

DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 139 896

UD 017 042

AUTHOR Schwartz, Lester J.
 TITLE Transitional Classes Program; School Year 1974-1975.
 INSTITUTION New York City Board of Education, Brooklyn, N.Y. Office of Educational Evaluation.
 PUB DATE 75
 NOTE 28p.; Pages 18-20 are marginally legible due to the print quality of the original document; New York City Board of Education Function No. 09-59602

EDRS PRICE MF-\$0.83 HC-\$2.06 Plus Postage.
 DESCRIPTORS *Behavior Change; *Compensatory Education Programs; Elementary School Students; Elementary Secondary Education; *Emotionally Disturbed Children; Junior High School Students; Remedial Instruction; *Remedial Mathematics; *Remedial Reading
 IDENTIFIERS *Elementary Secondary Education Act Title I; ESEA Title I; New York (New York); *Transition Education

ABSTRACT

This report is an evaluation of a New York City school district educational program funded under Title I of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965. The purpose of the Transitional Classes Program was to provide educational experience for emotionally handicapped students returning from residential centers. The program's basic goals were to assist students in developing school appropriate behaviors and to provide intensive academic remediation in reading and mathematics. Of the 244 students who participated in the program, the 118 students who received pre and posttests constituted the sample. Operating in eight sites located in four New York City boroughs, the program was staffed by qualified teachers, paraprofessionals, two counselors, a teacher trainer, an attendance teacher and two supervisors. The objectives were achieved through the use of a behavioral management model which is explained in detail in this report. To measure academic gains, the reading and arithmetic sections of the Wide Range Achievement Test were administered as pre and posttests. Statistically significant gains in reading and mathematics were made. It was concluded that the Transitional Classes Program was successful in increasing the reading and mathematics achievement levels of its participants beyond expectation, that the intensive individual and group remediation provided by the teachers was an important contribution to the success of the program, and that the behavioral management model and the team approach proved to be a useful model for facilitating student growth. (Author/BS)

Documents acquired by ERIC include many informal unpublished materials not available from other sources. ERIC makes every effort to obtain the best copy available. Nevertheless, items of marginal reproducibility are often encountered and this affects the quality of the microfiche and hardcopy reproductions ERIC makes available via the ERIC Document Reproduction Service (EDRS). ERIC is not responsible for the quality of the original document. Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made from

ED137876

EVALUATION REPORT

FUNCTION NUMBER: 09-59602

TRANSITIONAL CLASSES PROGRAM

School Year 1974-1975

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH,
EDUCATION & WELFARE
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF
EDUCATION

THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY.

LESTER J. SCHWARTZ

An evaluation of a New York City School district educational project funded under Title I of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965 (PL 89-10) performed for the Board of Education of the City of New York for the 1974-75 school year.

UD 017042

Dr. Anthony J. Polemeni, Director

BOARD OF EDUCATION OF THE CITY OF NEW YORK
OFFICE OF EDUCATIONAL EVALUATION
110 LIVINGSTON STREET, BROOKLYN, N. Y. 11201



i

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	<u>PAGE</u>
Table of Contents	i
List of Tables	ii
Chapter I: The Program	1
Chapter II: Evaluative Procedures	5
Chapter III: Findings	8
Chapter IV: Summary of Major Findings, Conclusions, and Recommendations	15
Chapter V: Exemplary Program Abstract	17

APPENDICES

Mailed Information Report For Categorically Aided Education Project

Student Interview Schedule and Responses

LIST OF TABLES

	<u>PAGE</u>
Table 1 Summary of Participants Tested and Not Tested	5
Table 2 Historical Regression Analysis of WRAT Reading Results	8
Table 3 Historical Regression Analysis of WRAT Arithmetic Results	9

CHAPTER I: THE PROGRAM

The Transitional Classes Program provides a transitional educational experience for emotionally handicapped students returning from residential centers. It also accepts district students who, for psychological reasons, have been unable to adjust satisfactorily in school. The program's basic goals are: a) to assist students in developing school-appropriate behaviors and b) to provide intensive academic remediation. With such preparation, it is expected that the students will be able to return with success to other long term school placements. The Title I Component of the program affords remedial service in reading and mathematics and supplements the program otherwise conducted by tax levy teaching personnel. The program operates in eight sites: The Hegeman Diagnostic Center and P.S. 236 in Brooklyn, P.S. 71 Queens, P.S. 146 and P.S. 130 in Manhattan, and P.S. 99, P.S. 14 and I.S. 155 in the Bronx. At seven of the sites there are two classes taught by two tax levy teachers and assisted by two tax levy paraprofessionals. At the eighth site there is one class with a tax levy teacher and a tax levy paraprofessional. The Title I teachers, at all eight sites, have separate rooms in which they work with individual students or with small groups. In addition to the personnel already cited, the program staff consists of two Title I counselors, one Title I Teacher Trainer, one tax levy supported attendance teacher and two supervisors. The two supervisors are provided by the Special Education Service for the Emotionally Handicapped and are totally tax levy supported. Besides administering the Transitional Classes they are responsible for the full range of Alternative Programs for the Emotionally Handicapped. The attendance teacher who serves all eight sites, handles student busing and deals with attendance problems including follow up visits to students' homes. Additionally, each site has the services of a clinical team from the treatment centers of East New York Community Mental Health Center.

THE PROGRAM (Continued)

St. Barnabas Home, Jacobi Hospital, Bronx Children's Psychiatric Center, Queens Children's Psychiatric Center, Brooklyn Developmental Services and the Manhattan State Children's Hospital. Each clinical team spends a half day weekly at the sites, meeting with the teaching staffs to help plan for the students and provide consultation service for the teachers. These clinical services stem from the interagency structure of the program and are provided at no cost to the program.

Children who are referred spend at least one day visiting in the program. They are seen by the psychiatrist and their parents are interviewed by a social worker. The placement decision is made, then, by the interdisciplinary team of clinicians and school staff. All students selected for the program had been previously certified as requiring Special Education. At Hegeman, all the residents attend the Transitional Program. The Title I teacher conducts an educational evaluation of each student when he or she enters the program. There is no prescribed diagnostic battery; each Title I teacher uses the diagnostic tests he or she deems most appropriate. The diagnostic tests in use include the Wepman, The Vallett Diagnostic Inventory, The Gates-MacGinitie Reading Test, The Frostig, The Motor Free Visual Perception Test and the Winterhaven Inventory.

METHODS FOR ACHIEVING OBJECTIVES

The objective of developing appropriate student behaviors is achieved through the use of a behavioral management model. Students earn credits for specified concrete, social, and activity reinforcers. The credits are applicable towards a variety of rewards. The specific behaviors vary somewhat from site to site but they generally fall into the following categories, a) Beginning lessons properly (e.g. having materials on hand, starting on time), b) Effective

METHODS FOR ACHIEVING OBJECTIVES (Continued)

participation (e.g. raising your hand, respecting those speaking, waiting for help), and c) Finishing the lesson (e.g. completing assignments, staying in seats, putting materials away). Although academic achievement is the desired outcome, the emphasis of the behavioral management approach is on behaving like a student.

The second objective of strengthening the students' basic skills in Reading and Math is integrated with the first objective through the use of student contracts. Each day an individualized program is outlined in a contract for each student. The contract includes the specific areas of Reading and Math that require remediation. Students earn credits for completing each part of the daily contract.

THE TITLE I TEACHERS

The Title I teachers play a critical role in achieving the second objective. After the initial diagnostic screening, they formulate prescriptive programs for each student. On a daily basis, the Title I teachers provide individual and group remediation. They spend between two and two and a half hours a day working with Title I eligible students ~~on an individual basis~~. During this time they provide remedial instruction to five or six students for about 30 minutes each. The children who are worked with individually are the ones who are most deficient in basic skills. The students are seen two or three times a week - a few, when necessary are seen daily. Title I teachers work with between nine and twelve students each week.

They also hold a 30 to 40 minute ~~group lesson for each class~~ daily. This lesson focuses on language development, dynamics of reading, and communication skills.

RELATION OF TITLE I TEACHERS TO PROGRAM

At each site the program operates on a team basis. The Title I teacher provides the rest of the staff with diagnostic information and systematic feedback about the progress of the students they see. This is important in preparing the daily contracts as well as for the longer term planning. They also work closely with the counselors in identifying problems, developing educational approaches for each child and formulating post Transitional Class plans.

It is the counselors who are responsible for working with the students when educationally related problems arise, gaining the cooperation of the parents, effecting interagency cooperation and processing post Transition Class placements. Consequently, the Title I teachers and the counselors must work closely together.

To implement the team approach, the Title I teachers confer daily with the other staff members. They also participate in the weekly sessions held with the clinical teams from the treatment centers.

LENGTH OF STAY IN THE PROGRAM

The program was originally intended as a relatively short transitional period.

Students typically spend from six months to a year in the program. There are pupils who spend more or less time in the program. In the latter group are those students who leave the program, usually with little notice, because of a court order, an agency action, or because the family moves. During the past this has included a sizable number of students. The former group of students are those for whom no appropriate placement can be found. For them, the Transitional Class is considered to be the only constructive or feasible option.

EVALUATION OBJECTIVE I

To determine whether, as a result of participation in the Transitional Classes Program, the reading grade of the students will show a statistically significant difference between the real post test score and the anticipated post test score.

EVALUATION OBJECTIVE II

To determine whether, as a result of participation in the Transitional Classes Program, the mathematics grade of the students will show a statistically significant difference between the real post test score and the anticipated post test score.

SUBJECTS

The subjects were to consist of all the participants in the program. Of the 244 students who participated in the program, 118 received pre and post tests and constitute the sample. Table 1 presents the reasons for the discrepancy between the total number of participants and the final sample.

TABLE I

SUMMARY OF PARTICIPANTS TESTED
AND NOT TESTED (N=244)

Program Participants	Grades 4-5-6		Grades 7-8-9		Total	
	N	%	N	%	N	%
Received pre and post tests	45	48.4	73	48.3	118	48.4
Abruptly withdrawn from program	23	24.7	57	37.8	80	32.8
Placed in Fall 1974	16	17.2	4	2.6	20	8.2
Entered after May 1, 1975	7	7.5	13	8.6	20	8.2
Absent during testing	2	2.1	4	2.6	6	2.5
TOTALS	93	99.9	151	99.9	244	100.1

SUBJECTS (Continued)

Of the students who did not receive pre and post tests the largest proportion were those who were abruptly withdrawn from the program by an agency or by parents who were moving. Most of the students, 56, attended the Hegeman Diagnostic Center which is a short term residence where girls are evaluated for appropriate placement. Girls often attend the Transitional Class on the site for a matter of weeks and placement often comes suddenly. A similar situation existed in a class in an elementary school whose participants largely lived in a nearby residential center. Eight per cent of the participants entered the program late in the school year and, therefore, were not tested. Another group of just under ten per cent, holdovers from last year, were placed in the Fall. Six students had prolonged absences during the time of the post tests.

METHOD AND PROCEDURES

The Reading and Arithmetic sections of The Wide Range Achievement Test (WRAT) were administered to each subject twice by the Title I teachers. The pre tests were administered in September and October 1974. Students who entered the program subsequently received the pre test soon after their entry. The post tests were administered during the last two weeks of May 1975. Students who left the program before May were given post tests, if possible, during their last week in the program. Students who were 12 years old, or younger than 12, at time of testing were given level 1 of the WRAT. Those older than 12 were given level 2. The test results were maintained by the Title I teacher who forwarded them in June to the supervisors, who in turn forwarded the total test results to the evaluator.

ANALYSIS OF DATA

The pre and post test results were analysed by the "Real (treatment) Post test

ANALYSIS OF DATA (Continued)

vs. Anticipated (without treatment) Post test" design. This design takes into account the varying lengths of time students were exposed to the program by comparing each student's total achievement gain for the specific length of time he or she spent in the program to that student's expected gain. The expected gain is a multiple of the yearly average gain made by the student since first grade times the number of months he or she spent in the program. The subjects were grouped into two grade ranges based on the grades corresponding to their ages: grades four-five-six and seven-eight-nine.

CHAPTER III: FINDINGS

READING ACHIEVEMENT

The evaluation objective related to reading was: to determine whether, as a result of participation in the Transitional Classes Program, the reading grade of the students will show a statistically significant difference between the real post test score and the anticipated post test score. Table 2 summarizes the results of the Historical Regression Analysis (Real [treatment] Post test vs. Anticipated [without treatment] Post test design) that was used to analyse the data.

TABLE 2

Historical Regression Analysis of WRAT Reading Results
(N=118)

Participants	N	Pre test Mean	Anticipated Mean	Post test Mean	Total
Grades 4-5-6	45	3.38	3.72	4.18	3.00**
Grades 7-8-9	73	4.75	5.00	5.55	5.00**

** Significant beyond the .01 level

The evaluation objective was reached for both groups of participants. The mean post test scores of 4.18 and 5.55 for the elementary and secondary groups consecutively are significantly greater than the means of the predicted scores. The students who would normally be in grades 4, 5, or 6 had a mean gain of eight months compared to an anticipated mean gain of 3.4 months. Thus, their gain was more than double of what would be expected. For the grades 7, 8, 9 group, the difference between what would be predicted and what occurred was more than five months; the actual gain of eight months was more than triple the predicted gain of three months.

READING ACHIEVEMENT (Continued)

Students entered the program all through the year which meant a shorter mean treatment time and a lower anticipated mean than would be found with similar students all spending a full year in a program.

MATHEMATICS ACHIEVEMENT

The evaluation objective related to mathematics was: to determine whether, as a result of participation in the Transitional Classes Program, the mathematics grade of the students will show a statistically significant difference between the real post-test score and the anticipated post-test score. Table 3 summarizes the results of the Historical Regression Analysis used to analyse the mathematics test results.

T A B L E 3

Historical Regression Analysis of WRAT Arithmetic Results
(N=93)

Participants	N	Pre Test Mean	Anticipated Mean	Post Test Mean	Total
Grades 4-5-6	45	3.37	3.69	4.09	2.12*
Grades 7-8-9	73	4.01	4.23	4.99	6.28**

* Significant beyond the .05 level

** Significant beyond the .01 level

The evaluation objective for mathematics was achieved in both groups. The mean post test scores of 4.09 and 4.99 for both groups consecutively was significantly greater than the predicted post test means. Like the Reading results, the difference between the predicted and the real mean gains was sizable. For the Grades 4, 5, and 6 group, the mean real gain of seven months, was more than twice the anticipated, while in the grades 7, 8, and 9 group the real gain of one full year was four times what was predicted.

OTHER FINDINGS AND DISCREPANCIES FROM PROPOSAL

This section is based on site visits and interviews of students and staff. Each site was visited twice; the first round of visits took place between October 21, 1974 and January 24, 1975, and the second round between May 7, 1975 and June 16, 1975.

A. Facilities and Materials

During the evaluator's first round of visits in the Fall, some shortages of materials were evident. The materials were on order but had not yet been delivered by the publishers. By the second round of visits, materials were in ample supply at all sites. The problem of late deliveries arose from the fact that orders could not be placed until the program was refunded.

The materials themselves were quite appropriate. It is difficult to secure interesting materials for adolescents with 4th or 5th grade reading levels but the Title I teachers managed well. Many of the teachers developed their own materials.

Audio visual equipment was available to all classes; however at one site the electrical wiring was inadequate and equipment like sound projectors could not be used there.

Facilities were generally good. Rooms were good sized, well ventilated, and well lit. On every site but one, the Title I teacher had the exclusive use of a separate room. In the one exception, the room was shared with an assistant principal. One other facility problem was noted; in one school, the classes were housed in temporary buildings in the school yard. The rooms themselves were quite adequate but the children had to go to the main building to use toilets. This, however, was less of a hardship than an inconvenience.

B. Student Reactions

An attempt was made to gain a general impression of the students' feelings about the program through interviews (see Appendix: Student Interview Schedule and Responses). One student in each class was interviewed during each visit when possible. The students were selected for interviews by the positions of their seats. In the first class, the student seated closest to the door was selected; in the second class, the student seated second closest to the door, and so on up to eight. In classes with fewer than eight students, the count continued circularly, returning to the first counted child and so on until the designated number was reached. A total of 27 students were interviewed. In three instances student interviews could not be held.

Only four students indicated that they had preferred other classes or schools. In response to the question of what they liked best about the class, a majority, 15, made responses that related to the staff's behavior towards them but there was no consistent emphasis. Responses included the staff's helpfulness, concern and the school work they provided. In response to the question of what they disliked about the program, the lack of more varied activities was the only factor cited by a majority. Some regretted not having more opportunity for activities like Art, Music, Shop, Homemaking and Physical Education. All of these were found but not all in any one site and they were only sometimes systematically programmed. The staffs provided as much of these activities as possible, given the constraints of the school day, the program requirements, and the time made available by the building principals. Generally, the principals were very cooperative in providing whatever resources possible.

C. Staff Functioning

The Title I teachers were outstandingly competent. They were not only well trained but they were thoroughly professional in their attitudes and performance. They had, apparently, been very carefully selected by the Supervisors.

In general, the teams they were members of functioned extremely well. Occasional problems arose but relatively few, considering how closely the teams worked together and that there was no on-site supervisor. Because effective team work is so vital to the program, even routine or understandable friction need to be dealt with and worked through.

The program is understaffed by counselors. Although they were highly competent and conscientious, they simply did not have the time to attend to all the functions outlined in the proposal. The tasks of intake, screening, and placement alone require a great deal of time. Consequently, they spent less time with parents, students, and teachers than they wanted to or was desirable.

D. The Clinical Teams

The clinical teams that met with the staffs each week at the schools were very helpful in developing placement plans and providing the teachers with greater understanding of the students and their families. Their observations of students in the classes was a particularly valuable aspect of their activities. The teams were most effective in the schools where they observed children routinely.

E. The Use of Behavioral Management

The teachers generally approved of the behavioral management model even though they sometimes had difficulty with its subtleties. Some teachers felt it has been the most effective method for developing students' behaviors in the history

E. The Use of Behavioral Management (Continued)

of the program. Most appreciated was the structure it provided and that it made expectations and requirements mutually clear to students and teachers. The use of student contracts reinforced the structure as well as providing a vehicle for individualized instruction.

AVAILABILITY OF PROGRAM TO TARGET POPULATION

The Title I teachers serviced all Title I eligible students in the program. They spent proportionately more time with those Title I students who were the most deficient in their basic skills.

CROSS REFERENCE TO OTHER PROGRAMS

The Transitional Classes Program is directly related to the Alternative Programs for the Emotionally Handicapped of the Division of Special Education & Pupil Personnel Services. The special education teachers, paraprofessionals and supervisors are all on tax-levy supported lines stemming from the Alternative Programs. The staff attends joint team meetings and various workshops together; is jointly involved in intake and with the clinical consultants. The community school districts which house various units of the program are involved on a regular basis through district-assigned liaison personnel. The administrators of the schools in which the programs are located are closely identified with the classes. At Hegeman Residential Center there is complex involvement with the New York City Bureau of Institutions and Facilities, New York City Office of Special Services to Children and East New York Community Mental Health Clinic. The Board of Education Bureau for Socially Maladjusted and Emotionally Disturbed, Bureau for Child Guidance, Evaluation and Placement Units, Bureau for Physically Handicapped are all related in planning for referrals. The New York State Department of Mental Hygiene and New York City Department of Mental Health and Mental Retardation Services provide clinical resources.

RECOMMENDATIONS FROM LAST STUDY

The recommendations of last year's study were:

- A. Each center or pair of centers should have the services of a Master Teacher available to it.
- B. One, or perhaps two, experts in behavioral management, should be available to the classroom teachers on an as-needed basis.
- C. One or two more attendance teachers would benefit the program.
- D. If the program continues to grow an intermediate administrative level will be necessary.

Regarding the first three recommendations, the supervisors agreed with them but budgetary constraints kept them from being implemented. As for the last recommendation, the supervisors had reassigned existing staff to provide for more of an intermediate administrative level. Further, although the Alternative Programs, as a whole, had grown, the Transitional Class component has remained at about the same size.

CHAPTER IV: SUMMARY OF MAJOR FINDINGS, CONCLUSIONS, AND RECOMMENDATIONS

SUMMARY OF FINDINGS

- a. The mean post test scores of the students in the Transitional Classroom Program, in Reading and Mathematics was significantly greater than the predicted mean post test scores. Just over 48 percent of the students took both the pre and post tests; their average gains were more than twice and up to four times their anticipated gains.
- b. Generally, facilities were adequate and materials were satisfactory.
- c. There were no major departures from the proposal.
- d. A limited sample of students viewed the program favorably.
- e. The staff and the Title I teachers, particularly, were well trained, professional in their approach and, generally, functioned well as teams.
- f. The Title I services were made available to all eligible children in the program.
- g. The behavioral management model and individualized student contract provided a structure which enabled the staff to assist students in developing appropriate school behaviors.
- h. The clinical teams were a helpful adjunct to the program.
- i. Counselors were effective in their duties but they did not have enough time to carry out all their responsibilities.
- j. The recommendations of the past study that were not implemented involved additional personnel. These were requested but not funded.

CONCLUSIONS

1. The Transitional Classes Program was extremely successful in increasing the Reading and Mathematics achievement levels of its participants beyond expectation. This conclusion is circumscribed by the fact that pre and post test comparisons were available for only 48.4 percent of the participants.
2. The intensive individual and group remediation provided by the Title I teachers was an important contribution to the success of the program.
3. The behavioral management model and the team approach proved to be a useful model for facilitating student growth.

RECOMMENDATIONS

1. An additional counselor is needed so that the counselors can carry out all their responsibilities as described in the proposal.
2. An additional Teacher Trainer should be acquired. Problems can arise that require specialized assistance. The teacher trainer should be competent in the area of interpersonal relations as well as professional practices.
3. An all day workshop should be held on the topic of professional interpersonal functioning. The workshop should be held early enough in the year to have impact on the program.
4. The behavioral management specialist recommended in the last study is still needed. If a full time person cannot be hired then a consultant should be retained on a per diem basis.
5. I recommend strongly that the program be continued. The improved achievement levels of the participants were dramatic. In addition the participants acquired appropriate school behaviors. It is a well administered program which is implemented by a generally competent staff.

CHAPTER V: EXEMPLARY PROGRAM ABSTRACT

<u>Component Codes</u>	<u>Activity Codes</u>	<u>Objective Codes</u>
60814	720	801
60815	720	801
60914	720	801
60915	720	801

The results of this evaluation indicate that the participants (48.4 percent for whom pre and post test data was available) showed gains in Reading and Mathematics achievement in excess of one month's gains for each month of treatment. In component 60814 (Reading, grades 4, 5, and 6) the real mean gain was 8.0 months while the predicted gain was 2.4 months. For component 60815 (Reading, grades 7, 8, and 9) the mean gain was 8.0 months and the predicted 2.5. For component 609 (Mathematics, grade 4, 5, and 6) the mean gain was 7.2 and the predicted 3.2. For component 60915 (Mathematics, grades 7, 8, and 9) the mean gain was 9.8 months and the predicted 2.2. All differences were statistically significant.

The aspects of the program which appear to account for the unexpected results are:

1. The use of a behavioral management model to develop student behaviors.
2. The use of a diagnostic prescriptive approach to insure individualized instruction implemented by daily student contracts.
3. The high quality of a carefully selected staff which worked in integrated interdisciplinary teams which focused on the psycho-social as well as the academic growth of the participants.
4. Superior leadership which permitted the staff to function professionally and which carefully fostered professional development.

The University of the State of New York
THE STATE EDUCATION DEPARTMENT
Bureau of Urban and Community Programs Evaluation
Albany, New York 12234

MAILED INFORMATION REPORT FOR CATEGORICALLY AIDED EDUCATION PROJECTS

SECTION III

1974-75 School Year

Due Date: July 15, 1975

SSD Project Number

		3	0	7	5	0	0	7	5	0	0	2
--	--	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---

BE Function Number (N.Y.C. only)

0	9	5	9	6	0	2
---	---	---	---	---	---	---

Project Title Division of Special Education & Pupil Personnel
Services Umbrella - Transitional Classes Program

School District Name Division of Special Education & Pupil Personnel
Services

School District Address 110 Livingston Street

Brooklyn, N.Y. 11201

Name and Title of Person Completing this form:

Name Norma S. Crippen

Title Acting Supervisor

Telephone Number 212 075-4429 30
(Area Code)

Date this form was completed 6/10/75

TRANSITION CLASSES PROGRAM

FUNCTION NUMBER: 09-59602

Use Table 26, for Historical Regression Design (6-step Formula) for Reading and Mathematics.

26. Standardized Test Results

In the Table below, enter the requested assessment information about the tests used to evaluate the effectiveness of major project components/activities in achieving desired objectives. This form requires means obtained from scores in the form of grade equivalent units as processed by the 6-step formula. (see District Evaluator's Handbook of Selected Evaluation Procedures, 1974, p. 29-31) Before completing this table, read all footnotes. Attach additional sheets if necessary.

25

Component Code	Activity Code	Test Used 1/	Form		Level		Total Group N 2/	Group ID 3/	Number Tested 4/	Pretest Date	Pretest Mean	Posttest Date	Posttest Mean	Predicted Posttest Mean	Actual Posttest Date	Actual Posttest Mean	Obtained Value of z	Sub- Group	5/
			Pre	Post	Pre	Post													
6 0 91 4	7 2 0	WRAT			1	1	93	14	45	*	3.38		3.72	*	4.22	3.00	1.01		
6 0 91 5	7 2 0	WRAT			2	2	151	15	73	*	4.75		5.00	*	5.55	5.00	1.01		
6 0 91 4	7 2 0	WRAT			1	1	93	14	45	*	3.37		3.59	*	4.09	2.12	1.05		
6 0 91 5	7 2 0	WRAT			2	2	151	15	73	*	4.01		4.23	*	4.95	5.28	1.01		

- 1/ Identify the test used and year of publication (WAT-58, CAT-70, etc.).
- 2/ Total number of participants in the activity.
- 3/ Identify the participants by specific grade level (e.g., grade 3, grade 5). When several grades are combined, enter the last two digits of the component code.
- 4/ Total number of participants included in the pre and posttest calculations.
- 5/ Provide data for the following groups separately: Neglected (code as N), Delinquent (code as D), and Harshipped (code as H). Place the indicated code letter in the last column to signify the subgroup evaluated.

* The pre tests were administered September and October 1974. Students who entered the program subsequently received the pre test soon after their entry. The post tests were administered during the last two weeks of 1975. Students who left the program before they were given post tests, if possible, during their last week in the program.

32. Program Abstract: Please provide an abstract of your project, including aspects of the project which account for highly positive results. Provide a summary of the findings in relation to the objectives, as well as a description of the pedagogical methodology employed.

33. Date activities began 9 / 9 / 74 Date activities will terminate 6 / 26 / 75
Mo. Day Yr. Mo. Day Yr.

34. Project time span (check one): 1 School Year 2 Summer 3 12 Mon. 4 More than 1 year

35. Project is: 1 New 2 Resubmitted 3 Continuation (title fill only)

A. If project is resubmitted, please indicate number of years operated;

2 years 4 years
 3 years 5 or more years

OFFICE OF EDUCATIONAL EVALUATION - DATA LOSS FORM
 (attach to MIR, item #30) Function # 09-59602

In this table enter all data loss information. Between MIR, item #30 and this form, all participants in each activity must be accounted for. The component and activity codes used in completion of item #30 should be used here so that the two tables match. See definitions below table for further instructions.

Component Code	Activity Code	(1) Group I.D.	(2) Test Used	(3) Total N	(4) Number Tested/ Analyzed	(5) Participants Not Tested/ Analyzed		(6) Reasons why students were not tested, or if tested, were not analyzed	Number/ Reason
						N	%		
6/0814720	14	WRAT 1965	93	45	48	51.6	Abruptly withdrawn without notice	23	
							Left program during early Fall	16	
							Entered program after May 1, 1975	7	
								Prolonged absence in May 1975.	2
60815720	15	WRAT 1965	151	73	78	51.7	Abruptly withdrawn without notice	57	
							Left program during early Fall	4	
							Entered program after May 1, 1975	13	
								Prolonged absence in May 1975	4
60914720	14	WRAT 1965	93	45	48	51.6	Abruptly withdrawn without notice	23	
							Left program during early Fall	16	
							Entered program after May 1, 1975	7	
								Prolonged absence in May 1975	2
60915720	15	WRAT 1965	151	73	78	51.7	Abruptly withdrawn without notice	57	
							Left program during early Fall	4	
							Entered program after May 1, 1975	13	
								Prolonged absence in May 1975	4

- (1) Identify the participants by specific grade level (e.g., grade 3, grade 9). Where several grades are combined, enter the last two digits of the component code.
- (2) Identify the test used and year of publication (MAT-70, SDAT-74, etc.).
- (3) Number of participants in the activity.
- (4) Number of participants included in the pre and posttest calculations found on item #30.
- (5) Number and percent of participants not tested and/or not analyzed on item #30.
- (6) Specify and reasons why students were not tested and/or analyzed. For each reason specified, provide a separate number count. If any further documentation is available, please attach to this form. If further space is needed to specify and explain data loss, attach additional pages to this form.

APPENDIX: STUDENT INTERVIEW SCHEDULE AND RESPONSES

The student interviews were non-structured but they always included the following questions:

1. How do you like this class compared to the other classes you have been in?
2. What do you like about this class?
3. What don't you like about this class?

Responses were categorized. Categories which represent a majority of student responses with examples of the responses follow:

<u>Question</u>	<u>Category</u>	<u>N</u>
1	Like class better	23
2	Responses favorable to staff	15
3	Too limited a range of activities	11

Sample Responses to Questions 2 and 3

- Question 2
- The teachers make it fun.
 - I like my teacher.
 - The teachers don't yell at you.
 - They give (the teacher) you work to do here.
- Question 3
- The other classes go to gym.
 - It's not like a school. (Q.) Nothing to do.
 - Don't know. (Q.) I wish I could draw more.
 - Too much work. (Q.) I like basketball.