

DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 055 029

SP 005 240

AUTHOR Scates, Malcolm
TITLE An Evaluation of P.R.O.B.E. A Program for the Recruitment of Beginning Educators. Part I, Part II, Part III.
INSTITUTION District of Columbia Public Schools, Washington, D.C.
SPONS AGENCY District of Columbia Public Schools, Washington, D.C. Model School Div.
PUB DATE Oct 70
NOTE 70p.
EDRS PRICE MF-\$0.65 HC-\$3.29
DESCRIPTORS *Beginning Teachers; Inservice Teacher Education; Interpersonal Competence; Program Evaluation; Reading Instruction; *Teacher Orientation; Teaching Methods; *Urban Schools
IDENTIFIERS Title V EPDA

ABSTRACT

The major objective of PROBE is to provide the beginning teacher with the support, assistance, and training needed for success during the initial stages of a career in teaching. The program--in the Model School Division--provides a 2-week period of intensive training and orientation prior to the opening of school, continuing individual support and assistance throughout the year, and three 1-day released-time workshops during November, December, and January. The content of the program consists of human relations skills, methods of teaching reading and diagnosing reading difficulties, and resource use. Each stage of the program was evaluated by the three-member staff and 35 participants on its success in these areas. The results of the evaluation questionnaires indicated that the program was largely successful in attaining its objectives. Suggestions for improvement included lengthening the program, providing more direct contact with children, and expanding the program to include all new teachers. A problem noted in participants' reactions was that although all the teachers were new to the Model Schools Division, some had had previous teaching experience and thus had different concerns and interests than the beginning teachers. (The report includes copies of the evaluation questionnaires used and tables of responses to each item.) (RT)

ED0 55029

DC
SP

AN EVALUATION OF
P.R.O.B.E.
A PROGRAM FOR THE RECRUITMENT OF
BEGINNING EDUCATORS
PART I
PART II
PART III

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH,
EDUCATION & WELFARE
OFFICE OF EDUCATION
THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRO-
DUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM
THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIG-
INATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPIN-
IONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY
REPRESENT OFFICIAL OFFICE OF EDU-
CATION POSITION OR POLICY.

Prepared by
Department of Research and Evaluation
Division of Planning, Innovation and Research
October 1970

Malcolm Scates
Washington, D.C.

August 17 - 28, 1970

PART I

A Program for the Recruitment and
Orientation of Beginning Educators
was funded under

EPDA, TITLE V, SECTION B-2

Sponsored by
the
Model School Division

Public Schools of the District of Columbia

Superintendent of Schools
Deputy Superintendent for Instruction
Asst. Superintendent, Model School Division

Hugh J. Scott
Norman W. Nickens
Gilbert A. Diggs

* * * * *

Division of Planning, Innovation and Research
Department of Research and Evaluation

Division Head -

Mildred P. Cooper

Secretary -

Rozelia M. Stewart

Evaluation Team

Educational Research and Evaluation Assoc.
Coordinator
Educational Research and Evaluation Assoc.
Educational Research Asst.

Herman Cobb, Jr.
Josefina Cardenas
Joyce [unclear]

* * * * *

PROBE

Director
Instructor
Instructor
Supervising Director of Teacher Education
Model School Division
Project Director Innovation Team

Annie Neal
Patricia Greer
Beryle Cherney

Anne Pitts
Irvin Gordy

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	iv
	Page
LIST OF TABLES	iv
Chapter	
I. INTRODUCTION.....	1
Background and Rationale	1
Program Objectives	2
Purpose of Study	3
Delimitations	3
II. PROCEDURE	3
Sample	3
Instruments	4
Collection of Data	4
Analysis of Data	4
III. RESULTS	4
IV. DISCUSSION	18
V. CONCLUSIONS	19
VI. RECOMMENDATIONS	20
VII. APPENDIXES	
A. Staff Program Evaluation Form	21
B. Participants' Program Evaluation Form	26

LIST OF TABLES

	<u>Page</u>
I. Staff Ratings of How Well Program Objectives Were Met	6
II. Staff's Responses As to How Well Certain Topics Were Covered	7
III. Staff's Overall Rating of the Program	8
IV. Comments Made By the Staff	9
V. Staff Response to Continuous Support	10
VI. Participants' Ratings of How Well Program Objectives Were Met	11
VII. Participants' Responses to the Methods of Instruction Used	12
VIII. Participants' Responses to the Major Aspects of the Program	13
IX. Participants' Ratings of the Overall Program	14
X. Comments Made By the Participants	15
XI. Participants' Responses to Continuous Support	16
XII. Participants' Suggestions for Improving the Program	17

INTRODUCTION

This is an interim report (Part I) of Phase I and II "A Program For The Recruitment and Orientation of Beginning Educators (PROBE)". Phase I was a two-week period of intensive preservice training and orientation prior to the opening of school and the assumption of teaching duties - August 17-28, 1970. Phase II is a program of "continuous support" involving direct assistance and in-service training throughout the academic year. Phase III (Part II of the Report) will consist of three workshop days of release time during the months of November, December and January.

Background and Rationale

PROBE was the product of the efforts of the Model School Planning Committee. The major area of emphasis within the Model School Division has been the planning and implementation of programs designed to develop and upgrade the professional staff. In recent years the concern has been focused upon developing a strategy for preventing "new teacher failures" and increasing the possibilities for success and satisfaction for the new entrants to the teaching profession. The previous Orientation Program for new teachers, 1969-70, provided four (4) half-day sessions. Teacher comments following the program indicated the value of the program, but also noted that the period was too short and the area of greatest need was reading.

Program Objectives

- A. The major goal of the program is to provide the beginning teacher with the support, assistance, and training needed for success during the initial stages of a career in teaching.
- B. The Specific Objectives are:
 1. To provide a program of staff support and development that is intensive, continuous, and responsive to the specific, individual needs and concerns of the new teacher.
 2. To increase the interpersonal awareness needed for dealing effectively with children and adults in the inner city school. The aim is to provide teachers with human relations skills which enable them to focus on their own roles and actions, and how they affect children as learners. Specific skills stressed will be:
 - a. Skill to hear and communicate with other people
 - b. Skill to understand and comprehend interpersonal relationships
 - c. Skill in the flexibility and capacity to accept and respond to change
 - d. Establishing trust in the capacity of others

3. To develop skill in using varied approaches, materials, and equipment in the teaching of reading skills. The program will acquaint the teachers with three approaches to the teaching of reading and will aim to make distinctions clear between these and the basal reader method with which teachers will be familiar. The specific reading approaches in which teachers will develop competencies include:
 - a. Individualized Reading - Individualized reading approaches will be employed which emphasize the organization of classroom and materials for individual pacing, choice, and learning styles.
 - b. Language Experience - Language experiences will be provided which relate to the children's oral language and its development as the core for building reading skill. This program emphasized oral language, writing, the use of materials, activities, and audio-visual equipment to enrich experiences and become the subject for language practice.
 - c. Linguistic - Linguistic-based basal readers, and the theories of linguistics and dialect which can be applied in wide-ranging, flexible programs in oral and written language will be utilized.
4. To train teachers in organizing students for individual learning.
This will be approached through:
 - a. Instruction in the physical arrangement of classrooms.
 - b. Instruction in the use of reading laboratories, listening centers, science laboratories, mathematical learning centers in a classroom focused on individual learning.
5. To provide teachers with skills as follows:
 - a. Ability to diagnose reading difficulties of pupils, using simple tests and diagnoses of errors.
 - b. Ability to decide on the basis of this and general observation of children, appropriate methods and growth aims for the individual needs.
6. To assist beginning teachers in developing an effective and productive teaching style.
7. To develop the teacher's competencies in the use of the following resources:
 - a. Workshops
 - b. Innovation Team Members
 - c. Resource people within the system (supervisors, special teachers, etc.)

- d. Other teachers
- e. Parent and community people
- f. Outside consultants
- g. Professional materials, e.g., books, articles, etc.

The major goal (A) is on-going and will be obtained through Phases I, II and III. Under B, specific objectives numbers 1, 6 and 7 also are on-going objectives, involving all three phases of the orientation program. Specific objectives number 2, 3, 4 and 5 were covered by Phase I, and are not necessarily on-going objectives of the total program.

Purpose of study

This report, (Part I), will attempt to make an assessment of Phase I, a two-week orientation program, and a part of Phase II, a continuing support program, based on the objectives stated. Part II will follow. Part II will be concerned with Phase II and Phase III, (one day follow-up workshops) of the orientation program.

Delimitations

The task here is to try to make an assessment of Phase I of the program after its completion. Therefore the evaluation is limited to the responses of the director, the two instructors and the participants in the two week orientation program.

PROCEDURE

Description of Sample

Eligibility requirements for participants are shown here as they were stated in the proposal.

- A. Participants in the program will be beginning teachers in the Model School Division, The number will be limited to 35.
- B. Recruitment will have been accomplished by the Personnel Office in the Model School Division with the hiring of new teachers during the preceding months.
- C. All teaching personnel with less than one semester of teaching who are not recent graduates of teacher education institutions will be eligible for participation in this program. In keeping with the philosophy of the Model School Division and the emphasis on the prevention of reading failure, priority will be given to primary grade teachers, especially those assigned to first grade.
- D. Substitutes who have rendered satisfactory service and who have not worked more than fifty percent of the time the previous year will also be eligible. They must be interested in a career in teaching.
- E. All will file written applications. The PROBE Committee will make the final selection.

From the applications received, the PROBE Committee selected 30 new teachers and 6 substitutes to participate in the program. During the follow-up evaluation an instrument will be designed to determine the extent to which these participants met the above requirements. This data will be reported in Part II of the evaluation report, which will be released at a later date.

Instruments

Two program evaluation forms were devised by the Department of Evaluation. These were the Participants' Program Evaluation Form and the Staff Program Evaluation Form. (See appendixes A and B). Questions on these forms were geared to obtain the individual's feelings on how well each program objective was met. Items also were included to get information concerning program content, attendance, methods of instruction, continuous support, overall program rating and suggestions for improving the program.

Collection of Data

A personal, unstructured interview was held with the supervising director of teacher education, Model School Division and with the program director of PROBE to get the necessary background material. A staff evaluation form was delivered to the director and the two instructors of PROBE for completion. A participants' evaluation form was delivered to 33 of the 36 participants in the program for completion. Three of the substitutes could not be located at the time.

Methodology and Analysis of Data

Data obtained on the program evaluation form were tabulated. Total responses for each item are shown. Means and percentages were computed where appropriate and presented in tabular form.

RESULTS

Staff Program Evaluation

A completed program evaluation was received from each of the three staff member. Part A concerned the program objectives. The items are listed below.

A. Objectives

1. The orientation program increased:
 - a. awareness of children's reading needs
 - b. ability to hear and communicate with other people
 - c. ability to understand and comprehend interpersonal relationships
 - d. ability to accept and respond to change
 - e. ability to establish trust in the capacity of others

2. Developed skill in
 - a. using the Individual Reading approach
 - b. using the Language Experience approach
 - c. using the Linguistic approach
 - d. organizing students for individual learning
 - e. diagnosing reading difficulties
 - f. using reading inventories
 - g. determining appropriate reading methods for individual needs
 - h. creating learning centers or stations
 - i. the physical arrangement of classrooms
 - j. making materials

3. Developed competencies in the use of the following resources:
 - a. workshops
 - b. Innovation Team Members
 - c. resource people within the system
 - d. other people
 - e. parents and community people
 - f. outside consultants
 - g. professional materials, e.g., books, articles, etc.
 - h. audio visual aids

The staff indicated how well the program met each of the above items. Their ratings were based on the following scale. The results are shown in Table I.

Totally	To A Great Degree	To some Extent	Not At All	No Response
1	2	3	4	0
(1 - 1.4)	(1.5 - 2.4)	(2.5 - 3.4)	(3.5 - 4.4)	

TABLE I

Staff Ratings of How Well Program Objectives Were Met.

Item Number	Single Item Mean	Number of Responses				
		1	2	3	4	0
1.a.	2.0		3			
b.	2.0		3			
c.	3.0			3		
d.	2.3		2	1		
e.	2.6		1	2		
2.a.	2.6		1	2		
b.	2.0		3	2		
c.	2.3		2	1		
d.	2.0	1	1	1		
e.	1.3	2	1			
f.	1.3	2	1			
g.	1.6	1	2			
h.	2.0		3			
i.	2.0		3			
j.	2.0		3			
3.a.	2.0		3			
b.	2.0		2			1
c.	2.3		2	1		
d.	2.6		1	2		
e.	3.0			3		
f.	3.0			3		
g.	2.0		3			
h.	1.3	2			1	
Mean (All Items)		2.2				

Part B of the staff evaluation form indicates the staff ratings on how well the program covered certain topics. Their responses are shown in Table II. Following the table are some general comments made by the staff supporting their responses.

TABLE II

Staff's Response as to How Well Certain Topics Were Covered

Topics	Very Well	Fairly Well	Poorly	Not At All	No Response
1. Information	3				
2. Skills	3				
3. Experiences	2	1			
4. Attitude Formation		3			
5. Project Development	2				1
Percentages of total response	67	27	0	0	7

Comments:

1. Information and skills were the main topics of emphasis.
2. Teachers wanted needed skills for carrying on a reading program.
3. Teachers were interested in information about the Clark proposal and the Model School Division.
4. A wealth of information was shared with the participants to enable them to identify their basic needs.

In part C of the staff evaluation form the staff indicated the attendance of the participants during the two week program as being 90 to 100 percent.

Part D has to do with evaluation during the program. Following are the staff comments concerning evaluation during the two week program.

1. What, if any, on-going evaluation was there?

Answers:

1. There was periodic evaluation between staff and participants to assess needs and to determine if changes in the program were necessary.
2. A daily assessment of the program was made by the staff.
2. Results of the evaluation if any:

Answers:

1. Changes in the daily sessions were made to meet varying needs of the group.

2. An overall evaluation at the end of the program by staff and participants indicated that the program met about 90 percent of the needs stated in the beginning.

The staff gave an overall rating of the program by using the following scale. This scale compared part E of the evaluation form. See Table III.

SCALE

Excellent			Good			Fair			Poor		
12	11	10	9	8	7	6	5	4	3	2	1

TABLE III

Staff's Overall Rating of the Program

Rating	Value	Number of Responses
Excellent	12	0
Excellent	11	1
Excellent	10	2
Good	9 - 7	0
Fair	6 - 4	0
Poor	3 - 1	0
Mean 10.3		

Part F of the staff evaluation form provided the staff the opportunity to make comments about the program as a whole. These comments are shown in Table IV.

TABLE IV

Comments Made by the Staff

Comments	Number of Responses
1. No Comment	1
2. This, of course, was the first time for such a program. It was very valuable for participants and staff. The staff was able to become to know the strengths and weaknesses of the new teachers and prepare for follow-up assistance in the classroom.	1
3. The group was very enthusiastic and anxious to see materials and strategies for teaching skills and concepts. The participants utilized resources within the group and were very anxious to share previous experiences with others in the group.	1
Total	3

Part G of the staff evaluation form obtained the staff's assessment of the amount of continuous support given the participants following the two week program. This is presented in the following Table.

TABLE V

Staff Response To Continuous Support

	Has Been Given	Available Not Requested	Not Available	Will Be Available Later
1. Direct assistance	3			
*2. In-service training				3
3. Close supervision	3			
4. Individual conferences	3			
*5. Workshops	2			1
6. Demonstration	3			
7. Acquisition of needed materials	3			
8. Other support services	3			
Percentages of total response	83	0	0	17

* Comments by the staff were made on these two items.

1. The first one day workshop is scheduled for November 2, 1970. All participants will attend.
2. Some participants have already been involved in in-building training sessions.

Participants' Program Evaluation

Completed evaluation forms were returned by 30 of the 33 participants who received the forms for completion. Part A of the participants' form, covering the objectives of the program, was identical to Part A of the Staff Form (see page 4 for the items). The participants indicated their feelings on how well the program met its objectives using the scale below. The results are shown in Table VI.

SCALE

Totally	To A Great Degree	To Some Extent	Not At All	No Response
1 (1 to 1.4)	2 (1.5 to 2.4)	3 (2.5 to 3.4)	4 (3.5 to 4.4)	0

TABLE VI

Participants' Ratings of How Well Program Objectives Were Met

Item Number	Single Item Mean	Number of Responses				
		1	2	3	4	0
1.a.	1.8	7	16	6	1	0
b.	2.0	8	15	6	1	0
c.	2.1	7	14	7	2	0
d.	2.0	7	15	4	3	1
e.	1.9	8	15	4	2	1
2.a.	2.4	3	15	10	2	0
b.	2.0	8	15	6	1	0
c.	2.4	6	10	10	4	0
d.	2.5	3	11	14	2	0
e.	2.1	8	12	10	0	0
f.	2.1	9	10	11	0	0
g.	2.4	4	14	9	3	0
h.	1.8	13	10	7	0	0
i.	2.4	6	10	9	5	0
j.	1.7	12	14	4	0	0
3.a.	1.8	9	18	3	0	0
b.	1.4	17	13	0	0	0
c.	1.9	8	16	6	0	0
d.	2.4	3	12	15	0	0
e.	2.6	4	8	13	5	0
f.	2.8	1	11	11	7	0
g.	2.1	6	17	5	2	0
h.	1.7	12	11	6	0	1
Mean (All Items)		2.1				

Part B of the participants' evaluation form was designed to get the participants' reactions as to the effectiveness of the methods of instruction used during the program. The methods were rated using the same scale used for rating the objectives in Part A. The results are shown in Table VII.

TABLE VII

Participants' Responses To The Methods of Instruction Used

Methods of Instruction	Single Item Mean	Number of Responses				
		1	2	3	4	0
1. Demonstrations	1.5	16	13	1	0	0
2. Lecture	1.8	8	17	4	0	1
3. Laboratory Experiences	1.9	7	18	5	0	0
4. Discussion Groups	1.5	16	13	1	0	0
5. Readings	2.2	5	14	8	2	1
6. Writing	2.4	5	10	13	2	0
7. Attitude Statements	1.9	6	16	6	0	2
8. Video Tape	2.2	7	13	7	3	0
9. Instructional Television Project Equipment	2.3	4	10	10	4	2
10. Films	2.3	6	10	13	1	0
Mean (All Items)		2.1				

In part C the participants indicated their satisfaction or dissatisfaction with the major aspects of the program. The results are shown in Table VIII.

TABLE VIII

Participants' Response To The Major Aspects of The Program

Item	Very Satisfied	Moderately Satisfied	Not Satisfied	No Response
1. Leadership	27	2	1	0
2. Subject Matter	23	6	1	0
3. Program Plan	20	9	1	0
4. Instruction	23	6	1	0
5. Materials	24	6	0	0
6. Facilities	22	7	1	0
Percentages of Total Responses	77	20	3	0

The participants' overall ratings of the total program are shown in Table IX. This information was supplied in Part D of the evaluation form. The scale used in this rating is shown below.

SCALE

Excellent			Good			Fair			Poor		
12	11	10	9	8	7	6	5	4	3	2	1

TABLE IX

Participants' Ratings of The Overall Program

Rating	Value	Number of Responses
Excellent	12	2
	11	5
	10	10
Good	9	8
	8	1
	7	0
Fair	6	2
	5	2
	4	0
Poor	3 - 1	0
Mean 10.7		

Part E offered the participants the opportunity to give comments about the program as a whole. All comments are listed below with the number of times each comment was made. The percentages of total comments are also shown.

TABLE X

Comments Made By The Participants

Comments	Number of Responses	Percentages of Total Responses
1. No comment	14	41
2. Very interesting and rewarding, helped me become a more effective teacher.	5	15
3. Enjoyed the program, hope to get another opportunity to enroll in a similar program.	3	9
4. The program should be continued for another year.	2	6
5. Was not relevant to preschool teachers. They should have been excluded.	1	3
6. The rapport and perceptiveness of the leaders and the warmth of the participants overcame the limitations of time and materials and made the program successful.	1	3
7. The leaders were great in providing solutions to classroom problems.	1	3
8. It is rare to find a program of this nature move so smoothly and in such a defined way.	1	3
9. Teaching math through discovery, as demonstrated, was most useful to me.	1	3
10. Excellent for beginning teachers. I am looking forward to the follow-up.	1	3
11. Helped in some areas more than my college method courses.	1	3
12. Would like to be contacted by the follow-up team.	1	3
13. The instructors were great, but as far as the workshop meeting any of the needs I have now, it didn't help much. Could have been more specific.	1	3
14. PROBE gave far too little actual first hand experience with children.	1	3
Totals	34	101

In Part F the participants indicated the extent to which they had received continuous support from the Innovation Team since the two week program through October 2, 1970. The Table below gives the results.

TABLE XI

Participants' Responses To Continuous Support

	A Great Deal	Some	Not Any		No Response
			None Requested	Requested Not Received	
1. Direct assistance	3	14	13	0	0
2. In-service training	4	4	20	0	2
3. Close supervision	1	6	20	0	3
4. Individual Conferences	3	5	22	0	0
5. Workshops	2	3	24	0	1
6. Demonstrations	3	4	22	0	1
7. Acquisition of needed materials	3	14	8	5	0
8. Other support ser- vices	2	6	17	0	5
Percentages of Total Responses	9	23	61	2	5

In part G of the program evaluation, the participants made suggestions for improving the program. All suggestions are listed below. The number of times each suggestion was made and the percentage of total suggestions are shown below.

TABLE XII

Participants' Suggestions for Improving The Program

Suggestions	Number of Responses	Percentages of Total Responses
1. No Suggestion	16	47
2. Longer program to provide more time for each aspect.	4	12
3. Include more time for actual work with children.	2	6
4. Make the program available to all new teachers regardless of their background in education.	2	6
5. Continue the program.	2	6
6. Provide small group instruction by grade levels.	1	3
7. Include daily written evaluation.	1	3
8. Provide more specific skills in reading approaches.	1	3
9. Emphasize the children's ways of life; how to meet needs of problem children and non-readers.	1	3
10. More classroom follow through to help with long range planning, especially in mathematics.	1	3
11. Part of PROBE should be extensive work with reading and mathematics and the other half geared to give teachers first hand experience with children.	1	3
12. Continue to re-orient participants at subsequent sessions, presenting the latest techniques and revisions.	1	3
13. Greater scrutiny in the selection of participants.	1	3
Totals	34	101

DISCUSSION

The responses of both staff and participants indicated that the program objectives were met. The mean of the participants' rating of objectives being met was 2.1. The staff mean rating was 2.2. Each mean falls into the "To A Great Degree" category on the rating scale. See Tables I and VI. Rated lowest by the staff, in the "To Some Extent" category were: The orientation program increased ability to understand and comprehend interpersonal relationships (mean 3.0); Developed competencies in the use of the following resources - other people (mean 2.6), parents and community people (mean 3.0), and outside consultants (mean 3.0). Rated lowest by the participants, in the "To Some Extent" category were: Developed skill in organizing students for individual learning (mean 2.5); Developed competencies in the use of the following resources - parents and community people (mean 2.6), and outside consultants (2.8).

94% of the staff's response indicated that all of the topics in the program was covered fairly well or better. See Table II.

Participants attendance was good throughout the program. It was indicated to be between 90 and 100 percent. This seems to indicate the degree of interest in the program.

Although the staff said there was periodic evaluation between staff and participants, one staff member suggested there be daily written evaluation.

In the overall rating of the program the staff's mean was 10.3. The participants' mean was 10.7. Both means fall into the "Excellent" category on the rating scale used. See Tables III and IX.

The staff indicated that continuous support has been given. Thirty-two percent of the participants stated that they have received continuous support. Sixty-one percent had not requested any. Of the remaining 7 percent, 5 percent did not respond to the question. The remaining 2 percent indicated that they had requested support, but had not received it. This 2 percent amounted to 5 people who requested help in acquiring needed materials, but as of the 2nd of October the materials had not arrived. Seventeen of the participants did receive some needed materials. See Tables V and XI.

The participants rated the methods of instruction in the program as effective to a great degree (mean 2.1). Demonstrations and discussion groups got the highest rating (mean 1.5). See Table VII.

Ninety-seven percent of the participants were satisfied with the major aspects of the program. See Table VIII. Of the twenty comments made by the participants only three were negative. See Table X. The main suggestions were for longer programs, more time allotted for working directly with children and continuing the program including all new teachers. See Table XII.

CONCLUSIONS

The data indicates that the large majority of people involved in the program said the program:

1. Provided the support, assistance and training needed for success during the initial stages of a career in teaching.
2. Increased the interpersonal awareness needed for dealing effectively with children.
3. Developed skill in using varied approaches, materials and equipment in the teaching of reading skills.
4. Helped to train new teachers in organizing students for individual learning.
5. Provided the participants with skills necessary for diagnosing reading difficulties.
6. Developed competencies in the use of workshops, Innovation Team Members, resources and materials.

In general the responses indicate that the program achieved many of its objectives. It should be noted that the results of this evaluation were based on an anonymous evaluation form which should have reduced any perceived obligation on the part of the respondents to appear more favorably disposed toward the program than was truly the case.

RECOMMENDATIONS

Comments and suggestions for improving the program leads to the following recommendations:

1. Whenever possible, teachers should be given more opportunity to work with children in actual training situations.
2. Teachers should have more opportunity to become effective in using consultants.
3. More direct contact with parents and community people would be helpful to new teachers.
4. Specific information should be geared to the kindergarten and preschool teachers. Instructional breakdown by grade levels might be helpful.

APPENDIX A

Staff Program Evaluation Form

A Program For The Recruitment and Orientation of Beginning Educators

Staff Program Evaluation

(Directors, Instructors, Consultants)

Number _____

Date _____

This is a follow-up evaluation of the training program held August 17 through 28. Please complete this form thoughtfully and return it to the Division of Planning, Research and Evaluation, Room 1013, 415 - 12th Street, N. W. Thank you.

A. Objectives:

Indicate the extent to which the orientation program's objectives were met by using the following rating: 1 = Totally; 2 = To a great degree; 3 = To some extent; 4 = Not at all.

1. The orientation program increased:

- a. awareness of children's reading needs _____
- b. ability to hear and communicate with other people _____
- c. ability to understand and comprehend interpersonal relationships _____
- d. ability to accept and respond to change _____
- e. ability to establish trust in the capacity of others _____

2. Developed skill in

- a. using the Individual Reading approach _____
- b. using the Language Experience approach _____
- c. using the Linguistic approach _____
- d. organizing students for individual learning _____
- e. diagnosing reading difficulties _____
- f. using reading inventories _____
- g. determining appropriate reading methods for individual needs _____
- h. creating learning centers or stations _____

2. (continued)

i. the physical arrangement of classrooms _____

j. making materials _____

3. Developed competencies in the use of the following resources:

a. workshops _____

b. Innovation Team Members _____

c. resource people within the system _____

d. other people _____

e. parents and community people _____

f. outside consultants _____

g. professional materials, e.g., books, articles, etc. _____

h. audio visual aids _____

B. Program Content

Indicate with an "X" in the appropriate column, how well the program operated in providing the following:

	<u>Very Well</u>	<u>Fairly Well</u>	<u>Poorly</u>	<u>Not at All</u>
1. Information	_____	_____	_____	_____
2. Skills	_____	_____	_____	_____
3. Experiences	_____	_____	_____	_____
4. Attitude Formation	_____	_____	_____	_____
5. Project Development	_____	_____	_____	_____

Comments _____

C. Attendance

How would you ~~rate~~ the attendance for the program? Indicate with an "X" in the appropriate space.

- _____ 90 to 100 percent
- _____ 90 to 95 percent
- _____ 85 to 90 percent
- _____ 80 to 85 percent
- _____ 75 to 80 percent
- _____ Less than 75

D. Evaluation during the two weeks

1. What if any on-going evaluation was there?

Results of the evaluation if any:

E. Record your overall evaluation of the two-week orientation program as a whole by placing an "X" in the appropriate box on the scale.

Excellent			Good			Fair			Poor		
12	11	10	9	8	7	6	5	4	3	2	1

F. Comments:

G. Continuous Support

To what extent is the following services being offered the participants since August 28? Indicate with an "X" in the appropriate column.

	<u>Has Been Given</u>	<u>Available Not Requested</u>	<u>Not Available</u>	<u>Will Be Available Later</u>
1. Direct assistance	_____	_____	_____	_____
2. In-service training	_____	_____	_____	_____
3. Close supervision	_____	_____	_____	_____
4. Individual conferences	_____	_____	_____	_____
5. Workshops	_____	_____	_____	_____
6. Demonstration	_____	_____	_____	_____
7. Acquisition of needed materials	_____	_____	_____	_____
8. Other support services	_____	_____	_____	_____

APPENDIX B

Participants' Program Evaluation Form

A Program For The Recruitment and Orientation of Beginning Educators
Participants' Program Evaluation

Number _____

Date _____

This is a follow-up of the training program held August 17 through 28. It is an important means of enlarging and upgrading programs of this type. Please help us by completing this form thoughtfully, and returning it to the Division of Planning, Research and Evaluation, Room 1013, 415 - 12th Street, N. W. Thank you.

A. Objectives:

Indicate the extent to which the orientation program's objectives were met by using the following rating: 1 = Totally; 2 = To a great degree; 3 = To some extent; 4 = Not at all.

1. The orientation program increased:

- a. awareness of children's reading needs _____
- b. ability to hear and communicate with other people _____
- c. ability to understand and comprehend interpersonal relationships _____
- d. ability to accept and respond to change _____
- e. ability to establish trust in the capacity of others _____

2. Developed skill in:

- a. using the Individual Reading approach _____
- b. using the Language Experience approach _____
- c. using the Linguistic approach _____
- d. organizing students for individual learning _____
- e. diagnosing reading difficulties _____
- f. using reading inventories _____
- g. determining appropriate reading methods for individual needs _____
- h. creating learning centers or stations _____

2. (continued)

i. the physical arrangement of classrooms _____

j. making materials _____

3. Developed competencies in the use of the following resources:

a. workshops _____

b. Innovation Team Members _____

c. resource people within the system _____

d. other people _____

e. parents and community people _____

f. outside consultants _____

g. professional materials, e.g., books articles, etc. _____

h. audio visual aids _____

B. Program Subject Instruction:

Indicate the degree of effectiveness of the following instructional methods used in the orientation program by using the following rating:
1 = Totally; 2 = To a great degree; 3 = To some extent; 4 = Not at all.

1. Demonstrations _____

2. Lecture _____

3. Laboratory Experiences _____

4. Discussion Groups _____

5. Readings _____

6. Writing _____

7. Attitude Statements _____

8. Video Tape _____

9. Instructional Television Project equipment _____

10. Films _____

C. To what extent were you satisfied with the following aspects of the orientation program. Place an "X" in the appropriate column.

	<u>Very Satisfied</u>	<u>Moderately Satisfied</u>	<u>Not Satisfied</u>
1. Leadership	_____	_____	_____
2. Subject Matter	_____	_____	_____
3. Program Plan	_____	_____	_____
4. Instruction	_____	_____	_____
5. Materials	_____	_____	_____
6. Facilities	_____	_____	_____

D. Record your overall evaluation of the orientation program as a whole by placing an "X" in the appropriate box on the scale.

<u>Excellent</u>			<u>Good</u>			<u>Fair</u>			<u>Poor</u>		
12	11	10	9	8	7	6	5	4	3	2	1

E. Comments

F. Continuous Support

Since August 28 until the present time, to what extent have you received the following: Indicate with an "X" in the appropriate column.

	<u>A Great Deal</u>	<u>Some</u>	<u>Not Any</u>	
			<u>None Requested</u>	<u>Requested Not Received</u>
1. Direct assistance	_____	_____	_____	_____
2. In-service training	_____	_____	_____	_____
3. Close supervision	_____	_____	_____	_____

F. Continuous Support (continued)

	<u>A Great Deal</u>	<u>Some</u>	<u>Not Any</u>	
			<u>None Requested</u>	<u>Requested Not Received</u>
4. Individual Conferences	_____	_____	_____	_____
5. Workshops	_____	_____	_____	_____
6. Demonstrations	_____	_____	_____	_____
7. Acquisition of needed materials	_____	_____	_____	_____
8. Other support services	_____	_____	_____	_____

G. Suggestions

Please list any suggestions for improving the orientation program.

PART II

A Program for the Recruitment and
Orientation of Beginning Educators
was funded under

EPDA, TITLE V, SECTION B-2

Sponsored by
the
Model School Division

Public Schools of the District of Columbia

Superintendent of Schools
Deputy Superintendent for Instruction
Asst. Superintendent, Model School Division

Hugh J. Scott
Norman W. Nickens
Gilbert A. Diggs

* * * * *

Division of Planning, Innovation and Research
Department of Research and Evaluation

Division Head -
Secretary -

Mildred P. Cooper
Rozelia M. Stewart

Evaluation Team

Educational Research and Evaluation Assoc.
Coordinator
Educational Research and Evaluation Assoc.
Educational Research Asst.

Herman Cobb, Jr.
Josefina Ordonez
Joyce Leader

* * * * *

PROBE

Director
Instructor
Instructor
Supervising Director of Teacher Education
Model School Division
Project Director Innovation Team

Annie Neal
Patricia Greer
Beryle Cherney

Anne Pitts
Irvin Gordy

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	Page
LIST OF TABLES	iv
I. INTRODUCTION	1
Background	1
Purpose of Study	1
Program Objectives	1
II. PROCEDURE	2
Sample	2
Instruments	2
Collection of Data	2
Analysis of Data	2
III. RESULTS	2
IV. DISCUSSION	16-18
V. SUMMARY AND CONCLUSIONS	19
VI. RECOMMENDATIONS	20
VII. APPENDIXES	
A. Questionnaire	22-24
B. Observation Checklist	26

List of Tables

	Page
I. Age Range of Workshop Participants	3
II. Types of Degrees Held by Workshop Participants	3
III. Grade Level Workshop Participants are Currently Teaching	4
IV. Teaching Experience of Workshop Participants	5
V. Length and Location of Service of Workshop Participants with Prior Teaching Experience	6
VI. Types of Grouping Used In Classroom Activities by Workshop Participants	7
VII. Reading Approaches Used by Workshop Participants	8
VIII. Participants' Opinions About the Extent to Which the Workshop Met Their Present Teaching Needs	9
IX. Participants' Responses to Overall Practices In Their Teaching Experiences	11-12
X. Total Value of Responses to Overall Practices In Teaching Experiences	13
XI. The Means and t-score of Participants' Responses	13
XII. Responses to Changes In Teaching Methods and Techniques	14
XIII. Participants' Special Concerns Not Met by One-day Workshop	14
XIV. Ways in Which the Workshop Can Better Meet Participant Needs	15

INTRODUCTION

Background

This report is Part II of an evaluation of a Program for the Recruitment and Orientation of Beginning Educators (PROBE). Part I covered the two-week summer session held in August 1970, known as Phase I of the Program. This report covers the first of three one-day workshops which make up Phase III of the PROBE program. Phase II of the program is one of continuous support and is included in both parts of the evaluation report.

Purpose of Study

The purpose of this report is to make an assessment of the one-day workshop held on November 2, 1970 and to see to what extent the needs and concern of the participants were met in the workshop.

Program Objectives

1. The major goal of the program (PROBE) is to provide the beginning teacher with the support, assistance, and training needed for success during the initial stages of a career in teaching.
2. The specific objective is to provide a program of staff support and development that is intensive, continuous, and responsive to the specific, individual needs and concerns of the new teacher.

In keeping with these objectives, PROBE participants were asked to list areas of special needs and concerns they would like to have covered in the one-day workshop. Lists received were compiled by the workshop staff. The areas of greater concern were found to be:

1. Individualizing reading instruction
 - a. Handling heterogenous grouping
 - b. Reading skills
 - c. Planning enrichment activities
2. Individualizing mathematics instruction
 - a. Handling heterogenous grouping
 - b. Skills to be taught on specified levels
 - c. Planning enrichment activities

Due to the one-day time limitation, staff focused the workshop on these specific concerns. The instructions were presented through the use of a film, a lecture, a demonstration, group discussion and small group activities.

EVALUATION PROCEDURES

Sample

The one-day workshop was intended to serve the thirty-six educators previously enrolled in the two week PROBE summer program of which thirty of the participants were regular teachers in the Model School Division and six were substitutes teachers in the Model School Division. Only twenty-nine of the regular teachers and two of the substitutes attended the one-day workshop. Substitutes were obtained by the Model School Division to hold the classes of the regular teachers attending the workshop.

Instruments

A questionnaire was constructed for completion by the participants. An observation checklist was also constructed for the observers.

Collection of Data

The observation checklist was used by each of two evaluators who attended the one-day workshop. At the end of the workshop, time was allotted for each participant to complete a questionnaire. In order to insure anonymity, names were not used on the questionnaires. It was hoped that this would lead to a freer expression on the part of the participants.

Analysis of Data

Information from the two instruments was compiled and is described in narrative form and in tables. Percentages and means were computed. A t-test was used to test for significance on the section that called for "Before" and "After" responses by participants.

RESULTS

PART I

The following results were compiled from the questionnaire administered to the participants. (See Appendix A.)

The first part of the questionnaire was designed to get background information relevant to each participant.

Table I shows the age range of the participants.

TABLE I

Age Range of Workshop Participants

Age Range	Number of Participants
20-30	25
30-40	6
40+	0
Total	31

Table II shows the types of degrees held by the participants.

TABLE II

Types of Degrees Held by Workshop Participants

Degree	Number of Participants
B.A. or B.S.	21
M.A.	8
M.F.A.	1
M.H.L.	1
Total	31

Table III gives a breakdown of the present grades taught by the participants.

TABLE III

Grade Level Workshop Participants Are Currently Teaching

Grade Level	Number of Participants
Pre-Kindergarten	2
Kindergarten	2
1	3
2	6
3	6
4	3
5	4
5-6 (Combined)	1
6	2
Substitute K-6	2
Total	31

Table IV shows a breakdown of the participants into categories according to their prior teaching experience both within the Model School Division and outside the Model School Division. The outside of the Model School Division experience is shown in three categories: in the District of Columbia, in other U.S. Cities; and Overseas. In the discussion of the results this data will be compared with the selection criteria for the PROBE program.

TABLE IV

Teaching Experience of Workshop Participants

Categories of Experience	Number of Participants
I. New Teachers in the Model School one semester experience or less	
A. 2 months only	12
B. 2 months plus 1 semester or less	3
II. Teachers new to the Model School Division with more than one semester prior experi- ence	
A. in the District of Columbia	2
B. in other U. S. Cities	9
C. overseas	1
III. Teachers with more than one semester prior experience in the Model School Division	2
IV. Substitutes	2
Total	31

Categories two and three of Table IV are examined in greater detail in Table V which gives the breakdown of participants' prior experience in The Model School Division; District of Columbia, other than The Model School Division; Other Cities; Overseas; and Total Experience.

TABLE V

Length and Location of Service of Workshop
Participants with Prior Teaching Experience

No. Years	In Model School Division	D. C. other Than M.S.D	Other Cities	Overseas	Total
1-2	2	2	3		7
3-4			3	1	4
5-6					
7-8					
9-10			2		2
11-12			1		1
TOTAL	2	2	9	1	14 *

* The two teachers who served as substitutes are not included here.

PART II

Sections 1 and 2 on the questionnaire deal with the types of classroom groupings and reading approaches used by participants this school year, 1970-71. Each participant checked several possibilities in each section. The responses are shown in Table VI and VII.

TABLE VI

Types of Grouping Used In Classroom Activities
By Workshop Participants

Types of Grouping	Number of Teachers Using this Grouping
Conference	9
Social	8
Pal reading	5
Permanent	3
Interest	12
Homogeneous	6
Heterogeneous	18
Special purpose	12
Skill need	23
Total class	21
Individualized	26
Other	0
No response	3

TABLE VII

Reading Approaches Used by Workshop Participants

Reading Approaches	Number of Teachers Using Approach
Basal series	20
Linguistic/Phonics	17
Programmed/Structured	3
Language experience	15
Individualized	16
Supplemental materials	12
Other (specify)	5
(magazines, newspapers, ITA, readiness kit, experience charts, weekly readers)	
No response	4

PART III

In section 3 of the questionnaire, the participants rated the one-day workshop. The rating was based on how well the workshop met their specific teaching concerns. These concerns were expressed to the workshop coordinators by the participants during the week prior to the workshop. The following scale was used in the rating. Mean ratings were computed on the responses. The results are shown in Table VIII.

Totally	To a great extent	To some extent	Not at all	No response
1	2	3	4	0

TABLE VIII

Participants' Opinions About the Extent to Which
The Workshop Met Their Present Teaching Needs

Item	Number of Responses					
	Single Item Mean	1 Totally	2 To A Great Extent	3 To Some Extent	4 Not At All	No Response
A. How well did the know- ledges and experiences gained in this workshop meet your present needs in:						
1. individualizing read- ing instruction?	2.3	2	16	10	0	3
2. individualizing math- ematics instruction?	2.6	2	8	16	2	3
3. recognizing specific reading skills to be taught?	2.3	3	14	10	1	3
4. recognizing specific math skills to be taught?	2.7	1	10	14	3	3
5. planning activities to enrich reading needs?	1.9	8	16	4	0	3
6. planning activities to enrich math needs?	2.3	5	11	9	2	4
B. How satisfied were you with all aspects of workshop?	2.1	5	16	7	0	3
Overall Mean = 2.3						

PART IV

Questions pertaining to the participants overall teaching practices and experiences during the current school year were presented in section four. Participants were asked to rate each question as follows: once in the "Before" column and once in the "After" column. In the "Before" column participants indicated their feelings and expectations about each question before their experiences in the one-day workshop. In the "After" column the participants indicated the degree of fulfillment of their expectations concerning each question as a result of having experienced the one-day workshop. The rating was based on the following scale. The responses are shown in table IX.

Very Often	Often	Sometimes	Seldom	Never
1	2	3	4	5

TABLE IX

Participants' Responses to Overall Practices
In Their Teaching Experiences

Questions	Number of Responses				
	Very Often	Often	Sometimes	Seldom	Never
BEFORE					
a. How often did you meet with a reading related problem you were hard pressed to solve?	5	9	4	4	0
b. How often have you felt less than sure of yourself as a reading teacher?	6	8	7	4	0
c. How often have you felt less than sure of yourself teaching math?	5	3	9	6	1
d. How often have you had difficulty in individualizing reading instruction?	6	9	5	5	0
e. How often have you had difficulty in individualizing math instruction?	4	6	6	8	2
f. How often did you receive professional assistance from the Innovation Team?	2	5	10	3	9
g. How often were you offered professional assistance from the Innovation Team?	3	7	9	2	8
AFTER					
a. How often did you meet with a reading related problem you were hard pressed to solve?	2	8	7	4	1
b. How often have you felt less than sure of yourself as a reading teacher?	1	8	7	9	0
c. How often have you felt less than sure of yourself teaching math?	0	7	7	8	2

TABLE IX (cont'd)

Questions	Number of Responses				
	Very Often	Often	Sometimes	Seldom	Never
AFTER(cond't)					
d. How often have you had difficulty in individualizing reading instruction?	3	7	6	8	1
e. How often have you had difficulty in individualizing math instruction?	1	7	8	8	2
f. How often did you receive professional assistance from the Innovation Team?	4	7	12	3	3
g. How often were you offered professional assistance from the Innovation Team?	6	8	10	2	3

Each response was weighted according to the number values assigned on the scale above. For questions "f" and "g" the number values were reversed. The number of responses in each category was multiplied by the value of that response to get a total score for each question in the "Before" column and in the "After" column. The totals are shown in Table X.

TABLE X

Total Values of Responses To The Overall Practices
In Teaching Experiences

Questions	Before	After	Difference
a.	51	60	9
b.	59	74	15
c.	67	77	10
d.	59	72	13
e.	76	81	5
f.	75	93	18
g.	82	99	17
TOTALS	469	556	87

A mean score was computed for the "Before" and the "After" responses. A t-test was applied to test the significance of the difference between mean scores. The results are shown in Table XI.

TABLE XI

The Means and t-Score Of Participants' Responses

Before Mean	67.0
After Mean	79.4
Mean Difference	12.4
t-Score	7.0

Section 5 of the questionnaire consisted of one question - "As a result of the workshop do you plan to make any changes in your teaching methods or techniques?" Participants' responses are shown in Table XII.

TABLE XII

Responses To Change In Teaching Methods And Techniques

Item	No Responses
No response	3
Yes	27
No	1
TOTAL	31

In section 6 the participants were asked to list any special concerns they might have had at the beginning of the workshop which were not met. These concerns are shown in Table XIII. Some participants listed more than one concern. Percentages were computed on the total responses.

TABLE XIII

Participants' Special Concerns Not Met By One-Day Workshop

Concerns	Total Number	Percentage of Total
1. No concerns	25	76
2. Discipline problems	2	6
3. Classroom management	1	3
4. Different value systems of pupils/teachers	1	3
5. Grouping	1	3
6. Individualizing math	1	3
7. Reading and math skills to be taught in kindergarten and first grade	1	3
8. Certain types of administrative problems	1	3
TOTALS	33	100

Participants were asked to offer suggestions for improving the next one-day workshop in section 7. Again some participants made more than one response. All responses are shown in Table XIV. Percentages were again computed on the total responses.

Table XIV

Ways In Which The Next Workshop Can Better Meet
Participants' Needs

Suggestions	Total No.	Percentages of Total
1. No suggestions	11	32
2. More on teaching reading; readiness approaches, sequence of skills, individualizing, etc.	7	21
3. Separate instructions geared to pre-school and kindergarten teachers	2	6
4. More free-type group discussion wherein participants can relate classroom experiences	2	6
5. Help in teaching math; individualizing, sequence skills, etc.	2	6
6. More organization; pre-arrangement with the principal	1	3
7. Foster a greater sense of accomplishment	1	3
8. Learning centers	1	3
9. By helping us to come to some concrete conclusions about teaching	1	3
10. By more exposure to teacher-made materials	1	3
11. Demonstration of teaching method	1	3
12. More time to focus on specific problems	1	3
13. Help in acquiring needed materials; teacher aides	1	3
14. Help with the problem of disruptive children	1	3
15. Discuss psychological reasons for apathy other than poor motivation or boredom	1	3
Totals	34	101

DISCUSSION

Background information on the participants reveals that most of them are in the 20 to 30 years of age group. Twenty-one hold bachelor degrees and ten hold masters. All are now working in elementary schools with nineteen teaching pre-kindergarten through third grade. The emphasis of the PROBE selection committee was to include more teachers of the primary grades. Ten participants teach the intermediate grades and two are substitutes working in grades K-6. See Tables I, II and III.

According to the selection criteria for the PROBE program, all participants were to be beginning educators with no more than one semester teaching experience in the Model School Division. The data in Table IV and V reveal that only fifteen of the participants could be called beginning educators. The other fourteen, excluding the two substitutes, had previous teaching experience ranging from one to eleven years. Two of the fourteen had taught from one to two years in the District of Columbia Public Schools outside of the Model School Division. Two others had taught from one to two years within the Model School Division. Three participants had over nine years total teaching experience. All of the participants, however, excluding the two substitutes, were either hired or re-hired since December 1969, and thus were entered in the Model School Division's new teacher file. Thus, in the selection process teachers with previous experience were chosen.

To the observers of the one-day workshop, it appeared that the participants had two distinct sets of concerns. One group seemed to have real beginning teaching problems such as classroom organization, discipline, grouping and individualizing instruction. The other group appeared more interested in being presented with new ideas, procedures and instructional methods. Perhaps the background experience of the participants made this difference in the expressed concerns and needs.

Participants, according to Tables VI and VII, have used a multitude of classroom groupings and reading approaches during the current school year, 1970-71. Listed according to the frequency with which they were mentioned, the groupings used by more than half the PROBE participants were: individualized groups, skill need groups, total class, and heterogeneous groups. Among the participants the least popular grouping method was permanent groups. Of the reading approaches, the basal series, mentioned most frequently, was used by only two-thirds of the workshop participants. The other approaches used by more than half the participants were the linguistic/phonics approaches the individualized approach, and the language experience approach, in that order. The least frequently used approach was the programmed/structured approach.

The findings of both of these questions indicate that the PROBE teachers lean heavily toward flexibility in classroom organization. Individualized instruction both in reading and in general classroom work ranked high in frequency of use among the participants. The more

structured approaches, such as programmed reading instruction and permanent grouping situations, were least frequently used. This could be a reflection of their training in the two-week summer PROBE workshop.

The findings in Table VIII show that on the average the participants were satisfied "to a great extent" with all aspects of the workshop. Of the teaching concerns expressed to the organizers before the workshop, the participants thought the workshop had done most to help them plan activities to enrich reading needs. All but two of their concerns were met "to a great extent." The two concerns met only "to some extent" related to mathematics instruction: individualizing mathematics instruction; and recognizing specific math skills to be taught. These findings indicate that the workshop, in the participants' opinions, was more constructive in meeting their reading instruction needs than their mathematics instruction needs.

According to Tables IX, X, and XI, participants had significantly higher expectations for their teaching practices following the one-day workshop than they felt they had been able to accomplish before the workshop. The mean value of participants' responses in the "before" column was 67.0; the "after" mean was 79.4. A t-test was applied to test the significance of the difference. To be significant at the 1 percent level of confidence with 6 df, a t of 3.7 is needed. The obtained t is 7.0. Therefore, the difference between the "before" responses and the "after" responses was statistically significant and can be attributed to the effects of the workshop. Compared with their teaching experiences prior to the workshop, the participants expected to meet fewer reading and math-related problems, to have less difficulty individualizing reading and math instruction, and to receive more assistance from the Innovation Team. The workshop, then, can be seen as effective in increasing the participants' self-confidence in their skill as classroom teachers.

The data in Table XII show that 27 of the 31 participants plan to make changes in their teaching methods and techniques as a result of the workshop. This finding indicates that the participants did gain concrete ideas and suggestions during the workshop which they expected to be adaptable to their teaching situations. This finding also helps explain the participants' higher expectations for their classroom performance following the workshop.

Only six of the 31 workshop participants indicated that they had some special concerns that had not been met in the one-day workshop; twenty-five said they had no unmet concern. Two of those who commented mentioned discipline as an unmet concern. The other concerns, mentioned once each, included classroom management, reading and math skills for kindergarten and first grade, administrative problems, and individualizing math instruction. Although math needs received the lowest average rating of the accomplishments of the workshop (see Table VIII), only one person indicated he was especially concerned with unmet mathematics needs. From this we can deduct that math problems, while they are a concern, do not constitute as large a stumbling block for the PROBE teachers as do other aspects of teaching.

The suggestions for the next workshop shown in Table XIV emphasized the need for additional assistance in reading instruction, including reading readiness, reading approaches, individualization and sequence of reading skills. This suggests that, although assistance in planning reading activities was the most effective aspect of the one-day workshop, participants are anxious to increase their store of reading instruction techniques, anticipating continual problems in teaching this important skill. That such a variety of suggestions for the next workshop were offered by the participants suggests that a workshop format designed to touch a number of areas in small group activities might be most effective.

SUMMARY AND CONCLUSIONS

The one-day workshop was designed as a follow-up to the two week orientation program held in August 1970. It was also considered part of the continued support phase of the original summer program. Instruction in the one-day program was geared to the needs and concerns aired by the participants.

In general, the workshop was rated highly successful by the participants. Most of their teaching needs had been met "to a great extent". (See Table VIII). Following the workshop their expectations for their overall teaching practices were statistically higher than was their opinion of their teaching practices before the workshop. (See Table IX) The workshop did a good job of meeting the stated problems of the PROBE participants. Twenty-five of the participants indicated they had no unmet needs at the end of the one-day workshop. (See Table XIII) The participants thought they had received the most assistance in planning reading enrichment activities. (See Table VIII)

One unanticipated outcome of the one-day PROBE workshop was that the PROBE teachers began to see themselves as a group. They chose a committee of five to study ways of airing their administrative complaints. This committee is scheduled to report during the next one-day workshop, which will be held December 8, 1970.

RECOMMENDATIONS

1. Future PROBE (A Program for the Recruitment and Orientation of Beginning Educators) two-week programs should be limited to educators with no more than one semester of total teaching experience.
2. Veteran teachers new to the Model School Division should be given at least a one-day orientation to the Model School Division.
3. The one-day follow-up workshop should present more specific information geared to pre-k and kindergarten instruction.
4. Time should be allotted at the workshop for discussing techniques of handling and solving discipline problems.
5. The workshop should include an increased number of small group activities designed to meet the special needs of the participants.

APPENDIX A

A PROGRAM FOR THE RECRUITMENT AND ORIENTATION OF
BEGINNING EDUCATORS (PROBE) PART II

Number _____

Date _____

The purpose of this survey is to determine the value of the one-day follow-up workshop in light of the participants needs. All responses will be kept confidential. Please respond as candidly as possible.

Your age (check) 20-30 _____ 30-40 _____ 40 or above _____

Degree(s) held: _____ Present grade taught _____

Teaching experience (D.C.): School years _____ months _____

Teaching experience (other than D. C.): Place _____

Grade _____ No. School years _____ months _____

1. The following items are concerned with classroom activities. Check the one(s) that indicate the types of grouping that you have used this year.

_____ conference	_____ interest	_____ skill need
_____ social	_____ homogeneous	_____ total class
_____ pal reading	_____ heterogeneous	_____ individualized
_____ permanent	_____ special purpose	_____ other (specify)

2. The following items are concerned with reading approaches. Check the reading approach(es) that you have used this year.

_____ Basal series	_____ Language experience	_____ other (specify)
_____ Linguistic/Phonics	_____ Individualized	_____
_____ Programmed/structured	_____ Supplemental Materials	_____

To rate the following statement use this rating: 1 = Totally; 2 = To a great extent; 3 = To some extent; 4 = Not at all. Write the number in the blank.

a. How well did the knowledges and experiences gained in this workshop meet your present needs in:

1. individualizing reading instruction? _____
2. individualizing mathematics instruction? _____
3. recognizing specific reading skills to be taught? _____
4. recognizing specific math skills to be taught? _____
5. planning activities to enrich reading needs? _____
6. planning activities to enrich math needs? _____

b. How satisfied were you with all the aspects of the workshop? .. _____

The following statements describe overall practices in your teaching experiences this year. The "before" column indicates your response prior to this workshop. The "after" column indicates what you expect in the future. Circle one number in "each" column for each statement. Use the following scale for your rating: 1 = Very often; 2 = Often; 3 = Sometimes; 4 = Seldom, 5 = Never

	<u>Before</u>	<u>After</u>
a. How often did you meet with a reading related problem you were hard pressed to solve?	1 2 3 4 5	1 2 3 4 5
b. How often have you felt less than sure of yourself as a reading teacher?	1 2 3 4 5	1 2 3 4 5
c. How often have you felt less than sure of yourself teaching math?	1 2 3 4 5	1 2 3 4 5
d. How often have you had difficulty in individualizing reading instruction?	1 2 3 4 5	1 2 3 4 5
e. How often have you had difficulty in individualizing math instruction?	1 2 3 4 5	1 2 3 4 5
f. How often did you receive professional assistance from the Innovation team?	1 2 3 4 5	1 2 3 4 5
g. How often were you offered professional assistance from the Innovation team?	1 2 3 4 5	1 2 3 4 5

As a result of this workshop do you plan to make any changes in your teaching methods or techniques? (Circle one) Yes No

6. Are there special concerns you had at the beginning of this workshop which were not met? If so, please state them here.

7. In what way(s) can the next workshop better meet your needs? (Specify)

APPENDIX B

PROBE
Observation Checklist

I. Methods of instruction

II. Topics covered

III. Participants' involvement

IV. Attendance

V. Enthusiasm throughout the day

VI. Problems encountered

VII. Other special concerns

PART III

PART III

Phase III of the PROBE program, a one-day follow-up workshop, was concluded in December and January. Because of the difficulty of obtaining substitutes, half-day instead of full-day workshops were held December 11 and January 12. About 25 of the original PROBE participants attended the sessions, slightly fewer than had attended the first follow-up workshop. Both sessions involved an exchange of ideas among the participants and an introduction to new materials and approaches to teaching.

At the December 11, 1970 workshop Dr. Mary Ann Hall, guest consultant from the University of Maryland, lectured on the language experience approach to the teaching of reading and led a discussion on the topic with the participants. Prior to the session each participant had received a copy of Dr. Hall's book Teach Reading As A Language Experience, which served as a base for the discussion. Participants readily joined in the discussion indicating that they found Dr. Hall's presentation interesting and informative. During the afternoon the few who had full-day substitutes remained at the Innovation Team center for an informal classroom material construction session.

The January 12, 1971 workshop covered two main areas: 1) an exchange of teaching ideas and experiences among the PROBE teachers, and 2) their familiarization with films designed to stimulate language experience lessons. During the first part of the morning about half the participants freely shared some of their classroom ideas -- suggestions ranged from a candy machine designed to stress the concept of giving at Christmas time to an original word wheel for teaching how 'e' at the end of a word changes the short vowel sound to a long vowel sound. In the second part of the workshop three films, which were created by Professor Roach Van Allen of the University of Arizona and designed to inspire children to talk creatively about the things around them, were shown: "What's Happening?", "Guessing Game", and "Getting Even". Following each film an Innovation Team member led a discussion about the film and stimulated the teachers to think about possible lessons relating to it. In both parts of the session, there was good participation and a lively exchange of ideas.

Generally the group appeared to have maintained its unity: for example, one member who was planning a school sharing program suggested he would try to establish it first with the schools of PROBE teachers. However, the committee established at the first workshop to discuss administrative grievances and devise procedures for airing them was not

mentioned at the final workshop. It made a report at the December workshop, but seemed by January to have ceased functioning. In addition, the differences in the concerns of the participants, which has established a tension at the first workshop between those concerned primarily with disciplinary methods and structural procedures and those concerned primarily with teaching techniques and suggestions, were not in evidence. Although some participants did not share their teaching ideas with the group as a whole, all were attentive during the exchange of substantive, concrete suggestions for classroom activities. Significantly there were no attempts to divert the discussions into grievance sessions.

In conclusion, participants indicated their satisfaction with the response of the Innovation Team to their individual needs. Some noted specifically how quickly their requests for certain teaching materials had been met. Whether these teachers will in fact choose to stay with the D. C. school system remains to be seen. It is clear, though, that they have received support and intensive training from the PROBE program, and this support and training will certainly be a factor influencing their decisions.