (e.g. blocks, dramatic play) are close together so they can be combined.	100
Areas have adequate artificial lighting.	100
Room has some natural lighting.	100
Areas are near essential supplies (e.g. water, books).	100
Multicultural pictures, dolls, and/or books are present.	100

(Table Continues)

CLASSROOM CHARACTERISTICS (CONT.)	PERCENTAGE
Children's work is displayed at eye level.	100
Quiet and noisy areas are separated.	100
Areas to store, display children's work are convenient.	100
Emergency and other exits are clear of barriers.	100
Teacher's views of children are free of physical barriers.	43
Children can use most equipment/materials with a minimum of adult assistance.	100
Equipment/materials can be easily moved when necessary.	100
Teacher's supplies are out of children's reach.	71
Space is available for individual, small-group, and large group activities.	100
The following centers are present in the classroom:	
Dramatic play	86
Art	100
Puzzles, blocks, and manipulatives	100
Home living	100
Reading/quiet area	100
Listening (e.g. recorder with headphones)	100
Science	57
Writing	50
Large group gathering area	100
Computer	14
Music	29

(Table Continues)

CLASSROOM CHARACTERISTICS (CONT).	PERCENTAGE
The following facilities are present in the classroom:	
Sink separate from the bathroom	71
Bathroom in the classroom	57
Water fountain in the classroom	43
The following equipment is present in the classroom:	
Child size chairs and tables	100
Audio equipment	86
Television	14
Video cassette recorder	14
Overhead projector	0
Projection screen	0
Filmstrip projector	0
The following carpeting is present in the classroom:	
Classroom is entirely carpeted	57
Classroom has area carpeting only	43
Classroom has no carpeting	0
The classroom has an outdoor play area.	86
The following is a description of the classroom's outdoor play area (if one is present):	
Appropriate equipment for prekindergarten children	71
Appears to be safe	86
Area is fenced in	86
Area is close to prekindergarten classroom	57
Area has a variety of equipment	86
Area has permanent equipment	57
	71

(4) how do you use the information you obtain. Table 24 presents the information by site.

It can be seen from Table 24 that four sites administered a norm-referenced developmental assessment, and one of these used it in the home-based program. Two sites used developmental assessment for the purpose of understanding the developmental level of the children so that they could individualize the program for each child. The other two sites were more interested in using this assessment to evaluate gains that the children make while they are in the program. The use of assessment for this purpose (program evaluation) has limited meaning, because these instruments provide imprecise estimates of children's abilities at this age and because all children of this age, whether or not they are in a special program, will make gains in development as they grow and mature.

TEACHER CHARACTERISTICS

All personnel answered a questionnaire concerning their gender, ethnicity, education, prior training for work with four-year-olds, and prior experience. All center-based classrooms have one lead teacher and one assistant teacher. Of this group approximately 49% was African-American, 49% was Caucasian, and 3% was Hispanic. Table 25 describes the certification or professional license status, education, and experiential background of the lead teacher in each classroom at each site. Table 25 also describes the teachers in the two home-based programs. It can be seen that there is much variety among the teachers. All had at least the equivalent of a high school diploma. The educational level ranges from a GED to a doctorate in Education. The center-based teachers have higher levels of education and relevant experience than the home-based teachers.

TABLE 24

SITE-ADMINISTERED DEVELOPMENTAL ASSESSMENT

SITE	DOES SITE ADMINISTER DEVELOPMENTAL ASSESSMENT?*	ASSESSMENT INSTRUMENT USED	DATE OF TEST
A	YES	BATTELLE**	FIRST 2 - 3 WEEKS
B	YES	DEVELOPMENTAL PROFILE; PPVT***	PRETEST NOVEMBER 1992 POSTTEST JUNE, 1993
C (Center-Based)	NO	N/A	N/A
C (Home-Based)	YES	DEVELOPMENTAL PROFILE	FEBRUARY 1993
D (Center-Based)	YES	DIAL-R	FIRST 4 - 5 WEEKS
D (Home-Based)	YES	PORTAGE	FIRST 4 - 5 WEEKS
E	NO	N/A	N/A
F	NO	N/A	N/A
G	NO	N/A	N/A

* No signifies that no norm-referenced assessment is used.

** Battelle Developmental Inventory, (Screening Inventory Section). Full test is administered if screening inventory indicates it is needed.

*** PPVT, Peabody Picture Vocabulary Test, is used as a follow-up in special cases.

TABLE 25

CHARACTERISTICS OF LEAD TEACHERS

SITE	TEACHING CERTIFICATE OR PROFESSIONAL LICENSE	EDUCATION	RELEVANT EXPERIENCE
A	None Reported	B.S., Deaf Ed. M.ED., Special Ed. ED.D., Special Ed.	Preschool Teacher Kindergarten Teacher
B	None Reported	High School Diploma	Teacher's Aide
B	None Reported	B.A. ECE M.S. Candidate	Asst. Teacher Head Start Teacher
B	Elementary Teaching Certificate, CDA*	High School Diploma	Teacher's Aide
C	None Reported	B.S., Education	Teaching Internship
C	Early Childhood Teaching Certificate	B.S., Education M.ED.	Preschool Teacher
C	None Reported	B.S., Early Childhood Ed.	First Grade and Primary Teacher
C	Early Childhood, Admin. and Supervision Certificates	B.ED., M. ED, ED.S	Not Reported
D	Early Childhood Teaching Certificate	B.S., Home Ec. M.S., ECE	Special Ed. and Kind. Teacher
D	Early Childhood Teaching Certificate	B.S., Special Ed and Elem. Ed.	Teacher Curr. Coor.
E	Early Childhood Teaching Certificate	B.S., Journalism M.ED.	Center Director Curriculum Dir.

* CDA: Child Development Associate Credential

(Table Continues)

Table 26 describes the same characteristics for the assistant teachers. These teachers work along with a lead teacher in the classrooms. Again, there is much variety among them. Their educational levels range from GED and high school diploma to bachelor's degrees. Two have completed Child Development Associate (CDA) training. All but one have had relevant experience.

Section 6

Teacher Training

The Georgia Department of Education sponsored 5 training programs for personnel. The 3 programs for teachers included Creative Curriculum, High/Scope, and Child Development Associate (CDA) training. Both Creative Curriculum and High/Scope training were based on the curriculum material described earlier in this chapter. CDA training, usually attended by caregivers of young children who do not intend to pursue college degrees, culminates in a credential recognized by the Early Childhood profession. Some teachers attended the 2 additional training programs offered: Foundations for the Helping Professions, designed to enhance understanding of the needs of various ethnic groups, and Collaboration, directed toward facilitating interaction among members of coordinating councils. Additionally, one local site presented assertiveness training for its own 6 parent educators.

The sites could not send all teachers to the various training sessions but had to make decisions concerning which ones to send. Table 27 shows the number of teachers, including lead teachers and teachers' assistants (paraprofessionals) at each sample site and the number who attended the various training programs sponsored by the Georgia Department of Education.

TABLE 26

CHARACTERISTICS OF ASSISTANT TEACHERS

SITE	TEACHING CERTIFICATE OR PROFESSIONAL LICENSE	EDUCATION	RELEVANT EXPERIENCE
A	CDA*	Not Reported	Paraprofessional, Kindergarten
B	None Reported	GED	Teacher's Aide
B	None Reported	High School Diploma	Teacher's Aide
B	None Reported	High School Diploma	Teacher's Aide
C	None Reported	High School Diploma	Teacher's Aide Daycare, Asst Director
C	None Reported	B.A., Interior Design	Preschool Teacher
C	None Reported	Associate Degree	Youth Teacher and Director
C	None Reported	B.S., Child Development	Daycare Teacher
D	CDA* Paraprofessional license	Diploma	Paraprofessional
D	None Reported	Child Development Diploma	Teacher Curriculum Coordinator

* CDA: Child Development Associate Credential

(Table Continues)

(TABLE 26 CONTINUED)

SITE	TEACHING CERTIFICATE OR PROFESSIONAL LICENSE	EDUCATION	RELEVANT EXPERIENCE
E	None Reported	B.S.	Not Reported
F	None Reported	Associate Degree	Teacher Assistant
F	None Reported	High School Diploma	Nursery Teacher
G	None Reported	High School Diploma	Church Youth Leader
G	None Reported	High School Diploma	Church Nursery

TABLE 27

NUMBER OF TEACHERS RECEIVING TRAINING

SITE	TYPE OF TRAINING					
	NUMBER OF TEACHERS AT SITE	CDA*	CREATIVE CURRICULUM	HIGH SCOPE	FOUNDATIONS	COLLABORATION
A	6	4	1	4	2	0
B	6	0	2	2	4	0
C	8	0	7	1	2	0
D	10	2	4	1	0	0
E	2	1	0	1	1	0
F	2	2	0	1	2	2
G	4	2	1	1	2	0
TOTAL	38	11	15	11	13	2

* CDA = Child Development Associate

All teachers attending Child Development Associate (CDA) training were in center–based programs, and most were paraprofessionals. However, at two sites both the lead teachers and the paraprofessionals attended. One of the lead teachers attending CDA training already had a very high level of education and experience with young children. At all sites except one, only lead teachers attended High/Scope training. At one site all lead teachers and teachers' assistants in the center–based classrooms attended. Foundations for the Helping Professions was attended by both groups of teachers. Only two teachers, who also served as family services workers at a site where one of them was the chair of the coordinating council, attended the training on collaboration presented for coordinating council members.

Section 7

Parent Involvement

Parent involvement in the prekindergarten program is thought to be important for at least three reasons. First, parents' involvement in the schooling of their children may have a positive influence on the children's motivation and accomplishments because the parents serve as positive models. That is, when children see that education is significant to their parents, they themselves adopt the attitude that school and achievement are important. Second, educational and intellectual experiences have direct benefits for the parents themselves. Some of the activities provide parents opportunities to gain knowledge in areas in which they have had no experience. For example, some parents had not seen a zoo or a wild animal until they chaperoned the field trip to the zoo. Other activities help them better understand child development, positive approaches for interacting with children, and the importance of providing intellectual, physical, and emotional nurturance and encouragement to children.

The third reason that parent involvement is thought to be important is that it may empower parents to interact effectively with the schools their children will attend in the future. If they learn to feel comfortable with the prekindergarten educational program, they may generalize this attitude to other schools.

The prekindergarten program attempted to involve parents in two general ways. First, relative to the children's program, parents could:

1. have scheduled conferences with the teacher, either at the parent's or the teacher's request;
2. help with class activities by actually working in the classroom with the children or helping the teacher to prepare materials, organize materials, tidy the room, clean equipment, and perform other tasks, either because the teacher requested, or the parent offered, the help;
3. have informal contacts with the teacher such as dropping in before or after school, or telephoning, to talk to the teacher, with either the teacher or the parent initiating such contact;
4. visit the class, or the teacher could visit the home.

For the Evaluation Project teachers recorded their contacts with parents and indicated whether the parent or the teacher initiated the activity. The results are presented in Table 28, which shows the number of parents that engaged in each of these activities and whether the initiator was the parent or teacher. The numbers in the tables are based only on families in the center-based program. Parents in the home-based programs were involved much more intensely in an educational program and met regularly once a week with the family educators. Thus, the

TABLE 28

PARENT INVOLVEMENT ACTIVITIES IN CENTER-BASED CLASSROOMS*

INITIATOR	CONFERENCES	HELP WITH CLASS	INFORMAL CONTACTS	VISITS**
TEACHER INITIATED	81	23	230	(HOME VISITS) 66
PARENT INITIATED	79	198	550	(CLASS VISITS) 148
TOTAL	160	221	780	214

* Reported Activities for a sample size of 106 families. Home-based families were not counted in those activities.

** The home visits reported were those made by teachers. At one site teachers also served as family services coordinators. Their visits in the role of family services coordinator are not reported in this table.

tables are based on a sample size of 106, which includes all the center-based families. It can be seen that parents were very proactive in involving themselves in their children's educational program. It is interesting that parents and teachers initiated an almost equal number of conferences. Many parents worked in the classroom at various times and volunteered to do so. They also had numerous informal contacts with the teachers.

The second way in which the prekindergarten program involved parents was by presenting workshops, educational programs, and social events for them. Tables 29 to 37 list the titles of all parent activities presented by each program. In most cases, when a site had classrooms in more than one location, the parent programs were presented in a central place. At one site where the classrooms were located many miles apart, separate parent activities were presented for each group. Tables 29 to 37 also indicate the number of times each program was offered, the name of the leader, the duration, and the number of parents present. It can be seen from these tables that the programs were varied. It is apparent that some programs were more successful than others in attracting parents.

In order to provide information to help other programs attract participants to their parent activities, the Evaluation Project requested the program staff at each site to answer the following questions:

1. What was your most successful parent activity?
2. What was your most successful time to schedule a parent activity?
3. What advice would you give others about planning parent activities?

Tables 38, 39, and 40 present the responses to these questions. Although the sites differ in the times of the day that they believe are best, they agree that "hands on" programs are

ERIC Full Text Provided by ERIC

TABLE 29

PARENT EDUCATION ACTIVITIES
(SITE A*)

TYPE OF ACTIVITY	NUMBER OF TIMES OFFERED	LEADER	DURATION	NUMBER OF PARENTS PRESENT
Nutrition	1	Health Department	1 hour	23
Fire Department/Safety	1	Fire Department	2 hours	19
Self esteem	1	UGA Extension	1 1/2 hours	16
Black history & storyteller	1	Program staff	1 hour	61
Christmas party	1	Program staff	2 hour	37
Educational toys	1	UGA Extension	1 hour	23
Discipline	1	Psychologist	1 hour	17
Child development	1	Program staff	1 hour	16
Behavior management	1	County School Staff	1 hour	18
Open house	1	Program staff	2 hours	20
Creative curriculum	1	Program staff	45 minutes	16
Kindergarten overview	1	County School Staff	1 1/2 hours	28

*Letters were randomly assigned to the sites.

TABLE 30

PARENT EDUCATION ACTIVITIES
(SITE B)

TYPE OF ACTIVITY	NUMBER OF TIMES OFFERED	LEADER	DURATION	NUMBER OF PARENTS PRESENT
Understanding "developmentally appropriate" activities	1	Elementary School	45 minutes	23
Reading and your four year old	1	Elementary School	45 minutes	11
Natural math and reasoning	1	Elementary School	45 minutes	16
Self esteem and your child	1	Program staff	45 minutes	16
Seizing teachable moments	1	Program staff	45 minutes	11
Resources for parents	1	Program staff	45 minutes	10
Parent input meeting	1	Program staff	45 minutes	14
Preparing for summer program	1	Program staff	45 minutes	15

TABLE 31

PARENT EDUCATION ACTIVITIES
(SITE C1)

TYPE OF ACTIVITY	NUMBER OF TIMES OFFERED	LEADER	DURATION	NUMBER OF PARENTS PRESENT
Pre-K orientation/Open house	1	Program staff	2 hours	20
Identifying special needs	1	Preschool Ed.program	1 hour	6
Behavior development problems	1	Preschool Ed. program	1 hour	6
Ethnic foods workshop	1	County home economist	1 hour	4
Single parenting workshop	1	Preschool Ed. teacher	1 1/2 hours	7
Child and growth development	1	Preschool Ed. teacher	2 hours	7
Community awareness workshop	1	Primary school principal	2 hours	9
Consumer education workshop	1	GA Power	2 hours	3
Home learning activity workshop	1	Program staff	1 hour	10
Health workshop	1	Sheriff's Office	3 hours	8
Dental workshop	1	McShane's Dental Off	2 hours	5
Safety practices workshop	1	Rescue Squad Fire Department	3 hours	6

* Since this site consisted of three programs which had separate parent activities, the programs are designated as C1, C2, and C3. These programs were separated by many miles, so that busing was not feasible.

(Table Continues)

(TABLE 31 CONTINUED)

PARENT EDUCATION ACTIVITIES
(SITE C1)

TYPE OF ACTIVITY	NUMBER OF TIMES OFFERED	LEADER	DURATION	NUMBER OF PARENTS PRESENT
First Aid/CPR	1	County Ambulance Department	4 hours	6
Mental health	1	County Health District	3 hours	8
China Doll Restaurant field trip	1	Program staff	2 hours	2
Farm field trip	1	Program staff	3 hours	3
Memorial park zoo field trip	1	Program staff	6 hours	4
Thanksgiving luncheon	1	County Primary School	1 hour	7
Parent breakfast	4	County Primary School	1 hour	22
School lunch week	5	County Primary School	1 hour	23

TABLE 32

PARENT EDUCATION ACTIVITIES
(SITE C2)

TYPE OF ACTIVITY	NUMBER OF TIMES OFFERED	LEADER	DURATION	NUMBER OF PARENTS PRESENT
Mental health	1	Lakewinds Recovery Center	1 hour	13
Safety Workshop "Power town"	1	GA Power Company	1 hour	12
Fire station field trip	1	Fire Department	1 hour	5
Amicalola Falls Field trip	1	Program staff	2 hours	5
Easter party	1	Program staff	2 hours	11
Group time "Valentine" theme	1	Program staff	2 hours	7
Group time "Children around the world"	1	Program staff	2 hours	4
Group time "Christmas" theme	1	Program staff	2 hours	4
Group time "Get Acquainted" Teddy bear theme	1	Program staff	2 hours	7
Stock dog show field trip	1	County Staff	1 hour	3
Identify special needs	1	Primary School	1 hour	13

TABLE 33

PARENT EDUCATION ACTIVITIES
(SITE C3)

TYPE OF ACTIVITY	NUMBER OF TIMES OFFERED	LEADER	DURATION	NUMBER OF PARENTS PRESENT
Orientation	1	Program staff	1 1/2 hours	12
Behavior Development Workshop	1	Board of Education	30 minutes	8
Observation of Child Growth	1	Board of Education	45 minutes	9
Special needs	1	Board of Education	1 hour	7
Single parent workshop	1	Board of Education	1 hour	8
Nutrition	1	Board of Education	45 minutes	5
Health workshop	1	Board of Education	45 minutes	5
Consumer education	1	Program staff	45 minutes	9
Home learning activities	1	Program staff	1 hour	12
Community awareness workshop	1	Program staff	45 minutes	9
First Aid/CPR	1	Fire Department	45 minutes	8
Parent safety workshop	1	Fire Department	45 minutes	8

TABLE 34

PARENT EDUCATION ACTIVITIES
(SITE D)

TYPE OF ACTIVITY	NUMBER OF TIMES OFFERED	LEADER	DURATION	NUMBER OF PARENTS PRESENT
Parent support group	weekly	Program staff	1 1/2 hours	9
Enrolling your child in kindergarten	2	Program staff	1 hour	20
Getting to know you	1	Leadership	2 hours	76
Establishing good eating patterns for Pre-K	1	Health Department	1 hour	12
Getting the health care your child needs	3	Program staff	45 minutes	16
Extending your child's learning at home	5	Program staff	30 minutes	14
Codependency	1	Family and Child Center	1 hour	9
Playing with your Pre-K child	1	Discovery Toys	1 hour	9

TABLE 35

PARENT EDUCATION ACTIVITIES
(SITE E*)

TYPE OF ACTIVITY	NUMBER OF TIMES OFFERED	LEADER	DURATION	NUMBER OF PARENTS PRESENT
Parent Orientation	1	Dept of Family and Children Services	1 hour	15
Parent responsibility for childrens school	1	Board of Education	45 minutes	14
Broaden your horizons	1	Project Read	45 minutes	7
Dental health	1	Project Smile (United Way)	45 minutes	4
Getting along with others	1	Board of Education	45 minutes	9
Healthy meals and healthy kids	1	UGA Cooperative Ext	45 minutes	2
Facts about child abuse	1	Program staff	45 minutes	7
Setting limits for your children	1	Board of Education	45 minutes	8

*The activities reported at this site were offered to a combined group of parents from two centers in close proximity to each other. Parents were bused from one location to another.

TABLE 36

PARENT EDUCATION ACTIVITIES
(SITE F)

TYPE OF ACTIVITY	NUMBER OF TIMES OFFERED	LEADER	DURATION	NUMBER OF PARENTS PRESENT
*PACT: Mother's Day party	1	Program staff	1 hour	9
*PACT: Pizza party	1	Program staff	1 hour	7
*PACT: Easter bunny visit	1	Program staff	1 hour	8
*PACT: Botanical gardens	1	Program staff	1 hour	9
*PACT: Birthday party	1	Program staff	1 hour	7
*PACT: Field day	1	Program staff	2 hours	6
*PACT: Colors and shapes parade	1	Program staff	1 hour	9
*PACT: Planting day	1	Program staff	1 hour	8
*PACT: Recipe- homemade playdough	1	Program staff	1 hour	10
*PACT: "Junk" pets	1	Program staff	1 hour	25
*PACT: "Center time"	3	Program staff	1 hour	36
*PACT: Leprachaun puppets	1	Program staff	1 hour	11

*PACT: Parents and children together. These were activities that involved parents working with their children.

(Table Continues)

(TABLE 36 CONTINUED)

PARENT EDUCATION ACTIVITIES
(SITE F)

TYPE OF ACTIVITY	NUMBER OF TIMES OFFERED	LEADER	DURATION	NUMBER OF PARENTS PRESENT
*PACT: field trip to UGA vet school	1	Program staff	2 hours	12
*PACT: crafts	1	Program staff	1 hour	12
*PACT: crafts	1	Program staff	1 hour	9
*PACT: Valentine's party	1	Program staff	1 hour	11
*PACT: crafts	1	Program staff	1 hour	12
*PACT: Airplane trip	1	Program staff	1 hour	11
*PACT: Dinosaur egg hunt	1	Progam staff	1 hour	8
*PACT: "Me" books	1	Program staff	1 hour	12
*PACT: Indian Pow wow	1	Program staff	1 hour	15
*PACT: Giant Hershey kisses	1	Program staff	1 hour	8
*PACT: Parent field trip	1	Program staff	1 hour	8
*PACT: Thanksgiving dinner	1	Program staff	1 hour	6

(Table Continues)

(TABLE 36 CONTINUED)

PARENT EDUCATION ACTIVITIES
(SITE F)

TYPE OF ACTIVITY	NUMBER OF TIMES OFFERED	LEADER	DURATION	NUMBER OF PARENTS PRESENT
*PACT: Bunny books	1	Program staff	1 hour	10
*PACT: Bunny puppets	1	Program staff	1 hour	9
*PACT: Sock puppets	1	Program staff	1 hour	12
*PACT: Baseball game	1	Program staff	1 hour	13
*PACT: Rice Krispies pumpkin	1	Program staff	1 hour	10
*PACT: Easter baskets	1	Program staff	1 hour	11
*PACT: "I can do it" video	1	Program staff	1 hour	9
*PACT: Valentine craft	1	Program staff	1 hour	10
*PACT: Parent storytellers	1	Program staff	1 hour	11
*PACT: Health screenings	4	Health District	2 hours	54
*PACT: Alphabet room decorating	1	Program staff	1 hour	9
*PACT: Feild trip to a play	1	Program staff	1 hour	9

(Table Continues)

(TABLE 36 CONTINUED)

PARENT EDUCATION ACTIVITIES
(SITE F)

TYPE OF ACTIVITY	NUMBER OF TIMES OFFERED	LEADER	DURATION	NUMBER OF PARENTS PRESENT
*PACT: Circus day	1	Program staff	1 hour	8
*PACT: Crafts	1	Program staff	1 hour	9
*PACT: Nutritious snacks	1	County Extension Services	1 hour	11
*PACT: Spaghetti luncheon	1	Program staff	1 1/2 hours	15
*PACT: field trip to UGA petting zoo	1	Program staff	2 hours	8
*PACT: parent party and slide presentation	1	Program staff	1 hour	8
*PACT: Meet Santa	1	Program staff	1 hour	7
*PACT: Skating party	1	Program staff	2 hours	8
*PACT: Black history program	1	Program staff	1 hour	6
*PACT: Kite day	1	Program staff	2 hours	12
*PACT: Game day	1	Program staff	1 hour	11
*PACT: Reading day	1	Pre-K parents	1 hour	9

(Table Continues)

(TABLE 36 CONTINUED)

PARENT EDUCATION ACTIVITIES
(SITE F)

TYPE OF ACTIVITY*	NUMBER OF TIMES OFFERED	LEADER	DURATION	NUMBER OF PARENTS PRESENT
*PACT: Crafts	1	Program staff	1 hour	9
*PACT: Mother's Day tea	1	Program staff	1 hour	8
*PACT: Make mailboxes	1	Program staff	1 hour	15
*PACT: Planes in flight	1	Program staff	1 hour	8
Parent Meeting with GSU Evaluators	1	Program Staff	1 1/2 hours	29
Child Development: Transition to Kindergarten	1	University of Georgia	1 hour	29
End of Year Picnic	1	Program staff	2 hours	30
Employment opportunity/ Employability	1	Department of Labor	1 hour	36
Appreciation Luncheon	1	Pre-K Parents	1 1/2 hours	
Disciplining with love	1	Program staff	1 hour	41
Meet Governor Miller	1	Program staff	1 hour	15
Empowerment: How to pull down community resources	4	Program staff	1 hour	36

*Activities that are not PACT include all parents. Parents are bused from one location to another.

TABLE 37

PARENT EDUCATION ACTIVITIES
(SITE G)

TYPE OF ACTIVITY	NUMBER OF TIMES OFFERED	LEADER	DURATION	NUMBER OF PARENTS PRESENT
Martin Luther King, Jr.	1	Program staff	4 hours	7
Circus	1	Program staff	5 hours	10
Four year olds parent dinner	1	Program staff	2 hours	8
Family connection meeting	1	Program staff	30 minutes	9
Stone Mountain petting zoo	1	Program staff	3 hours	10
Sci-trek	1	Program staff	4 hours	11
Zoo Atlanta	1	Program staff	6 hours	10
Callaway Gardens	1	Program staff	8 hours	13
Center for puppetry arts	1	Program staff	3 hours	8
Yellow game ranch	1	Program staff	5 hours	10
End of year family planner	1	Program staff	7 hours	55
Ga. State parent meeting	1	Ga State Pre-K Proj	2 hours	8
Pre-K workshop	1	Kindergarten class	2 hours	13
Parents aerobics	1/week for 12 weeks	Program staff	2 hours	6 - 12

TABLE 38

PROGRAM STAFF'S EVALUATION OF PARENT ACTIVITIES (CONTENT)

Answers of program staff at each site to the question "What was your most successful parent activity?"

SITE	ACTIVITY
A	Christmas Party
B	Parent Information before each field trip
C1	Christmas dinner/workshop
C2	"Power town" by Georgia Power
C3	Home Activities workshop
D	Getting to Know you
E	Workshop "Parents' Responsibility for Success of Child Education"
F	Parent Workshop "Disciplining with love"
G	Prekindergarten workshop

TABLE 39

PROGRAM STAFF'S EVALUATION OF PARENT ACTIVITIES (TIME OF DAY)

Answers of program staff at each site to the question "What was your most successful time to schedule a parent activity?"

SITE	ACTIVITY
A	10:00 A.M. - 12:00 noon on Tuesday
B	Morning
C1	Night time and early mornings - 8:00 A.M.
C2	10:00 A.M.
C3	3:00 - 5:00 P.M.
D	Weekends or at pick-up/arrival time of children
E	12:00 noon
F	10:00 A.M. - 12:00 noon
G	Anytime after 6:00 P.M. or Saturday at 12:00 noon

TABLE 40

PROGRAM STAFF'S EVALUATION OF PARENT ACTIVITIES (PLANNING ADVICE)

Advice of program staff at each site about planning parent activities.

SITE	ADVICE ABOUT PLANNING ACTIVITIES
A	Provide food, babysitting, and transportation; have interaction with children over a meal; give choice of programs, include social time.
B	Keep sessions short and open floor to parental questions and concerns. (Read aloud, natural learning, child development).
C1	Make parents feel welcome and keep them active and involved; have fun; do survey for parent interest; get parents to help.
C2	Make fun educational; help parents get acquainted; look for people to lead workshops.
C3	Encourage families to join and participate in workshops and activities.
D	Don't arbitrarily determine topics; ask parents what they need. Provide childcare services to facilitate participation. Make sure planned activities reflect practical needs of parents as they see them.
E	Have activities which have practical value. Plan activities that don't exceed 30-45 minutes, and plan around the time that Pre-K children are dismissed from school. Remind parents of activities in a notice.
F	Make sure parents get personally involved in PACT and workshops. Give them hands-on experiences. Let them learn by doing and participating. Make workshops fun and exciting.
G	Ask your parents what interests and concerns them.

enjoyable and attractive for parents. This implies that a traditional classroom format of a leader talking to the participants may not be successful with this group.

Section 8

Case Studies

Following are four case studies illustrating parents' increased involvement in their children's education as a result of the prekindergarten program. Although the anecdotes are factual, the names are fictitious.

Case Study I

At the end of the prekindergarten year, the parents at this site approached the teachers about having a graduation ceremony. The teachers told them that there was a county policy prohibiting formal graduation ceremonies until after high school is completed. The teachers did suggest that if the parents wanted to plan a celebration they were certainly free to do so. As a result, 13 parents got together to plan a celebration. The parents called the program staff to a meeting 10 days before the event, gave them assignments, and informed them of the plans.

Eighty adults representing 24 prekindergarten children attended the celebration. The teacher sharing this story proudly described how the parents had done 100% of the planning and implementation. This was especially important at this site because a goal had been set for parents to feel like partners in the program. The teacher thought that this experience was an indication that this goal had been achieved.

Case Study II

"Ms. Miller" began in this home-based program as a reluctant participant. At first the home visitor was not sure if this mother was actually working with the child herself or if someone else in the home might be doing it instead. As the year progressed, Ms. Miller began to communicate with the prekindergarten home visitor and share some of her problems. Ms. Miller eventually became so involved in the lessons that she asked if she could include a young niece in the activities. Although this was an unusual request, the program decided to allow Ms. Miller to include the child, and she completed the whole series of activities with both children.

Case Study III

After participating in the prekindergarten program, "Mr. White" attempted to register his child for kindergarten. Since Mr. White speaks limited English, the school told him that he should register his child in the special ESOL program instead of the neighborhood school. Mr. White asserted that his child's ability to speak English was far better than his own and he wanted him enrolled in the neighborhood school. The prekindergarten program director felt that this parent had been empowered during the program year to assert his opinion in this way. The director also concurred in Mr. White's assessment that the neighborhood school was the appropriate placement for this child.

Case Study IV

"Ms. Harper" reported that she began the prekindergarten year expecting her child to learn her letters and numbers and other traditional academic–type concepts. As the school year progressed Ms. Harper spent time periodically in the classroom, and at first she was disappointed that little "Suzie" was not getting traditional academic content. However she gradually began to see that, although the children were listening to stories, looking at books, and counting things, the real "work" of the classroom was learning about sharing, getting along with other children, following a schedule, and other similar activities. She said that her idea of what was appropriate for 4-year-olds had changed and that she really appreciated what the program was teaching her child.

CHAPTER FIVE

THE FAMILY SERVICES COMPONENT

The comprehensiveness of the Georgia Prekindergarten Program is its most important and unique feature. In addition to providing educational experiences for children and families, a major goal of the program is to help families secure needed services. To assure that the families learn about and acquire services for themselves and their children, each prekindergarten site employs at least one family services worker.

FAMILY SERVICES WORKERS

One task of the evaluation is to describe the position, characteristics, and activities of the prekindergarten personnel who provide family services. To obtain this information two questionnaires were administered. One questionnaire was designed specifically for the purpose of eliciting information from individuals who are responsible for working directly with families about their positions, goals, and activities. A second questionnaire was administered to all professionals and paraprofessionals who worked with the prekindergarten program. Data from the second questionnaire pertaining to family service workers' title, experience, and training are presented in this chapter.

The Position of the Family Services Workers

One of the questionnaires elicited information about the administrative characteristics of the family services coordinator position. The respondents were asked to provide their own title, the name and title of their immediate supervisor, and the name and title of the person responsible for hiring the family services coordinator. Table 41 presents this information.

TABLE 41

ADMINISTRATING RESPONSIBILITY FOR FAMILY SERVICES WORKERS AT EACH SITE

SITE	TITLE	IMMEDIATE SUPERVISOR	PERSON WHO HIRES
A	Coordinator, Family Services/Inst.*	Program Director	Program Director with CC* Consultation
A	Resource Parent/Inst.	Program Director	Principal, with CC** Consultation
B	Social Worker	Program Director	Program Director
C	Family Services Coordinator	Program Director	Director Research Grants and Special Projects
D	Community Director,DFCS	Casework Supervisor Principal (DFCS)***	Director, DFCS
E	Service Coordinator	Social Worker	Program Director Principal
F	Family Services Worker	Lead Teacher	Program Director
F	Coordinator Home Based Program	Program Director	Program Director
F	Parent Educator (Six Positions)	Coordinator Home-Based Program	Program Director
G	Center Coordinator	Program Director	Program Director
G	Family Support	Center Coordinator	Policy Committee
G	Family Support	Center Coordinator	Center Coordinator

* Inst. = Instructor

** CC = Coordinating Council

*** DFCS = Department of Family and Children Services

Table 41 shows that at the 7 evaluation sites a total of 17 employees provided family services. The titles of the position differ from site to site and are likely to reflect the variety of expectations for this position among the programs.

Site A had 2 family services workers, each of whom combined two roles. Each worked as a classroom teacher in the mornings and as a family services worker in the afternoons. The title of one was Coordinator of Family Services/Instructor; that of the other, Resource Parent/Instructor. Sites B, C, and D each employed one experienced social worker to provide family services. At Site E a parent from the local community was selected as the family services coordinator. At Site F family services were provided by 2 family services coordinators and 6 paraprofessionals. One of the family services coordinators worked with parents whose children were in the center-based program; the other was responsible for families in the home-based program and for supervising the 6 paraprofessionals. She and the paraprofessionals combined two roles, teaching the parents to work with their children educationally and helping them obtain services to meet other needs. Site G, a large rural site, consisted of three counties. One had a home-based program; the other two had center-based programs. A family services worker was assigned to each county.

Both the immediate supervisor and the person responsible for hiring the family services workers vary across sites. The program director, either alone or in consultation with the coordinating council or others, is responsible for hiring at most sites. Supervision is sometimes delegated by the program director to a supervisor closer in proximity to the prekindergarten program. This is the case in at least two of the sites.

Several additional people who are not employed by the prekindergarten program nevertheless work with the prekindergarten families. A social worker who is employed by the Department of Family and Children Services (DFCS) is assigned full time to the prekindergarten program at one of the sites. Although she is not employed directly by the prekindergarten program, she has full responsibility for the entire family services component. Therefore, she, unlike others who work in unpaid ancillary positions, is described in the tables in this chapter.

One social worker who is not employed by the prekindergarten program and who is assigned to a site which employs a full-time professional family services coordinator is not described in the tables in this chapter. Assigned to the program full time by Positive Employment and Community Health (PEACH), a job-training program, she helps AFDC-qualified prekindergarten parents to obtain the following services related to job training: continuing education, pursuit of the GED, job training, internships with pay after job training, finding day care for young children, and obtaining drug and alcohol treatment if necessary before beginning job training. Although in most communities the waiting period for obtaining PEACH services may require several months or years, she facilitates the timely acceptance of qualified prekindergarten parents.

In another program, a VISTA volunteer works along with the family services coordinator. At still another site the project manager for The Family Connection and the principal and school social worker contribute time and effort to the prekindergarten families.

An additional contribution to families is made by a county Housing Authority, which provides classroom space in two of the housing projects which it administers. Similarly, a local recreation department furnishes two classrooms at another site. The fact that several programs have obtained community contributions of service and space attests to the ability of prekindergarten personnel, even at this early stage of collaboration, to pursue cooperation between themselves and other agencies.

The Characteristics of The Family Services Workers

Table 42 describes the educational and experiential backgrounds of the family services workers at each site. It can be seen that there is much variety among them. All had at least the equivalent of a high school diploma. The educational level ranges from a GED to a doctorate in an educational specialty. Sites used parents from the communities they served in various capacities. At one site, the primary family services coordinator was a paraprofessional with a GED and little experience. Because she was a member of the immediate community, the program personnel thought that she might be able to relate more effectively to her constituents than a professional social worker. At other sites using paraprofessionals, an additional family services worker served either as a supervisor or as a part of the family services team.

Goals and Activities of Family Services Workers

The second part of the questionnaire for family services coordinators was designed to elicit information about their goals, functions, and activities. These questions, along with the frequencies with which the respondents answered them, are presented in Table 43. These questions were directed to the person who has the primary responsibility to plan and carry out family services activities. There were 10 respondents, since two sites have different people supervising the center–based and home–based family services.

The first question in Table 43 elicited responses about goals of the family services program. Each goal that was mentioned is listed. Most of the family services workers agreed on

TABLE 42

CHARACTERISTICS OF FAMILY SERVICES WORKERS

SITE	TITLE	EDUCATION	RELEVANT EXPERIENCE
A	Coordinator, Family Services/ Instructor	B. S., Deaf Ed. M. ED., Spec. Ed. ED. D., Spec. Ed.	Preschool Teacher Kindergarten Teacher
A	Resource Parent/ Instructor	Not Reported	Paraprofessional Kindergarten
B	Social Worker/ Fam. Serv. Coord.	B. S., Psychology M.S.A, Administrat.	Family and Children Services
C	Family Services Coordinator	B.S., Early Childhood Ed. M.ED.,Special Ed	K-4 Teacher Special Ed.Teacher RESA Counselor
D	Community Director, DFCS*	B.S.	Substitute Teacher
E	Service Coordinator	High School Diploma	Teacher's Aide
F	Family Service Worker (Center Based Program)	High School Diploma	Peer Counselor WIC**
F	Coordinator, Home-Based Program	B.S.,Human Resources M. ED.,Early Childhood Ed.	Dir. of Daycare Montessori School Admin., Teacher
F	Parent Educator	Associate Degree	Psychologist Aide
F	Parent Educator	GED	Teacher Aide Daycare Teacher
F	Parent Educator	High School Diploma	Babysitting
F	Parent Educator	High School Diploma	Preschool Sunday Teacher Babysitting
F	Parent Educator	GED	Babysitting
F	Parent Educator	GED	Babysitting
G	Center Coordinator	Associate, Child Dev.	Daycare Teacher
G	Family Support Staff	High School Diploma	Head Start Primary School
G	Family Support	Not Reported	In-Home Daycare

* DFCS = Department of Family and Children Services

** WIC = Women, Infants, and Children

TABLE 43

RESPONSES TO THE FAMILY SERVICES QUESTIONNAIRE*

1. What are the two most important overall goals of your family services program this year?

(The following goals were mentioned and are presented in the order of the frequency of their occurrence)

- Identify and meet the needs of the families
- Provide services to families
- Build rapport with families
- Encourage family participation in the Prekindergarten program
- Develop team work with agencies
- Help parents to become self sufficient
- Provide opportunities for parents to develop skills
- Provide education to parents
- Coordinate activities between school and home
- Assure that the EPSDT's are completed
- Register at-risk children for prekindergarten
- Provide developmentally appropriate education and family support
- Build a close relationship with children and build their self esteem

2. Do you develop a family services plan for each family?

YES = 5
NO = 5

3. Do you have a resource file which includes all the service agencies in your community?

YES = 5
NO = 5

4. How many times per month do the family services coordinator and the teachers meet?

1 time -	2
4 times -	3
8 times -	1
30 times -	3
No answer -	1

* These responses were provided by the 10 family service coordinators who were responsible for their programs.

(Table Continues)

(TABLE 43 CONTINUED)

5.	**How do you determine when to make family contacts?**		
	Weekly		3
	Twice a month		1
	Once a month		1
	As needed		2
	Through family assessment		1
	By phone assessment		1
	In case of crisis		1
6.	**What is your caseload?**		
	Caseload of 12	-	1
	Caseload of 16	-	1
	Caseload of 20	-	2
	Caseload of 28	-	2
	Caseload of 34	-	1
	Caseload of 54	-	1
	Caseload of 66	-	1
	Caseload of 78	-	1
7.	**What percentage of your time is spent with the 4-year-old families?**		
	20%	-	1
	50%	-	4
	75%	-	2
	99%	-	1
	100%	-	2
8.	**Does your program have a formal family needs assessment?**		
	YES = 6		NO = 4
9.	**Do you have a system for recording your contacts with families?**		
	YES = 10		NO = 0
10.	**Do you have a system for tracking referrals?**		
	YES = 7		NO = 3
11.	**Do you have a system for following up referrals?**		
	YES = 8	NO = 1	No RESPONSE = 1

the first 4 goals, indicating that their major focus was to help families secure services and become involved with the program. Some more limited goals were to make sure that the health examinations (EPSDT's) are completed and to register at-risk children for the program.

Responses to questions 2 through 7 indicated that there is a great deal of variation among the sites. Only half of the family services coordinators indicate that they develop a family services plan or maintain a resource file. Their responses about the number of times they meet with teachers are probably related to their proximity to the teacher. Actually, one of them has the dual role of teacher and family services coordinator. Another one is in the same center with the teachers every day and frequently helps the teacher in the classroom. Such proximity is likely to facilitate communication about the children.

Responses to the question "How do you determine when to make family contacts?" suggest that most family services workers make the contacts on a regular schedule, since most responded by giving a time period. Caseloads and percentage of time spent with 4-year-old families vary considerably. Answers to questions 8, 10, and 11 indicate that some family services coordinators might need help in implementing a family needs assessment, tracking referrals, and following up referrals. It is not surprising that all have a system for recording contacts with families, since the Evaluation Project provided such a system and requested that they implement it for the sample children.

Family Services Record

To obtain data on specific activities of the family services coordinators in relation to the families, a form was developed for the family services coordinators to record all contacts with families. They were asked to indicate the extent to which each family in the sample utilized community resources in the areas of health and medical, nutrition and food, housing, child care, adult literacy/continuing education, job training, transportation, and other services. Specifically, they were requested to indicate which family member (child, mother, father, sibling, entire family) was referred for each service, the service provider, the date referred, the date services began, and whether the family services coordinator or the family member initiated the request for service. These particular data enabled the evaluators to determine whether the family actually obtained the service that was discussed or recommended. Table 44 provides the information on health and medical services for the sample. The information is provided in Table 45 for mental health; Table 46 for nutrition and food; Table 47, housing; Table 48, utilities; Table 49, clothing and furnishings; Table 50, education; Table 51, job training; Table 52, transportation; Table 53, additional services.

In reviewing these tables it is apparent that many referrals occurred in the areas of education and job training. In Chapter Three of this report, the chapter on families, data were presented indicating that approximately 50% of the sample children's mothers have never worked, and approximately 25% of those who do work are in unskilled labor positions. These figures, in combination with the data on education and job training referrals, suggest that the focus of many of the family services coordinators is to facilitate self–sufficiency in these mothers.

In reviewing these tables, it must be remembered that the data refer only to the sample children at each site. The sample was selected as a percentage of the children at the site, so that all sites are on the same standard. However, it is known that family services coordinators who

TABLE 44

HEALTH AND MEDICAL SERVICES

PERSON REFERRED	SERVICE PROVIDER	WAS SERVICE INITIATED?	DID FOLLOW-THROUGH OCCUR?	WHO IDENTIFIED PROBLEM, PROGRAM OR FAMILY?
4-yr-old = 69*	Health Dept. = 33	Yes = 47	Yes = 34	Program = 41
Mother = 10	GSU Nursing = 11**	No = 12	No = 25	Family = 19
Siblings = 3	Community Hospital = 5			
Family = 2	WIC = 1			
	Speech = 5			
	Dental = 2			
	Other = 2			

* This number included at least 10 children referred to the GSU Nursing School for EPSDT's.

** Provided EPSDT's.

TABLE 45

MENTAL HEALTH SERVICES

PERSON REFERRED	SERVICE PROVIDER	WAS SERVICE INITIATED?	DID FOLLOW-THROUGH OCCUR?	WHO IDENTIFIED PROBLEM, PROGRAM OR FAMILY?
4-yr-old = 2	Family or Individual Counseling = 6	Yes = 4	Yes = 4	Program= 2
Mother = 4		No = 2	No = 2	Family = 4
Siblings = 0				
Family = 0				

TABLE 46

NUTRITION AND FOOD

PERSON REFERRED	SERVICE PROVIDER	WAS SERVICE INITIATED?	DID FOLLOW-THROUGH OCCUR?	WHO IDENTIFIED PROBLEM, PROGRAM OR FAMILY?
4-yr-old = 4 Mother = 10 Siblings = 0 Family = 7	Food Stamps = 1 Churches = 6 Community Food Program = 7 Other = 7	Yes = 17 No = 4	Yes = 15 No = 6	Program = 15 Family = 6

TABLE 47

HOUSING

PERSON REFERRED	SERVICE PROVIDER	WAS SERVICE INITIATED?	DID FOLLOW-THROUGH OCCUR?	WHO IDENTIFIED PROBLEM, PROGRAM OR FAMILY?
Mother = 5	Community Charities = 4	Yes = 7	Yes = 7	Program = 5
Family = 2	Church Assisted = 1	No = 0	No = 0	Family = 2
	Metro Housing Authority = 1			
	Housing Improvement = 1			

TABLE 48

UTILITIES

PERSON REFERRED	SERVICE PROVIDER	WAS SERVICE INITIATED?	DID FOLLOW-THROUGH OCCUR?	WHO IDENTIFIED PROBLEM, PROGRAM OR FAMILY?
Mother = 7 Family = 0	Atlanta Gas = 3 Churches = 2 Private Donors = 2	Yes = 7 No = 0	Yes = 6 No = 1	Program = 4 Family = 3

TABLE 49

CLOTHING AND FURNITURE

PERSON REFERRED	SERVICE PROVIDER	WAS SERVICE INITIATED?	DID FOLLOW-THROUGH OCCUR?	WHO IDENTIFIED PROBLEM, PROGRAM OR FAMILY?
4-yr-old = 0 Mother = 12 Siblings = 4 Family = 6	Church-Thrift = 0 Family and Children Services = 6 Community Clothes Closet = 0	Yes = 20 No = 2	Yes = 20 No = 2	Program= 19 Family = 3

TABLE 50

EDUCATION

PERSON REFERRED	SERVICE PROVIDER	WAS SERVICE INITIATED?	DID FOLLOW-THROUGH OCCUR?	WHO IDENTIFIED PROBLEM, PROGRAM OR FAMILY?
Father = 1 Mother = 38 Siblings = 1 Family = 1	Head Start = 5 High School GED = 8 Literacy = 2 ESOL* = 2 Other = 24	Yes = 40 No = 1	Yes = 21 No = 20	Program = 33 Family = 8

* ESOL = English as a second language.

TABLE 51

JOB TRAINING

PERSON REFERRED	SERVICE PROVIDER	WAS SERVICE INITIATED?	DID FOLLOW-THROUGH OCCUR?	WHO IDENTIFIED PROBLEM, PROGRAM OR FAMILY?
Mother = 3	Community Action = 19	Yes = 18	Yes = 6	Program = 18
Father = 17	Local Board of Education = 2	No = 3	No = 15	Family = 3
Family = 1				

TABLE 52

TRANSPORTATION

PERSON REFERRED	SERVICE PROVIDER	WAS SERVICE INITIATED?	DID FOLLOW-THROUGH OCCUR?	WHO IDENTIFIED PROBLEM, PROGRAM OR FAMILY?
4-yr-old = 1 Mother = 8 Siblings = 0 Family = 5	Prekindergarten Program = 2 Child Care = 5 Other Agency = 8 Other = 9	Yes = 14 No = 10	Yes = 23 No = 1	Program = 17 Family = 7

TABLE 53

ADDITIONAL SERVICES

PERSON REFERRED	SERVICE PROVIDER	WAS SERVICE INITIATED?	DID FOLLOW-THROUGH OCCUR?	WHO IDENTIFIED PROBLEM, PROGRAM OR FAMILY?
4-yr-old = 45	All Others = 56	Yes = 37	Yes = 30	Program = 49
Mother = 7		No = 19	No = 26	Family = 7
Father = 1				
Siblings = 1				
Family = 2				

recorded no visits in a particular service area for the sample families actually did make referrals for non–sample families.

HOME VISITS

Since family services coordinators are expected to make home visits, data were collected on the number of visits the family services workers made to each sample family. Table 54 presents the mean number of home visits made to each sample family by the family services coordinators at the sites having center–based programs. At sites having home–based programs in which the roles of parent educator and family services worker are combined, the families were visited weekly, either in their home or at a central location. It can be seen from Table 54 that the average number of visits per family made at all sites was 3.36. The sites differed in the number of home visits made. These differences may be attributed to the size of the population each family services worker had to serve and the different needs and expectations of the various sites.

TRAINING OF FAMILY SERVICES WORKERS

The Georgia Department of Education provided the training described in the previous chapter for all professional and paraprofessional personnel. Table 55 indicates that the following training was offered: Child Development Associate (CDA), Creative Curriculum, High Scope, Foundations for the Helping Professions, and Collaboration. In addition, one of the programs offered training in early screening for health problems (EPSDT) and in assertiveness. This site had 6 parent educators who served two roles in relation to parents, educator and family services worker. It can be seen from Table 55 that these parent educators and an additional family

TABLE 54

MEAN AND (SD) OF HOME VISITS BY FAMILY SERVICES WORKERS TO SAMPLE CHILDREN*

SITE	NUMBER OF FAMILIES IN SAMPLE	MEAN AND (SD) OF HOME VISITS
A	8	1.63 (1.41)
B	22	4.91 (4.46)
C	16	6.38 (2.33)
D	7	2.00 (0.00)
E	8	2.00 (0.00)
F	10	3.00 (0.94)
G	14	2.43 (1.16)
H	14	4.50 (1.56)
TOTAL	99	3.36 (1.48)

* Home-based families not included.

TABLE 55

NUMBER OF FAMILY SERVICES WORKERS RECEIVING TRAINING

SITE	TYPE OF TRAINING						
	CDA	CREATIVE CURRICULUM	ASSERTIVENESS	HIGH SCOPE	EPSDT	FOUNDATIONS	COLLABORATION
A	0	0	0	0	0	1	6
B	0	0	0	0	0	1	1
C	0	2	7	0	7	2	0
D	2	1	0	0	0	1	0
E	0	0	0	0	0	1	1
F	2	0	0	1	0	2	2
G	0	0	0	0	0	0	0

ERIC Full Text Provided by ERIC

services worker took advantage of the training provided for them by this prekindergarten program.

Eight family services coordinators attended Foundations for the Helping Professions training. The Georgia Academy, a non-profit organization, was engaged by the Georgia Department of Education to provide this training. The Georgia Academy conducted its own participant evaluation immediately following the training. A summary of this evaluation is presented in Appendix C. Reviewing the summary leads to the conclusion that the participants believed the training in collaboration to be effective and helpful. Collaboration training, directed to members of coordinating councils, was also provided by the Georgia Academy. The family services coordinators who are members of coordinating councils attended that training. The family services workers who also had the role of parent educator were the ones who attended CDA and Creative Curriculum training. Although they had this training as educators, it is likely to have been helpful to them in their role as family services workers.

Most of the training was provided to educators. Very little was planned especially for family services coordinators this year. In fact, it seems that for many of the evaluation sites the first year's energy was spent primarily in getting the educational component up and running. These programs anticipate being able to focus more attention on the family services component in their second year of operation. To support this, one recommendation is that more direct training be provided for those who work with families, especially the ones who have had little formal training in this area.

CASE STUDIES

Brief case studies which illustrate the ways in which families were helped by the family services component of the prekindergarten program were obtained from each site. A sample of four of these case studies follows. Although the situations described are factual, the names used are fictitious.

Case Study I

"Ms. Jones" had lost custody of her two young girls and had moved in with her own mother. She had been told by DFCS that she could not regain custody unless she got her own housing and furniture and attended regular parent meetings. The family services coordinator helped Ms. Jones obtain housing and furniture by bringing her into interaction with the housing authority and DFCS. Ms. Jones also attended the weekly parent meetings. As a result, Ms. Jones has regained custody of her daughters.

Case Study II

This is a situation of a household with a disabled mother and an addicted father. After being released from a 90–day rehabilitation program "Mr. Williams" was jailed for driving under the influence. After coming home from jail he relapsed, became abusive, and held Ms. Williams and the children at knife point for 24 hours. When Ms. Williams was able to leave the house, she [illegible]d the family services coordinator from the prekindergarten program who sent her to a "safe house" for a week. In the meantime Mr. Williams was jailed again for breaking his probation. The prekindergarten program was able to help Ms. Williams get counseling and legal assistance to obtain a divorce. According to the family services coordinator, Ms. Williams is now "starting her life over again."

Case Study III

The "Smith" family's home was destroyed by fire when Ms. Smith was 8 months pregnant. The prekindergarten program organized the community to help. Neighbors went door–to–door seeking outgrown clothing and furniture that was not being used. They were able to refurnish the home and replace the lost clothing.

Case Study IV

The "Wallace's" are a prekindergarten family with 5 children and many problems. The prekindergarten program has been involved with this family throughout the year and has made several referrals. For example, Ms. Wallace attempted suicide on more than one occasion and the prekindergarten staff referred her to the local mental health agency. The Wallace's were living in a trailer which had no doors or windows, and had a leaking roof. The program referred them to the weatherization program for assistance. The Wallace family also had many health problems. The prekindergarten staff helped them get medicaid. When Ms. Wallace lost her job, the program helped her get another one driving a van. Currently, both parents are working, have bought their own trailer and are living in a trailer park subdivision. Also, the family services coordinator reports that the children's health seems much improved.

CHAPTER SIX

THE COORDINATING COUNCIL

The Georgia Department of Education required all prekindergarten programs to have a coordinating council composed of members from various community, social service, and educational agencies. If such a council already existed at a particular site, the prekindergarten program had the option of working with it rather than establishing a new one. The purpose of the coordinating council was to enhance community agency responsiveness to the prekindergarten families through interagency collaboration.

Many government agencies have been observed to have problems in being adequately responsive to their clients' needs. Swan and Morgan[7] point out that the classic pyramidal bureaucratic model under which most government organizations operate causes excessive complexity, fragmentation, and frustration. They suggest that this model ultimately acts to the disadvantage of both agency and client. Recently, the development of interagency (or coordinating) councils has been emphasized as a solution to the problem of the intractability of individual agencies. It is suggested that by bringing representatives of all the agencies together to focus on a total problem, rather than having each agency view it from only one perspective, some of the complexity and disorganization could be removed from the service delivery system as seen by the client. For example, by working together agencies might prevent duplication and complexity in the procedures required for families to obtain services. Such improvements would enable families to access services more easily.

---

[7] Swan, W. S., & Morgan, J. L., (1993). Collaborating for Comprehensive Services for Young Children and Their Families. Baltimore: Brookes.

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

THE COORDINATING COUNCIL QUESTIONNAIRE

One task of the evaluation was to understand the operation of the coordinating councils. For the purpose of describing the coordinating council at each site, a questionnaire was developed. Swan and Morgan's[8] work served as an important reference in developing the structure and substance of the questionnaire. This instrument was sent to a sample selected from the coordinating councils at each of the 7 sites and to all 7 coordinating council chairs. This resulted in responses from 32 members and the 7 chairs. The chair at 6 of the sites was the prekindergarten program director. At 1 of the 7 evaluation sites the chair was a teacher.

The questionnaire had 3 sections. The first section was different for the chair and the members of the coordinating council. Section I for the chairs consisted of 9 short-answer questions, designed to elicit information about the number of meetings held: average attendance; the time of the council's inception (before or as a result of the prekindergarten program); the administrative relationship between the council and the agencies represented; and changes occurring in the focus, mission, and structure of the coordinating council over the course of the prekindergarten year. Table 56 presents an abbreviated form of these questions along with the responses given by the chairs at each site.

Coordinating Council Questionnaire, Section I for Chairs

Table 56 shows a great deal of variation among the sites. According to the chairs, the number of meetings held ranged from 2 to 15, and the average number of members present at meetings ranged from 4 to 15. Out of the 7 coordinating councils, 4 were in existence prior to the beginning of the prekindergarten program; 4 have a written mission statement; 1 has a

---

[8] Ibid.

TABLE 56

RESPONSES OF COORDINATING COUNCIL CHAIRS TO PART I OF THE COORDINATING COUNCIL QUESTIONNAIRE

SITE	Number of Meetings Held	Average Attendance/ Number of Members	Existed before 1992	Mission Statement Exists	Written Agreement between CC & agencies	Mutually Agreed Upon Budget	Has Focus Changed?	Has Mission Changed?	Has Structure Changed?
A	5	5/7	YES	NO	NO	YES	NO	NO	NO
B	13	15/16	NO	NO	NO	NO	NO	NO	YES
C	2	7/11	YES	NO	NO	YES	NO	NO	YES
D	4	7/8	YES	YES	NO	YES	NO	NO	NO
E	15	10/12	YES	YES	YES	YES	NO	NO	YES
F	7	4/7	NO	YES	NO	NO	NO	NO	NO
G	10	10/11	NO	YES	NO	NO	NO	NO	YES

written agreement with the agencies represented on the council; 4 have a budget that is mutually agreed upon with the agencies represented. All 7 chairs report that neither the focus nor the mission of the council has changed since the prekindergarten program began; but 4 chairs report that the structure of their councils has changed.

In reviewing the data, Swan[9] noted that the number of meetings held was, for most of the sites, reasonable. He suggested that the councils at the sites having only 2 to 5 meetings would not have had opportunities to develop the kind of working relationships among agencies that would lead to true collaboration. He also pointed out that coordinating councils progress through various stages of development, and several years of working together are required for true collaboration to develop. He thought that the average attendance at meetings reflected a number that was conducive to the establishment of positive group process.

Coordinating Council Questionnaire, Section I for Members

Section I for the council members consisted of 7 short–answer questions. In answering these questions the sample of members described their own participation in the coordinating council (how long they had been members and how many meetings they had attended); their views on whether the council had existed before the prekindergarten program began; and their beliefs about whether changes in the focus, mission, and structure of the council had occurred since the prekindergarten program started. Table 57 presents an abbreviated form of these questions, along with the number of responses, by site.

It can be seen from Table 57 that the members varied a great deal in their responses to the questions. It is interesting to note that the average length of time members had been on the

---

[9] Swan, W.S. (August 11, 1993). Personal Communication.

TABLE 57

RESPONSES OF COORDINATING COUNCIL MEMBERS TO PART I OF THE COORDINATING COUNCIL QUESTIONNAIRE

SITE	Months on Coor. Council (mean)	Meetings Attended (mean)	Distance Traveled (mean)	Existed before 1992	Has Focus Changed?	Has Mission Changed?	Has Structure Changed?
A	11.00	3.50	7.25	no = 1 yes = 3	no = 1 yes = 2 NR* = 1	no = 2 yes = 1 NR* = 1	no = 2 yes = 1 NR* = 1
B	13.25	9.50	5.35	no = 3 yes = 1	no = 2 yes = 2	no = 3 yes = 1	no = 2 yes = 2
C	6.00	2.25	8.00	no = 2 yes = 1 *NR = 1	no = 1 yes = 3	no = 4 yes = 0	no = 3 yes = 1
D	11.25	2.50	40.75	no = 1 yes = 3	no = 2 yes = 2	no = 4 yes = 0	no = 2 yes = 2
E	13.17	12.50	2.67	no = 0 yes = 6	no = 5 yes = 1	no = 3 yes = 3	no = 6 yes = 0
F	9.75	5.25	6.75	no = 3 yes = 1	no = 3 yes = 1	no = 3 yes = 1	no = 3 yes = 1
G	9.50	7.33	3.50	no = 3 yes = 3	no = 6 yes = 0	no = 6 yes = 0	no = 3 yes = 3

* NR = No Response

coordinating council ranged roughly from 6 to 13 months at the different sites. The mean number of meetings attended ranged from 2.25 to 12.5. While most members traveled a reasonable distance, at one rural site the members averaged traveling over 40 miles to attend a council meeting.

To further substantiate that the sites differed significantly from each other, a one–way MANOVA was computed to compare sites on the length of time the members had been on the council, the number of meetings they had attended, and the distance they traveled to attend meetings. The MANOVA was significant, $\underline{F}$ (18, 72) = 3.61, $\underline{p} < .001$. Subsequent ANOVA's indicated that the sites differed significantly in the number of months the members had been on the council, $\underline{F}$ (6, 30) = 2.79, $\underline{p} < .05$, the number of meetings attended, $\underline{F}$ (6, 30) = 5.56, $\underline{p} < .001$, and the number of miles traveled, $\underline{F}$ (18, 72) = 7.07, $\underline{p} < .001$. These analyses further confirm the diversity among the sites.

Members from the same council did not always agree on whether their council existed before 1992. There could be several explanations for this disagreement. One might be that there were different interpretations of the relationship between the new council and a parent council. Because parent councils had to change considerably in order to accommodate to the prekindergarten program, some members may have interpreted the evolving organization as a new council while others viewed it as a continuation of the parent council. An interesting situation occurred at Site C. Although the chair indicated that the council had been in existence prior to 1992, the responding members had been on the council for an average of only 6 months. Members who do not have a history with the parent council may view it as separate from the new council. These results may indicate that members need to participate on the council for longer periods of time in order for a mutual vision and understanding about the council to be developed. As the councils mature, it is likely that agreement among the members will increase.

Some members did not agree with the chairs or with each other on whether the focus, mission, or structure of the council had changed since the prekindergarten program began. Exceptions occurred at one site where all agreed that neither the focus nor the mission had changed. At two additional sites members agreed that the mission had changed, and at one site members agreed that the structure had changed. When both chairs and members responded that the focus, mission, or structure had changed since the prekindergarten program began, they were asked to describe the changes. Tables 58, 59, and 60 present their statements concerning the nature of the change.

Coordinating Council Questionnaire, Section II, Chairs and Members

On the first part of Section II (items 1 through 22) the chairs and the members answered the same questions. On a 5–point scale, they gave their opinions about 22 characteristics of their coordinating councils. The chair and member responses were analyzed separately. In each group an individual could respond to a question by marking 1 of the 5 categories: strongly disagree, disagree, neutral, agree, strongly agree. The scores for the categories ranged from 1 for strongly disagree to 5 for strongly agree. Table 61 presents the questions and the percentages of members' and chairs' responses that fell into each of the 5 categories. Table 62 presents the means and standard deviations of the scores (1 to 5) representing the categories from strongly disagree to strongly agree.

Tables 61 and 62 present the same body of material. Table 61 shows the items and the percentage of members and chairs who responded to them in each category. Table 62 presents

TABLE 58

COORDINATING COUNCIL RESPONSES TO:
Has the Focus of the Coordinating Council Changed Since the Prekindergarten Program Started? If so, in what way?

CHAIRS RESPONSES
No: For the past two years, the Interagency Council has been in the process of redefining it's mission from one of information sharing to one of expanding services for low income families in the community. The Pre-K program has been a part of this change in focus.
No: We are still in the process of developing a focus.
MEMBERS RESPONSES
Yes: Because of the Pre-K program I have been asked to participate as a DFCS representative and I assume the Council has broadened it's focus. The Pre-K subcommittee is new and through my participation my agency is now more involved in the community.
Yes: We started planning a new program and now are dealing with program improvements and changes.
Yes: To deal with different issues and concerns such as the impact of the Pre-K program on local child care facilities.
Yes: Involvement of private child care center directors.
Yes: Focus is in maintaining the program and looking for ways to expand. Initially, it was..."How are we going to do this at all?"
Yes: Getting more parents involved.
Yes: Moved from start-up recruiting families to determining program strengths and strategies
Yes: To include more information geared toward Pre-K children.
Yes: somewhat. Children who were ineligible because of federal guidelines have been added to at-risk intervention.
No: The children's early development is our main focus.
Yes: Developed from the Interagency committee with birth-to-adult focus. That collaborative divided, this branch developed. It consists of service providers who deliver to preschoolers and their families.

TABLE 59

COORDINATING COUNCIL RESPONSES TO:
Has the Mission of the Coordinating Council Changed? If so, in what way?

CHAIRS RESPONSES
No: We are still in the process of developing a focus.
MEMBERS RESPONSES
No: My job on the council is the same. I tell the council about family needs - hispanics - about school and other services. Also I work on publicity.
No: Basic mission is the same; finding ways to serve as many Pre-K children in our community as possible.
Yes: Increased support for the families and communities that are responsible for our children.
Yes: Our group focuses on preschoolers and their families.

TABLE 60

COORDINATING COUNCIL RESPONSES TO:

Has the Structure of the Coordinating Council Changed? If so, in what way?

CHAIRS RESPONSES
No: Not really. A Pre-K subcommittee has been established but the council has traditionally dealt with new issues and programs through special sub-committees.
Yes: Several members have been added since last summer. We also have two parents now that represent both the center-based and the home-based programs.
Yes: Added Department of Children and Youth services when they achieved Departmental Status.
Yes: We added Director of Head Start and Director of Chapter I to our council.
Yes: More members have been added as new agencies joined in our efforts to serve Pre-K families. They were invited to join the council day care operators, Housing Authority, etc...
Yes: Our group focuses on preschoolers and their families.

MEMBERS RESPONSES
No: Some of the members have changed because of reassignment.
Yes: A Pre-K subcommittee was added and I was asked to participate.
Yes: Involvement of private child care directors.
Yes: Teachers/parents more involved.
Yes: Expanded to include representatives from agencies not directly dealing with program clients.
Yes: The Pre-K budget and planning has been added.
Yes: Specified or designated members are added as needed.
Yes: The participants are teachers and direct service delivery personnel who keep agency directors informed and involved as needed rather than vice-versa.
Yes: In content, as far as specific representatives, yes. Health Dept representative added.Another added to replace a representative (an employee transferred elsewhere).
Yes: Two new members have been added to the council.
Yes: The Head Start Coordinator was added to the Council in early 1993.

TABLE 61

PERCENTAGES IN EACH RESPONSE CATEGORY FOR COORDINATING COUNCIL CHAIRS (C) AND MEMBERS (M)

ITEM		Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Neutral	Agree	Strongly Agree
1.There is an undesirable duplication of services among agencies.	M*	38	28	19	3	13
	C*	43	14	29	14	0
2.Once an issue is brought before the Coordinating Council, a decision is made quickly.	M	6	6	31	34	22
	C	0	0	14	14	71
3.Once a decision is made, it is implemented quickly.	M	9	3	16	44	28
	C	0	0	14	29	57
4.Agencies in the Coordinating Council discharge their responsibilities in a timely manner.	M	6	6	6	38	41
	C	0	0	14	29	57
5.The other members and I make a "team".	M	0	3	13	31	53
	C	0	0	0	29	71
6.When a problem arises,the members work on it agreeably.	M	0	3	13	41	44
	C	0	0	0	29	71
7.When a problem arises, I feel the Coordinating Council can handle it effectively.	M	0	6	16	34	44
	C	0	0	14	29	57
8.Agencies represented on the Coordinating Council work together outside the meetings.	M	0	9	19	31	41
	C	0	0	14	0	86
9.The members of the Coordinating Council are committed to working collaboratively.	M	0	3	9	16	72
	C	0	0	0	29	71
10.All members of the Coordinating Council have an adequate opportunity to participate in the meetings.	M	0	6	0	22	72
	C	0	0	14	29	57
11.The Coordinating Council primarily serves as a policy making body.	M	3	19	28	16	34
	C	0	14	14	29	43
12.The Coordinating Council primarily deals with individual case management.	M	25	44	13	13	6
	C	29	43	29	0	0
13.The coordinating Council primarily serves as an advisory group.	M	3	9	22	38	28
	C	0	14	0	29	57
14.The Coordinating Council primarily serves as a way for the PreK program to influence the community agencies.	M	9	28	28	19	13
	C	14	0	14	29	43

*M = Members; N = 32

*C = Chairs; N = 7

(Table Continues)

(TABLE 61 CONTINUED)

ITEM		Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Neutral	Agree	Strongly Agree
15.An effective system exists to enable any member to bring a policy issue before the coordinating council.	M	0	6	16	47	28
	C	0	0	0	0	100
16.An effective system exists to permit members to bring a case before the Coordinating Council.	M	0	3	19	47	31
	C	0	0	0	57	43
17.Differences of opinion on policy issues can be discussed easily in Coordinating Council meetings.	M	0	6	19	28	47
	C	0	0	0	29	71
18.An effective system exists to permit members to get a case management issue before the Coordinating Council.	M	3	3	34	38	22
	C	14	14	14	0	43
19.Parents and PreKindergarten staff are able to bring case management issue before the Coordinating Council.	M	0	6	28	38	28
	C	14	14	29	14	14
20.Differences of opinion on case management issues can be discussed freely when the issue is appropriate for open discussion.	M	3	6	16	31	44
	C	14	0	0	43	29
21.I have been released from other responsibilities in order to participate in the Coordinating Council meetings.	M	44	9	13	16	13
	C	57	0	14	14	14
22.I have authorization to commit my agency's resources if a decision is needed quickly.	M	25	3	13	41	13
	C	14	0	14	29	43
23.The Coordinating Council meets in a place that is generally convenient to me.	M	0	0	6	22	72
23.The Coordinating Council meets in a place that is generally convenient to all members.	C	0	14	0	29	57
24.I am informed of every meeting of the Coordinating Council well in advance.	M	0	3	3	47	47
24.The Coordinating Council members are informed of every meeting of the Coordinating council well in advance.	C	0	0	0	29	71
25.I know all the other members of the Coordinating Council on a first name basis.	M	0	9	22	16	53
25.The Coordinating Council members know each other on a first name basis.	C	0	0	14	14	71

(Table Continues)

(TABLE 61 CONTINUED)

ITEM		Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Neutral	Agree	Strongly Agree
26.I am familiar with the mission of each agency represented by the other members of the Coordinating Council.	M	0	3	22	28	47
26.The mission of each agency represented in the Coordinating Council is familiar to all the Coordinating Council members.	C	0	14	14	29	43
27.The agency I represent will modify its procedures in order to work with others to give the best services to children and families.	M	0	9	16	22	28
27.Coordinating Council members have been released from work responsibilities in order to participate in the meetings.	C	14	14	43	14	14
28.The agency I represent will risk "bending the rules" to help children and families.	M	9	6	13	16	22
28.Coordinating Council members generally have the authorization to commit their agencies resources if a decision is needed quickly.	C	0	0	43	29	29
29.My agency will commit the resources necessary to permit it to work effectively within the Coordinating Council.	M	0	9	6	38	19
29.The agencies represented on the Coordinating Council are committed to modifying their procedures in order to work with others to give the best services to children and families.	C	0	0	14	43	43
30.I understand the procedures and policies of the Coordinating Council.	M	0	3	13	34	50
30.The agencies represented on the Coordinating Council will risk "bending the rules" to help children and families.	C	0	0	29	43	29
31.I support the mission of the Coordinating Council.	M	0	0	0	25	75
31.The agencies represented on the Coordinating Council will commit the resources necessary to permit them to work effectively within the Coordinating Council.	C	0	0	14	43	43

(Table Continues)

(TABLE 61 CONTINUED)

ITEM		Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Neutral	Agree	Strongly Agree
32.I enjoy being a part of the Coordinating Council.	M	3	0	6	13	78
32.The Coordinating Council members understand the procedure and policies of the Coordinating Council.	C	0	0	29	14	57
33.All the other members understand my role on the Coordinating Council.	M	3	0	16	31	50
33.The Coordinating Council members support the mission of the Coordinating Council.	C	0	0	14	29	43
34.There is a clear plan for follow-up once a policy or case management decision is made by the Coordinating Council.	M	0	3	28	38	31
34.Coordinating Council members enjoy being a part of the Coordinating Council.	C	0	0	0	57	43
35.I feel comfortable contacting the other members of the Coordinating council outside the meeting time.	M	0	0	9	28	59
35.Agencies represented on the Coordinating Council discharge their responsibilities without constant reminders.	C	0	0	0	43	57
36.I am an effective participant in the Coordinating Council.	M	0	6	13	31	50
36.I have effective group process skills.	C	0	0	14	43	43
37.I feel others enjoy being part of the Coordinating Council.	M	0	3	9	31	56
37.I support the mission of the Coordinating Council.	C	0	0	14	29	57
38.Information is easily shared among the agencies represented on the Coordinating Council.	M	0	3	3	44	47
38.Agencies represented on the Coordinating Council are willing to share all the information they have regarding a policy.	C	0	0	14	29	57
39.When I ask for information from another agency, I get accurate information quickly.	M	0	6	9	34	44
39.Agencies represented on the Coordinating Council are willing to share all the information they have regarding a policy.	C	0	0	0	14	86
40.Agencies represented on the Coordinating Council make information about families available when needed.	C	0	0	0	14	86

TABLE 62

MEANS AND STANDARD DEVIATIONS OF THE RESPONSE CATEGORIES FOR COORDINATING COUNCIL CHAIRS AND MEMBERS

(1 = Strongly Disagree; 2 = Disagree; 3 = Neutral; 4 = Agree; 5 = Strongly Agree)

ITEM	MEMBER		CHAIR	
	Mean	(SD)	Mean	(SD)
1.There is an undesirable duplication of services among agencies.	2.25	(1.34)	2.14	(1.22)
2.Once an issue is brought before the Coordinating Council, a decision is made quickly.	3.59	(1.10)	4.57	(.79)
3.Once a decision is made, it is implemented quickly.	3.78	(1.18)	4.43	(.79)
4.Agencies in the Coordinating Council discharge their responsibilities in a timely manner.	4.03	(1.17)	4.43	(.79)
5.The other members and I make a "team".	4.34	(.83)	4.71	(.49)
6.When a problem arises,the members work on it agreeably.	4.25	(.80)	4.71	(.49)
7.When a problem arises, I feel the Coordinating Council can handle it effectively.	4.16	(.92)	4.43	(.79)
8.Agencies represented on the Coordinating Council work together outside the meetings.	4.03	(1.00)	4.71	(.76)
9.The members of the Coordinating Council are committed to working collaboratively.	4.56	(.80)	4.71	(.49)
10.All members of the Coordinating Council have an adequate opportunity to participate in the meetings.	4.59	(.80)	4.43	(.79)
11.The Coordinating Council primarily serves as a policy making body.	3.59	(1.24)	4.00	(1.16)
12.The Coordinating Council primarily deals with individual case management.	2.31	(1.18)	2.00	(.82)
13.The coordinating Council primarily serves as an advisory group.	3.78	(1.10)	4.29	(1.11)
14.The Coordinating Council primarily serves as a way for the PreK program to influence the community agencies.	2.97	(1.20)	3.86	(1.46)

(Table Continues)

(TABLE 62 CONTINUED)

ITEM	MEMBER		CHAIR	
	Mean	(SD)	Mean	(SD)
15.An effective system exists to enable any member to bring a policy issue before the coordinating council.	4.00	(.87)	5.00	(.00)
16.An effective system exists to permit members to bring a case before the Coordinating Council.	4.06	(.80)	4.43	(.54)
17.Differences of opinion on policy issues can be discussed easily in Coordinating Council meetings.	4.16	(.95)	4.71	(.49)
18.An effective system exists to permit members to get a case management issue before the Coordinating Council.	3.72	(.96)	3.50	(1.76)
19.Parents and PreKindergarten staff are able to bring case management issue before the Coordinating Council.	3.86	(.91)	3.00	(1.41)
20.Differences of opinion on case management issues can be discussed freely when the issue is appropriate for open discussion.	4.06	(1.08	3.83	(1.47)
21.I have been released from other responsibilities in order to participate in the Coordinating Council meetings.	2.40	(1.55)	2.29	(1.70)
22.I have authorization to commit my agency's resources if a decision is needed quickly.	3.13	(1.46)	3.86	(1.46)
23.The Coordinating Council meets in a place that is generally convenient to me.	4.66	(.60)		
23.The Coordinating Council meets in a place that is generally convenient to all members.			4.29	(1.11)
24.I am informed of every meeting of the Coordinating Council well in advance.	4.38	(.71)		
24.The Coordinating Council members are informed of every meeting of the Coordinating council well in advance.			4.71	(.49)
25.I know all the other members of the Coordinating Council on a first name basis.	4.13	(1.10)		
25.The Coordinating Council members know each other on a first name basis.			4.57	(.79)
26.I am familiar with the mission of each agency represented by the other members of the Coordinating Council.	4.19	(.90)		

(Table Continues)

(TABLE 62 CONTINUED)

ITEM	MEMBER		CHAIR	
	Mean	(SD)	Mean	(SD)
26.The mission of each agency represented in the Coordinating Council is familiar to all the Coordinating Council members.			4.00	(1.16)
27.The agency I represent will modify its procedures in order to work with others to give the best services to children and families.	3.92	(1.06)		
27.Coordinating Council members have been released from work responsibilities in order to participate in the meetings.			3.00	(1.29)
28.The agency I represent will risk "bending the rules" to help children and families.	3.52	(1.44)		
28.Coordinating Council members generally have the authorization to commit their agencies resources if a decision is needed quickly.			3.86	(.90)
29.My agency will commit the resources necessary to permit it to work effectively within the Coordinating Council.	3.91	(.95)		
29.The agencies represented on the Coordinating Council are committed to modifying their procedures in order to work with others to give the best services to children and families.			4.29	(.76)
30.I understand the procedures and policies of the Coordinating Council.	4.31	(.82)		
30.The agencies represented on the Coordinating Council will risk "bending the rules" to help children and families.			4.00	(.82)
31.I support the mission of the Coordinating Council.	4.75	(.44)		
31.The agencies represented on the Coordinating Council will commit the resources necessary to permit them to work effectively within the Coordinating Council.			4.29	(.76)
32.I enjoy being a part of the Coordinating Council.	4.63	(.87)		
32.The Coordinating Council members understand the procedure and policies of the Coordinating Council.			4.29	(.95)

(Table Continues)

ITEM	MEMBER		CHAIR	
	Mean	(SD)	Mean	(SD)
33.All the other members understand my role on the Coordinating Council.	4.25	(.95)		
33.The Coordinating Council members support the mission of the Coordinating Council.			4.33	(.82)
34.There is a clear plan for follow-up once a policy or case management decision is made by the Coordinating Council.	3.97	(.86)		
34.Coordinating Council members enjoy being a part of the Coordinating Council.			4.43	(.54)
35.I feel comfortable contacting the other members of the Coordinating council outside the meeting time.	4.52	(.68)		
35.Agencies represented on the Coordinating Council discharge their responsibilities without constant reminders.			4.57	(.54)
36.I am an effective participant in the Coordinating Council.	4.25	(.92)		
36.I have effective group process skills.			4.29	(.76)
37.I feel others enjoy being part of the Coordinating Council.	4.41	(.80)		
37.I support the mission of the Coordinating Council.			4.43	(.79)
38.Information is easily shared among the agencies represented on the Coordinating Council.	4.39	(.72)		
38.Agencies represented on the Coordinating Council are willing to share all the information they have regarding a policy.			4.43	(.79)
39.When I ask for information from another agency, I get accurate information quickly.	4.23	(.90)		
39.Agencies represented on the Coordinating Council are willing to share all the information they have regarding a policy.			4.86	(.38)
40.Agencies represented on the Coordinating Council make information about families available when needed.			4.86	(.38)

the means and standard deviations of the response categories chosen. It can be seen from these tables that both members and chairs generally had positive views about the ability of the coordinating council representatives to work together effectively and cooperatively and to accomplish the goals of the council. They generally viewed the council as being composed of agency representatives who had been given some authority by their agencies and who were understanding, effective, and compatible.

Councils at the different sites are likely to have different functions. Reflecting the variation in the functions is the wide range of responses to the statement that the coordinating council primarily serves as a policy making body. Obviously, the councils make policy to varying degrees.

Most respondents indicated that case management is not a primary function of their council. Although there is a high level of agreement that councils serve as advisory groups, roughly 14% of the respondents report that their councils do not have this function.

On the second part of Section II (items 23 through 40) chairs and members again answered different questions, but they responded to the questions on the same 5–point scale described above. These questions and the percentage of responses in each category appear in Table 61. These questions were asked for several reasons. One was to determine whether the chairs understood the opinions and feelings of the members. The patterns of responses for the two groups indicate that the chairs are quite sensitive to the members' views.

Another purpose of these questions was to obtain the feelings of the members and chairs about their own effectiveness and enjoyment in relation to the council. Most respondents viewed themselves as being personally and professionally effective, and they indicated that they enjoyed their role on the council.

Conclusions

The most salient conclusion from the data presented here is that the coordinating councils are very diverse. This suggests that the sites have developed a particular focus, mission, structure, and mode of operation to meet their local needs. In view of the current emphasis on the site–developed approach to solving community problems, rather than a centrally designed set of rules for communities to follow, the coordinating councils appear to be developing in a positive direction.

Chairs and members generally view their councils and their own contributions in a positive way. It must be emphasized that this was the first year in the development of the coordinating council in relation to the prekindergarten program. As Swan[10] noted, it takes time for such councils to develop to a stage in which they accomplish meaningful collaboration. Many of the developing councils at the evaluation sites appear to be moving in that direction.

EVALUATION OF TRAINING IN COLLABORATION

A second task involving the evaluation of coordinating councils was to consider the quality of training provided in collaboration. The Georgia Academy, a non–profit organization, was engaged by the Georgia Department of Education to provide training to members of coordinating councils from all communities in which a prekindergarten program had been funded. The members met in Atlanta for a three–day training session. The Georgia Academy conducted its own participant evaluation immediately following the training. A summary of this evaluation is presented in Appendix D. Reviewing the summary leads to the conclusion that the participants believed the training in collaboration to be effective and helpful.

---

[10] Ibid.

CHAPTER 7

SUMMARY AND DISCUSSION

This final chapter summarizes the description of Georgia's Prekindergarten Program presented in the previous chapters. Additionally, it contains questions and suggestions by the evaluators. Five areas of the prekindergarten program were described: the children, the families, the educational component, the family services component, and the coordinating council.

Summary

THE CHILDREN

What was learned about the children? The selected sites included an equal number of boys and girls. Although a majority of the children was African–American (186), a large number was Caucasian (107); and a small number was Hispanic and other minorities. The primary language of most children is English, with only about 5% speaking other languages.

All children in the program were given the Early Periodic Screening and Diagnostic Testing for health and medical problems. Disorders were identified in approximately 10% of the children, and they were referred for treatment. In addition, 18% of the children entered the program having chronic health problems that had previously been diagnosed. Most children received the Measles, Mumps, and Rubella immunization (the most important vaccination for this age group) after entering the prekindergarten program. It is unlikely that these children would have obtained this vaccination if they had not been in the program.

The children's physical, self–help, social, academic, and communication development was assessed using the Developmental Profile II. This assessment, conducted for descriptive purposes

The children's physical, self-help, social, academic, and communication development was assessed using the Developmental Profile II. This assessment, conducted for descriptive purposes only, consisted of interviewing the teachers about each child's abilities and skills in each area. Although the children exhibited a wide range of individual differences in all the developmental areas, the average scores for all areas of development except self-help were below the score expected of a typical 4-year-old. The average self-help score was considerably above that of a typical child of the same chronological age. The scores in the developmental areas reflect the opportunities and experiences that the children have had. The difference between the self-help score and the scores in the other areas may indicate that these children have had special opportunities to develop self help skills but have lacked these opportunities to develop skill in other areas. This suggests that experiences in the other areas of the kind that are provided by the prekindergarten program may well be beneficial in enhancing the development of these children.

Records of children's absences from school indicated that almost 50% of the children missed fewer than 8% of the days that their school was in session. Although most of the children attended regularly, some children were chronically absent. More than 13% of the children were absent at least 1/4 of the school term. In absolute number of days missed, about 12% missed more than 30 days. At least one of these, and perhaps more, withdrew without notifying the school.

The attrition was less than 6%. Of the 8 children, out of the sample of 135, who withdrew, 2 had moved away, 2 had encountered logistical problems, and 2 left because the mothers were dissatisfied because the program was not more "academic."

THE FAMILIES

Although many different household configurations were found, almost 40% of the children lived in a two–parent household. The next most prevalent configuration was the single–mother household (37%). In addition, about 1/4 of the households were multi–adult which were comprised predominantly of mother and grandmother although some households included mother and aunt, or mother and some other adult. Very few children lived with foster parents. Most households included 1 or 2 adults, although about 15% of the households had 3 or more adults.

Almost 1/2 of the households had only 1 or 2 children. Four or fewer children lived in 90% of the households, and 7 children were the most living in any household.

Information was obtained on mothers' and fathers' educational levels, employment status, and occupational levels when possible. Although some information was not available or not reported, it was found that almost 40% of the mothers did not graduate from high school, approximately 30% are high school graduates; and the rest of them who reported their educational level (5%) had attended or graduated from college. Of the 30% of the fathers on whom data are available, 12% did not graduate from high school, but almost 15% did graduate, and the remainder (4%) attended or graduated from college. Although over 1/2 of the mothers in the program do not have jobs, more than 30% are employed outside the home. Of the 1/2 of the mothers who have worked, most have had unskilled jobs, and about 10% have had semi–skilled, skilled, or semi–professional jobs.

Of the fathers for whom data were obtained, the vast majority had jobs. Counting all fathers almost 40% had jobs. Most of them worked in unskilled positions, with a few having semi–skilled and skilled occupations. One unemployed professional who had done graduate work was in the sample. Adults other than the mother or father earned wages in some (21%) households and presumably contributed to the household. Although nobody earned wages in over 30% of the households, the remainder of the households had one, two, or three wage earners. Of these, most were single mothers (almost 50%).

To be eligible for the prekindergarten program families had to receive some kind of federal assistance or be referred by a social service agency. However, according to the families' applications, almost 40% of them received no federal assistance. Of those who did receive assistance, most received food stamps and/or AFDC. Almost 20% of the families obtained assistance from only 1 source. The remainder obtained assistance from 2 or more sources.

Parents' evaluations of the prekindergarten program were obtained through focused group interviews. Parents' perceptions and opinions were solicited in three areas: (1) the educational component of the program; (2) the family services component of the program; and (3) the social service resources in their community.

Parents unanimously expressed very positive feelings about the children's program. They repeatedly mentioned their joy in watching their children become more independent, cooperative, self-initiated, outgoing, verbal, confident, observant, interactive, inquisitive, persistent at problem-solving, mature, and competent at "real life skills."

Parents often reported that they had expected their children to learn the "ABC's" and "123's" by the old fashioned drill approach. Several reported that they had originally been skeptical of the "developmentally appropriate approach" which looked more like play to them. However, they observed as the year progressed that their children were learning those skills but "were also learning many more valuable things" in a way that made learning both fun and meaningful to them. Several parents stated that their children had become very different during this year and that they now felt "better about the child being ready to start a full day program in kindergarten."

Parents demonstrated positive attitudes toward the program and all staff members associated with it. No examples of negative events involving parents and prekindergarten personnel were reported. At all sites parents expressed positive attitudes toward the family services coordinator. In several sites the parents named the family services worker as the person they would approach with a family need. Several parents reported that the family services coordinator had been beneficial in helping them meet a need. However, parents did share some concerns about someone coming into their homes and asking personal questions. They appeared sensitive to having a "caseworker" in their homes and "their business."

In discussing community agencies, parents gave conflicting responses about the health department. Although at most sites, parents were critical, indicating that using these services made them feel negative and uncomfortable, at other sites they reacted favorably because their health departments had established an appointment system which made them feel that they and their time were respected.

Perceptions of the Department of Family and Children Services (DFCS) were predominantly negative. Most parents regarded DFCS as taking an adversarial rather than a supportive position. Negative perceptions centered around three issues: disrespect for parental time, disrespect for the person seeking assistance, and the lack of confidentiality. Two specific exceptions to the negative pattern of attitudes were evident. First, one prekindergarten pilot program had a DFCS caseworker assigned to the prekindergarten program on a full-time basis.

She was viewed as a parent advocate and as a powerful, positive resource for parents. The second exception was parental perceptions of workers for Positive Employment and Community Health (PEACH). Parents at several sites reported many positive attributes of the PEACH program and expressed feelings of respect and regard for the PEACH workers.

Parents in several of the focus groups pointed out two limitations related to public housing. First, waiting lists are long for units which have more than one or two bedrooms. Second, many working parents cannot qualify for public housing and must live in less adequate housing.

Parents applauded the prekindergarten program for helping them with continuing education and job training. Although community PEACH coordinators were credited in several sites as the local resource for information about and support in continuing education, family services coordinators and teachers were also cited as resources. Three parents in one site attributed the assistance they had received in returning to school to the teacher/family services workers in the prekindergarten project.

THE EDUCATIONAL COMPONENT

All 7 of the sample sites had a center–based program. In addition, 2 of the sites had a home–based program, and 1 of these had a combination of center–based and home–based. Each classroom in center–based programs had 1 lead teacher and 1 assistant teacher (paraprofessional). The teachers in the home–based programs were parents from the communities which they served.

Each site selected a curriculum for both center–based and home–based programs. The curriculum models selected were the Creative Curriculum, the High/Scope curriculum, A

Foundation for the Future: the Georgia State University curriculum, the Home Instruction Program for Preschool Youngsters (HIPPY), and the Portage Project curriculum. As the year progressed, the sites revised the curricula which they selected.

One lead teacher from the center-based program at each site and one teacher representing each of the two home-based programs were interviewed. When asked about the curricula and the educational experiences occurring in their classrooms, 4 teachers reported that they are using the Creative Curriculum, with 3 of the 4 reporting that they were supplementing this with the High/Scope curriculum. Although three teachers indicated that they were predominantly using High/Scope, 1 combines this curriculum with Head Start guidelines and another combines it with the Georgia State University curriculum. High/Scope appears as either a major or a secondary thrust in 6 of the 7 center-based programs. In the 2 home-based programs 1 teacher is using HIPPY and the other is using the Portage Project.

No teacher was satisfied with using only 1 model. Teachers were positive about the freedom to revise and combine models. They described their role as listening and communicating, reading aloud, finding out about the children's needs and interests, setting up the environment, providing support, and not pushing or forcing the children. They eschewed the traditional role of the teacher presenting information to the children, and instead wanted the children to explore, experiment, pursue their interests, and learn through their own experiences.

The physical features of the classrooms were observed and recorded on a checklist, and the teachers were interviewed concerning their satisfaction with and impression of the facilities. All classrooms had art, manipulatives, puzzles, blocks, home living, listening, and a large group gathering area. Most had a science center. Fewer than 1/3 of the classrooms had an identified writing center, 1/3 had a music center, and 1 classroom had a computer for the children's use. In about 40% of the classrooms the teachers' ability to see the children was obstructed by furniture if they were in certain parts of the room.

Some centers had magnificent playgrounds, and some of these were built by parents and volunteers. Others had playgrounds which were less than adequate. In their interviews the teachers indicated that they were very satisfied with the classroom and the building in which it was located. However, their opinions about the playgrounds ranged from very dissatisfied to very satisfied. Three of the 7 teachers were very dissatisfied with the playground, and another thought the playground was only mediocre.

Teachers were queried about whether they used assessment procedures with the children, and if so at what date and for what purpose. Four of the 7 sites do administer norm-referenced assessment. Two of these sites use this assessment for individualizing instruction. The other 2 use it as a pre- and posttest in an attempt to assess gains made by the children in the program. The use of assessment for this purpose (program evaluation) has limited meaning because these instruments provide imprecise estimates of children's abilities at this age and because all children of this age, whether or not they are in a special program, will make gains in development as they grow and mature.

A questionnaire administered to all program personnel indicated that the teachers, including both lead teachers and paraprofessionals, were approximately 49% African-American, 49% Caucasian, and 3% Hispanic. There is much variety among the teachers in education and experience. The educational levels range from a GED or high school diploma to a doctorate in an educational specialty. All lead teachers and all but 1 assistant teachers have had relevant experience working with young children.

The Georgia Department of Education sponsored the following training programs: Child Development Associate (CDA), Creative Curriculum, High/Scope Curriculum, Foundations for the Helping Professions, and Collaboration. Assistant teachers from 5 of the 7 sites attended CDA training. In addition, the lead teacher, who has a doctorate in an educational specialty, from 1 site attended this training. At least 1 lead teacher from each site attended High/Scope training. Both lead and assistant teachers from all sites except 1 attended training in Foundations for the Helping Professions, and 2 teachers from the same site, both of whom are on the coordinating council in their communities, attended Collaboration training.

A major goal of the prekindergarten program was to involve parents in their children's education. To ascertain the extent to which parents engaged in various parent involvement activities related to their children, the center–based teachers were requested to keep records of parent conferences, parents' help in the classroom, informal contacts with parents, and visits by the parents to the class or by the teacher to the home. They were also asked to indicate whether each of these activities was initiated by the teacher or the parent. Because one goal of the educational component was to empower parents to negotiate effectively with schools their children will attend in the future, it was important to understand how the parents were interacting in the present educational situation. Many parents did have contact with the teacher and the classroom. Of all the parent–teacher conferences, about 1/2 were initiated by the parent. Parents volunteered to help with the class 198 times, compared to the 23 times that they helped because the teacher asked them to. Parents at the 7 sample sites initiated over 500 informal contacts with the teacher, whereas the teacher only initiated 230 with the parent. There were 148 parental visits to the class and 66 teacher visits to the homes. Parents were very proactive in involving themselves in their children's programs.

Another aspect of parent involvement is providing programs that have direct educational and intellectual benefits for the parents themselves. All programs, both center– and home–based, planned and implemented workshops, training sessions, and social events for the parents. Some programs encouraged parents to chaperon field trips and staff found that the field trips provided new experiences for the parents as well as the children. This type of activity attracted more parents than the traditional workshop or training format.

Although at least 1 program required parents to attend parent meetings regularly, other programs allowed the parents to attend on a volunteer basis. The latter programs expressed disappointment that attendance was frequently low.

To guide future programs in producing attractive parent activities, programs were asked to indicate their most successful parent activity, the most successful time of day to schedule an activity, and their advice to others about planning parent activities. The most attractive activities were those which involved getting acquainted, social events, and providing information about kindergarten. The most successful time of day varied from program to program. The advice was unanimous in indicating that parent activities should be "hands on," should involve a great deal of parent involvement and activity, should be planned based on input from the parents themselves, and should not be the traditional academic format in which a leader speaks to a group of participants.

THE FAMILY SERVICES COMPONENT

At the 7 evaluation sites a total of 17 workers provided family services. The titles of the position differ from site to site and are likely to reflect the variety of expectations for this position among the programs. Several additional people who are not employed by the prekindergarten program nevertheless work with the prekindergarten families. DFCS assigned a full time social worker to the prekindergarten program at one of the sites. PEACH assigned a full time social worker to another site. At one site a VISTA volunteer works along with the family services coordinator. At still another site the project manager for The Family Connection and the principal and school social worker contribute time and effort to the prekindergarten families.

The training and experience of the family services workers vary from site to site. Some are trained and experienced social workers. Others are paraprofessionals, parents from the communities which they serve. With the exception of 1 site, paraprofessionals either work with a supervisor or as a part of the family services team.

The goals of the family services workers are very similar across sites. The most frequently cited goals are to help families secure services and become involved with the prekindergarten program. However, the activities of the family services workers vary a great deal from site to site. Variation occurs in caseloads and percentage of time spent with the families. Only a few conduct family needs assessments, track referrals, or follow up on referrals.

Family services workers made many referrals for family members to obtain health and medical, mental health, nutrition and food, housing, child care, adult literacy/continuing education, job training, and other services. Many referrals occurred in the areas of education and job training. In view of the data presented earlier in this report indicating that approximately 50% of the sample children's mothers have never worked and approximately 25% of those who do work are in unskilled labor positions, it is apparent that there is a need for these referrals. One focus of many of the family services coordinators seems to be to facilitate self-sufficiency.

The families in home-based programs were visited weekly. Although the center-based programs varied in the number of visits the family services workers made to the families, across all sites the average number of visits per family was 4.63 for the year.

The family services workers participated in some of the training sponsored by the Georgia Department of Education. Eight of the 17 family services workers attended training in Foundations for the Helping Professions, and 2 who were on their community coordinating councils attended the training in Collaboration. In addition, 1 local site presented training in assertiveness and the EPSDT which benefited the center-based family services worker and the 6 parent educators who also served families. Most of the training presented during 1992-93 was directed to teachers, and very little training was offered to family services coordinators.

THE COORDINATING COUNCIL

All sites had a coordinating council composed of members from various community, social service, and educational agencies. For the purpose of describing the coordinating councils, 2 questionnaires were administered. One was administered to a sample of 32 members selected from the coordinating councils at each of the 7 sites; the other, to all 7 coordinating council chairs.

The coordinating councils differed a great deal from each other. The number of meetings held ranged from 2 to 15. The average length of time members had served ranged from 6 to 13 months; the number of meetings they attended ranged from an average of 2 to an average of 13; and the distance members traveled to attend the meetings ranged from a very short distance to 40 miles.

All chairs reported that neither the mission nor the focus of their coordinating councils had changed since the prekindergarten program began. However, 4 of the 7 chairs indicated that the structure had changed. Members at several sites did not agree on whether the mission, focus, or structure had changed although members in a few sites did agree.

Councils at the different sites appear to have different functions. Some members and chairs report that their coordinating council primarily serves as a policy making body; others report that theirs does not. The councils make policy to varying degrees, and some not at all.

Most respondents indicated that case management is not a primary function of their council. Although most chairs and members report that their councils serve as advisory groups, roughly 14% of the respondents report that their councils do not have this function.

Both members and chairs generally had positive views about the ability of the coordinating council representatives to work together effectively and cooperatively and to accomplish the goals of the council. They generally viewed the council as being composed of agency representatives who had been given some authority by their agencies and who were understanding, effective, and compatible. Most respondents viewed themselves as being personally and professionally effective, and they indicated that they enjoyed their role on the council.

The most salient conclusion is that the coordinating councils are very diverse. This probably indicates that the sites have developed a particular focus, mission, structure, and mode of operation to meet their local needs. In view of the current emphasis on the site–developed approach to solving community problems, rather than a centrally designed set of rules for communities to follow, the coordinating councils appear to be developing in a positive direction.

Chairs and Members generally view their councils and their own contributions in a positive way. Many of the developing councils at the evaluation sites appear to be moving toward collaboration. With more time, they are likely to reach this stage of development.

Discussion

To this point the report has been a factual description based on data obtained from the evaluation sites. This section will include interpretations and questions by the evaluators.

The most striking observation or interpretation is that the prekindergarten program is living up to its intentions and expectations. Program directors, teachers, family services workers, and parents cite example after example of the positive effects it is having on families and children. Observations of the children reveal that they are learning many new things and are enjoying the experience.

We have observed much diversity among the sites, and we tend to view this diversity as indicating that the program fits the needs of the community in which it is located. The families in the rural site which serves children living in single family dwellings with two parents have many educational and social services needs. However, these needs are different from those of the families in the urban site where the classrooms are located in a housing project and most of the children have single mothers who are struggling with a plethora of problems in addition to the financial one. All sites believe that the freedom to design programs which best address the problems in their local communities has been beneficial. While the evaluators agree that this freedom has contributed to the high levels of morale and motivation observed at the sites, they still must raise the following question: are there some aspects of the program that should be standardized across sites?

There is great variation in the educational backgrounds and the experience of both teachers and family services workers. We have observed a high level of dedication and motivation in every employee of this program with whom we have had contact. However, we must ask whether education and experience make a difference. In the classrooms it is standard practice to have 2 teachers. Because 1 is usually more experienced or better trained than the other, 1 can act as a mentor or the 2 can function as a team so that the skills and interests of 1 can supplement those of the other. The Georgia Department of Education sponsors training for teachers, but the sites cannot afford to have all teachers attend this training. For some types of training (e. g. High/Scope) a lead teacher is likely to attend; for other types (e. g. CDA) the assistant teachers are more apt to attend. However, some lead teachers, even those who have a high level of education and experience in teaching young children, attend CDA training; and some assistant teachers attended other types of training. Usually 1 teacher at a site can attend this training and share new ideas with others at the site. One question we have is: should training be required of some teachers, but not others? If so, are there criteria to indicate which teachers should attend which training? Should some teachers even be discouraged from attending certain training programs because of cost ineffectiveness?

Working directly with the entire family is a relatively new function for most schools. Many sites seemed to be defining the role of the family services workers this year. Although the family services workers have similar goals—they all want to do their utmost to help the families—there is much variation among them in education, training for the job, experience, and the activities in which they engage. At some sites it was thought that a professional social worker was necessary for this job. At other sites, a member of the community of parents was thought to have an advantage in that she would be acceptable to and accepted by the parents. While there are advantages to each approach, we must raise the following questions: 1. should there be some basic criteria for training and experience that all family services workers should meet? or 2. should those without training and experience spend a certain period of time working with someone who is trained and experienced? or 3. should more intensive training be provided by the Georgia Department of Education or by the local sites for family services workers?

Our opinion about the coordinating councils, based on the data that we obtained, are that they are off to a good start. They seem to have the right number of participants to foster positive group process. The members believe that both as individuals and agency representatives they are doing an effective job on the council and that the council itself is having an influence in the community. The members also enjoy being on the coordinating council. According to Professor Swan, our consultant on coordinating councils, it is too soon for true collaboration to have developed. Although this requires several years, we see indications of cooperation that is likely to lead to collaboration. However, in view of the parents' concerns, as expressed in the focused interviews, we must raise some questions. Are there any changes the coordinating councils can effect to make the Departments of Health and DFCS more sensitive to the families? In view of our own difficulties in obtaining data, via the programs, from the health department, we must ask if there is some way that the coordinating councils can bring about a greater sense of trust and a higher level of cooperation between the Health Department and the schools. At an even higher level, we wonder if some type of agreement could be reached between the state Department of Health and Department of Education to resolve the issue of access to health information.

We were privileged to hear discussions among some program directors concerning whether parent involvement should be required or voluntary. At least 1 site requires each parent to be involved if the child is to be allowed to continue in the program. Their rationale is that because children benefit most if their parents are involved, and because many children cannot be served, it is unreasonable to continue the ones in the program who have the lowest probability of benefitting while others are deprived of the experience. At other sites it is thought that parent involvement should be voluntary, with the notion that children should not be penalized because of the actions of their parents. It is obvious that for both arguments the focus is on the children. A different way to look at this dilemma is to place the focus on the families, as the program intended, and ask which course of action will have the greatest benefit to families. Will families who do not participate benefit from the program? If families are not willing to participate, should they be excluded so that other families may be served?

We have visited classrooms at every site and have observed busy children, happily learning all kinds of positive things. Many are learning songs, and we even heard 1 group singing "Now I've Said My ABC's," and they did know many letters, even though it was not the goal of the program to teach them. We observed their progress in learning to follow a schedule, to pay attention, to sit quietly and listen, and to share. Their parents report that they "love school" and do not want to miss a day. It appears that these children are developing attitudes about school which will benefit them later when they enter into a more difficult academic arena. Even here, there are questions to be asked. The parents believe that the program should not be limited to low income children. They think because of the income requirement their children are "labeled" as at-risk or disadvantaged. They also express the unselfish notion that other children should not be deprived of this beneficial experience. The questions here are "what should the criteria for eligibility be?" Are the criteria too stringent? Are many children from "working poor" families being excluded? Should some type of survey be conducted to determine whether children who really need this program are ineligible because their parents work and have incomes that put them slightly above the limit? Another question relates to special needs children. Are there any policies concerning their inclusion?

Still another question involves the very sensitive notion that children who do not attend regularly are holding a place in the classroom that might benefit other children who would attend. The attendance data indicated that a significant number of children were chronically absent. Should there be some policy concerning child attendance?

We look forward to continuing our efforts to answer questions such as the ones we have raised here as we follow the progress of Georgia's Prekindergarten Program.

Now we have said our ABC's.

Appendix A

Pilot Program Guidelines

GEORGIA DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
OFFICE OF INSTRUCTIONAL SERVICES

Georgia's Pre-Kindergarten Program

Pilot Program Guidelines

The Division of Curriculum and Instruction of the Georgia Department of Education shall administer the ollowing procedures to ensure effective implementation of the pilot program for at-risk, four-year-old children nd their families.

I. LINKAGES

A local coordinating council shall be formed among the agencies that will be coordinating/providing services to at-risk, four-year-old children and their families. This council shall share responsibility in: (1) the development of the pilot program application; (2) the establishment of collaborations to provide all available services to the children and their families; and (3) the ongoing evaluation and development of the program. The coordinating council shall be composed of at least one parent of a child enrolled, or intending to enroll, in the program and representatives from the local Department of Family and Children Services, local health department, and the local board of education. In addition, entities are encouraged to include other public and private agencies on their coordinating council. Each agency shall be limited to one representative on the council. An established coordinating council that includes the representatives listed above may serve as the coordinating council required by this program.

Collaboration shall occur across agencies serving children and their families. As part of their duties, project personnel shall operate as ombudsmen for the children and families by identifying community services offered by community agencies and volunteer organizations and by facilitating access to those services that are needed.

II. COMMUNITY DESCRIPTION

Grants/contracts will be awarded only to an entity whose community has an identified population of at-risk children. There shall be included in the application evidence of the presence of at-risk children who are not being served by existing preschool programs, the percentage of families in the community below the poverty level and other factors which demonstrate community need for a program.

III. FINANCES

A. FUNDING

Grants or contracts will be awarded to entities through a competitive process. The cost effectiveness of the proposed program will be considered during the review process. Monies are intended to supplement rather than to supplant existing funding sources. Entities eligible to apply for funding include school systems, other public\private non-profit agencies, and private for-profit providers.

EST COPY AVAILABLE

B. LOCAL CONTRIBUTION

The total budget for each program shall consist of 70 percent state funds and 30 percent local funds. In addition to direct local funding (cash match), the local contribution may be in the form of appropriate in-kind services. Such services may include, but are not limited to, space, staff, new or used equipment, copying services, office supplies, food for the program, vehicle usage, telephone equipment and use, donated professional services, and food for program families.

C. BUDGET

A detailed budget shall be submitted with the application delineating funds requested in the areas of curriculum, family support and training, and staff development. In addition, the applying entity shall provide a statement identifying all other financial and in-kind support that will be used in conjunction with this grant. Entities receiving grants/contracts from the Georgia Department of Education shall maintain accounting records that contain information pertaining to the grant/contract and authorizations, obligations, unobligated balances, assets, liabilities, outlays or expenditures, and income. The accounting records shall be supported by proper source documentation.

Accounting records shall also support the 30 percent local match. Time and attendance records must be kept for staff who work multiple programs or activities. Worksheets must be kept to support in-kind support; i.e., space, equipment, photocopy charges, etc. The in-kind support must not have been used to match any other grant the entity may receive, and funding the in-kind funding must be an allowable source.

D. REQUIREMENTS

> Entities shall establish separate accounting procedures and be subject to an annual audit.
> Grant/contracts funds shall not be used for capital outlay or daily transportation of children.

IV. CHILD SELECTION

Children eligible to be served shall be limited to those who are:

A. Four (4) years of age on or before September 1 of the school year and *either*

B. Participants in or income eligible for one of the following:

1. Medicaid
2. AFDC\Food Stamps
3. Women, Infants,and Children (WIC)
4. Child Nutrition Programs
5. Subsidized federal housing

or

'EST COPY AVAILABLE

C. Referred by an agency serving children and their families other than the entity. Such agencies include, but are not limited to, United Way, Health Department, Migrant Program, Homeless Shelters, Salvation Army, or local Department of Family and Children Services.

V. PROGRAM DESCRIPTION

A. PHILOSOPHY, MISSION, AND GOALS -- The foundation program's philosophy, mission, and goals shall be based on developmentally appropriate practices for four-year-old children and coordination of services to the family. The focus shall be on the child in the family.

B. PROGRAM ELEMENTS -- All programs shall include direct services through a variety of options to meet the needs of children and their families. Examples of such options include, but are not limited to, delivery of services Saturdays, evenings, year-round, and/or summer. All programs shall contain the following elements:

1. Curriculum

a. Guiding Principles

The program shall be organized around a developmentally appropriate curriculum and shall be submitted to and approved by the Georgia Department of Education prior to implementation. No part of the program's curriculum funded by this grant/contract shall be religious in nature. The curriculum shall not be a "junior version" of a grade school program, but shall be designed specifically to meet the needs of children four years of age and younger. All programs shall be based on the following assumptions adopted by the National Association for the Education of Young Children (NAEYC):

(1) Children learn best when their physical needs are met and they feel psychologically safe and secure.

(2) Children learn through active involvement with people and materials.

(3) Children learn through social interaction with adults and other children.

(4) Children's learning reflects a recurring cycle that begins in awareness, moves to exploration, to inquiry, and, finally, to utilization.

(5) Children learn through play.

(6) Children's interests and "need to know" motivate learning.

(7) Human development and learning are characterized by individual variation.

b. Delivery

The entity and coordinating council will decide the most appropriate way to deliver services to meet the needs of identified at-risk, four-year-old children and their families. Listed below are several program options.

(1) **Combination**

Services are delivered that incorporate features of some or all of the following models.

(2) **Home-based Delivery**

Services are delivered to children in the home by project personnel. *The total number served should not exceed twelve (12) families per staff member, not including non-service delivery staff.*

(3) **Community-based Delivery**

Services are delivered in a community setting such as a community center, public facility, day-care home, van, or bus. The service provider travels to the at-risk children in this model.

(4) **Center-based Delivery**

Services are provided by program staff in a facility that meets health and safety regulations from the Department of Human Resources. *Each classroom shall have a minimum of one adult for every ten (10) children and shall not exceed twenty (20) children.* Consideration should be given to the coordination of services which address the child care needs of working parents.

(5) **Other**

2. **Coordination of Support**

A variety of community resources shall be utilized to coordinate support services for children and their families.

a. All participating children shall receive a health and developmental (nonacademic) screening such as the Early and Periodic Screening, Diagnosis, and Treatment (EPSDT). Services should be coordinated to meet needs identified through the screening process.

b. If eligible, all programs shall participate in the Child and Adult Care Food Program.

c. Other

3. **Parent Assistance**

Training shall be provided to parents in their role as the most important facilitators of their child's development.

4. **Staff Development**

Program staff shall participate in intensive initial and ongoing staff development as designated by the Georgia Department of Education.

C. PROGRAM EVALUATION – An assessment shall be ongoing in all facets of the program. Most assessment shall focus on the evaluation of program effectiveness. Entities shall conduct ongoing measurement of the progress of the children and their families through the use of qualitative measures such as anecdotal records, interviews,and portfolios. The use of standardized tests may not be the most appropriate method of assessment for the young child. Program participants must agree to utilize the evaluation design and/or instruments prescribed by the Georgia Department of Education.

VI. PERSONNEL

A. REQUIREMENTS

The mission and goals of the program will determine the most appropriate staff. A certified teacher is not a program requirement. Project personnel shall be:

-at least 21 years of age
-a high school graduate or possess the GED equivalent
-experience working with children younger than five years of age
-proficient with communication skills in the children's home language.

B. QUALIFICATIONS

In selecting personnel, entities should seek individuals with knowledge of:

-child development
-developmentally appropriate instructional practices
-family dynamics and family needs
-human diversity
-agencies and resources.

C. OPTIONS

1. **Child and family development specialist** – individual who has received professional level training specific to child development and the child in the family.

2. **Parent educator** -- specially trained individual who provides families with support and training in the areas of developmental characteristics of children younger than five years of age and the family's role in fostering the child's development.

3. **Paraprofessional** -- specially trained individual who holds a Child Development Associate (CDA) credential or has completed an equivalent amount of training in child development or preschool curriculum.

4. **Certified teacher** -- a certified teacher who has received special training in the developmental characteristics of and appropriate instruction for children younger than five years of age.

5. **Other related fields** -- individuals other than those listed above with training and/or experience appropriate to the mission and goals of a particular local program.

The working hours for the staff shall be decided by the needs of the families being served; therefore, flexible staff schedules may be necessary.

VII. ASSURANCES

Upon program acceptance, the following assurances shall be required:

A. A statement from the coordinating council stating that the program will be implemented as described in the guidelines.

B. Compliance with appropriate accounting procedures as established by the Georgia Department of Education and the laws regarding financial disclosures and audits.

C. Documentation of compliance with nondiscriminatory procedures.

D. Statements regarding compliance with the Georgia Department of Education drug-free work place policy.

E. Compliance with the Georgia Department of Human Resources facility licensing requirements if the program is located in a building. Local school systems are exempt from this requirement.

F. Agreement to serve as a program visitation site.

G. Participation of all staff in training/staff development designated by the Georgia Department of Education and that designed by the operating entity.

Appendix B

Data Collection Forms

GEORGIA PRE-KINDERGARTEN EVALUATION PROJECT

Information Sheet

Program Name ____________________

Program Address ____________________ ____________________
Street & No. City County

Program Director ____________________ Phone: (___) ____ _____
(please print)

Day to Day Contact: (If other than Director)

Name. ____________________
(please print)

Job Title/Position ____________________ Phone (___) __________

Address ____________________
____
____

ill you be administering a child development assessment? ___yes ___no

If yes, which one? ____________________

Please attach a list of the names and affiliations of the Coordinating Council Members (If your Council has a chairperson, please identify that individual)

Name & Title	Address	Agency/or Affiliation	Phone

Please attach a list of the children with the following information: (List center-based and home-based children separately)

Name	Sex	Birthdate

Each group of children includes the following number of:

(Center based) ______African Americans ______Caucasian ________Hispanic _______Asian ______Other

(Home based) ______African Americans ______Caucasian ________Hispanic _______Asian ______Other

PLEASE RETURN IN THE ENCLOSED SELF-ADDRESSED ENVELOPE BY FEBRUARY 12, 1993, THANKS!

GEORGIA PREKINDERGARTEN EVALUATION PROJECT
Staff Questionnaire

SITE ______________________________

(If at any time you need more room to include more information than space allows, please use the other side of this sheet and indicate what section of the form that you are referring to. Thank you for your time.)

NAME ____

GENDER ____________________ ETHNICITY _______________

TITLE ____

PREVIOUS JOBS (LIST TITLE OF JOB AND HOW LONG YOU WORKED IN THAT JOB)

JOB TITLE	DATES

EXPERIENCE RELATED TO WORKING WITH YOUNG CHILDREN (LIST EACH EXPERIENCE, YOUR JOB TITLE, HOW LONG YOU WORKED IN THAT JOB)

JOB TITLE	DATES	DESCRIPTION OF EXPERIENCE

LIST BELOW SPECIFIC TRAINING THAT YOU RECEIVED WHILE WORKING IN YOUR PRE-K PROGRAM

TYPE OF TRAINING	TRAINING PROVIDER	LENGTH OF TRAINING	DATES OF TRAINING

LIST BELOW ANY TRAINING THAT YOU HAVE TAKEN ON YOUR OWN THAT HAS NOT BEEN OFFERED BY YOUR PRE-K PROGRAM

TYPE OF TRAINING	TRAINING PROVIDER	LENGTH OF TRAINING	DATES OF TRAINING

PLEASE SEE THE BACK SIDE OF THIS FORM FOR MORE QUESTIONS

EDUCATION (LIST ALL, DATE COMPLETED, DEGREE OR CERTIFICATE EARNED, FOR EXAMPLE, HIGH SCHOOL, GED, TECHNICAL SCHOOL OR PROGRAM, COLLEGE, POST GRADUATE)

LICENSURE/CERTICIATION (PLEASE LIST ANY TACHING CERTIFICATE OR PROFESSIONAL LICENSES THAT YOU HOLD.)

CHILD AND FAMILY INFORMATION

SAMPLE CHILD'S ID #
SITE:
DATE COMPLETED: INITIALS:

SAMPLE CHILD'S PERSONAL INFORMATION

CHILD'S ID#:
CHILD'S DOB:
CHILD'S SEX:
CHILD'S ETHNICITY:
CHILD'S PRIMARY LANGUAGE:
CHILD'S PARENT OR GUARDIAN'S RELATIONSHIP TO THE CHILD:
OTHER NOTES:

FAMILY COMPOSITION: ADULTS IN THE HOME

ADULT'S RELATIONSHIP TO THE SAMPLE CHILD	OCCUPATION AND IF CURRENTLY EMPLOYED	EDUCATION

FAMILY COMPOSITION: CHILDREN IN THE HOME

CHILD'S RELATIONSHIP TO THE SAMPLE CHILD	SEX	AGE

SAMPLE CHILD'S ID #
SITE:
DATE COMPLETED: INITIALS:

SAMPLE CHILD'S HOME INFORMATION
GUARDIAN'S DESCRIPTION OF TYPE OF HOME SINGLE PARENT TWO PARENT MULTI ADULT FOSTER HOME OTHER (DESCRIBE)
FAMILY INCOME LEVEL:
FAMILY'S SOURCES OF INCOME:
SAMPLE CHILD'S HEALTH INFORMATION
CHILD'S LAST PHYSICAL EXAM DATE: WAS THIS EXAM A EPSDT EXAM? YES NO
RESULTS OF LAST EXAM: NORMAL: ABNORMAL FOLLOW UP: BY WHOM: FOLLOW THROUGH: BY WHOM:
IMMUNIZATION RECORDS: (DATE DPT ________ DATE MMR ________)
CHRONIC MEDICATIONS:
OTHER RELEVANT HEALTH INFORMATION:

SAMPLE CHILD'S ID #:
SITE:
DATE COMPLETED: **INITIALS:**

PLEASE LIST ANY OTHER SERVICES THAT THE SAMPLE CHILD IS RECEIVING OR HAD RECEIVED IN DETAIL:

CHILD ETHNICITY CHECKLIST

SITE NAME________________________

ETHNICITY	# OF BOYS	# OF GIRLS
AFRICAN AMERICAN		
ASIAN		
HISPANIC		
WHITE		
OTHER		

MISSING CHILD DATA

MISSING AS OF: (ENTER DATE)
SITE:

CHILD'S NAME	EPSDT EXAM YES OR NO	EPSDT PASS OR FAIL (IF THE CHILD HAS FAILED, PLEASE SPECIFY AREA)	MMR (DATE OF LAST SHOT)	DPDT (DATE OF LAST SHOT)	IF DROPPED

GEORGIA PREKINDERGARTEN EVALUATION PROJECT

Parent Involvement in School Activities Form

SITE ____

Each time a child's parent is somehow involved in school activities, please indicate the child's name, the date the involvement occurred in the appropriate box below. Informal contacts refer to unscheduled discussions with a parent. If you, the teacher initiated the involvement, please make a check in the last column.

CHILD'S NAME	TEACHER CONFERENCES	VOLUNTEERING TO HELP	ATTENDANCE AT PARENT EDUCATION MEETINGS	INFORMAL CONTACTS	CLASSROOM VISITS BY PARENT	HOME VISITS BY TEACHER	CHECK IF TEACHER INITIATED ( )

GEORGIA PREKINDERGARTEN EVALUATION
Service Delivery Record

Site ________________ Family ________________ (CENTER USE)

________________ (PROJECT USE ONLY)

We want to be certain that everything you do for families is recognized. Please use this form to record what you do to help a particular family. We realize that sometimes you might try to obtain a service for the family, but the family does not follow through. We still want your effort on the family's behalf to be recognized. Some families may be inspired by you to obtain some service or achieve some goal even though you did not directly initiate the service or program. (For example, we have heard of parents returning to school as a result of being involved in a home-based program). Please record any such self-initiated activity in the appropriate column.

SERVICE DELIVERY	PERSON REFERRED	SERVICE PROVIDER	DATE REFERRED	DATE SERVICES BEGAN	CHECK ( ) IF SELF INITIATED
Health					
Mental Health					
Nutrition (food)					
Housing					
Utilities					
Clothing or Furnishings					
Education					
Job Training					
Employment Services					
Trans-portation					
Other (describe)					

Dates of Family Service Coordinator's Home Visits:

________, ________, ________, ________, ________,

________, ________, ________, ________, ________.

Program________________________________

Observation Checklist for Classroom Layout

		YES	NO	NP
1.	Children have access to available materials	___	___	___
2.	Children have privacy if desired	___	___	___
3.	Centers have adequate space for several children	___	___	___
4.	Children can play in centers with a minimum of interference from others engaged in other activities	___	___	___
5.	Storage areas are clearly identified and labeled	___	___	___
6.	Similar activities (e.g. blocks, dramatic play) are close together so they can be combined	___	___	___
7.	Areas have adequate artificial lighting	___	___	___
8.	Room has some natural lighting	___	___	___
9.	Areas are near essential supplies (e.g. water, books)	___	___	___
10.	Multicultural pictures, dolls, and/or books are present	___	___	___
.	Children's work is displayed at eye level	___	___	___
12.	Quiet and noisy areas are separated	___	___	___
13.	Areas to store, display children's work are convenient	___	___	___
14.	Emergency and other exits are clear of barriers	___	___	___
15.	Teachers' views of children are free of physical barriers	___	___	___
16.	Children can use most equipment/materials with a minimum of adult assistance	___	___	___
17.	Equipment/materials can be easily moved when necessary	___	___	___
18.	Teacher/caregiver supplies are out of children's reach	___	___	___
19.	Space is available for individual, small-group, and large group activities	___	___	___

Notes:

NP = not present - check this column if condition does not exist for item to be present (e.g. check 'NP' for item 'e' if there are no storage reas at all; check 'no' if there are storage areas but they are not labeled clearly)

Check those areas present in the classroom

Centers:
______ dramatic play (dress up)
______ art
______ manipulatives
______ puzzles
______ blocks
______ home living
______ reading/quiet area
______ listening (e.g. recorder with headphones)
______ science
______ writing
______ large group gathering area
______ computer
______ music (instruments, record player)

Facilities: other: (list)
______ sink (separate from bathroom)
______ bathroom
______ fountain

Equipment:
______ Child-size tables and chairs other: (list)
______ audio
______ television
______ VCR
______ overhead projector
______ projection screen
______ filmstrip projector
ote: ask if items are available, if not present in classroom

Is the room carpeted?
______ entirely ______ are rug(s) only ______ no

Dimensions of the room: ____________________

Classroom is in a ______ school bldg. ______ trailer (school-based)
______ community ctr. housing authority rec. room
______ comm. ctr. recreation dept. rec. room.
______ mobil unit (comm.-based)

Is the classroom on the ground floor? ______ yes ______ no

Ask teacher:
How satisfied are you with your classroom? (1-5)
Why?

How satisfied are you with the building you are in? (1-5)
Why?

ERIC

Is there an outdoor play area? ___________

If yes, check all of the following that apply:

- _______ appropriate equipment for 4-yr. olds
- _______ appears to be safe
- _______ fenced in
- _______ close to 4-year old classroom
- _______ variety of equipment
- _______ equipment is permanent

Overall impression of outdoor play area: ___________
1 (unsatisfactory) - 5 (outstanding)

Notes:

Ask teacher: How satisfied are you with you outdoor play area? (1-5)
Why?

DEVELOPMENTAL ASSESSMENT

Program ____

Does your program do a formal developmental assessment of the children? ______ yes ______ no

If yes, what instrument are you using? ______________________

When did you (or will you) administer this? ________________

Please attach a sheet with the children's social security # (or names, if that is easier) and their developmental results. (Of course we will not disclose **ANY** individuals' results)

Staff Evaluation of Parent Education Activities

Program________________________________

Name of Responder_______________________

Position of Responder_____________________

We are interested in the different types of parent education activities that were offered this year. We'd like to know about the variety of activities conducted as well as your ideas about which ones were most successful.

Please answer the following general questions and then complete the subsequent information for each parent education activity offered this year.

1. Briefly describe the parent education activity that you consider to be your most successful one. What made it so successful?

2. What time(s) of day seemed to work best for the parents?

3. If you were giving advice to a new PreKindergarten program, what would you tell them about planning parent education activities?

(Staff Evaluation of Parent Education Activities - cont'd)

ease complete the next items for each parent education activity you fered this year

Title of activity ______

How many times this was offered? ______

Who led the activity? ______

Is this person a PreKindergarten Program staff member? ______

If not, what agency does he/she work for? ______

How long did the activity last? ______

How many people attended? ______

Title of activity ______

How many times was this offered? ______

Who led the activity? ______

Is this person a PreKindergarten Program staff member? ______

If not, what agency does he/she work for? ______

How long did the activity last? ______

How many people attended? ______

Title of activity ______

How many times was this offered? ______

Who led the activity? ______

Is this person a PreKindergarten Program staff member? ______

If not, what agency does he/she work for? ______

How long did the activity last? ______

How many people attended? ______

QUESTIONNAIRE FOR FAMILY SERVICE COORDINATOR

Administration

1. Who is your immediate supervisor?
Name:____________________________
Title:___________________________

2. Who hires the person who fills your position?
Name:____________________________
Title:___________________________

Functions

3. What are the two most important overall goals of your family services program this year?

4. Do you develop a family services plan for each family? YES___ NO___

5. Do you have a resource file which includes all the service agencies in your community? YES___ NO___

6. How often do the family service coordinator and the teachers meet? YES___ NO___

7. How do you determine when to make family contacts?

8. What is your case load?

9. What percentage of you time is spent with the four-year-old families?

10. Does your program have a formal family needs assessment? YES___ NO___

11. If yes, give a brief description of the system you use or attach a copy of any forms you use.

12. Do you have a system for recording your contacts with families? YES___ NO___

13. Do you have a system for tracking referrals? YES___ NO___

14. Do you have a system for following up referrals? YES___ NO___

Please attach a copy of your job description.

ATTENDANCE SHEET

CHILD'S NAME	# OF ABSENSES

* Please note that forms are due to be mailed back to the Evaluation Project *NO LATER THAN* 2 weeks after the deadline

ERIC
Full Text Provided by ERIC

NUMBER OF HOME VISITS BY TEACHER

CHILD'S NAME	# OF HOME VISITS BY TEACHER

* Please note that forms are due to be mailed back to the Evaluation Project *NO LATER THAN* 2 weeks after the deadline

NUMBER OF PARENT EDUCATION MEETINGS ATTENDED

CHILD'S NAME	# OF PARENT EDUCATION MEETINGS ATTENDED

* Please note that forms are due to be mailed back to the Evaluation Project *NO LATER THAN* 2 weeks after the deadline

INSTRUCTIONS FOR QUESTIONNAIRE FOR COORDINATING COUNCIL CHAIR

Please respond to the items on the attached Questionnaire for Coordinating Council Chairs. For the first eight (lettered) questions, please circle YES or NO and/or supply short written answers. For the remainder of the questions (numbered), please give your opinion by using the rating scale from one to five which appears after each question. On this scale, circle one if you ***strongly disagree*** and circle five if you ***strongly agree*** with the item. Use numbers two, three, and four to express other gradations of your agreement or disagreement with each item. Please make any additional comments that you think would be helpful. Return the questionnaire in the attached envelope. We would appreciate having it back as soon as possible. Thanks for your help.

Site ______________________________

QUESTIONNAIRE FOR COORDINATING COUNCIL CHAIRS

I. **PLEASE ANSWER THE FOLLOWING QUESTIONS IN THE SPACE PROVIDED. FOR ADDITIONAL EXPLANATION USE THE BOTTOM OF THIS PAGE.**

A. What is the average attendance at Coordinating Council meetings?

B. List the dates of the coordinating council meetings from January 1, 1992 to June 1, 1993.

C. Was this committee or a parent committee in existence prior to January, 1992? YES NO

D. Is there a written mission statement and/or list of goals and objectives for the Coordinating Council? YES NO
(If so, please include a copy.)

E. Is there a written agreement between the Coordinating Council and each of the agencies represented concerning the agency's participation? YES NO

F. Does the Coordinating Council have a mutually agreed upon budget? YES NO

G. Has the focus of the Coordinating Council changed since the PreKindergarten program started? YES NO
If so, in what way?

H. Has the mission of the Coordinating Council changed since the Prekindergarten Program started? YES NO
If so, in what way?

I. Has the structure of the Coordinating Council changed? YES NO

If so, in what way?

VI. **FROM YOUR PERSPECTIVE AS CHAIR OF THE COORDINATING COUNCIL, PLEASE CONSIDER EACH OF THE FOLLOWING AS A STATEMENT DESCRIBING YOUR COUNCIL AND DETERMINE THE DEGREE TO WHICH YOU AGREE/DISAGREE THAT IT ACTUALLY DESCRIBES YOUR COORDINATING COUNCIL. CIRCLE THE NUMBER THAT BEST DESCRIBES YOUR OPINION.**

	Strongly Disagree				Strongly Agree
1. There is an undesirable duplication of services among agencies.	1	2	3	4	5
2. Once an issue is brought before the Coordinating Council, a decision is made quickly.	1	2	3	4	5
3. Once a decision is made, it is implemented quickly.	1	2	3	4	5
4. Agencies in the Coordinating Council discharge their responsibilities in a timely manner.	1	2	3	4	5
5. The other members and I make a "team".	1	2	3	4	5
6. When a problem arises, the members work on it agreeably.	1	2	3	4	5
7. When problems arise, the Coordinating Council handles them effectively.	1	2	3	4	5
8. Agencies represented on the Coordinating Council work together effectively outside the meetings.	1	2	3	4	5
9. The members of the Coordinating Council appear to be committed to working collaboratively.	1	2	3	4	5
10. All members of the Coordinating Council have an adequate opportunity to participate in the meetings.	1	2	3	4	5
11. The Coordinating Council primarily serves as a policy making body.	1	2	3	4	5

	Strongly Disagree				Strongly Agree
12. The Coordinating Council primarily deals with individual case management.	1	2	3	4	5
13. The Coordinating Council primarily serves as an advisory group.	1	2	3	4	5
14. The Coordinating Council primarily serves as a way for the Prekindergarten program to influence the community agencies.	1	2	3	4	5
15. An effective system exists to enable any member to bring a policy issue before the Coordinating Council.	1	2	3	4	5
16. Parents and Prekindergaten staff are able to get issues before the Coordinating Council.	1	2	3	4	5
17. Differences of opinion on policy issues can be discussed easily in Coordinating Council meetings.	1	2	3	4	5
18. An effective system exists to permit members to get a case management issue before the Coordinating Council.	1	2	3	4	5
19. Parents and Prekindergarten staff are able to get a case management issue before the Coordinating Council.	1	2	3	4	5
20. Differences of opinion on case management issues can be discussed freely when the issue is appropriate for open discussion.	1	2	3	4	5
21. I have been released from other responsibilities in order to participate in the Coordinating Council meetings.	1	2	3	4	5
22. I have authorization to commit my agency's resources if a decision is needed quickly.	1	2	3	4	5

ERIC
Full Text Provided by ERIC

	Strongly Disagree				Strongly Agree	
23. The Coordinating Council meets in a place that is generally convenient for me.	1	2	3	4	5	
24. I am informed of every meeting of the Coordinating Council well in advance.	1	2	3	4	5	
25. I know all the other members of the Coordinating Council on a first name basis.	1	2	3	4	5	
26. I am familiar with the mission of each agency represented by the other members of the Coordinating Council.	1	2	3	4	5	
27. The agency I represent will modify its procedures in order to work with others to give the best services to children and families.	1	2	3	4	5	NA
28. The agency I represent will risk "bending the rules" to help children and families.	1	2	3	4	5	NA
29. My agency will commit the resources necessary to permit it to work effectively within the Coordinating Council.	1	2	3	4	5	NA
30. I understand the procedures policies of the Coordinating Council.	1	2	3	4	5	and
31. I support the mission of the Coordinating Council.	1	2	3	4	5	
32. I enjoy being part of the Coordinating Council.	1	2	3	4	5	
33. All the other members understand my role on the Coordinating Council.	1	2	3	4	5	
34. There is a clear plan for follow-up once a policy or case management decision is made by the Coordinating Council.	1	2	3	4	5	

	Strongly Disagree				Strongly Agree
33. The Coordinating Council members support the mission of the Coordinating Council.	1	2	3	4	5
34. Coordinating Council members enjoy being a part of the Coordinating Council.	1	2	3	4	5
35. Agencies represented on the Coordinating Council discharge their responsibilities without constant reminders.	1	2	3	4	5
36. I have effective group process skills.	1	2	3	4	5
37. I support the mission of the Coordinating Council.	1	2	3	4	5
38. I enjoy being a part of the Coordinating Council.	1	2	3	4	5
39. Agencies represented on the Coordinating Council are willing to share all the information they have regarding a policy.	1	2	3	4	5
40. Agencies represented on the Coordinating Council make information about families available when needed.	1	2	3	4	5

INSTRUCTIONS FOR QUESTIONNAIRE FOR COORDINATING COUNCIL MEMBERS

Please respond to the items on the attached Questionnaire for Coordinating Council Members. For the first seven (lettered) questions please circle YES or NO and/or supply short written answers. For the remainder of the questions (numbered), please give your opinion by using the rating scale from one to five which appears at the end of each question. On this scale, circle one if you **strongly disagree** and circle five if you **strongly agree** with the item. Use numbers two, three, and four to express other gradations of your disagreement or agreement with each item. Please make any additional comments that you think would be helpful.

Since we do not need to know your name or the name of your agency, we are asking that you respond to this questionnaire anonymously. However, we would like for you to fill in the name of your site. When you finish the questionnaire, place it in the attached self-addressed envelope, seal the envelope, and either return the envelope to your Coordinating Council chair or place it in the mail.

This questionnaire is an important part of the statewide Prekindergarten Program evaluation. We very much appreciate your time and effort.

SITE ______________________________

QUESTIONNAIRE FOR COORDINATING COUNCIL MEMBERS

I. PLEASE PROVIDE A SHORT ANSWER TO EACH QUESTION BELOW.

A. I have been a member of this Coordinating Council for __________ months.

B. I have attended __________ meetings.

C. I travel __________ miles to attend the Coordinating Council meetings.

PLEASE CIRCLE YES OR NO AND PROVIDE A SHORT ANSWER IF NEEDED FOR EACH QUESTION BELOW.

D. Was this Council or a parent committee in existence prior to January, 1992? YES NO

E. Has the focus of the Coordinating Council changed since the Prekindergarten Program started? YES NO
If so, in what way?

F. Has the mission of the Coordinating Council changed since the Prekindergarten Program started? YES NO
If ao, in what way?

G. Has the structure of the Coordinating Council changed since the Prekindergarten Program started? YES NO
If so, in what way?

		Strongly Disagree				Strongly Agree
35.	I feel comfortable contacting the other members of the Coordinating Council outside the meeting times.	1	2	3	4	5
36.	I am an effective participant in the Coordinating Council.	1	2	3	4	5
37.	I feel others enjoy being part of the Coordinating Council.	1	2	3	4	5
38.	Information is easily shared among the agencies represented on the Coordinating Council.	1	2	3	4	5
39.	When I ask for information from another agency, I get accurate information quickly.	1	2	3	4	5

Appendix C

Foundations Training Evaluations

Foundations of the Helping Profession: A Customized Program for Georgia's PreKindergarten

OVERALL EVALUATION FORM

Please rate this workshop by indicating which response best expresses your feelings about the workshop.	EXCELLENT (4)	GOOD (3)	FAIR (2)	POOR (1)	AVERAGE
1. Introduced new information/concepts	82	30	1		3.7
2. Activity(s) reinforced main ideas	91	21			3.9
3. Information presented: a. Utilized interactive methods	85	24			3.8
b. Provided practical/realistic examples	88	22			3.8
c. Was well organized/content well sequenced	97	13	1		3.8
d. Was clear and understandable	99	22			3.8
4. Topic has direct application to my responsibilities	74	33	1		3.8
5. Written materials were helpful	78	32	1		3.6
6. Audiovisuals were helpful	79	27	2		3.7
7. Presenter was effective	99	14			3.8
8. Overall quality of presentation	97	18			3.8

GEORGIA ACADEMY
WORKSHOP EVALUATION FORM

Session Title: Foundations of the Helping Profession: A Customized Program for Georgia's PreKindergarten Program

Academy Presenter: Trainer #1

Date: January 11-15, 1993 (Morris Brown College and North Fulton)

Please rate this workshop by indicating which response best expresses your feelings about the workshop.	EXCELLENT (4)	GOOD (3)	FAIR (2)	POOR (1)	AVERAGE	COMMENTS
1. Introduced new information/concepts	11	2			3.8	
2. Activity(s) reinforced main ideas	11	2			3.8	
3. Information presented: a. Utilized interactive methods	10	3			3.7	
b. Provided practical/realistic examples	11	2			3.8	
c. Was well organized/content well sequenced	10	3			3.7	
d. Was clear and understandable	10	3			3.7	
4. Topic has direct application to my job	8	5			3.6	
5. Written materials were helpful	8	5			3.6	
6. Audiovisuals were helpful	7	5			3.6	
7. Presenter(s) was effective	12				4	
8. Overall quality of presentation	12				4	

GEORGIA ACADEMY
WORKSHOP EVALUATION FORM

Session Title: Foundations of the Helping Profession: A Customized Program for Georgia's PreKindergarten Program

Academy Presenter: Trainer #2

Date: January 11-15, 1993 (Bibb and Lamar Counties)

Please rate this workshop by indicating which response best expresses your feelings about the workshop.	EXCELLENT (4)	GOOD (3)	FAIR (2)	POOR (1)	AVERAGE	COMMENTS
1. Introduced new information/concepts	7	2			3.7	
2. Activity(s) reinforced main ideas	5	4			3.5	
3. Information presented: a. Utilized interactive methods	4	5			3.4	
b. Provided practical/realistic examples	5	4			3.5	
c. Was well organized/content well sequenced	5	3	1		3.4	
d. Was clear and understandable	6	3			3.6	
4. Topic has direct application to my job	6	3			3.6	
5. Written materials were helpful	5	4			3.5	
6. Audiovisuals were helpful	5	3	1		3.4	
7. Presenter(s) was effective	6	3			3.6	
8. Overall quality of presentation	6	3			3.6	

GEORGIA ACADEMY
WORKSHOP EVALUATION FORM

Session Title: Foundations of the Helping Profession: A Customized Program for Georgia's PreKindergarten Program

Academy Presenter: Trainer #3

Date: January 11-15, 1993 (Glynn and McIntosh Counties)

Please rate this workshop by indicating which response best expresses your feelings about the workshop.	EXCELLENT (4)	GOOD (3)	FAIR (2)	POOR (1)	AVERAGE	COMMENTS
1. Introduced new information/concepts	9	5			3.5	
2. Activity(s) reinforced main ideas	10	4			3.7	
3. Information presented: a. Utilized interactive methods	10	3	1		3.6	
b. Provided practical/realistic examples	10	3			3.7	
c. Was well organized/content well sequenced	12	2			3.8	
d. Was clear and understandable	9	5			3.5	
4. Topic has direct application to my job	10	3			3.7	
5. Written materials were helpful	9	5			3.5	
6. Audiovisuals were helpful	9	5			3.5	
7. Presenter(s) was effective	9	5			3.5	
8. Overall quality of presentation	9	5			3.5	

GEORGIA ACADEMY
WORKSHOP EVALUATION FORM

Session Title: Foundations of the Helping Profession: A Customized Program for Georgia's PreKindergarten Program

Academy Presenter: Trainer #4

Date: January 11-15, 1993 (Haralson and Paulding Counties)

Please rate this workshop by indicating which response best expresses your feelings about the workshop.	EXCELLENT (4)	GOOD (3)	FAIR (2)	POOR (1)	AVERAGE	COMMENTS
1. Introduced new information/concepts	3	3			3.5	
2. Activity(s) reinforced main ideas	5	1			3.8	
3. Information presented: a. Utilized interactive methods	4	2			3.6	
b. Provided practical/realistic examples	3	3			3.5	
c. Was well organized/content well sequenced	6				4.0	
d. Was clear and understandable	6				4.0	
4. Topic has direct application to my job	5		1		3.6	
5. Written materials were helpful	4	2			3.6	
6. Audiovisuals were helpful	2	1	1		3.2	
7. Presenter(s) was effective	6				4.0	
8. Overall quality of presentation	5	1			3.8	

GEORGIA ACADEMY
WORKSHOP EVALUATION FORM

Session Title: Foundations of the Helping Profession: A customized Program for Georgia's PreKindergarten Program

Presenter(s): Trainer #5

Date: January 25-29, 1993 (Coweta County and Carrolton County)

Please rate this workshop by indicating which response best expresses your feelings about the workshop.	EXCELLENT (4)	GOOD (3)	FAIR (2)	POOR (1)	AVERAGE
1. Introduced new information/concepts	9	3			3.7
2. Activity(s) reinforced main ideas	10	1			3.9
3. Information presented: a. Utilized interactive methods	10	2			3.8
b. Provided practical/realistic examples	10	1			3.9
c. Was well organized/content well sequenced	10	1			3.9
d. Was clear and understandable	10	1			3.9
4. Topic has direct application to my job	8	2			3.6
5. Written materials were helpful	8	3			3.7
6. Audiovisuals were helpful	10	3			3.7
7. Presenter(s) was effective	10	1			3.9
8. Overall quality of presentation	10	1			3.9

GEORGIA ACADEMY
WORKSHOP EVALUATION FORM

Session Title: Foundations of the Helping Profession: A Customized Program for Georgia's PreKindergarten Program

Presenter(s): Trainer #6

Date: January 25-29, 1993 (Crisp County, Coffee County)

Please rate this workshop by indicating which response best expresses your feelings about the workshop.	EXCELLENT (4)	GOOD (3)	FAIR (2)	POOR (1)	AVERAGE
1. Introduced new information/concepts	8	1			3.8
2. Activity(s) reinforced main ideas	9				4.0
3. Information presented: a. Utilized interactive methods	9				4.0
b. Provided practical/realistic examples	9				4.0
c. Was well organized/content well sequenced	9				4.0
d. Was clear and understandable	9				4.0
4. Topic has direct application to my job	7	2			3.7
5. Written materials were helpful	8	1			3.8
6. Audiovisuals were helpful	8	1			3.8
7. Presenter(s) was effective	9				4.0
8. Overall quality of presentation	9				4.0

GEORGIA ACADEMY
WORKSHOP EVALUATION FORM

Session Title: Foundations of the Helping Profession: A Customized Program for Georgias PreKindergarten Program

Presenter(s): Trainer #7

Date: January 25-29, 1993 (Clarke County, Walton County, Social Circle)

Please rate this workshop by indicating which response best expresses your feelings about the workshop.	EXCELLENT (4)	GOOD (3)	FAIR (2)	POOR (1)	AVERAGE
1. Introduced new information/concepts	6	2	1		3.5
2. Activity(s) reinforced main ideas	6	3			3.6
3. Information presented: a. Utilized interactive methods	7	2			3.7
b. Provided practical/realistic examples	8	1			3.8
c. Was well organized/content well sequenced	9				4.0
d. Was clear and understandable	6	3			3.6
4. Topic has direct application to my job	6	3			3.6
5. Written materials were helpful	7	2			3.7
6. Audiovisuals were helpful	7	1	1		3.6
7. Presenter(s) was effective	9				4.0
8. Overall quality of presentation	9				4.0

GEORGIA ACADEMY
WORKSHOP EVALUATION FORM

Session Title: Foundations of the Helping Profession: A Customized Program for Georgia's PreKindergarten Program

Presenter(s): Trainer #8

Date: February 1-5, 1993 (City of Decatur)

Please rate this workshop by indicating which response best expresses your feelings about the workshop.

	EXCELLENT (4)	GOOD (3)	FAIR (2)	POOR (1)	AVERAGE
1. Introduced new information/concepts	8	2			3.8
2. Activity(s) reinforced main ideas	10				4.0
3. Information presented: a. Utilized interactive methods	10				4.0
b. Provided practical/realistic examples	10				4.0
c. Was well organized/content well sequenced	10				4.0
d. Was clear and understandable	10				4.0
4. Topic has direct application to my job	7	3			3.7
5. Written materials were helpful	10				4.0
6. Audiovisuals were helpful	9	1			3.7
7. Presenter(s) was effective	10				4.0
8. Overall quality of presentation	10				4.0

GEORGIA ACADEMY
WORKSHOP EVALUATION FORM

Session Title: Foundations of the Helping Profession: A Customized Program for Georgia's PreKindergarten Program

Presenter(s): Trainer #9

Date: February 1-5, 1993 (Randolph County, Muscogee County)

Please rate this workshop by indicating which response best expresses your feelings about the workshop.	EXCELLENT (4)	GOOD (3)	FAIR (2)	POOR (1)	AVERAGE
1. Introduced new information/concepts	3	2			3.6
2. Activity(s) reinforced main ideas	5				4.0
3. Information presented: a. Utilized interactive methods	4	1			3.8
b. Provided practical/realistic examples	4	1			3.5
c. Was well organized/content well sequenced	2	3			3.4
d. Was clear and understandable	2	3			3.4
4. Topic has direct application to my job	1	5			3.1
5. Written materials were helpful	2	4			3.3
6. Audiovisuals were helpful	1	4			3.2
7. Presenter(s) was effective	15	1			3.9
8. Overall quality of presentation	13	3			3.8

GEORGIA ACADEMY
WORKSHOP EVALUATION FORM

Session Title: Foundations of the Helping Profession: A Customized Program for Georgia's PreKindergarten Program

Presenter(s): Trainer #10

Date: February 1-5, 1993 (Randolph County, Muscogee County)

Please rate this workshop by indicating which response best expresses your feelings about the workshop.	EXCELLENT (4)	GOOD (3)	FAIR (2)	POOR (1)	AVERAGE
1. Introduced new information/concepts	10	2			3.8
2. Activity(s) reinforced main ideas	12	1			3.9
3. Information presented: a. Utilized interactive methods	9	4			3.0
b. Provided practical/realistic examples	10	2			3.8
c. Was well organized/content well sequenced	11	2			3.38
d. Was clear and understandable	11	2			3.5
4. Topic has direct application to my job	7	6			3.5
5. Written materials were helpful	7	5			3.5
6. Audiovisuals were helpful	10	2			3.8
7. Presenter(s) was effective	15	2			3.8
8. Overall quality of presentation	13	4			3.7

GEORGIA ACADEMY
WORKSHOP EVALUATION FORM

Session Title: Foundations of the Helping Profession: A Customized Program for Georgia's PreKindergarten Program

Presenter(s): Trainer #11

Date: February 1-5, 1993 (Ninth District, Jackson County)

Please rate this workshop by indicating which response best expresses your feelings about the workshop.	EXCELLENT (4)	GOOD (3)	FAIR (2)	POOR (1)	AVERAGE
1. Introduced new information/concepts	11	8			3.5
2. Activity(s) reinforced main ideas	13	5			3.7
3. Information presented: a. Utilized interactive methods	12	5			3.7
b. Provided practical/realistic examples	12	6			3.6
c. Was well organized/content well sequenced	15	2			3.8
d. Was clear and understandable	12	5			3.7
4. Topic has direct application to my job	10	6			3.6
5. Written materials were helpful	12	5			3.7
6. Audiovisuals were helpful	12	5			3.7
7. Presenter(s) was effective	13	3			3.8
8. Overall quality of presentation	14	4			3.7

Appendix D

Collaboration Training Evaluations

GEORGIA ACADEMY
WORKSHOP EVALUATION FORM
FOR GEORGIA'S PRE-KINDERGARDEN PROGRAM

CUMULATIVE

Session Title: Working in Partnership to Serve Children and Families
Date: December 2 & 3, 1992

Please rate this workshop by indicating which response best expresses your feelings about the workshop.	EXC (4)	GOOD (3)	FAIR (2)	POOR (1)	
1. Introduced new information/concepts	41	29	10	3	3.3
2. Activity(s) reinforced main ideas	53	31	3		3.6
3. Information presented: a. Utilized interactive methods	53	25	3		3.6
b. Provided practical/ realistic examples	48	30	7		3.5
c. Was well organized/content well sequenced	56	30	2		3.6
d. Was clear and understandable	54	26	3		3.6
4. Topic has direct application to my job	47	27	5	4	3.4
5. Written materials were helpful	40	39	6	2	3.3
6. Audiovisuals were helpful	32	28	18	2	3.1
7. Presenter(s) was effective	59	27	1		3.7
8. Overall quality of presentation	54	30	2	1	3.6

Working in Partnership to Serve Children and Families
Facilitator Evaluation

e: 12/4/92

Facilitator#1

Process of Facilitation	Excellent 4	Very Good 3	Good 2	Fair 1	Average	Helpful Comments
Attention to Process Ensures Participation, limits dominators, manages process	6	2	1		3.5	
Adaptability Flexible, assists in group creativity, encourages options	7	1	1		3.6	
Efficiency Minimizes wasted time, keeps group on task	6	2	1		3.5	
Attention to Content Ensures group understanding, checks for comprehension of critical choices, RCA	6	2	1		3.5	
Physical Aspects	Excellent 4	Very Good 3	Good 2	Fair 1	Average	Helpful Comments
Physical Presence Gestures, body language, eye contact, posture, appearance	7	2			3.7	
Manner & Voice Directness, assurance, enthusiasm	7	1	1		3.6	
Use of Boards or Charts Uses groups' words, size of print, style, accuracy	3	2			3.6	n/a (x4)

The best thing you did for the group was: Focus our attention to things we had not done previously; Made folks think; Participated and offered expertise; Kept us on task; Lead support and expertise; Encouraging group with our ideas and goals - Positive attitude; Participated but did not dominate

This experience would have been better for me if: We had brought some materials with us; Lighting had been brighter; Room/lighting was better

Recommendation(s) for facilitator's improvement: Very good; Facilities more conducive to learning; None - Did a great job - Helped group look at objectives more intensively

ERIC
Full Text Provided by ERIC

GEORGIA ACADEMY
WORKSHOP EVALUATION FORM

sion Title: Working in Partnership to Serve Children and Families
esenter(s): #4
Date: December 2 & 3, 1992

Please rate this workshop by indicating which response best expresses your feelings about the workshop.	EXCL (4)	GOOD (3)	FAIR (2)	POOR (1)	AVG	COMMENTS
1. Introduced new information/concepts	1	3	4	2	2.3	Especially second day; Already familiar with concepts prior to this meeting;
2. Activity(s) reinforced main ideas	2	7	1		3.1	
3. Information presented: a. Utilized interactive methods	5	5			3.5	
b. Provided practical/ realistic examples	1	7	1		2.7	
c. Was well organized/content well sequenced	2	6	1		2.8	
d. Was clear and understandable	2	7			3.2	
4. Topic has direct application to my job	2	4	1	2		
5. Written materials were helpful		7	1	2		To be shared with other agencies
6. Audiovisuals were helpful	1	2	4	1		
7. Presenter(s) was effective	3	7				Very pleasant, non-threatening.
8. Overall quality of presentation		8	1	1		

- Trainer had knowledge of her materials, but we needed different level of collaboration. Session moved slower than usual.

- Material did not reach level at which our collaborative already operates.

- The presenter w[illegible]d - SHe was flexible and able to allow each group to move at their own pace, yet continued to keep on task. Topics & materials were not at the level of development of our team members - We needed more advanced topics/materials.

- Could have been geared higher, as group was well into collaboratives.

- The Academy underestimated the expertise of this group and presented information too basic for our needs. Presenter could have been more prepared at first, bu then got better and was very good on second day. I thought she was very personable.

- Group overall was more advanced than curriculum.

GEORGIA ACADEMY
WORKSHOP EVALUATION FORM

sion Title: Working in Partnership to Serve Children and Families
resenter(s): #6
Date: December 2 & 3, 1992

Please rate this workshop by indicating which response best expresses your feelings about the workshop.	EXCL (4)	GOOD (3)	FAIR (2)	POOR (1)	AVG	COMMENTS
1. Introduced new information/concepts	14	2			3.8	Some duplication of past training.
2. Activity(s) reinforced main ideas	14	2			3.8	
3. Information presented: a. Utilized interactive methods	12	4			3.7	
b. Provided practical/ realistic examples	13	3			3.8	
c. Was well organized/content well sequenced	14	2			3.8	
d. Was clear and understandable	15	1			3.9	
4. Topic has direct application to my job	10	6			3.6	I'm not the boss.
5. Written materials were helpful	10	6			3.6	
6. Audiovisuals were helpful	10	6			3.6	Did not take quite enough time on these.
7. Presenter(s) was effective	16				4	Excellent facilitator
8. Overall quality of presentation	16				4	

- Conference was excellent! Looking forward to the next one!
- Excellent - Outstanding workshops!
- Trainer was well prepared. Excellent job in presenting material.
- Very good workshop and instructor.
- Excellent presentation. Thanks!

GEORGIA ACADEMY
WORKSHOP EVALUATION FORM

sion Title: Working in Partnership to Serve Children and Families
senter(s): #8
Date: December 2 & 3, 1992

Please rate this workshop by indicating which response best expresses your feelings about the workshop.	EXCL (4)	GOOD (3)	FAIR (2)	POOR (1)	AVG	COMMENTS
1. Introduced new information/concepts	9	4			3.7	Some was review, but was still helpful.
2. Activity(s) reinforced main ideas	11	3			3.8	Time allotted for some was too long.
3. Information presented: a. Utilized interactive methods	13	1			3.9	
b. Provided practical/ realistic examples	10	4			3.7	
c. Was well organized/content well sequenced	13	1			3.9	Yes - But too laborious!; Some seemed too long and drawn out.
d. Was clear and understandable	9	3	1		3.6	
4. Topic has direct application to my job	9	4		1	3.5	
5. Written materials were helpful	11	3			3.8	
6. Audiovisuals were helpful	6	7			3.5	
7. Presenter(s) was effective	11	3			3.8	I was able to learn much from this workshop!; Yes - Even though her feet hurt!
8. Overall quality of presentation	11	3			3.8	Excellent presentation

- Wish we had some time to get together by function (all parents, DFCS, etc.)
- Very informative and should help council be successful in their attempt to improve the quality of life in our community.
- An excellent, worthwhile experience!
- I really enjoyed the way Pam conducted these sessions. She did a great job!
- Pam was fine, but the schedule she had to follow was too slow and the content too laborious
- I'm so excited about having the Academy for good training. We've enjoyed having you as our trainer!
- Very good instructor. Knows her subject well. Very attractive - smartly dressed.
- You did a wonderful job!

  Pam is a great facilitator!
- Pam has excellent interpersonal skills! She listens and respects each person's opinion.
- Pam - Thanks for the long hours!

ERIC
Full Text Provided by ERIC

GEORGIA ACADEMY
WORKSHOP EVALUATION FORM

sion Title: Working in Partnership to Serve Children and Families
esenter(s): #9
Date: December 2 & 3, 1992

Please rate this workshop by indicating which response best expresses your feelings about the workshop.	EXCL (4)	GOOD (3)	FAIR (2)	POOR (1)	AVG	COMMENTS
1. Introduced new information/concepts	6	14	4		3	Repetitious of previous training
2. Activity(s) reinforced main ideas	14	11	2		3.3	Change exercise 5 - NFA redesign.
3. Information presented: a. Utilized interactive methods	14	11	3		3.4	
b. Provided practical/ realistic examples	10	12	5		3.2	
c. Was well organized/content well sequenced	13	12	1		3.5	
d. Was clear and understandable	13	12	2		3.4	
4. Topic has direct application to my job	12	9	4	1	3.2	Would have preferred more info on application of "higher level" aspects of collaboration.
5. Written materials were helpful	8	16	3		3.2	
6. Audiovisuals were helpful	7	11	9		2.9	
7. Presenter(s) was effective	12	14	1		3.4	
8. Overall quality of presentation	11	15	1		3.2	Good presentation, but I feel most of our group is beyond the basic introductory level

- Quality of presenter and material was excellent, however it appeared a bit simplistic.
- Change the last handout and provide one for each student.
- Information will also be beneficial in team building activities as we evolve into a TQM philosophy.
- Workshop needs to be limited to one day. Some activities seemed to be "fillers" and "stretchers" - added nothing to digestion on materials.

GEORGIA ACADEMY
WORKSHOP EVALUATION FORM

Session Title: Working in Partnership to Serve Children and Families
nter(s): #10
: December 2 & 3, 1992

Please rate this workshop by indicating which response best expresses your feelings about the workshop.	EXCL (4)	GOOD (3)	FAIR (2)	POOR (1)	AVG	COMMENTS
1. Introduced new information/concepts	6	5	2		3.3	Limited by project curriculum
2. Activity(s) reinforced main ideas	8	4	1		3.5	
3. Information presented: a. Utilized interactive methods	8	4			3.7	
b. Provided practical/ realistic examples	8	3		1	3.7	
c. Was well organized/content well sequenced	8	5			3.6	
d. Was clear and understandable	8	4	1		3.5	
4. Topic has direct application to my job	8	4		1	3.5	
5. Written materials were helpful	4	6	2		3.5	
6. Audiovisuals were helpful	4	6	2	1	3	
7. Presenter(s) was effective	10	3			3.8	
8. Overall quality of presentation	8	4			3.7	

- Curriculum needs to be more flexible and take individual group members' abilities/skills more into consideration.
- These ratings do not reflect the presenter's performance (with the exception of 7 & 8). I would have liked to have had input into the structure of this 3 day workshop. I don't feel like the information presented is what I/our group needed. We are actively working toward collaboration and we have many pieces in place. We need time and space to continue working.
- Participant input was welcomed and utilized. Kitty was flexible in order to assure that all groups' needs were met.
- I appreciate Kitty's manner and professionalism. She is a great presenter!
- Conversations about what each of us were doing, barriers faced, community groups and their growth and change was very helpful. This workshop made me think about what we are doing with collaboration.
- Kitty was an excellent facilitator - Her demeanor was non-threatening, accepting, supportive.
- Kitty is an excellent presenter. She was fair and extremely flexible. I feel the conference days were a bit too long.
- The curriculum was too basic. Thanks to our flexible trainer, Kitty, we were able to make changes to meet our group's needs.
- She was very flexible in adapting the material to the need of the group, considerate of the needs, and had a desire to be informative and cooperative.
- I enjoyed the workshop, but it could possibly be streamlined to some degree.

ERIC Full Text Provided by ERIC

GEORGIA ACADEMY
WORKSHOP EVALUATION FORM

ion Title: Working in Partnership to Serve Children and Families
nter(s): #11
te: December 2 & 3, 1992

Please rate this workshop by indicating which response best expresses your feelings about the workshop.	EXCL (4)	GOOD (3)	FAIR (2)	POOR (1)	AVG	COMMENTS
1. Introduced new information/concepts	5	5		1	3.2	Presenter did well with introducing information, but information was not new to me because of my research background
2. Activity(s) reinforced main ideas	4	7			3.3	
3. Information presented: a. Utilized interactive methods	7	4			3.6	
b. Provided practical/ realistic examples	6	5			3.5	
c. Was well organized/content well sequenced	6	5			3.5	Very much so!
d. Was clear and understandable	7	2			3.7	Very!
4. Topic has direct application to my job	6	4			3.6	I feel I will be able to represent my agency better
5. Written materials were helpful	7	4			3.6	Yes - But not error free; Misspelled words/incorrect grammar; Yes - add fewer; Yes - Some need editing for spelling, etc.
6. Audiovisuals were helpful	4	3	3		3.1	Liked visuals about Wagner families; Yes- Add color next time; Not many used
7. Presenter(s) was effective	7	3			3.7	Very effective!; Yes, but maybe needs to speak louder; Needed to speak louder
8. Overall quality of presentation	8	3			3.7	The training program was very beneficial

- I may be misinterpreting the question on area #1. If the issue is did the presenter introduce new informationwell then I would change the answer to #1. If question #1 refers to new information, then leave answer as is. However, I did a lot of research for my dissertation, so this modle is generally appropriate and right on target for counties' needs.

- The overall program was very beneficial.

- I am most impressed with the Georgia Academy for Children and Youth, Inc. This was my first experience with this group. I think having a guide that has errors in it is really bad. It makes me think that there is a "weak link" in the chain. I find it offensive.

- Excellent job!

- Good facilitator.

CUMULATIVE

Working in Partnership to Serve Children and Families
ilitator Evaluation

Date: 12/4/92

Process of Facilitation	Excellent 4	Very Good 3	Good 2	Fair 1	Average
Attention to Process Ensures Participation, limits dominators, manages process	48	19	6		3.6
Adaptability Flexible, assists in group creativity, encourages options	55	13	5		3.7
Efficiency Minimizes wasted time, keeps group on task	48	18	5	1	3.6
Attention to Content Ensures group understanding, checks for comprehension of critical choices, RCA	50	17	6		3.6
Physical Aspects	Excellent 4	Very Good 3	Good 2	Fair 1	Average
Physical Presence Gestures, body language, eye contact, posture, appearance	52	17	4		3.7
Manner & Voice Directness, assurance, enthusiasm	54	13	5	1	3.6
Use of Boards or Charts Uses groups' words, size of print, style, accuracy	48	14	4		3.7

Working in Partnership to Serve Children and Families
Facilitator Evaluation

e: 12/4/92

Facilitator: #4

Process of Facilitation	Excellent 4	Very Good 3	Good 2	Fair 1	Average	Helpful Comments
Attention to Process Ensures Participation, limits dominators, manages process	3	4	2		3.1	
Adaptability Flexible, assists in group creativity, encourages options	7	1	1		3.6	
Efficiency Minimizes wasted time, keeps group on task	6	2		1	3.4	
Attention to Content Ensures group understanding, checks for comprehension of critical choices, RCA	6	2	1		3.5	
Physical Aspects	Excellent 4	Very Good 3	Good 2	Fair 1	Average	Helpful Comments
Physical Presence Gestures, body language, eye contact, posture, appearance	5	3	1		3.4	
Manner & Voice Directness, assurance, enthusiasm	6	2	1		3.5	
Use of Boards or Charts Uses groups' words, size of print, style, accuracy	6	2	1		3.5	

The best thing you did for the group was: Being felxible with the group - Encouraging us to make our own issues very neat; Made suggestions and provided ideas; Being flexible with group's individual needs; Great role model; let us out early; Participated in goals & objectives

This experience would have been better for me if: More from our county had been here; If all members of our council were present; training was on a more advanced level; I could have attended all three days - Maybe make the workshop shorter next time;

Recommendation(s) for facilitator's improvement:

ERIC Full Text Provided by ERIC

Working in Partnership to Serve Children and Families
Facilitator Evaluation

Facilitator: #5

te: 12/4/92

Process of Facilitation	Excellent 4	Very Good 3	Good 2	Fair 1	Average	Helpful Comments
Attention to Process Ensures Participation, limits dominators, manages process	2	4	1		3.14	
Adaptability Flexible, assists in group creativity, encourages options	1	4	2		2.85	
Efficiency Minimizes wasted time, keeps group on task	2	2	2		3	no response
Attention to Content Ensures group understanding, checks for comprehension of critical choices, RCA	2	3	2		3	Your attention to content was appreciated!
Physical Aspects	Excellent 4	Very Good 3	Good 2	Fair 1	Average	
Physical Presence Gestures, body language, eye contact, posture, appearance	3	2	2		3.14	
Manner & Voice Directness, assurance, enthusiasm	3	2	2		3.14	
Use of Boards or Charts Uses groups' words, size of print, style, accuracy	3		2		3.2	n/a, n/a

The best thing you did for the group was: Tried to add input; Gave directions/questions to clarify; Shared mt ideas; Kept group on task (x2); Faciliated inter-group discussion; Periodically checked our work; Helped us set goals and become a working unit

This experience would have been better for me if: We had been asked to bring our proposal (x3); We had been able to have all our representatives present

Recommendation(s) for facilitator's improvement: None - all was good; I enjoyed the seeion - a terrific learning xperience; Have all groups share at all levels of the workshop

Working in Partnership to Serve Children and Families
Facilitator Evaluation

Facilitator: #6

ate: 12/4/92

Process of Facilitation	Excellent 4	Very Good 3	Good 2	Fair 1	Average	Helpful Comments
Attention to Process Ensures Participation, limits dominators, manages process	4	2			3.6	
Adaptability Flexible, assists in group creativity, encourages options	5	1			3.8	
Efficiency Minimizes wasted time, keeps group on task	3	3			3.5	
Attention to Content Ensures group understanding, checks for comprehension of critical choices, RCA	3	2	1		3.3	
Physical Aspects	Excellent 4	Very Good 3	Good 2	Fair 1	Average	Helpful Comments
Physical Presence Gestures, body language, eye contact, posture, appearance	4	2			3.6	
Manner & Voice Directness, assurance, enthusiasm	4	2			3.6	
Use of Boards or Charts Uses groups' words, size of print, style, accuracy	3	3			3.5	

The best thing you did for the group was: You as an instructor, making sure we understood what was expected of us as far as collaboration and planning; Kept us on task and presented information in a very professional manner; Reviewed workplans and suggested places that needed clarification; Stayed focused, which carried the message of importance of the three day activity as it related to helping children and families - Thanks!; Encouraged us to strive harder to accomplish our goals

This experience would have been better for me if: I had worn sweats; We had done it earlier in the year; I could ave been assured it was okay to wear jeans/casual clothes; It was too much in too little time - The day was really o long!

Recommendation(s) for facilitator's improvement: None - very good instructor; Not much room for improvement from my perspective! - Thanks for making a difficult task manageable and pleasant!; Excellent

Working in Partnership to Serve Children and Families
Facilitator Evaluation

Facilitator: #8

e: 12/4/92

Process of Facilitation	Excellent 4	Very Good 3	Good 2	Fair 1	Average	Helpful Comments
Attention to Process Ensures Participation, limits dominators, manages process	6	2	1		3.5	
Adaptability Flexible, assists in group creativity, encourages options	7	1	1		3.6	
Efficiency Minimizes wasted time, keeps group on task	4	4	1		3.3	
Attention to Content Ensures group understanding, checks for comprehension of critical choices, RCA	7	1	1		3.6	
Physical Aspects	Excellent 4	Very Good 3	Good 2	Fair 1	Average	Helpful Comments
Physical Presence Gestures, body language, eye contact, posture, appearance	7	2			3.7	
Manner & Voice Directness, assurance, enthusiasm	7	2			3.7	
Use of Boards or Charts Uses groups' words, size of print, style, accuracy	7	2			3.7	

The best thing you did for the group was: Helped us organize thinking (material); Allowed us to use the skills we have learned and gave us direction as needed; Gave us direction to meet together to talk, plan, share information without the interruption of being in our home county; Kept us on task and on schedule; Helped us to finish our mission and start our tasks; Kept us focused on task

This experience would have been better for me if: We had more parents attend; I had been more involved in the council before this training; I had been involved from the very beginning in our project;

Recommendation(s) for facilitator's improvement: Excellent presentation ny the facilitator - Much was learned during the workshop; Thanks for all your help and your good attitude; Everything was just great!; Today was very helpful to help us take the time to get our plan done away from responsibilities at home; The session was very helpful and provided council the opportunity to outline our golas and objectives without interruption. This could not have been accomplishedat the local level without constant interruption and could not have been completed in timely manner

Working in Partnership to Serve Children and Families
Facilitator Evaluation

Facilitator: #9

te: 12/4/92

Process of Facilitation	Excellent 4	Very Good 3	Good 2	Fair 1	Average	Helpful Comments
Attention to Process Ensures Participation, limits dominators, manages process	4	1	1		3.5	
Adaptability Flexible, assists in group creativity, encourages options	6				4	
Efficiency Minimizes wasted time, keeps group on task	4	1	1		3.5	
Attention to Content Ensures group understanding, checks for comprehension of critical choices, RCA	4	2			3.6	
Physical Aspects	**Excellent 4**	**Very Good 3**	**Good 2**	**Fair 1**	**Average**	**Helpful Comments**
Physical Presence Gestures, body language, eye contact, posture, appearance	6				4	
Manner & Voice Directness, assurance, enthusiasm	5	1			3.8	
Use of Boards or Charts Uses groups' words, size of print, style, accuracy	6				4	

The best thing you did for the group was: Very good critical feedback; Participated openly & honestly; Helped us get past obstacles; Kept us on target; Shared feelings openly

This experience would have been better for me if: I knew what the training involved - However, it was most useful; All of my group had stayed and participated

Recommendation(s) for facilitator's improvement:

ERIC

Working in Partnership to Serve Children and Families
Facilitator Evaluation

Facilitator: #10

Date: 12/4/92

Process of Facilitation	Excellent	Very Good	Good	Fair	Average	Helpful Comments
Attention to Process Ensures Participation, limits dominators, manages process	6				4	
Adaptability Flexible, assists in group creativity, encourages options	6				4	Very adaptable - group oriented;
Efficiency Minimizes wasted time, keeps group on task	6				4	
Attention to Content Ensures group understanding, checks for comprehension of critical choices, RCA	6				4	Allowed group to establish own facilitator, assured rotation, assisted when needed;
Physical Aspects	Excellent	Very Good	Good	Fair	Helpful Comments	
Physical Presence Gestures, body language, eye contact, posture, appearance	6				4	
Manner & Voice Directness, assurance, enthusiasm	6				4	
Use of Boards or Charts Uses groups' words, size of print, style, accuracy	6				4	

The best thing you did for the group was: Allowed the group to change the formats if needed to meet group needs - not facilitor's; Let us work on what we needed to do; Let us move at our own pace

This experience would have been better for me if: There was more of a sharing process - It was too curriculum oriented; We could have done it in Athens; We could have known our assignment ahead of time so that we could have brought with us any helpful materials

Recommendation(s) for facilitator's improvement: ______________________

Working in Partnership to Serve Children and Families
Facilitator Evaluation

Date: 12/4/92

Facilitator #11

rocess of Facilitation	Excellent 4	Very Good 3	Good 2	Fair 1	**Average**	Helpful Comments
Attention to Process Ensures Participation, limits dominators, manages process	4	2			3.6	
Adaptability Flexible, assists in group creativity, encourages options	2	4			3.3	
Efficiency Minimizes wasted time, keeps group on task	3	3			3.5	
Attention to Content Ensures group understanding, checks for comprehension of critical choices, RCA	3	3			3.5	

Physical Aspects	Excellent 4	Very Good 3	Good 2	Fair 1	**Average**	Helpful Comments
Physical Presence Gestures, body language, eye contact, posture, appearance	2	3	1		3.1	
Manner & Voice Directness, assurance, enthusiasm	2	2	1	1	2.6	
Use of Boards or Charts Uses groups' words, size of print, style, accuracy	2	3	1		3.1	

The best thing you did for the group was: Really got everyone motivated and involved in using critical thinking; Assisted as well as lead and guided; Created a team that will work well for children and families; MAci was very attentive to group activities - She was encouraging and supportive; Showed patience; Kept us on tak and worked with us to complete the task

This experience would have been better for me if: Lunch was brought in on planning day; We had more time; It was closer to Decatur; We caould have been seated in a circle on days 1&2; It could have been over an extended period of time

Recommendation(s) for facilitator's improvement: Everything was very well done and well recieved; Do more in keeping group on task; Extend training to 4 days instead of 3 days; The facilitator is very laid back - Almost too much so at times

Foundations of the Helping Profession: A Customized Program for Georgia's PreKindergarten Program

OVERALL EVALUATION FORM

Please rate this workshop by indicating which response best expresses your feelings about the workshop.	EXCELLENT (4)	GOOD (3)	FAIR (2)	POOR (1)	AVERAGE
1. Introduced new information/concepts	82	30	1		3.7
2. Activity(s) reinforced main ideas	91	21			3.9
3. Information presented: a. Utilized interactive methods	85	24			3.8
b. Provided practical/realistic examples	88	22			3.8
c. Was well organized/content well sequenced	97	13	1		3.8
d. Was clear and understandable	99	22			3.8
4. Topic has direct application to my responsibilities	74	33	1		3.8
5. Written materials were helpful	78	32	1		3.6
6. Audiovisuals were helpful	79	27	2		3.7
7. Presenter was effective	99	14			3.8
8. Overall quality of presentation	97	18			3.8