

DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 215 019

UD 022 148

TITLE The Influence of Student Characteristics on Absentee Patterns: Ninth Graders, 1979-80.

INSTITUTION Clark County School District, Las Vegas, Nev.

PUB DATE [80]

NOTE 35p.

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC02 Plus Postage.

DESCRIPTORS *Academic Achievement; *Attendance Patterns; Data Analysis; *Enrollment Trends; *Grade 9; High School Students; Junior High School Students; School Policy; Secondary Education; *Student Characteristics

IDENTIFIERS *Clark County School District NV

ABSTRACT

This study examines the relationship between student absentee patterns and the characteristics of ninth grade students in Clark County School District, Nevada. It is reported that the absentee patterns of junior high school students are significantly different from those of senior high school students. The length of continuous enrollment, and scholastic aptitude, reading, and math scores are reported to be significant factors regarding student absentee rate. Neither the sex nor ethnic background of students are reported to be significant factors regarding absenteeism. It is suggested that the data from this study could be used for a longitudinal comparative study to determine the impact of new attendance policies on student absentee patterns. (Author/JCD)

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

**THE INFLUENCE
OF
STUDENT CHARACTERISTICS
ON
ABSENTEE PATTERNS
(Ninth Graders 1979-80)**

THE INFLUENCE OF STUDENT CHARACTERISTICS
ON
ABSENTEE PATTERNS
(Ninth Graders 1979-80)

Introduction

The advent of any significant policy change is generally accompanied by differing views regarding its workability or probable worth. Such differing views are evident with the recently adopted student attendance policy. However, an inspection of secondary student absenteeism would certainly suggest that alternative programs be initiated in an attempt to improve attendance.

The Problem

For the ninth attendance period (April 7 to May 2), the Average Daily Attendance (ADA) to Average Daily Membership (ADM) computes to 89.6 percent for secondary District resident membership. Stated another way, an average of 4,229 secondary students were absent each day of this period. The apparent debilitating effect on the student's learning sequence, the make-up effort required by classroom teachers, and the related clerical factors associated with such an absenteeism rate suggest that the subject be investigated for possible redirection of efforts and energies to combat the attendance problem.

In addition to the 4,229 daily student absences, there is a reportedly high incident rate of partial absenteeism. Partial absence would be defined as a condition whereby the student missed one or more classes on a given day but was in attendance for a portion of the school day.

Purpose of the Study

The primary purpose of this study was to analyze characteristics of ninth grade students as related to absentee patterns.

Of secondary purpose, the study will provide a baseline of data elements for a subsequent comparative study to determine the behavioral changes evidenced following implementation of the new attendance policy.

Questions to be Answered by the Study

Answers to the following questions have been provided by the study.

1. Do the absentee patterns of junior high students differ from senior high students?
2. Are there differences in absentee patterns of students by gender?
3. Are there differences in absentee patterns of students by race?
4. Are there differences in absentee patterns of students by length of enrollment?
5. Are there differences in absentee patterns of students evidenced by scholastic aptitude (DIQ) scores?
6. Are there differences in absentee patterns of students evidenced by Total Reading results from the California Achievement Test?
7. Are there differences in absentee patterns of students evidenced by Total Mathematics results from the Metropolitan Achievement Test?
8. Does the performance of students on the state-mandated reading proficiency test reflect absentee pattern differences?
9. Does the performance of students on the state-mandated writing proficiency test reflect absentee pattern differences?

10. Does the performance of students on the state-mandated math proficiency test reflect absentee pattern differences?

Information Sources

The data reported in this study were gleaned from the following sources:...

1. S1020005 Comparative Analysis of Attendance Percentages
2. S2015005 Student Attendance Profiles
3. S1015045 Student Master Record

Evaluation Design

A stratified random sample of 600 students in grade nine housed in schools utilizing the Daily Attendance Program formed the data basis of this study.

A conditioning of the sampling required that the students selected be enrolled in the school for the entire school year of 1979-80.¹ This condition was prompted by the fact that the Student Attendance Profile data does not make allowances for date of enrollment. The removal of late enrollees assured comparable time periods for enrollment of the students in the study. The conditioning required the deletion of fifty-seven (57) students, leaving a population of 543 remaining in the study.

The pre-determined data elements available were gathered for each of the 543 students. The data was then keypunched and statistically treated using the SPSS package.

The data treatment used an analysis of variance to ascertain which differences were statistically significant.

Findings

The following responses to the pre-stated questions resulted from an interpretation of the treated data.

1. Do the absentee patterns of junior high students differ from senior high students?

The conditioned sample of 543 students recorded a mean of 24.0 days of partial absences. The junior high school students averaged 11.5 days of partial absences during the year versus the senior high school student mean of 31.0 days of recorded partial absences.

It is observable from Table I that the minimum number of partial absence days recorded for a junior high school student was 0 and the maximum recorded was 54 days. Of 349 high school students, all recorded at least two days of partial absence--the minimum was 2.0 days and the maximum was at least 99 days.

(Students recording more than 100 days were truncated at 99.)

Table I
The Mean Days of Partial Absences
For Junior High School and Senior High School Students

Group	N-count	Mean	Minimum	Maximum
JHS Students	194	11.5	0.0	54.0
SHS Students	349	31.0	2.0	99.0
TOTAL	543	24.0	0.0	99.0

An analysis of variance indicated that there was a statistically significant difference in the pattern of partial absences for the two groups (F-ratio = 125.9). The data treatment output is shown in Figure I, Appendix A.

When analyzing the data for differences in total absences, a reversal of the partial absence findings appeared. The junior high school student recorded an average of 11.5 days of total absences for the school year. The minimum number of total absences was 0 and the maximum was 68 days. The senior high school student averaged 8.3 days of total absences. The minimum was 0 and the maximum was 62.

Table 2
The Mean Days of Total Absences
For Junior High School and Senior High School Students

Group	N-count	Mean	Minimum	Maximum
JHS	194	11.5	0.0	68
SHS	349	8.3	0.0	62
TOTAL	543	9.4	0.0	68

When the dichotomy of junior high school versus senior high school students was analyzed for differences relative to total absences, the results were statistically significant (F-ratio = 11.059). (See Figure II, Appendix A.)

2. Are there differences in absentee patterns of students by gender?

When viewing absentee patterns by gender for ninth grade students, the sampling reflected the following for partial absences. The male student recorded slightly more

partial absences than the female student--24.9 to 23.2 days respectively. An analysis of variance treatment of the data placed the F-ratio = 0.913 and was not statistically significant. (See Figure III, Appendix A.)

The minimum and maximum profiles for both male and female students were virtually identical.

Table 3
The Mean Days of Partial Absences
For Male and Female Students

Group	N-count	Mean	Minimum	Maximum
Male	264	24.9	0.0	99.0
Female	278	23.2	1.0	99.0
TOTAL	542	24.0	0.0	99.0

An inspection of the total absentee pattern for male and female students indicated significant differences. The male student averaged 8.8 days of total absences compared to the female student with an average of 11.2 days during the school year. The minimum and maximum days reflected a slight advantage in favor of the male student, with the highest incidence of total days of absences being 61 compared to 68 for one of the female students. The maximum differences were of little concern when considering that both of the cases indicated that the students missed more than one-third of the school year. An analysis of variance produced an F-ratio = 1.613 that was not statistically significant. (See Figure IV, Appendix A.)

Table 4
The Mean Days of Total Absences
For Male and Female Students

Group	N-count	Mean	Minimum	Maximum
Male	264	8.8	0.0	61
Female	278	10.0	0.0	68
TOTAL	542	9.4	0.0	68

3. Are there differences in absentee patterns of students by race?

An inspection of the partial absence data indicated that Hispanics and Blacks had the highest incident of absenteeism--28.7 and 28.3 days respectively. The White students averaged 23.4 days and all other ethnically identifiable groups were collectively combined, with a partial absentee rate of approximately one-half of that of the total sample average, with 12.4 days. The minimum incident of partial absences was, for all practical purposes, equal and the variation for maximum days was extremely diverse. An analysis of variance produced an F-ratio = 3.028 which was statistically significant at the 0.03 level. This is to say that the differences recorded in partial absences would only be accounted for in three out of every 100 replications. (See Figure V, Appendix A.)

Table 5
The Mean Days of Partial Absences
By Race

Group	N-count	Mean	Minimum	Maximum
White	424	23.4	0.0	99.0
Black	79	28.3	1.0	96.0
Hispanic	25	28.7	0.0	80.0
Other	15	12.4	1.0	30.0
TOTAL	543	24.0	0.0	99.0

When analyzing the absentee patterns for total absences by race, Hispanics recorded the highest number of total absences at 14.0 days, Blacks were absent 10.4 days, Whites were absent 9.1 days, and Others were absent the least number of days, with 6.6 days. The frequency of absenteeism placed the races in the same position for total absences as for partial absences. Minimum days were equal and the maximum days were only noteworthy in the case of Others. An analysis of variance did not result in any statistical significant differences with an F-ratio of 2.160. (See Figure VI, Appendix A.)

Table 6
The Mean Days of Total Absences
By Race

Group	N-count	Mean	Minimum	Maximum
White	424	9.1	0.0	61
Black	79	10.4	0.0	62
Hispanic	25	14.0	0.0	68
Other	15	6.6	0.0	40
TOTAL	543	9.4	0.0	68

Sampling Check

Using the ethnic breakdown of the sample, percentages were computed and compared with the ninth grade District percentages. The data is displayed in Table 7. It is apparent from the comparison that the percentages are identical to a degree that the sample could be considered representative on ethnic composition.

Table 7
An Ethnic Comparison of The Sample
And Ninth Grade Population

Group	Sample N-count	Sample Percentage	Ninth Grade District Percentage
White	424	78.1	78.9
Black	79	14.5	13.5
Hispanic	25	4.6	4.6
Other	15	2.8	3.0
TOTAL	543	100	100

4. Are there differences in absentee patterns of students by length of enrollment?

It was the purpose of this element of the study to attempt to determine if there was a difference in the attendance pattern of students in regard to their length of enrollment in the Clark County School District. The procedure used involves the student number sequence. When the Student Master File was initiated in the fall of 1972, all students enrolled in the previous spring and projected for re-enrollment were given a student number containing a leading zero. All subsequently enrolling students were given a first digit number other than zero. Therefore, the zero level group was enrolled in first grade in the spring of 1972, while the other group enrolled subsequent of that time. It should be understood that some of the "later enrolled" students have been in attendance varying lengths of time from fall 1972 to as late as early spring 1980 and various points in between these extremes.

Out of the 543 students in the sample, 251 (46.2 percent) were in attendance in

the spring of 1972 and the remaining 292 (53.8 percent) enrolled subsequent of that point. Assuming the sample was representative of the parent population, these figures indicated the degree of stability of the current ninth grade population which exists in the District.

The spring 1972 group recorded a higher incident of partial absences than their counterparts (post-spring 1972)--26.6 and 21.8 days respectively. Their minimum and maximum profiles were identical. These differences were statistically significant when treated by an analysis of variance with an F-ratio = 6.815. (See Figure VII, Appendix A.)

Table 8
The Mean Number of Partial Absences
By Length of Enrollment

Group	N-count	Mean	Minimum	Maximum
Spring 1972	251	26.6	0.0	99
Post-spring 1972	292	21.8	0.0	99
TOTAL	543	24.0	0.0	99

When analyzing the total days absences by length of enrollment, an interpretation of the days reflected similar absentee patterns for the two groups. An analysis of variance lends credence to the visual interpretation inasmuch as no statistical significance was attained with an F-ratio = 0.893. (See Figure VIII, Appendix A.)

Table 9
The Mean Number of Total Absences
By Length of Enrollment

Group	N-count	Mean	Minimum	Maximum
Spring 1972	251	9.9	0.0	68
Post-spring 1972	292	9.0	0.0	61
TOTAL	543	9.4	0.0	68

5. Are there differences in absentee patterns of students evidenced by scholastic aptitude (DIQ)?

Using Otis-Lennon Mental Ability Test (OLMAT) scores, the sample was partitioned into their respective nine stanine groups. The mean number of days of partial absences for each group was computed and is shown in Table 10. It is apparent from the data that the students' absenteeism patterns show considerable difference relative to their scholastic aptitude scores. Drawing a comparison of the stanine 2 group with the highest mean of 38.3 days and the stanine 9 group with the lowest mean of 15.1, the stanine 2 group was absent 153.7 percent more than the stanine 9 group. Minimum and maximum profiles are also provided in Table 10. When an analysis of variance was performed on the data, an F-ratio = 3.974 was statistically significant at the 0.001 level. In other words, the odds of this happening by chance were only one in a thousand. (See Figure IX, Appendix A.)

Table 10
The Mean Number of Days of Partial Absences
By Scholastic Aptitude

Group	N-count	Mean	Minimum	Maximum
Stanine 1	17	26.1	1.0	87
Stanine 2	26	38.3	4.0	99
Stanine 3	50	29.9	1.0	84
Stanine 4	107	27.5	0.0	96
Stanine 5	115	25.2	1.0	94
Stanine 6	94	21.6	1.0	99
Stanine 7	53	16.3	2.0	54
Stanine 8	31	19.5	2.0	99
Stanine 9	20	15.1	4.0	86
TOTAL	513	24.5	0.0	99

A very similar distribution of absentee patterns relative to the number of days of total absences is evident from Table 11. Observation of stanine group 6-9 reflected little, if any, difference between themselves; however, when compared to absentee patterns for stanine group 1-3, the differences were extremely apparent. An analysis of variance with an F-ratio = 7.585 suggested that replication of the data would not occur by chance with a statistically significance level in excess of 0.0001. (See Figure X, Appendix A.)

Table 11
The Mean Number of Days of Total Absence
By Scholastic Aptitude

Group	N-count	Mean	Minimum	Maximum
Stanine 1	17	11.6	1.0	33
Stanine 2	26	18.8	0.0	62
Stanine 3	50	16.7	0.0	56
Stanine 4	107	9.6	0.0	68
Stanine 5	115	8.6	0.0	48
Stanine 6	94	6.6	0.0	38
Stanine 7	53	7.3	0.0	27
Stanine 8	31	6.4	0.0	37
Stanine 9	20	6.5	0.0	40
TOTAL	513	9.5	0.0	68

6. Are there differences in absentee patterns of students evidenced by Total Reading results from the California Achievement Test?

In order to determine if differences in partial absences were evident by Total Reading performance, the sample was partitioned into three groups (stanines 1-3, 4-6, and 7-9). Attention to Table 12 clearly indicates a difference in absentee patterns with the lower reading performance group exhibiting a higher rate of absenteeism. Minimum and maximum profiles are virtually identical. An analysis of variance produced an F-ratio = 16.118, which was statistically significant at the 0.0001 level. (See Figure XI, Appendix A.)

Table 12
The Mean Number of Days of Partical Absences
By Total Reading Performance

Group	N-count	Mean	Minimum	Maximum
Stanine 1-3	96	34.1	1.0	99
Stanine 4-6	283	24.5	0.0	99
Stanine 7-8	122	17.5	2.0	99
TOTAL	501	24.6	0.0	99

When student reading performance was analyzed with total absences, it was found that the lower the reading scores, the higher the incident of total absences. The maximum number of days absent for any student in stanine group 7-9 was, likewise, considerably less than for any other group (48 versus 62 or 68 days). The differences were statistically significant at the 0.0001 level with an F-ratio = 13.539. (See Figure XII, Appendix A.)

Table 13
The Mean Number of Days of Total Absence
By Total Reading Performance

Group	N-count	Mean	Minimum	Maximum
Stanine 1-3	96	14.4	0.0	62
Stanine 4-6	283	8.6	0.0	68
Stanine 7-9	122	7.5	0.0	48
TOTAL	501	9.5	0.0	68

7. Are there differences in absentee patterns of students evidenced by Total Mathematics results from the Metropolitan Achievement Test?

The data would suggest that how a student performs in mathematics will impact his/her partial absence profile. The ability to predict attendance patterns in regard to mathematics performance does not have the degree of reliability that was evident with reading performance. However, an analysis of variance produced an F-ratio = 6.117 which was statistically significant. (See Figure XIII, Appendix A.)

Table 14
The Mean Number of Days of Partial Absences
By Total Mathematics Performance

Group	N-count	Mean	Minimum	Maximum
Stanine 1-3	90	31.7	1.0	99
Stanine 4-6	231	25.2	0.0	99
Stanine 7-9	88	20.2	2.0	99
TOTAL	409	25.5	0.0	99

Likewise, the performance level in Total Mathematics showed significantly statistical differences in terms of total absences. The top performing mathematics group was only absent 6.4 total days during the school year versus 13.9 days for the lowest level of mathematics performance. The maximum profile was similarly distributed by mathematics performance. The resulting F-ratio = 10.338 from an analysis of variance was significant at the 0.0001 level. (See Figure XIV, Appendix A.)

Table 15
The Mean Number of Days of Total Absences
By Total Mathematics Performance

Group	N-count	Mean	Minimum	Maximum
Stanine 1-3	90	13.9	0.0	68
Stanine 4-6	231	9.3	0.0	62
Stanine 7-9	88	6.4	0.0	40
TOTAL	409	9.7	0.0	68

8. Does the performance of students on the state-mandated reading proficiency test reflect absentee pattern differences?

As required by legislative action (NRS 389.015), ninth grade students are to be tested on state-mandated proficiency examinations in reading, writing, and mathematics.

Attempting to respond to the above question, the sample of students was divided into three groups relative to reading proficiency testing. The three groups were: tested and proficient; tested and non-proficient; and not tested. It is apparent from Table 16 that the not tested category exhibited considerably more days of partial absences than either the proficient or non-proficient groups. Minimum and maximum profiles demonstrated nothing of noteworthiness.

Analysis of variance used to determine if the differences were statistically significant resulted in an F-ratio of 16.709, significant at the 0.00001 level. (See Figure XV, Appendix A.)

Table 16
Mean Number of Days of Partial Absences
By Reading Proficiency Status

Group	N-count	Mean	Minimum	Maximum
Proficient	435	21.7	0.0	99
Non-Proficient	44	27.9	0.0	96
Not Tested	64	37.5	1.0	99
TOTAL	543	24.0	0.0	99

In terms of total absences, the differences were similar to the partial absences reported above. The group attaining proficiency status missed 7.9 days, non-proficient students recorded 12.5 days, and the not tested category missed more than twice that of the proficient group with a recorded 17.7 days of total absences from school. The maximum profile showed that at least one student was absent for 68 days during the school year but attained proficiency status. The F-ratio = 26.706 substantiated statistically significant differences at the 0.0001 level of confidence. (See Figure XVI, Appendix A.)

Table 17
The Mean Number of Days of Total Absences
By Reading Proficiency Level

Group	N-count	Mean	Minimum	Maximum
Proficient	435	7.9	0.0	68
Non-Proficient	44	12.5	0.0	38
Not Tested	64	17.7	0.0	62
TOTAL	543	9.4	0.0	68

9. Does the performance of students on the state-mandated writing proficiency test reflect absentee pattern differences?

In terms of partial absences and writing proficiency status, an interpretation of data reflected an identical trend to absenteeism profiles such as existed in the area of reading. Treating the data with an analysis of variance routine gave an F-ratio = 9.859 and was statistically significant at the 0.0001 level. (See Figure XVII, Appendix A.)

Table 18
The Mean Number of Days of Partial Absences
By Writing Proficiency Status

Group	N-count	Mean	Minimum	Maximum
Proficient	459	22.3	0.0	99
Non-Proficient	35	30.6	1.0	96
Not Tested	49	35.1	0.0	99
TOTAL	543	24.0	0.0	99

In terms of total absences, a different pattern appeared. In this instance, the group designated non-proficient was absent a total number of days more than the not tested. The differences between the recorded performance and total day absenteeism were statistically significant at the 0.008 level. (See Figure XVIII, Appendix A.)

Table 19
The Mean Number of Days of Total Absences
By Writing Proficiency Status

Group	N-count	Mean	Minimum	Maximum
Proficient	459	8.7	0.0	68
Non-Proficient	35	14.4	0.0	62
Not Tested	49	12.8	0.0	56
TOTAL	543	9.4	0.0	68

10. Does the performance of students on the state-mandated math proficiency test reflect absentee pattern differences?

The performance in mathematics proficiency was in close agreement with that reported for reading in terms of partial absences. The non-proficient group continued to be in attendance more than the group which was not tested. The F-ratio = 25.017 was statistically significant at the 0.00001 level. (See Figure XIX, Appendix A.)

Table 20
The Mean Number of Days of Partial Absences
By Mathematics Proficiency Status

Group	N-count	Mean	Minimum	Maximum
Proficient	414	20.6	0.0	99
Non-Proficient	67	31.9	0.0	96
Not Tested	62	38.2	1.0	99
TOTAL	543	24.0	0.0	99

Total absence patterns were identical as shown in Table 21 and Figure XX, Appendix A.)

Table 21
The Mean Number of Days of Total Absences
By Mathematics Proficiency Status

Group	N-count	Mean	Minimum	Maximum
Proficient	414	7.5	0.0	48
Non-Proficient	67	13.9	0.0	68
Not Tested	62	17.3	0.0	62
TOTAL	543	9.4	0.0	68

The implementation of the study provided the data from which the following findings were interpreted.

Findings

1. The absentee patterns of junior high students are significantly different than those of senior high students.
2. The sex of a student is not a significant factor regarding student absentee rate.
3. The race of a student is a significant characteristic regarding partial absenteeism.
4. The length of continuous enrollment is a significant factor regarding student partial absenteeism.
5. A student's scholastic aptitude score is a significant factor regarding student absentee rate.

6. A student's total reading score is a significant factor regarding both partial and total days absence rate.
7. A student's total math score is a significant factor regarding both partial and total days absence rate.
8. Reading proficiency status or the fact the student was not tested are significant factors regarding their absenteeism.
9. Writing proficiency status or the fact the student was not tested are significant factors regarding their absenteeism.
10. Math proficiency status or the fact the student was not tested are significant factors regarding their absenteeism.

The Summary Chart which follows attempts to provide a quick visual aid in determining what student characteristics produced statistically significant differences relative to partial and/or total absenteeism data. The asterisk(*) indicates that statistically significant differences occurred in the data treatment and the 'Note' column specifies which group recorded the highest incidence of absenteeism. For example, in terms of the 'Location,' the senior high and the junior high school were significantly different in both partial and total absences; however, the highest rate for partials was recorded by senior high schools. Conversely, junior high schools recorded the highest rate of absenteeism in terms of total days. Continuing down the chart, the void of an asterisk in the Partial and Total columns would be indicative that gender did not show differences that were statistically significant.

SUMMARY CHART

Absences Category

Area Investigated	Partial		Total	
	Sig	Note	Sig	Note
Location	*	Senior High	*	Junior High
Gender				
Race	*	Hispanic		
Enrollment Date	*	Spring 1972		
Scholastic Aptitude	* +	Low	*	Low
Total Reading	*	Low	*	Low
Total Math			*	Low vs High
Reading Proficiency	*	Not Tested	*	Not Tested
Writing Proficiency	*	Not Tested	*	Non-proficient
Math Proficiency	*	Not Tested	*	Not Tested

Implications of the Study

This study investigated ten (10) student characteristics in regard to two (2) modes of absentee patterns--partial days and total days absences. Of the twenty (20) variables studied, fifteen (15) of the characteristics recorded statistically significant differences.

An interpretation of the data would suggest the following considerations relative to controllable factors.

1. The location of ninth grade students in junior high schools would lower the incidence of partial days absences but would increase total days absences.
2. When comparing students who have had their entire public school education in this District to students enrolling from other districts, it was found that Clark County School District students recorded a significantly higher degree of partial days absences. Further studies should be conducted in an attempt to ascertain the attitudinal difference towards school absenteeism of the groups.
3. Student scores on aptitude, achievement, and proficiency tests indicated that students performing below average were absent from school significantly more than students performing above average. Interpretation of the data provides a quandary. Are the test results low because of absenteeism patterns or is the fact that the student's performance is low creating a tendency for he/she to record a higher rate of absences? Regardless of the cause and effect relationship which may exist, it seems apparent that increasing the student's school attendance is highly desirable.

4. The data and resulting interpretations from this study could be used for a longitudinal comparative study to ascertain the impact of the new attendance policies on student absenteeism patterns. The study could examine the attendance of this sample of students in their subsequent school years.

Likewise, a random sample of the 1980-81 freshman's attendance data could be comparatively analyzed to determine if significant differences occurred from one group of freshmen to another.

APPENDIX A

FIGURE I
ANALYSIS OF VARIANCE
Table of Partial Absences
For Junior High Schools and Senior High Schools

Source	D.F.	Sum of Squares	Mean Squares	F-ratio
Between Groups	1	47,407.22	47,407.21	125.86
Within Groups	541	203,782.36	376.68	
TOTAL	542	251,189.56		

FIGURE II
ANALYSIS OF VARIANCE
Table of Total Absences
For Junior High Schools and Senior High Schools

Source	D.F.	Sum of Squares	Mean Squares	F-ratio
Between Groups	1	1,279.79	1,279.79	11.06
Within Groups	541	62,606.12	115.72	
TOTAL	542	63,885.91		

FIGURE III
ANALYSIS OF VARIANCE
Table of Partial Absences
For Male and Female Students

Source	D.F.	Sum of Squares	Mean Squares	F-ratio
Between Groups	1	424.02	424.02	0.91
Within Groups	540	250,763.94	464.38	
TOTAL	541	251,187.93		

FIGURE IV
ANALYSIS OF VARIANCE
Table of Total Absences
For Male and Female Students

Source	D.F.	Sum of Squares	Mean Squares	F-ratio
Between Groups	1	190.16	190.16	1.61
Within Groups	540	63,676.11	117.92	
TOTAL	541	63,866.27		

FIGURE V.
ANALYSIS OF VARIANCE
Table of Partial Absences By Race

Source	D.F.	Sum of Squares	Mean Squares	F-ratio
Between Groups	3	4,162.80	1,387.60	3.03
Within Groups	539	247,026.32	458.30	
TOTAL	542	251,189.12		

FIGURE VI
ANALYSIS OF VARIANCE
Table of Total Absences By Race

Source	D.F.	Sum of Squares	Mean Squares	F-ratio
Between Groups	3	758.90	252.97	2.16
Within Groups	539	63,127.01	117.12	
TOTAL	542	63,885.90		

FIGURE VII
ANALYSIS OF VARIANCE
Table of Partial Absences By Length of Enrollment

Source	D.F.	Sum of Squares	Mean Squares	F-ratio
Between Groups	1	3,124.94	3,124.94	6.82
Within Groups	541	248,063.44	458.53	
TOTAL	542	251,188.37		

FIGURE VIII
ANALYSIS OF VARIANCE
Table of Total Absences By Length of Enrollment

Source	D.F.	Sum of Squares	Mean Squares	F-ratio
Between Groups	1	105.31	105.31	0.89
Within Groups	541	63,780.58	117.89	
TOTAL	542	63,885.88		

FIGURE IX
ANALYSIS OF VARIANCE
Table of Partial Absences By Scholastic Aptitude

Source	D.F.	Sum of Squares	Mean Squares	F-ratio
Between Groups	8	14,380.61	1,797.58	3.97
Within Groups	504	227,978.87	452.34	
TOTAL	512	242,359.43		

FIGURE X
ANALYSIS OF VARIANCE
Table of Total Absences By Scholastic Aptitude

Source	D.F.	Sum of Squares	Mean Squares	F-ratio
Between Groups	8	6,539.86	817.48	7.59
Within Groups	504	54,318.02	107.77	
TOTAL	512	60,857.88		

FIGURE XI
ANALYSIS OF VARIANCE
Table of Partial Absences By Total Reading Performance

Source	D.F.	Sum of Squares	Mean Squares	F-ratio
Between Groups	2	14,656.53	7,328.27	16.12
Within Groups	498	226,423.04	454.66	
TOTAL	500	241,079.56		

FIGURE XII
ANALYSIS OF VARIANCE
Table of Total Absences By Total Reading Performance

Source	D.F.	Sum of Squares	Mean Squares	F-ratio
Between Groups	2	3,025.03	1,512.51	13.54
Within Groups	498	55,634.74	111.72	
TOTAL	500	58,659.77		

FIGURE XIII
ANALYSIS OF VARIANCE
Table of Partial Absences By Total Mathematics Performance

Source	D.F.	Sum of Squares	Mean Squares	F-ratio
Between Groups	2	5,978.28	2,989.14	6.12
Within Groups	406	198,405.60	488.68	
TOTAL	408	204,383.87		

FIGURE XIV
ANALYSIS OF VARIANCE
Table of Total Absences By Total Mathematics Performance

Source	D.F.	Sum of Squares	Mean Squares	F-ratio
Between Groups	2	2,537.51	1,268.75	10.34
Within Groups	406	49,829.03	122.73	
TOTAL	408	52,366.54		

FIGURE XV
ANALYSIS OF VARIANCE
Table of Partial Absences By Reading Proficiency Status

Source	D.F.	Sum of Squares	Mean Squares	F-ratio
Between Groups	2	14,639.16	7,319.58	16.71
Within Groups	540	236,550.70	438.06	
TOTAL	542	251,189.81		

FIGURE XVI
ANALYSIS OF VARIANCE
Table of Total Absences By Reading Proficiency Status

Source	D.F.	Sum of Squares	Mean Squares	F-ratio
Between Groups	2	5,750.18	2,875.09	26.71
Within Groups	540	58,135.76	107.66	
TOTAL	542	63,885.94		

FIGURE XVII
ANALYSIS OF VARIANCE
Table of Partial Absences By Writing Proficiency Status

Source	D.F.	Sum of Squares	Mean Squares	F-ratio
Between Groups	2	8,848.78	4,424.39	9.86
Within Groups	540	242,340.15	448.78	
TOTAL	542	251,188.87		

FIGURE XVIII
ANALYSIS OF VARIANCE
Table of Total Absences By Writing Proficiency Status

Source	D.F.	Sum of Squares	Mean Squares	F-ratio
Between Groups	2	1,668.65	834.32	7.24
Within Groups	540	62,217.23	115.22	
TOTAL	542	63,885.88		

FIGURE XIX
ANALYSIS OF VARIANCE
Table of Partial Absences By Mathematics Proficiency Status

Source	D.F.	Sum of Squares	Mean Squares	F-ratio
Between Groups	2	21,300.67	10,650.33	25.02
Within Groups	540	229,889.83	425.72	
TOTAL	542	251,190.43		

FIGURE XX
ANALYSIS OF VARIANCE
Table of Total Absences By Mathematics Proficiency Status

Source	D.F.	Sum of Squares	Mean Squares	F-ratio
Between Groups	2	6,651.88	3,325.94	31.38
Within Groups	540	57,234.10	105.99	
TOTAL	542	63,885.98		

DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 215 021

UD 022 155

TITLE Follow Through Resource Center: Community School 77. Final Evaluation Report, 1980-1981.

INSTITUTION New York City Board of Education, Brooklyn, N.Y. Office of Educational Evaluation.

SPONS AGENCY Office of Education (DHEW), Washington, D.C.

PUB DATE [81]

NOTE 26p.

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC02 Plus Postage.

DESCRIPTORS *Adoption (Ideas); *Community Schools; Elementary Education; Individualized Instruction; *Information Dissemination; Inservice Education; Institutes (Training Programs); Parent Participation; *Program Evaluation; *Resource Centers; Student Motivation

IDENTIFIERS *New York City Board of Education; *Project Follow Through; University of Kansas

ABSTRACT

This is a final report on the Follow Through Resource Center at Community School 77 in the Bronx (New York). The Center was established in 1977 to disseminate information about the University of Kansas behavior analysis Follow Through model. The report discusses the program's activities during 1980-81, and includes an evaluation of the Center's success in dissemination of program information, demonstration of the program, and pre-service training as well as the impact of the training on new adoption sites. A participant evaluation form, behavior analysis implementation check list for adopting sites and the questionnaire used for inservice participants are appended. The center's activities include the following components: (1) individualized instruction; (2) positive motivation; (3) continuous assessment of student progress; and (4) parent participation in classroom instruction and educational planning. The results of the evaluation indicate that most of the components of the behavior analysis model were implemented at the two adoption sites surveyed and that eleven new adoptions were achieved. Likewise, information about the model was disseminated through a variety of channels and resulted in an expanded audience. It is suggested, however, that more follow-up training time is needed for pre-service training workshops. (JCD)

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

ED215021

FINAL EVALUATION REPORT
Project Number: 5001-48-17712

FOLLOW THROUGH RESOURCE CENTER
COMMUNITY SCHOOL 77
1980-1981

Project
Director: Marjorie McAllister

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION
CENTER (ERIC)

This document has been reproduced as
received from the person or organization
originating it.

Minor changes have been made to improve
reproduction quality.

• Points of view or opinions stated in this docu-
ment do not necessarily represent official NIE
position or policy.

Prepared By The
ANCILLARY SERVICES EVALUATION UNIT
Sharon Walker, Manager
Lila Lasky, Ed.D., Consultant

NEW YORK CITY PUBLIC SCHOOLS
OFFICE OF EDUCATIONAL EVALUATION
RICHARD GUTTENBERG, ADMINISTRATOR

UP 022 155

**A SUMMARY OF THE EVALUATION
FOR THE
1980-1981 COMMUNITY SCHOOL 77 FOLLOW THROUGH RESOURCE CENTER**

The Follow Through Resource Center located at Community School 77 in the Bronx was established in 1977 to disseminate information about the University of Kansas behavior analysis Follow Through model. The major goal of the behavior analysis model is to increase students' academic performance through positive reinforcement of appropriate behavior. The Resource Center is charged with disseminating information about the program as well as demonstrating the program, providing pre-service training, providing in-service training for teachers at two pre-identified adoption sites, insuring that teachers at adopting sites are implementing the core elements of the program, and identifying new sites as prospective adopters.

The C.S. 77 Follow Through Resource Center more than adequately fulfilled its obligation during 1980-1981. Highlights of the findings reported in the comprehensive evaluation are listed below.

- *Resource Center staff conducted more than 21 meetings and awareness workshops attended by over 335 participants, and the staff mailed information about the program to 135 individuals.
- *The Resource Center staff responded to 100 percent of the requests they received for pre-service workshops, holding 13 three day pre-service training sessions attended by 127 people.
- *Participant ratings of awareness workshops and training sessions were overwhelmingly positive. However, there was a general consensus that more in-service training is needed.
- *Although full implementation of the program has yet to be achieved, in most cases, teachers at the two targeted adopting sites have at least partially implemented three of the four components of the behavior analysis model.
- *The 11 projected adoptions for 1981-1982 bring the total number of schools using the behavior analysis model to 31.

The recommendations reported in the comprehensive evaluation which follows focus on helping the Resource Center effectively service the many schools which have adopted the behavior analysis Follow Through model, and are summarized below.

*In an effort to provide staff members at adopting schools with more support, the trainer's time needs to be carefully organized so that teachers at adopting sites can be continually monitored. Alternatively, the identification of a turn-key trainer at each site served for two or more years would allow the Resource Center staff to focus their training effort on newer adoptions.

*Requesting that all trainees complete an evaluation of each training program will provide both the training team and the evaluators with more complete information about the effectiveness of their training program.

*A reassessment and modification of the behavior analysis model, with the assistance of trained personnel, will allow the Follow Through Resource Center team to more effectively meet the needs of the special education and day care center children who will be served in the coming year.

*Arranging for parents at adopting schools to visit the C.S.77 parent involvement room and meet with parents already familiar with the program should lead to increased parental involvement at adopting sites.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	Page
SUMMARY	i
LIST OF TABLES	iv
INTRODUCTION	1
I. PROGRAM DESCRIPTION	2
II EVALUATION PLAN	4
III. FINDINGS	6
Dissemination	6
Demonstration	7
Pre-Service Training	7
In-Service Training	9
Impact of Training	10
New Adoptions	11
IV. CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS	13
V. APPENDICES	16
Participant Evaluation Form	17
Program Implementation Checklist	19
Questionnaire Used for In-Service Participants	20

LIST OF TABLES

	Page
Table 1 - Evaluation Objectives and Assessment Procedures	4
Table 2 - Participants' Ratings of Awareness Workshops	8

INTRODUCTION

The Follow Through Program at Community School 77 (C.S. 77) in the Bronx is part of a federally funded, nation-wide project designed to extend the exemplary early education practices of Headstart and other preschool programs into the early elementary school grades. Follow Through models, based on the designs of different sponsoring institutions, were replicated at sites throughout the country in the late 1960's. Based on the evaluation of pupil achievement at these sites, the United States Office of Education validated 21 programs as successful and worthy of replication. One of the two validated programs in New York City is at Community School 77 in the Bronx.

Subsequent to validation, the Follow Through staff applied for and received an Office of Education grant to establish a resource center to disseminate its program. The Resource Center was initially funded for the year 1977-1978; subsequent awards were made for the next three years.

This report focuses on the Center's activities during 1980-81, its fourth year of operation, and includes an evaluation of the following Resource Center activities: dissemination of program information, demonstration of the program, pre-service training, impact of the training, and new adoptions.

I. PROGRAM DESCRIPTION

The Community School 77 Follow Through Resource Center is housed with Follow Through classrooms in an annex to an older elementary school in the South Bronx. The Center's arrangement and activities reflect the philosophy of the Follow Through model designed by its sponsoring institution, the University of Kansas.

A major goal of the University of Kansas Follow Through model is to increase students' academic performance through positive reinforcement of appropriate behavior. The core elements of the model are:

- individualized instruction,
- positive motivation,
- continuous assesment of pupil progress, and
- parent participation in classroom instruction and educational planning.

These strategies are applied to the teaching of reading, math, and language arts in the C.S.77 Follow Through Program.

Classrooms are arranged so that three distinct groups can function simultaneously, and teams of teachers, paraprofessionals, and trained parent assistants provide instruction to individuals as well as small groups. Most of the instruction is individualized, and the adult supervising each work group shows the children how much work they are to complete, corrects finished work, answers questions, and provides instruction when children are having difficulties.

Time is divided into "earn" periods, during which children earn tokens by behaving appropriately, and "spend" periods, during which children exchange their tokens in order to participate in activities of their choice.

Children whose behavior is disruptive to others are separated from the group for a short "time out," and are thus excluded from the opportunity to earn or spend tokens. The token system is generally used in kindergarten and first grade, while a point-sheet is substituted in the second grade, and a contract procedure is used in the third grade.

The New York City Board of Education, through the Early Childhood Unit within the Division of Curriculum and Instruction, administers the Follow Through Program, and the Resource Center activities are administered directly by a project management team, which consists of the Resource Center manager, a teacher trainer, a parent trainer, demonstration teachers, and a consultant from the University of Kansas. Part-time health and social services consultants are also members of the Resource Center staff. This year, a part-time public relations consultant was engaged to provide outreach assistance to the program. Because of cuts in federal funding, the auxiliary trainer, who was formerly part of the team, was not re-appointed. The Resource Center is supervised by the school's Follow Through coordinator and the principal of C.S. 77.

Two rooms in the annex of C.S.77 are the hub of the Resource Center activities. The dissemination unit, known as the Resource Center room, serves as the office and exhibit area. Charts and graphs of pupil progress are displayed here, along with logs, scrap books, and samples of instructional materials. Meetings and workshops are held in the Resource Center room and in the nearby parent room. The classrooms of the kindergarten through third-grade Follow Through teachers, who are certified as demonstration teachers, are also utilized in the training of adopting-site staff and parents.

II. EVALUATION PLAN

Six evaluation objectives were specified to assess the Resource Center's activities in 1980-1981, and an assessment procedure for evaluating each objective was determined. The evaluation objectives and assessment procedures are outlined in Table 1. Samples of the implementation checklists, participant evaluation forms, and interview schedule are presented in the Appendices.

TABLE 1
Evaluation Objectives and Assessment Procedures

ACTIVITY	OBJECTIVES	METHOD OF ASSESSMENT
A. Dissemination	<ul style="list-style-type: none">-To determine whether information about the program was distributed at least twice locally and nationally.	<ul style="list-style-type: none">-Examination of Resource Center records and logs.-Staff interviews.
B. Demonstration	<ul style="list-style-type: none">-To determine whether Resource Center staff presented 3-5 awareness workshops.-To evaluate participant responses to these workshops.	<ul style="list-style-type: none">-Examination of monthly calendars and workshop agendas.-Analysis of a random sample of participant evaluation forms.
C. Pre-Service Training	<ul style="list-style-type: none">-To determine whether Resource Center staff responded to 75 percent of the requests for pre-service workshops.-To evaluate participant responses to these workshops.	<ul style="list-style-type: none">-Examination of records and workshop agendas.-Analysis of completed evaluation forms.
D. In-Service Training	<ul style="list-style-type: none">-To determine whether in-service training was provided 5-10 times at each of two adoption sites.	<ul style="list-style-type: none">-Classroom observations.-Interviews with participants.

TABLE 1 (continued)

Evaluation Objectives and Assessment Procedures

ACTIVITY	OBJECTIVES	METHOD OF ASSESSMENT
E. Impact of Training	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> -To evaluate participant responses to the in-service training. -To determine whether the core elements of the program are being implemented at the targeted adopting sites. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> -Analysis of completed evaluation forms. -Review of implementation checklists completed during classroom observations. -Interviews with participants.
F. New Adoptions	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> -To determine whether at least two new sites have been identified as prospective adopters of the model. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> -Examination of Resource Center final report. -Interviews with Resource Center staff.

III. FINDINGS

Dissemination

The Resource Center far exceeded its obligation to disseminate information about the program at least twice locally and nationally. In 1980-1981, the Resource Center mailed information about the program to 135 schools, 35 outside of New York City and 100 within the city. Staff members felt it best to concentrate their dissemination efforts on schools within New York that service populations similar to C.S. 77, and information about the program was sent to teachers outside of New York City only on request. Telephone contacts were not regularly logged.

The Resource Center also provided information about the program to over 200 people who attended the one on-site workshop and the 15 meetings and workshops held off-site. As well, the Resource Center staff advertised the program in several periodicals; however, only one of the five advertisements appeared to generate requests for information. The Center planned to develop radio spots, but these were not completed because final approval to hire a the public relations consultant came late in the year.

In their effort to provide useful information about the program, the Resource Center staff also revised and developed a number of publications. An awareness brochure, which had previously been xeroxed, was revised and printed commercially. In addition, two parent training manuals were developed for use in parent training workshops.

Another important element in the Resource Center's dissemination activities is the Resource Center itself. It contains literature on the behavior analysis model as well as samples of staff-developed and commercially published curriculum materials. Samples of daily schedules and back-up activities are also available for visitors to examine.

Demonstration

While the Resource Center staff was obligated to present three to five awareness workshops during the year, in fact, they exceeded this goal, and demonstrated the program to 135 participants. Those who attended the workshops were asked to complete a Participant Evaluation Form (see Appendix 1) in order to provide both the Center's staff and program evaluators with feedback about the effectiveness of the workshops.

Evaluators analyzed the responses of 45 workshop participants, and this sample included teachers, parents, aides, day care directors, administrators and paraprofessionals. Table 2 summarizes the participant's ratings of the awareness workshops, and indicates that 88 percent of the participants sampled gave the workshops very high ratings. However, many participants suggested that more time be spent answering questions, and requested additional time for classroom visits at C.S. 77.

Pre-Service Training

While the Resource Center staff was committed to respond to 75 percent of the requests they received for pre-service workshops, in fact, they honored 100 percent of these requests. Thirteen

TABLE 2

Participants' Ratings of Awareness Workshops (N=45)

Rating Scale	Usefulness of Content	Clarity of Presentation
5 (High)	14	17
4	24	27
3	0	0
2	7	1
1 (Low)	0	0

three-day pre-service training sessions were held. Thirty teachers and 18 supervisors attended the seven teachers' workshops, and 79 parents participated in the six training sessions for parents.

Of the 43 teachers and supervisors asked to evaluate the pre-service training, 21 responded.* Fourteen found the training very helpful, four considered it helpful, and three expressed no opinion. Comments appended to the evaluation forms were generally laudatory and indicated positive feelings about the trainer, the materials, and the behavior analysis model, although several participants expressed the need for longer workshops. Parents were not asked to evaluate the pre-service training program.

*The teacher trainer felt this low response rate might be due to the length of the evaluation form. A revised, one-page evaluation form was successfully field tested in June.

In-Service Training

The Resource Center staff was committed to provide five to ten in-service training sessions at each of two pre-identified adoption sites. A public elementary school in Queens and a publicly funded inner-city day care center in the Bronx were selected for evaluation because both programs not only reflected the broad spectrum of Follow Through adoption sites, but were also in the second year of adoption. According to training log entries, five training sessions were conducted at the day care center, and seven were conducted at the elementary school between September and December of 1980.

The evaluator observed six classes in the elementary school (K-2) and two classes in the day care center, and interviewed each of the teachers of these classes twice.

All teachers at both sites found the quality of training excellent and the personal qualities of the trainer outstanding. However, all felt that more in-service training was needed, particularly because several of the targeted teachers were involved in the program for the first time. In addition, eight of the ten teachers interviewed felt they needed more time to observe at the C.S. 77 demonstration classroom, and four expressed the desire for more on-site coordination of training by a liaison person.

Indications of preference for individualized and group training were evenly split, as was the teachers' assessment of the usefulness of the different components of the in-service program.

Administrators at the target elementary school were interviewed, and they clearly shared the teachers' generally positive feeling regarding the quality of the training. They were also equally aware of the need for additional training time, but were concerned about the source of funds for providing substitute teachers while the regular staff numbers attended training sessions.

Impact of Training

The evaluator collected information about the implementation of the core elements of the program at the two selected adoption sites through classroom observations and teacher interviews. Analysis of observation checklists and interview responses indicate that at least three of the core elements--individualized instruction, positive motivation, and continuous assessment of pupil progress--had been or were being implemented in the eight classrooms surveyed.

Teachers at the adoption elementary school noted that many of the children, especially those who had been low achievers, were more motivated, and they appreciated the assistance of adults in the classroom and liked the flexibility of the program materials. Teachers also noted significant changes in the children's behavior, and their ability to work independently. However, some teachers remarked that behavior problems still exist and that "time out" did not always work. Others found that individualization was difficult to accomplish alone, and expressed the need for more paraprofessional assistance.

The day care center teachers interviewed also commented on the children's increased motivation, although they had more difficulty implementing the program than their elementary school colleagues did. While they felt that the program worked well for some children, they had difficulty adapting the program to the needs of the younger children.

Several of the day care teachers suggested that if more materials were made available to them, they could perhaps implement the elements of the program more extensively. The director of the day care center also noted the need for more materials, and she suggested that teachers make their own. On the whole, the director felt the program was most effective with the older children at the day care center.

Parent involvement at both sites appeared rather limited. Parents at the elementary school had received training at the school early in the year, and as the year progressed, interest began to wane. With the exception of the kindergarten classroom, parental assistance was not evident. At the day care center, since most of the children's parents work full-time, the aides and volunteers were considered to be substitute participants, and although they had not received special training, they met regularly with the director of the day care center to discuss the program.

New Adoptions

The Resource Center was obligated to identify at least two new sites as prospective adopters of the model. In fact, the Resource

Center's final report lists eleven new adoptions for the 1980-1981 year, including four public elementary schools, three private elementary schools, and four day care centers, all located in New York City. A total of 31 classes will be served. Several of the potential adopters of the behavior analysis model serve special-education children; this is most likely in response to the National Diffusion Network's sanctioning of this center's solicitation of special education programs as possible adopters of the behavior analysis model. As well, several of the potential adopters are Bronx day care centers which feed into public elementary schools which have already adopted the model. However, implementation of the behavior analysis model at these sites is being delayed until the United States Office of Education issues guidelines for pre-school adoptions of Follow Through models.

The C.S.77 Follow Through coordinator and the city-wide coordinator expressed satisfaction with the number of new adoptions, and they hope to expand the program to schools in New Jersey and Pennsylvania next year.

IV. CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

The C.S. 77 Resource Center more than adequately fulfilled its obligation to disseminate information about the program, provide training, and solicit new adoptions during the 1980-1981 funding year. Moreover, the data clearly demonstrate the effectiveness of the staff's activities. Information about the behavior analysis Follow Through model was disseminated through a variety of channels and resulted in an expanded audience. The addition of a paid consultant facilitated the revision of printed materials, the creation of a new slide program, and additional parent training materials.

Analysis of participant ratings of awareness and pre-service training workshops were consistently positive; more than 75 percent of the teacher trainees at adoption sites responded favorably to the training workshops. However, there is a general consensus that more follow-up training time is needed.

The data also reveal that most of the core elements of the behavior analysis model have been implemented at the two adoption sites surveyed. The evaluators also found that the day care center teachers who were involved in the program were warmly accepting of its components, despite their awareness of the unique needs of the younger children they serve.

The Center's success in achieving new adoptions is noteworthy. The earnestness and professionalism of the Resource Center staff resulted in eleven new adoptions, nine more than projected at

the onset of the program year. Although the program is generally costly to implement, the staff's willingness to allow adopters to modify the program enabled them to achieve more widespread acceptance of the program in the New York City area.

The cooperation of the principal, community school board, parent advisory council, and the city-wide Follow Through coordinator has served to stimulate interest in this Follow Through model. As well, their support and assistance enabled paperwork to move through the necessary channels swiftly. The Center team managed to organize each facet of its responsibilities successfully.

In light of the successful implementation of proposed objectives, it is strongly recommended that the Community School 77 Follow Through Resource Center be continued.

Recommendations

Teachers at the two adopting sites evaluated expressed a strong need for more in-service training, and the Resource Center staff may want to consider a careful organization of the trainer's time so that teachers at adopting sites can be continually monitored. Alternatively, it might be beneficial to train an on-site "turn-key" trainer at each adopting site served for two or more years to support the participants' efforts at implementation. However, before this suggestion can be implemented, it would be important to write a clear job description for this new position.

In order to provide the training team with a more complete evaluation of their training programs, we suggest that all trainees be asked to complete an assessment questionnaire at the conclusion of the training program, and that a more determined effort be made to collect these program evaluations.

As well, it is recommended that members of the Follow Through team conduct a careful assessment of the model with the assistance of trained personnel who will be able to help the team modify components of the program. Perhaps consultants from the University of Kansas could assist in this undertaking. Such modifications should be aimed at the needs of individual pupils particularly in special education settings.

In order to increase the effectiveness of parent participation, we recommend that the team arrange for parents at adopting sites to visit the C.S. 77 Resource Center, where they can interact with parents already experienced in the program.

The practice of preparing a monthly calendar of events has been useful in the past and we suggest that it be continued. We would also recommend that a log of telephone contacts be kept next year. The cost effectiveness of advertisements should also be carefully monitored.

In the event that the Resource Center is funded next year, it is recommended that the Center manager become more involved in the training provided at adoption sites; the increased number of adoptions will certainly necessitate such action.

In light of the projected federal budget cuts, it is recommended that the Center team look to the strengths of existing staff members in order to close the gap which personnel cuts may create. Efficiency and cooperation have characterized the Resource Center staff's operations in the past, and are a testament to good human relations practices. It is strongly urged that they be continued.

APPENDIX

BEHAVIOR ANALYSIS FOLLOW THROUGH RESOURCE CENTER

Participant Evaluation Form

1. How did you find out about the Community School 77 B.A. Resource Center?

- Publication, Meida ()
National Diffusion Network ()
Educational Programs That Work ()
Newsletters, announcements ()
Other () - please indicate _____

2. Was the information presented or content useful to you?

Not at All	Somewhat	No Opinion	Yes	Absolutely
()	()	()	()	()

3. Were the presentations clear and easily understood?

Not at All	Somewhat	No Opinion	Yes	Absolutely
()	()	()	()	()

4. What activities did you find most informative and helpful with regard to describing the Follow Through Program & Resource Center?

(example: slide presentation, data presentation, staff development, parent involvement panel)

5. Do you wish further contact with the Resource Center Staff for additional information and/or possible adoption of program components?

Yes No Undecided

Name _____

Address _____

6. Check the appropriate box that indicates position held.

School Administrator ()

School Board Member ()

Teacher ()

Parent ()

Other - () - please indicate _____

Leon Taylor, Principal
Ruth Khelseau, Coordinator

Louise Cooper, Manager
Judith Scher BenHaim Staff Trainer
Thomasenia Key, Auxiliary Trainer
Elva Fulton, Parent Coordinator



Adopting Site Behavior Analysis Implementation Checklist

School: _____ School Year _____
 Address: _____ District: _____
 Number of Classrooms Participating: _____ Principals: _____

Key: √: Implemented N: Not Implemented
 S: Sometimes Implemented NA: Not Applicable

	Class					
	A	B	C	D	E	F
Instruction in small groups and/or individualized						
Daily plan on board						
Menus posted						
Back-ups vary						
Tokens, point sheets or contracts in use						
Frequent teacher contacts						
Frequent pupil response						
Use of descriptive praise						
Absence of negative comments						
Use of behavior contingencies						
Daily spend periods						
Curricula materials used appropriately						
Pupil Progress monitoring						
Parents assist in instruction						

QUESTIONNAIRE USED FOR IN-SERVICE PARTICIPANTS

1. Would you please describe the type(s) of training you received?
2. Which type did you find most useful?
3. Was this training adequate?
4. If you could have additional training, which type would you like to have?
5. How would you evaluate the trainer's approach to her work?
6. About which of the core elements did you receive the most helpful training?
7. Which element of the B.A. model do you like best?
8. Which element(s) were you able to implement?
9. Which element(s) do the pupils appear to like best?
10. Have you noticed any changes in your pupils since your implementation, or differences from previous groups?
11. What had been the extent of parent participation?