DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 275 715 TM 860 629

AUTHOR Neufeld, Barbara; And Others
TITLE Hartford Effective Schools Initiative: Implementation Year Evaluation Report, 1984-1985 and Executive Summary.
PUB DATE 1 Aug 85
NOTE 172p.
PUB TYPE Tests/Evaluation Instruments (160)

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC07 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS *Academic Achievement; Achievement Tests; Bilingual Education; Classroom Observation Techniques; Data Collection; Instructional Effectiveness; Intermediate Grades; Interviews; Models; Primary Education; *Program Effectiveness; *Questionnaires; Research Design; *School Effectiveness; *School Surveys; Scores; *Teacher Response
IDENTIFIERS Connecticut School Effectiveness Project; Facilitators; *Hartford Effective Schools Initiative; Metropolitan Achievement Tests

ABSTRACT

This evaluation report summarizes the impact of the Hartford Effective Schools Initiative (HESI) during the 1984-85 implementation year and is based on: (1) interview and observation data gathered during two day visits to each of the three schools in April and May and compared with similar data collected from the same teachers, facilitators, administrators and paraprofessionals in October and November 1984; (2) responses to the teacher survey developed by the evaluation team; (3) responses to the second administration of the Connecticut School Effectiveness Questionnaire compared with those generated by the first administration (May 1984); and (4) an analysis of the standardized test scores of students in participating schools. Section One describes components of the HESI model in use in classrooms based on interviews and observations and the confidential survey returned by 130 teachers. Section Two, HESI in schools, is based on interview and observation data and describes the role of the facilitators, school profiles and concerns across the school at the end of year 1. Section Three describes changes in teachers' perceptions of school effectiveness based on the Connecticut School Effectiveness Questionnaire, and Section Four presents an initial look at student achievement. Appendices include questionnaires, program strengths and weaknesses, and recommendations as reported on the teacher survey. (Author/JAZ)

HARTFORD EFFECTIVE SCHOOLS INITIATIVE

IMPLEMENTATION YEAR EVALUATION REPORT

1984 - 1985

Prepared by

Fieldwork Team

Barbara Neufeld

Quantitative/Survey Team

Robert Gable
Edward Iwanicki

August 1, 1985

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

HARTFORD EFFECTIVE SCHOOLS INITIATIVE

IMPLEMENTATION YEAR EVALUATION REPORT

1984-1985

Prepared by

Fieldwork Team

Barbara Neufeld

Quantitative/Survey Team

Robert Gable

Edward Iwanicki

August 1, 1985

Hartford Effective Schools Initiative

IMPLEMENTATION YEAR 1984-1985

Final Evaluation Report

INTRODUCTION

This evaluation report is the last in a series that includes the Planning Phase Evaluation Report, Summer Institute Phase Evaluation Report and Implementation Year: Fall 1984 Evaluation Report. It summarizes the impact of HESI during the 1984-85 implementation year and is based on 1) interview and observation data gathered during two day visits to each of the three schools in April and May and compared with similar data collected from the same teachers, facilitators, administrators and paraprofessionals in October and November 1984, 2) responses to the teacher survey developed by the evaluation team, 3) responses to the second administration of the Connecticut School Effectiveness Questionnaire compared with those generated by the first administration (May 1984), and 4) an analysis of the standardized test scores of students in participating schools.

Section One describes components of the HESI model in use in classrooms based on interviews and observations and th confidential survey returned by 130 teachers. Secti wo, HESI in schools, is based on interview and observation data and describes the role of the facilitators, school profiles and concerns across the schools at the end of Year I. Section Three describes changes in teachers' perceptions of school effectiveness

based on the Connecticut School Effectiveness Questionnaire, and Section Four presents an initial look at student achievement. As in previous reports, school names have been changed to protect confidentiality.

SECTION ONE: HESI IN CLASSROOMS - 1984-1985

General Overview. In the Spring of 1985, both interview and survey data reveal that teachers remain enthusiastic about the intellectual content of the Hunter training, the model of instruction presented, and the possibility of additional training. Teachers are using the vocabulary, participating in post-observation conferences, and are generally positive. This sustained enthusiasm is a distinct and significant project accomplishment.

COMPONENTS OF THE MODEL IN USE

Vocabulary. The Hunter vocabulary is used well by a solid 80% of the staff members with whom we spoke. It has become a common language in part as a result of the successful coaching component and in part because staff members find it useful.

Reinforcement Theory. Most teachers are attempting to use reinforcement theory in their classrooms. Some are using it effectively. Those for whom positive reinforcement does not come naturally have difficulty using it convincingly. They make positive comments that do not ring true to the evaluator's (or the facilitators') ear.

Positive Feeling Tone. In the Fall we noted that there were teachers in each school who were making a serious effort to create

a positive feeling tone in their classrooms. They have continued to work on feeling tone throughout the year.

Lesson Design. Teachers remain convinced that lesson design is a valuable framework with which to think about and plan their lessons. Teachers who claimed in the Fall to be using most aspects of lesson design, but who we (and facilitators) judged not to be using them, have changed very little. Teachers who reported in the Fall that they were trying aspects of lesson design have found them helpful and continue to use them in their classrooms.

At this point in the school year, some (but not all) teachers believe that lesson design is a unit or recipe and that all parts must be included in every lesson. In the coming year teachers might work with facilitators on 1) ways in which the model can be varied and 2) how segments of it do and do not apply to specific kinds of lessons.

Anticipatory Set/Motivation. Teachers remain interested in presenting a successful anticipatory set that increases the likelihood that students will pay attention. In the Fall, we reported that some teachers told children to pay attention because the content was going to be on their competency tests; others created considerable drama in order to indicate the importance of the material and a few were unable to explain why the material was worth knowing. These differences remain. The component needs continuing focus as teachers work to understand why terial is worth teaching and learning at a particular time.

Stating the Objective. Teachers continue to e asize stating the objective so that children will unders what they

are working to accomplish. The expertise with which this is done, varies, and (as in the Fall) so does the extent to which the lesson actually focuses on the objective

Opportunities for Practice. A few teachers indicated that they were taking advantage of techniques that enabled them to increase student participation and therefore practice. They have made changes in the structure of their lessons and in the way they ask questions. Teachers are more alert to providing practice opportunities than they were prior to training.

Checking for Understanding. In the Fall we reported that teachers were checking for understanding but that 1) they often seemed unable to use the information that they were getting, and 2) they were not always asking students for useful information. There were also classrooms in which signaling was used very well. As of May, we did not find teachers more skillful with respect to this component. The quality of implementation is mixed, but it is clear that teachers are working on this area in order to improve their understanding of what children are learning during instruction.

Dignifying Answers. More than half of the teachers indicated that they now dignify students' answers and find this a positive, productive way to interact with children and encourage their participation. We were able to see and hear this in many more classrooms in the Spring than in the Fall.

TEACHER SURVEY: 1984-1985

Teachers at the three schools were asked to complete a

confidential survey (see Appendix A) which was distributed by the facilitators and returned to them in sealed envelopes provided by the evaluators. A total of 130 teachers returned completed surveys. Sections of the survey addressed such areas as the extent of Summer 1984 and 1984-1985 school year training; type of training; training presenters and content; teacher involvement with the facilitator, principal and other teachers; staff meetings; program strengths and weaknesses; and recommendations.

We note that at the project level (i.e., three schools combined) teachers report that they are focusing on many of the important aspects of lesson design, were able to implement many of them into their instruction, and perceive the implementation as a change in many of their instructional techniques. These survey findings agree with those of the qualitative evaluation.

Program Strengths and Weaknesses. Section VI of the survey asked the teachers to list strengths and weaknesses of the Hunter model as implemented in their classroom and school. The comments of teachers from all three schools and Summer 1984 training time groups were very supportive of the program. Weaknesses tended to focus on school rather than program factors. Both strengths and weaknesses complement those described by the qualitative data.

Summary: Impact of HESI in Classrooms

HESI has had a positive impact on teachers, administrators and facilitators. First, it has made the improvement of teaching a school wide focus, goal and priority and it has provided the assistance necessary to move toward that goal.

Second, the project has increased many teachers' sense of efficacy with respect to their work. Collegial involvement with the facilitator, a common language, and useful techniques have helped teachers feel more professional. The project has had a negative impact on sense of efficacy for a very small number of teachers. Comparing their teaching with the Hunter model has left them aware of serious deficiencies in their skills.

Third, although the project has had an overall positive impact, facilitators and building administrators and some teachers had hoped HESI would produce a visible impact on students at the end of this first year. They are a disappointed that such an impact is not yet apparent and that it will take several years to answer questions about student impact. However, it is reasonable to assume that positive reinforcement and feeling tone have a beneficial impact on students' lives in classrooms, if not yet on their academic achievement.

In this regard, two facilitators believe classroom climate has improved as a result of HESI. Attention to motivation has helped teachers alleviate some problems; "preserving dignity" has likewise kept down minor behavior problems and has increased student participation. These facilitators report that some teachers do a better job of whole group instruction as a result of striving for active participation and they provide more coherent lessons as they pay attention to providing and teaching to a clear objective.

The changes described are distinct improvements and they can be attributed to HESI. Whether they are yet of sufficient

magnitude to make a difference to students remains to be seen as the project continues.

SECTION TWO: HESI IN SCHOOLS

The Role of the Facilitator. We noted in the interim report that HESI's success rested heavily on the facilitators. They have done an outstanding job and during the year have become far more sophisticated in their ability to provide support and instructional assistance to teachers. Their presence and skill are essential components of HESI. Without them there would be no one to promote video taping, conferencing, or reflecting about teaching on a continuing basis.

Project Design: Year II. Facilitators have raised important issues about project design for Year II. First, they are concerned about what to provide for teachers who are highly skilled and feel that the project is not providing enough new information to justify the time spent in conferences and additional in-service programs. Facilitators do not know what to provide to make their participation worthwhile. As mentioned earlier, we recommend differentiating HESI in order to provide appropriate training.

Second, facilitators are troubled by teachers who need something more than HESI. They feel that providing only positive reinforcement and Type A conferences for these teachers is inappropriate. Yet it is not within their authority, role or expertise to describe what is wrong and provide an improvement strategy. We recommend that principals or coaches from outside

the building work with marginal teachers. As with highly skilled teachers, differentiating facilitator services could provide teacher-appropriate training and make optimal use of facilitators' skills.

Third, facilitators are disappointed that they have been unable to establish on-going teacher/teacher observations in their schools. There are teachers who do not want to observe or be observed by their peers and others who doubt the value of such observations. A few do want to observe but have simply not gotten around to it. For those teachers' who want to observe one another, a formal schedule with coverage provided might help initiate and sustain the process.

Fourth, demonstration lessons were frequently offered primarily as a way to reimburse teachers for the time they had committed to the project and secondarily as an opportunity for additional learning. Facilitators demonstrated, but teachers were not required to observe. It is not clear that there was a particular focus to this piece of the model during the first year. (See Teacher Survey, Table 5 for further data on this issue.)

Fifth and finally, facilitators wonder how to make the transition to other types of conferences in which they will note teaching behaviors that merit improvement; they wonder how to hold such conferences and not lose the trust established during Year I. This concern is worth some serious consideration by facilitators and project coordinator prior to the start of the next school year.

SCHOOL PROFILES. When we first visited the HESI schools in May 1984, we reported that faculty were generally enthusiastic about HESI and that each school had its own concerns with respect to both the project and its functioning as a school. At the end of Year I, we find that concerns which existed a year ago and which are unrelated to HESI in origin still exist. We make this point because school-specific factors interact with HESI and influence implementation and attitudes. We do not mean this as criticism; HESI was not designed to solve school problems. However, solving them is necessary if HESI's the full benefit is to be achieved.

CONCERNS ACROSS THE SCHOOLS

The differences in HESI implementation across schools are not great; the similarities are more dominant despite school specific issues of leadership, physical plant and discipline. Therefore, it is not surprising that similar areas of concern arise in all three schools. These require immediate consideration if the project is to move forward.

Pacing versus Mastery. The Hunter instructional model urges teachers to teach to the correct level of difficulty and proceed only when children have mastered the material. According to teachers and administrators, pacing is an instructional priority in Hartford. Teachers are experiencing the tension of trying to 1) teach at the correct level of difficulty and for mastery and 2) cover a years worth of material in a year. They cannot do both. Further, the pacing demand does not take into account the different rates at which students learn; it contradicts the HESI

emphasis. We recommend that this tension be directly addressed by central office administrators and school site personnel. Teachers are getting mixed messages both of which they cannot respond to; each message has different implications for those children who have the most difficulty learning.

Differentiating HESI. A second issue that is equally difficult and important concerns differentiating and targetting HESI training. Teaching to the correct level of difficulty and for mastery is critical for students; it is equally so for adults. During Year I, HESI could be described as "whole group instruction." This was appropriate at the point where new information was introduced. Teachers have learned at different rates and to different extents; the same program, therefore, is no longer appropriate for all. We suggest, along with the facilitators, that the project either develop ways to provide more appropriate facilitation for these teachers -- that is facilitation at the correct level of difficulty -- that the project find another way to use these teachers skills -- perhaps as demonstration teachers or subject matter specialists -- or that the project exempt them from further participation if they prefer not to participate.

Assisting Marginal Teachers. A third and related issue concerns teachers who we, along with administrators describe as marginal. Facilitators have great difficulty coaching these teachers. We recommend that administrators coach marginal teachers, freeing facilitators to deal more fully with the large group of teachers for whom HESI is pitched at the correct level of

difficulty. This would make better use of both facilitators' and teachers' time.

Teaching versus Telling. A fourth concern centers on teachers' understanding of curriculum and what it means to "teach." We have been struck by the difficulty some teachers have in teaching elementary school fractions, proportions, and percentages, for example. Unless teachers improve their own knowledge of content as well as how to teach it, the impact of HESI on student achievement will be limited. It will come from better classroom management rather than from better teaching. We recommend that HESI staff in Year II consider how to better identify and address this particular problem

Role of the Principal A fifth concern is the role of the principal in implementing HESI. Given the demands on administrators, it is virtually impossible for them to implement the supervisory component of the model, although we have little doubt that principals are now more astute observers of teaching. Therefore, in considering the future of the project, the Hartford Board of Education should consider whether it will relieve principals of some administrative burdens in order to provide them with supervisory time, continue to fund facilitator positions or both. Without coaching and supervision, the project will not remain vibrant for very long.

SECTION THREE: TEACHER PERCEPTIONS OF SCHOOL EFFECTIVENESS CHARACTERISTICS

Purpose. Teacher's perceptions of school effectiveness characteristics were assessed Spring 1984 (pre) and Spring 1985 (post). The pre data were presented in a previous report as baseline data for describing pre-project perceptions. The relationship between the amount of training sessions attended and changes in teacher perceptions is not clear in this data set. While the relationship appears to exist for the High Expectations characteristic for those attending some of the training, high levels of positive change for the no training group suggest the relationship may be moderated by some other variable. Project staff should discuss this exploratory finding further.

SECTION FOUR: STUDENT ACHIEVEMENT

It is well known through the school improvement literature that raising student achievement is a long term process which may involve at least a five year process. Therefore, it would be inappropriate to place emphasis on achievement outcomes during the first year of the project. We presented end of Year I achievement data as baseline data for a long term (i.e., five year) sustained achievement effects study. No short term causal relationships between the one year HESI project and student achievement were discussed. We recommend that Hartford staff review the achievement of students during the first year of the project to identify those schools and grade levels where the basic skill progress of

students (a) exceeded expectations, (b) met expectations, and (c) was below expectations. Once progress is categorized in this manner, instructional programs should be analyzed by school and grade level to identify specific aspects or features of these programs which teachers believe affected the levels of student achievement exhibited. Through this process directions for instructional improvement for the next school year can be identified on the basis of student progress during the initial project year.

SECTION FIVE: PARAPROFESSIONAL SURVEY 1984-1985 SCHOOL YEAR

The paraprofessionals assisted in evaluating the HESI program through the completion of the 1984-1985 School Year Paraprofessional Survey (see Appendix A). Sections of the survey addressed paraprofessional training and asked for any recommendations regarding program improvement. Paraprofessionals were generally quite positive to the project.

SECTION SIX: SUMMARY

At the end of this evaluation report, we want to reiterate that Year I of HESI has been very good and in some ways quite remarkable. Teachers and principals continue to praise the quality and content of the training. Not only have they kept their initial positive reaction to the Summer training and clinical experience, they have remained enthusiastic about the in-service provided during the academic year. Teachers should be recognized for their commitment to the project; the project coordinator and trainers

should be recognized for the outstanding design and implementation of the model. It is not easy to sustain a staff development project of this intensity and teachers and project personnel have done an outstanding job.

Building facilitators have likewise been superb. Their skill and commitment resulted in a level of attention to teaching that is needed but ordinarily difficult to achieve. As a result, teachers became more comfortable being observed; in many cases they wished they could have had more coaching than what was available. The isolated, closed door attitude of many gave way to a desire for support and assistance. This is a major step forward in the effort to improve teaching.

With respect to implementation, we found teachers using the language extensively and incorporating components of the model into their teaching. The sophistication with which they use these components varies as a function of previous teaching style and level of expertise. This is to be expected. It reveals that the project is proceeding along the expected three to five year implementation time table described by Hunter.

We did note areas of concern that have arisen during the year. Some competent teachers find the coaching and conferencing insufficiently sophisticated; facilitators struggle with how to use the model with teachers they and their principals describe as marginal. These are difficult issues and we have suggested differentiating the training in Year II to meet the needs of individual teachers. Such an approach is compatible with the Hunter model which reminds us to select learning objectives at the

correct level of difficulty and be aware of the learning style of the student. Teachers, as participants in HESI, are most assuredly students; they deserve the kind of instruction that is most likely to result in high levels of learning.

In the course of completing this evaluation we uncovered problems that are not a result of HESI but which will influence 1) the extent to which HESI has the intended impact and 2) the fair evaluation of HESI. First, we noted in the interim report that teachers and principals were uncertain that central office administrators were committed to HESI for the foreseeable future. They reported little overt support from the Superintendent or his associates and felt reluctant to wholeheartedly embrace the project if the next academic year would see its demise. We anticipated limited implementation due to teachers' perceptions that HESI would end and they would be asked to do something different next year.

To some extent, these concerns were alleviated when central office personnel visited the schools in the Spring, tried the model in HESI classrooms and participated in conferences. Teachers were pleased when the Superintendent made a public commitment to the project at the start of an in-service training day. If the district is committed to the project, these kinds of activities should continue.

Second, because the evaluation team as well as the project staff were paying close attention to classroom teaching, we became aware that a number of teachers have professional development needs that HESI is not designed to address. Some of these are

described as marginal; others have a great deal of difficulty explaining particular subject matter material to children. HESI can help these teachers, but we end the year wondering whether even this intensive program can improve their teaching sufficiently to make a significant difference to children.

We urge caution, therefore, when eventually evaluating HESI on the basis of improvements in students' achievement test scores. As a result of our evaluation this year, we would expect differential achievement score outcomes as a function of teachers' skill and ability at the start of the project. We urge continued attention to and evaluation of program content and quality during the next year or two in order to accurately assess what was implemented, the extent and quality of that implementation, and the associated impact on test scores. The Board of Education has initiated a sustained effects study of achievement; we recommend that it be continued throughout the life of the project in order to accurately assess the connections between HESI and student achievement.

Hartford Effective Schools Initiative

IMPLEMENTATION YEAR 1984-1985

Final Evaluation Report

INTRODUCTION

This evaluation report is the last in a series that includes the Planning Phase Evaluation Report, Summer Institute Phase Evaluation Report and Implementation Year: Fall 1984 Evaluation Report. It summarizes the impact of HESI during the 1984-85 implementation year and is based on 1) interview and observation data gathered during two day visits to each of the three schools in April and May and compared with similar data collected from the same teachers, facilitators, administrators and paraprofessionals in October and November 1984, 2) responses to the teacher survey developed by the evaluation team, 3) responses to the second administration of the Connecticut School Effectiveness Questionnaire compared with those generated by the first administration (May 1984), and 4) an analysis of the standardized test scores of students in participating schools.

The report details our findings, summarizes the strengths and weaknesses of the implementation year and suggests recommendations for the 1985-86 school year. Section One describes components of the HESI model in use in classrooms based on interviews and observations and the confidential survey returned by 130 teachers. Section Two, HESI in schools, is based on interview and observation data and describes the role of the facilitators,

school profiles and concerns across the schools at the end of Year I. Section Three describes changes in teachers' perceptions of school effectiveness based on the Connecticut School Effectiveness Questionnaire, and Section Four presents an initial look at student achievement.

The findings and recommendations in this report will be compelling to members of the Board of Education, central office administrators and other interested readers only if they fairly represent implementation among all teachers working in the three HESI schools. Therefore, we begin with a brief description of our interview and observation sample and how we selected it.

With the assistance of building principals and facilitators, we chose five teachers in each school to interview and observe both in the Fall and Spring. They include Black, White, and Hispanic men and women, teachers of bilingual as well as English language classes, primary as well as intermediate grade teachers, and teachers with more and less seniority. In addition, we selected teachers who were ranked by principals and facilitators as more and less skillful, and specifically excluded teachers on administrative warning as a result of poor performance evaluation. Finally, we chose only teachers who were committed personally to use Hunter in their classrooms and who agreed to participate in the evaluation.

In the Spring, because of the sensitive nature of some of our findings, we explicitly asked both building administrators and facilitators to reconsider whether the sample of teachers fairly represented the range of teaching skill and ability in their

buildings. They reassured us that the samples honestly represented that range. Their assurance gives us additional confidence in the appropriateness of generalizing the findings from these 15 teachers to the remaining HESI teachers.

SECTION ONE: HESI IN CLASSROOMS - 1984-1985

General Overview. In the Spring of 1985, both interview and survey data reveal that teachers remain enthusiastic about the intellectual content of the Hunter training, the model of instruction presented, and the possibility of additional training. Teachers are using the vocabulary, participating in post-observation conferences, and are generally positive. This sustained enthusiasm is a distinct and significant project accomplishment. It suggests that, for the most part, staff members believe that it has been worthwhile to participate; they have gained from their investment.

Some staff members are disappointed, not with the model, but with the level of implementation. They regret that not more of the model has been internalized and that teachers use what they have learned haltingly.

> The majority are using it, but it isn't them. It's not a smooth flow. They are still learners. They have the sense that it works and they want to learn the model, but it isn't them yet.

This is to be expected. No one, least of all Rob Hunter, suggested that teachers would have internalized all aspects of the model by the end of Year I, and we raise the issue to point out that the actual level of implementation does not indicate a failure. It reveals that the project is proceeding along the expected three to five year implementation time table described by Hunter.

There are a few teachers in each school who claim that the project has not helped them improve. These are often highly competent teachers, according to administrators and facilitators,

for whom the conferences have not been productive. Some have asked to be released from further conferences; others prefer to seek ways to make the conferences more meaningful. Their desire is more, not less from HESI.

Finally, although the project has been well received by teachers and they have worked hard to learn the vocabulary and use the skills and techniques, at the end of this first year many still believe that for the district the project is an "add on" rather than a core component of school improvement. As such, they think it could cease at any time. Some of this sentiment is unavoidable as the project is new and therefore without a history. Some of it grows out of increased central office attention to instruction, which teachers see as conflicting with rather than complementing HESI and as a demand that reduces the emphasis on HESI. Teachers wish to keep their attention on HESI. They end Year I with a strong desire for Year II.

The next part of Section One details components of the Hunter model that are most visible at the end of this first implementation year. In many respects, they are the components that were visible in the Fall. Without exception, we can say that what was in place in the Fall is in place in the Spring. We did not observe any teachers who were using positive reinforcement in the Fall, for example, who had elected to no longer use it in the Spring. We did not always see a great deal of change in the skill level with which components were used in the Spring as compared with the Fall, but we can say that teachers continued to work on

the various aspects of the model that were meaningful to them and emphasized by facilitators.

COMPONENTS OF THE MODEL IN USE

Vocabulary. The Hunter vocabulary is used well by a solid 80% of the staff members with whom we spoke. Administrators and facilitators agree that teachers within their schools are well versed in the vocabulary. It has become a common language in part as a result of the successful coaching component. As one facilitator noted, using the vocabulary and model everyday during post-observation conferences, made her fluent in it. Through the same process, coaching has made the vocabulary an active part of teachers' language.

The vocabulary has also become a common language because staff members find it useful. It has enabled them to feel positive about themselves and their professional knowledge and skill. More importantly, it has enabled them to talk about instructional improvement. Several teachers who were doubtful about the value of the language (and content) in the Fall, have developed positive views over the year. No one has become negative.

Reinforcement Theory. As in the Fall, most teachers are attempting to use reinforcement theory in their classrooms. They are using it with varying levels of sincerity and success. Those teachers for whom positive reinforcement does not come naturally have difficulty using it convincingly. They make positive

comments that do not ring true to the evaluator's (or the facilitators') ear. Said one facilitator:

> I thought that the mixed emotions wouldn't show. I thought it would become part of the teachers and not remain part of those mixed emotions...but when I listen in the classrooms, the teachers sound like they are reading a script. It's not yet a part of them... Our teachers are using it as an add on and the kids will soon say "big deal." It's not a synthesis into their own personality.

Individual personality and psychology contribute to this situation. As one administrator suggested:

> It is easy for some to implement the model because so much of it is personality and psychology. If you really and truly like kids, if you really and truly like what you are doing, the model comes a lot easier than if you are doing it as a job and you don't like a lot of people. If your physical make up is tense, it is a lot more difficult.

This is not to say that no teachers have incorporated positive reinforcement in a convincing way into their repertoire. According to facilitators, some have. However, facilitators judge that those teachers who were not using positive reinforcement prior to HESI, for the most part are now using it in an unconvincing manner.

Despite the "add-on" feeling, positive reinforcement is still an effective tool in most of the classrooms we observed. In the interim report we suggested that teachers in all three schools were using identical phrases and were using them excessively. We were concerned, as were the facilitators, that the students would get bored and that the phrases would become meaningless. We are still concerned about this outcome, but it seems not to have happened yet. It remains the case that teachers across all three

schools use identical phrases for positive reinforcement in their classes.

One concern teachers raised in the Fall had to do with their perception of inflated claims for positive reinforcement. Some believed (incorrectly) that they had been told that it would solve all classroom discipline problems. We did not hear this complaint in any of the schools this Spring. Instead, teachers reported that there has been an emphasis on applying assertive discipline techniques in their schools and that they are looking at those to solve discipline problems and at positive reinforcement to improve instruction and prevent some discipline problems. This is a move in the right direction. The project coordinator should be credited for providing support and resources for assertive discipline material and training.

Rob Hunter had suggested that extrinsic reinforcers were less desirable than intrinsic reinforcers. He emphasized developing childrens' internal desire to learn. Teachers initially balked at this suggestion, especially those who had relied on stickers and other sorts of extrinsic reward. Some, however, attempted to incorporate intrinsic reinforcement and found it a useful addition.

During an in-service this year, Carole Helstrom suggested that extrinsic reinforcers can be used moderately and effectively. As a consequence, several teachers have returned to using stickers or candy. Others have used a specific technique that Carol described. They are putting marbles into glass jars to signify positive student work and behavior. One teacher has a jar for the

entire class; when the marbles reach a specified level the class will have a party. Another has a jar for each student. Teachers seem more comfortable with this modified approach to extrinsic reinforcement used in combination with intrinsic reinforcement.

We heard negative comments about Hunter's use of positive reinforcement techniques from teachers who teach well and have few discipline problems in their classrooms. These teachers "don't want to stand in front of the room and say, three of our tables are ready, let's wait for the fourth to get ready," or "I like the way Lillian is sitting, in order to get somebody named George to sit down." They want to take a more direct route and tell children what they are to do. They say that Hunter's approach doesn't reflect their personality.

These teachers have a valid point. There are teachers for whom this method is not going to work; these teachers sound as though they are reading a script. Further, there is research evidence suggesting that direct approaches may be more effective and efficient. Consequently, we urge flexibility in implementing the model so that teachers can adapt it to their own styles. At the moment, within these schools, there is "pressure to conform because observers are looking for specifics that Hunter taught when they are observing lessons." Neither Hunter nor we recommend this recipe approach to implementation. It would be helpful to have the facilitators and principals think about how to take the principles and use them differently in individual classrooms.

Positive Feeling Tone. In the Fall we noted that there were teachers in each school who were making a serious effort to create a positive feeling tone in their classrooms. They have continued to work on feeling tone throughout the year. Some of their attempts look amateurish rather than polished. This is not meant as a criticism; it is meant to suggest that teachers are still in the process of developing a positive feeling tone with the help of the facilitators.

As with positive reinforcement, there are occasional discrepancies between words and tone. For example, a teacher might say to a child, "Oh, you are a super reader," while grabbing a pencil out of the same student's hand. Despite the difficulty of changing entrenched habits, teachers and facilitators maintain their interest in improving classroom tone.

Lesson Design. Teachers remain convinced that lesson design provides them with a valuable structure and framework within which to think about and plan their lessons. "It gives kids a sequence of learning. It gives a teacher a way to check for understanding and ask whether the students are learning what I am teaching," said one teacher whose sentiments were echoed by others. "It allows you to check for understanding during closure; to find out if the kids picked up what I wanted them to learn."

As in the Fall, there are teachers who say they have always used lesson design. This is true for some, but not for others. Teachers who claimed in the Fall to be using most aspects of lesson design, but who we (and facilitators) judged not to be

using them, have changed very little. Facilitators and administrators indicate that these individuals are quite resistant to change because they remain convinced that they do what is being promoted. Convincing such teachers that they are not implementing all aspects of the model will be a considerable challenge for the coming year.

Teachers who reported in the Fall that they were not already using all aspects of lesson design, and found the ideas very helpful, continue to try them in their classrooms. A few, however, believe that lesson design is appropriate only to lessons that introduce new material. As one teacher commented, "When I do guided practice, they are not learning something new, they are just practicing. Lesson design doesn't work for guided practice and it doesn't work with small groups."

When Hunter presented lesson design last year, he stressed that it was not a recipe. He noted that different components might be included or excluded depending on the teacher's purpose but that an understanding of lesson design would put the teacher in a better position to choose what to include or omit. At this point in the school year, some (but not all) teachers seem to have the idea that lesson design is a unit or recipe and that all parts must be included. They are not yet clear about how to adapt the model or think about lesson design when they are not presenting new material. In the coming year teachers might work with facilitators on 1) ways in which the model can be varied and 2) how segments of it do and do not apply to specific kinds of lessons.

Anticipatory Set/Motivation. Teachers remain interested in presenting a successful anticipatory set that involves their students and increases the likelihood that they will be attentive to the material presented. The thoughtfulness of anticipatory sets continues to vary. In the Fall, we reported that some teachers told children to pay attention because what was going to be taught was on their competency tests; others created considerable drama in order to indicate the importance of the material.

These strategies have not shifted. Those who said little in the Fall say little now. Those who were creative in the Fall are equally creative now. The teacher who indicated in the Fall that she did not know why second graders were learning about punctuation, other than that they would need it in the next grade, taught a math lesson in which she used a similar kind of anticipatory set to introduce a lesson on the hundreds place.

> Today we are going to do something new, something that we have not worked on at all and you need to listen because you are going to use what we learn in third grade, fourth grade, fifth grade, sixth grade, seventh grade, and tenth grade and all the way through high school.

It is noteworthy that teachers remain concerned with providing an anticipatory set/motivation. The component needs continuing focus as teachers work to understand why the material is worth teaching and learning at a particular time. Perhaps teachers could work together to develop appropriate and enticing rationales.

Stating the Objective. Teachers continue to emphasize stating the objective so that children will understand what they are working to accomplish. The expertise with which this is done, varies, and, as in the Fall, so does the extent to which the lesson actually focuses on the objective

Teachers and facilitators have worked on this component quite extensively, and some teachers are more able to focus and keep their lesson on the objective. However we observed several classrooms where this was not the case. For example, one teacher stated the lesson objective clearly. He said:

> Before we get started, I want you to know that this is a review of word problems. We are becoming very efficient with adding, subtracting, multiplying, and dividing. I'm going to use the overhead today to do some problems with you. I want to see whether you know when to use each of these operations.

However, the lesson never focused on when (or why) to use each operation.

For example, the first problem was, "If there are 180 days in the school year, five days in a school week, how many school weeks are there in a school year?" The teacher pretended that he did not know how to solve the problem and asked for assistance. Several children raised their hands; the teacher picked one who went to the side board and wrote 180 x 5 = 900. The teacher was very polite and positive to the children when this solution was on the board. He asked the class whether they agreed with the answer. In unison the children said "no" and the teacher called on another student who went to the board and wrote 180 divided by 5. She, however did not know how to divide and the next ten

minutes were spent in clarifying how to divide 180 by 5. At no point was there any discussion about why one would divide to solve this problem.

Remaining class time was spent on four other problems. Each child who went to the board chose an operation that was incorrect. The teacher never explained which operation to use or why it was to be used. What is more, division was the correct operation for all problems. The objective was clear; the lesson did not focus on it.

Opportunities for Practice. A few teachers indicated that they were taking advantage of techniques that enabled them to increase student participation and therefore practice. They have made changes in the structure of their lessons and in the way they ask questions. For example, one (initially skeptical) teacher tried some of the techniques and by Spring made the following comments:

> I am now more conscious of what I am doing. I am breaking things down better, making sure that there is enough practice before I go on, but I think I was always good at properly picking the right work for each youngster. I'm also providing more practice, but the most important thing is that in the group lesson I am getting longer listening, better listening, and better responses because of the way I am throwing out the questions. Not everybody is yelling together. I am beaming the questions out to the whole class and then calling on particular people for the answer. Nobody knows who is going to be asked so they all tune in. In the old days you'd say, "Gary, how much is such and such?" and everyone else went to sleep. Now I'm very conscious of not preferencing questions with one person and instead I say, "I'm going to ask all of you the question, but one of you is going to be picked for the answer. I've learned how to raise their level of concern and make that better. That's my main thing. I'm also getting better behavior because

of using some of the techniques.

Another teacher has diversified practice so that it involves more than one sense. When teaching about patterns in previous years, she relied on pencil tasks and manipulatives. This year she tried music, clapping and drumming as well. Teachers are considerably more alert to providing practice opportunities than they were prior to training.

Checking for Understanding. In the Fall we reported that teachers were checking for understanding but that 1) they often seemed unable to use the information that they were getting, and 2) they were not always asking students for the information they needed. This was particularly apparent with use of signaling. As of May, we did not find teachers more skillful with respect to this component.

Facilitators concur with our evaluation. As one said

> A teacher will ask the children to put their thumbs up if they understand and down if they don't. But that kind of signaling doesn't give the teacher any sense of what the problem is or what to do next.

Teachers are not using signaling to learn which pieces of information children are missing. Further, as in the Fall, teachers do not always respond to the signaling when it does provide usable information. They might learn that children do not know how to name the hundreds place, but then go on with a lesson that requires such understanding.

There are, of course, some classrooms in which signaling is used very well. We observed one teacher who followed signaling

with brief, targetted instruction prior to continuing with a lesson. She reports that she is using more signaling this year in part because the building principal has emphasized its use. At his urging, she kept trying to use the technique and now finds that she is able to determine who understands and who does not during active instruction.

Although the quality of implementation is mixed, it is clear that teachers are working on this area in order to improve their understanding of what children are learning during instruction.

Dignifying Answers. More than half of the teachers indicate that they now dignify students' answers and find this a positive, productive way to interact with children and encourage their participation. We were able to see and hear this in many more classrooms in the Spring than in the Fall. One teacher discussed the process of internalizing the technique;

> Sometimes I still forget about dignifying responses and I still stay, "no." I don't feel that there is anything wrong with once in a while saying no to a young child if its done with a smile, in a light way with a sense of humor. But we've been made very conscious of not saying that too much. For instance saying instead, "You were thinking of something else, and I was thinking of that." Dignifying responses was to me, one of the most meaningful kinds of things that were new and it gave me a technique of correcting things. That's the part that I like a lot because it was something that was really new to me.

Summary: Components of the Model in Use. Our interviews and observations revealed that teachers have taken HESI training seriously and have made genuine efforts to improve their teaching. As a result of HESI, the improvement of instruction is of greater

concern to many teachers than in previous years. What is more, teachers now have a meaningful framework to apply to what they do and against which to measure themselves. These are significant accomplishments for the project.

To supplement the interview and observation data, we administered a paper and pencil survey. The results of the survey are presented next.

TEACHER SURVEY: 1984-1985

Teachers at the three schools were asked to complete a confidential survey (see Appendix A) which was distributed by the facilitators and returned to them in sealed envelopes provided by the evaluators. A total of 130 teachers returned completed surveys. Sections of the survey addressed such areas as the extent of Summer 1984 and 1984-1985 school year training; type of training; training presenters and content; teacher involvement with the facilitator, principal and other teachers; staff meetings; program strengths and weaknesses; and recommendations.

Teacher Training. Table 1 presents a summary of the extent of training received during the Summer 1984 period and during the 1984-85 school year. Of the 130 respondents, 61 indicated that they had attended the full six weeks of Summer training, while 18 indicated that they have never participated in any HESI training. The number of participants for the seven training sessions during the school year ranged from 38 to 61; the two Friday sessions (Oct. 26 and March 22) received the highest attendance figures.

Table 1

Summer 1984 and School Year HESI Training for Teachers as Indicated by Spring 1985 Survey Respondents

(N=130)

Training Period	Weeks	Rome	Hyde	All Schools
Summer 1984:				
1 week	8	8	3	19
6 weeks	19	21	21	61
Did not attend Summer but did during year	10	15	7	32
Never received training	4	11	3	18
School Year:				
Oct 8	15	23	8	46
Oct 26	18	27	15	60
Nov 10	13	21	7	41
Nov 12	14	16	8	38
Dec 8	13	21	9	43
Jan 12	10	20	7	37
Mar 22	17	29	15	61

Table 2

Teacher Ratings of the Quality of HESI Trainers

(N=112)

	Weeks					Rome					Hyde					All Schools				
	SD[b]	D	U	A	SA	SD	D	U	A	SA	SD	D	U	A	SA	SD	D	U	A	SA
The HESI trainer:																				
a. Clearly presented the material.	3		3	52	42	5	2		49	44			7	61	32	3	1	3	53	40
b. Maintained liveliness in discussions.			9	56	35	5	5	11	42	37	4		7	71	18	2	3	10	54	31
c. Used good examples to illustrate points.	3			64	33	5		7	53	35	4		4	75	17	3	1	4	62	30
d. Responded clearly to questions.	3	6	6	61	24	2	7	12	48	31	4		7	71	18	2	6	9	58	25
e. Modeled the described behaviors.	3	3	9	64	21	2	5	5	52	36	11		7	57	25	2	6	7	57	28
f. Used good transparencies.	3	3	21	58	15	2	7	16	42	33			11	75	14	2	4	16	56	22
g. Allocated time well to topics covered.	3	3	6	70	18	5	2	12	53	28	4		18	57	21	3	3	11	60	23
h. Provided the opportunity to ask questions.	3	6		64	27	2	9	2	61	26	4			78	18	2	7	1	66	24

[a] Table entries are percentages.

[b] SD = Strongly Disagree
D = Disagree
U = Undecided
A = Agree
SA = Strongly Agree

These figures may differ from project staff attendance records, but do reflect the statements of the Spring 1985 survey respondents.

Teachers who attended the Summer 1984 training were asked to describe the type of training they received during the seven school year sessions. Of the 58 teachers responding to the question 34% noted they received the same material presented during the Summer training, 47% indicated that the training extended and refined Summer material, and 19% noted that new material was presented in addition to Summer material.

Training Presenters and Content. Teachers were asked to evaluate the quality of the HESI trainers for the Summer and school year sessions. Table 2 presents the ratings by school and for the total group of teachers. Consistent with the data presented in previous reports, teachers' comments are extremely positive and supportive of the high quality of HESI trainers. Table 3 presents the ratings for quality of training content which are also very supportive of the HESI training.

Teacher Involvement. Section III of the survey addressed the area of teacher involvement with the facilitator, principal and other teachers. The far right side of Table 4 presents the responses for the total group of respondents broken down by length of Summer 1984 training (i.e., 6-weeks, 1-week, no Summer training). The center portion of the table displays the responses for each school.

Focusing first on the far right "all schools" data, we note that the frequency of facilitator observations, as reported by the

Table 3

Teacher Ratings of the Quality of HESI Training Content

(N=112)

	Weeks					Rome					Hyde					All Schools				
	SD	D	U	A	SA	SD	D	U	A	SA	SD	D	U	A	SA	SD	D	U	A	SA
a. Sequence of topics.			11	56	33		2	29	48	21	4	4	32	50	10	1	2	24	51	22
b. Quality of information presented.		3	8	53	36		2	19	42	37			31	48	21	1	1	19	47	32
c. Variety of topics presented.		3	6	61	30		5	19	44	33		7	25	54	14	1	4	16	52	27
d. Depth of the topic presented.		3	22	53	22		2	17	60	21		14	25	47	14	1	4	21	54	20

Table 4

Teacher Ratings of the Extent of Involvement with the Facilitator and Principal by School and Summer Training Group[a]

Teacher Involvement	Training Group	Weeks Frequency 0	1	2	3	4	5	$\bar{X}$	Rome Frequency 0	1	2	3	4	5	$\bar{X}$	Hyde Frequency 0	1	2	3	4	5	$\bar{X}$	All Schools Frequency 0	1	2	3	4	5	$\bar{X}$
Average number of times each month observed by?																													
Facilitator	6			8	9		2	1.8			4	13	2	1.9		2	6	13			1.5	2	18	35	2	2		1.7
	1			6		1		1.3		3	4	1			.8	1						0	4	10	1	1			.9
	0	2	3	3		1		1.4		3	5	5		1	1.4	1	3	2			1.2	6	11	10		1	1	1.4
	Total	2	17	12	1	3				6	13	19	2	1		4	9	15				12	39	46	3	3	1	
Principal	6	11	3	2	2			.7		5	7	5			1.0	11	4	4	1	1	.9	27	14	11	3	1		.9
	1		3	2	1			.7		2	6				.8	1						0	6	8	1			.7
	0	6	1					.1		6	5	1			.6	2	3				.6	14	9	1				.5
	Total	17	7	4	3					13	18	6				14	7	4	1	1		47	31	13	3	1		

[a]Table entries are frequencies.

respondents, ranged on the average from 0 to 5 per month (see boxed-in frequencies). Overall, the average number of observations appears to be in the 1-2 range. For principals, the teachers report an average number of observations from 0 to 4. For all schools combined we note that 47 teachers indicated that the average number of times they were observed each month was zero and 31 teachers indicated one visit per month on the average. Examining the frequency of observations across the Summer training time groups indicates that the highest average number of observations for both facilitators and principals was for the 6-week training group. Readers may wish to examine the school level data further.

Table 5 presents the responses for the extent to which teachers were involved in selecting the focus of the observations by facilitators and principals. The percentages listed on the right side of the table indicate that for all schools combined the teachers tended to be "sometimes" (32%) or "very often" (21%) involved by the facilitators. Involvement by the principals received lower ratings as 47% of the teachers indicated that they were "never" involved, while 12% said "rarely", and 19% said "sometimes."

Teachers were also asked if they had the opportunity to observe other teachers. For the three schools combined, 33% of the teachers were offered the opportunity with the highest percentage (39%) representing the Summer 6-week training group. Those indicating they had the opportunity noted they had made about two observations, and 75% indicated they would like more

Table 5

Teacher Ratings Regarding Observations and Staff Development[a]

(N=112)

Area	Training Group	Weeks 0	1	2	3	4[b]	Rome 0	1	2	3	4	Hyde 0	1	2	3	4	All Schools 0	1	2	3	4
Extent of involvement in selecting focus of observation:																					
When facilitator observed?	6	18	18	18	35	11	5	10	30	25	30	16	16	52	5	11	13	14	34	21	18
	1			72	14	14	38	38		24							20	20	33	20	7
	0	14		57	15	14	31	7	23	15	23	20	20	20	40		24	8	32	20	16
	Total																17	14	32	21	16
When principal observed?	6	60	7	13	13	7	25	6	19	38	12	47	23	18	6	6	44	12	17	19	8
	1	67		16	17		38	38		24							50	21	22	7	
	0	67		33			50	8	17	8	17	50		25	25		53	5	21	10	11
	Total																47	12	19	15	7
		Yes					Yes					Yes					Yes				
Offered opportunity to observe other teachers?	6	39					20					57					39				
	1	13					0					0					7				
	0	59					20					67					35				
	Total																33				
Building facilitator presented demonstration lessons in classroom?	6	53					90					55					66				
	1	38					0					0					19				
	0	38					13					50					28				
	Total																48				
		0	1/4	1/2	3/4+		0	1/4	1/2	3/4+		0	1/4	1/2	3/4+		0	1/4	1/2	3/4+	
Proportion of staff meeting time devoted to HESI teaching strategies?		18	52	21	9		36	46	13	5		35	39	19	7		30	46	17	7	

[a]Entries are percentages.

[b]0 = Never 2 = Sometimes 4 = Always
1 = Rarely 3 = Very Often

opportunities to observe other teachers. (We do not know why these data indicate considerably more observations than do qualitative data. The 15 teachers interviewed may have done fewer observations than the 130 survey respondents. However, facilitators noted that little teacher/teacher observation took place.)

In all three schools the facilitators presented demonstration lessons in selected classrooms. Across the three schools 48% of the teachers indicated that such lessons were presented. In almost all cases, teachers reported that the demonstration lessons were useful. Subjects demonstrated and the number of teachers noting the topic included the following:

Science	(14)	Transparencies	(1)
Social Studies	(3)	Hemisphericity	(1)
Mathematics	(4)	Questioning	(1)
Language Arts	(4)	Black Board Use	(1)
Drawing	(1)	Creative Writing	(1)
Computers	(2)	Art	(1)
Lesson Design	(2)	Music	(1)
Wait Time	(1)	Discipline	(3)

The final question in Section IV of the survey asked teachers what proportion (on the average) of staff meeting time was devoted to discussions of effective teaching strategies from the Hunter model. The lower right section of Table 5 indicates that across the three schools 30% indicated no time was spent on the topic and

46% noted about 1/4 of the meetings on the average. The time indications appear to have been similar for the three schools according to the respondents. When asked for any comments, a few teachers responded as follows: (Note that the letter following the comment indicates the teacher's school).

"Many questions still unanswered" (W)

"More effective school procedure has been useful in our school" (R)

"I found this program information to be very useful in helping me to design and deliver better lessons" (H)

"Unless I missed something we don't have enough staff meetings and rarely on one topic" (W)

"Use better judgment as to a teacher's needs and the purpose for planning time" (R, did not attend Summer training)

Use of HESI Training Lesson Design. The traditional evaluation of staff development programs includes an assessment of staff perceptions at the end of the training period. In our previous Summer Institute Phase Evaluation Report we reported positive findings at the end of the Summer 1984 training period. The evaluation of long term outcomes of staff development is an important part of assessing the effectiveness of training efforts. To this end, Section V of the survey listed 17 aspects of lesson design and asked the teachers to rate on a 4-point Likert scale (i.e., 1 = Not at all, 2 = Very little, 3 = Somewhat, and 4 = To a great extent) the extent that:

1. They focused on the aspect during the school year.
2. They were able to implement the aspect into their instruction, and

3. The implementation was a change from their previous instructional techniques.

Tables 6-9 present the teacher responses broken out by school, the combined set of three schools, and by amount of Summer 1984 training. Table 6 presents the primary set of analyses for all three follow-up questions. Our focus will be on the boxed-in percentages for the total group of respondents for each question.

The data in Table 6 are quite positive in that they suggest that teachers focused on many aspects of lesson design discussed in the training and attempted to implement the aspects into their instruction. (Detail on implementation appears in the previous section, Components of the Model in Use.) With respect to focusing on the 17 topics, we used an arbitrary percentage criterion of 60% for the "to a great extent" response option. Using this criterion, we note that all aspects of lesson design received much attention except the following:

4. Stating the objective and purpose to students (58%)
17. Six variables of motivation (58%)
9. Closure (43%)
11. Signaling (37%)
12. Hemisphericity (35%)
16. Negative reinforcement (26%)

Using the same 60% criterion for a "To a great extent" rating, we note that all aspects of lesson design were implemented into the instruction except the following:

9. Closure (43%)
11. Signaling (42%)

12. Hemisphericity (35%)

16. Negative reinforcement (33%)

The final section of Table 6 presents the ratings regarding the extent to which the implementation represented a change from previous instructional techniques. It is difficult to address these ratings from a positive or negative evaluation finding viewpoint without clearly documenting the initial level of use of the aspect of lesson design prior to the training. We can note, though, that these descriptive data indicate that several of the teachers perceive that instructional changes are present. For 13 of the 17 objectives over 50% of the teachers indicated that the implementation of the aspect of lesson design was a "Somewhat" or "To a great extent" change in their instructional techniques.

In summary, we note that at the project level (i.e., three schools combined) teachers report that they are focusing on many of the important aspects of lesson design, were able to implement many of them into their instruction, and perceive the implementation as a change in many of their instructional techniques. These survey findings agree with those of the qualitative evaluation.

Readers may wish to examine the school level data also reported in Table 6. While we observe many similarities in the ratings across the schools, we do note that the "To a great extent" ratings for the focus and implementation questions (first two sections of the table) received the lowest ratings from the Weeks teachers for about half of the 17 aspects of lesson design. Again, these findings agree with our interview and observation

Table 6

Teacher Ratings of the Extent of Use of Selected Aspects of Lesson Design by School[a]

(N=112)

Topics	School[b]	To what extent did you focus on these during this school year? 1	2	3	4[c]	To what extent were you able to implement these into your instruction? 1	2	3	4	To what extent did this implementation represent a change from your previous instructional techniques? 1	2	3	4
1. Selecting the objective at the correct level of difficulty	W	3		29	68			35	65	27	21	33	19
	R	5	5	10	80	3	3	15	79	26	40	21	13
	H		4	21	75			37	63	30	37	26	7
	Total	3	3	19	75	1	1	28	70	28	33	26	13
2. Teaching to the objective with relevancy.	W		3	21	76			38	62	9	36	40	15
	R	5	3	17	75		3	25	72	18	38	23	21
	H			18	82			22	78	11	22	52	15
	Total	2	2	18	78		1	29	70	13	33	37	17
3. Using an anticipatory set.	W	3	15	23	59	3	12	35	50	21	18	43	18
	R	5	5	24	66	3		26	71	10	30	35	25
	H		7	33	60			40	60	4	33	44	19
	Total	3	9	26	62	2	4	33	61	12	27	40	21
4. Stating the objective and the purpose to the students.	W	3	6	32	59		3	30	67	15	24	40	21
	R	5	3	37	55	3	3	25	69	13	32	35	20
	H		7	32	61	4	4	33	59	4	28	56	12
	Total	3	5	34	58	2	3	29	66	11	29	42	18
5. Input.	W		6	49	45		3	53	44	9	25	50	16
	R	5	5	18	72	3	3	12	82	25	33	15	27
	H			42	58			31	69	20	32	32	16
	Total	2	4	34	60	1	2	31	66	19	30	31	20
6. Modeling.	W		9	24	67	3	3	23	71	18	27	37	18
	R	5	3	18	74	3	3	13	81	21	37	21	21
	H			19	81			15	85	36	24	20	20
	Total	2	4	20	74	2	2	18	78	24	30	26	20
7. Checking for understanding.	W	3	3	23	71		3	15	82	18	27	24	31
	R	5	5	12	78	3	3	10	84	25	30	18	27
	H			7	93			11	89	32	20	20	28
	Total	3	3	15	79	1	2	12	85	25	27	20	28

Table 6 (cont.)

Topic	School	To what extent did you focus on these during this school year? 1	2	3	4	To what extent were you able to implement these into your instruction? 1	2	3	4	To what extent did this implementation represent a change from your previous instructional techniques? 1	2	3	4
8. Guided practice.	W	3		44	53		3	36	61	18	27	24	31
	R	5	5	22	68	3	5	20	72	25	35	18	22
	H			18	82			11	89	31	27	19	23
	Total	3	2	28	67	1	3	24	72	24	30	20	25
9. Closure.	W	6	18	49	27	6	16	47	31	6	30	40	24
	R	5	8	36	51	3	3	43	51	18	31	33	18
	H		4	48	48		16	36	48		39	42	19
	Total	4	10	43	43	3	11	43	43	9	33	38	20
10. Independent practice.	W	6	21	20	62	3	15	21	61	21	33	28	18
	R	8	5	25	62	3	3	27	67	36	31	13	20
	H		7	10	75		4	31	65	23	39	30	8
	Total	5	8	22	65	2	7	26	65	28	34	22	16
11. Signaling.	W	9	24	39	27	7	19	42	32	10	42	29	19
	R	10	13	33	44	11	3	31	55	16	24	29	31
	H	7	11	45	37	12	12	42	34	8	12	52	28
	Total	9	16	38	37	9	11	38	42	12	27	35	26
12. Hemisphericity.	W	13	6	56	25	17	7	53	23	13	26	42	19
	R	12	9	38	41	7	10	35	48	18	47	15	20
	H	4	4	52	40	4	8	38	50	22	22	43	13
	Total	10	7	48	35	10	8	42	40	17	33	32	18
13. Dignifying incorrect responses.	W	3		32	65			33	67	12	30	18	40
	R	5	8	23	64	8	5	21	66	18	33	18	31
	H			39	61			32	68	21	29	25	25
	Total	3	3	31	63	3	2	28	67	17	32	20	31
14. Monitoring and adjusting accordingly.	W	3		18	79			23	77	19	34	22	25
	R	5	5	18	72	3	3	16	78	21	31	25	23
	H			41	59			42	58	24	32	32	12
	Total	3	2	24	71	1	1	26	72	21	32	26	21

Table 6 (cont.)

Topic	School	To what extent did you focus on these during this school year? 1	2	3	4	To what extent were you able to implement these into your instruction? 1	2	3	4	To what extent did this implementation represent a change from your previous instructional techniques. 1	2	3	4
15. Positive reinforcement.	W	3		18	79		3	16	81	21	30	15	34
	R	5	3	20	72	3	3	16	78	21	24	24	31
	H			21	79			27	73	31	23	35	11
	Total	3	1	20	76	1	2	19	78	24	26	24	26
16. Negative reinforcement.	W		15	52	33	3	13	48	36	16	38	31	15
	R	18	33	31	18	17	23	23	37	24	41	16	19
	H	4	29	39	28	4	23	46	27	42	27	27	4
	Total	8	26	40	26	9	20	38	33	26	36	24	14
17. Six variables of motivation.	W	3	9	35	53	3	9	31	57	12	27	46	15
	R	5	3	32	60	3	3	25	69	16	34	16	34
	H			39	61		7	37	56	23	31	35	11
	Total	3	4	35	58	2	6	31	61	17	31	31	21

[a] Table entries are percentages.

[b]
Weeks N=37
Rome N=44
Hyde N=31

[c]
1 = Not at all
2 = Very little
3 = Somewhat
4 = To a great deal

data.

Relationship of Amount of Summer Training to Teacher Perceptions Tables 7 - 9 present the teacher ratings for each of the three evaluation questions with responses broken out by school and amount of Summer 1984 training. This analysis of the relationship of 1984 Summer training to teacher perceptions of focus on and implementation of aspects of lesson design is exploratory in nature. To a great extent this is necessitated by the fact that seven HESI training sessions were made available to all teachers during the 1984-85 school year. To the extent that teachers in the 1-week and, especially the no training group, attended many of the seven sessions, the training time distinction would be less meaningful. As we noted in Table 2, though, only from one third to one half of the total set of 112 teachers who responded to the survey question indicated that they had attended the seven listed sessions. Given this situation in light of the trends to be reported in the next section, it appears that it was worthwhile to quantify the amount of Summer training time.

Table 7 addresses the extent to which teachers focused on the aspect of lesson design during the school year. Noting that the small training group sizes created by breaking out the school level data by training time group places a limitation on generalizations, we still observe the following distinct trends in the data for especially the Weeks and Rome schools:

> Weeks and Rome teachers participating in the 6-week Summer training exhibited the highest percentage of "To a great extent" ratings on focusing on lesson design aspects for over half of

Table 7

Teacher Ratings of the Extent of Their Focus on Selected Aspects of Lesson Design by School and Summer Training Group[a]

(N=112)

Topics	Training Group	To what extent did you focus on these during this school year? Weeks 1	2	3	4[b]	Rome 1	2	3	4	Hyde 1	2	3	4
1. Selecting the objective at the correct level of difficulty.	6			22	78			5	95	5	28	67	
	1			25	75	12		13	75			100	
	0	13		50	37	7	14	14	65			100	
2. Teaching to the objective with relevancy.	6			22	78	5		11	84		19	81	
	1			25	75			25	75		50	50	
	0		12	13	75	7	7	22	64			100	
3. Using an anticipatory set.	6		17	22	61			16	84	10	28	62	
	1		13	25	62	12	13	25	50		50	50	
	0	13	12	25	50	7	7	36	50		50	50	
4. Stating the objective and the purpose to the students.	6			33	67			39	61	5	38	57	
	1			38	62	12		25	63		50	50	
	0	12	25	25	38	7	7	43	43	20		80	
5. Input.	6			44	56		5	5	90		45	55	
	1		13	37	50	12		38	50		100	-	
	0		14	72	14	7	8	23	62		20	80	
6. Modeling.	6			17	83			17	83		19	81	
	1		13	12	75	12		25	63			100	
	0		25	50	25	8	8	15	69		25	75	
7. Check for understanding.	6			17	83			11	89		5	95	
	1			38	62	12		13	75			100	
	0	12	13	25	50	7	14	14	65		20	80	
8. Guided practice.	6			33	67			16	84		14	86	
	1			50	50	12	13	12	63		50	50	
	0	12		63	25	7	7	36	50		20	80	

Table 7 (cont.)

To what extent did you focus on these during this school year?

Topics	Training Group	Weeks 1	Weeks 2	Weeks 3	Weeks 4	Rome 1	Rome 2	Rome 3	Rome 4	Hyde 1	Hyde 2	Hyde 3	Hyde 4
9. Closure.	6	11	22	39	28			41	59		5	52	43
	1		12	75	13	12		25	63			100	
	0		14	43	43	7	21	36	36			20	80
10. Independent practice.	6	6	11	11	72	6		33	61		5	29	71
	1			37	63	12		25	63		50		50
	0	12	25	25	38	7	14	14	65				100
11. Signaling.	6	17	33	28	22		11	33	56	10	5	47	38
	1			57	43	25	25	25	25		100		
	0		25	50	25	15	8	38	39		20	40	40
12. Hemisphericity.	6	13	6	56	25		7	47	46		5	55	40
	1		13	62	25	33		50	17	100			
	0	25		50	25	15	16	23	46			50	50
13. Dignifying incorrect responses.	6			22	78			22	78			38	62
	1			25	75	12		25	63			50	50
	0	12		63	25	8	23	23	46			40	60
14. Monitoring and adjusting accordingly.	6			17	83			22	78			43	57
	1				100	12		13	75			100	
	0	12		38	50	8	15	15	62			20	80
15. Positive reinforcement.	6			11	89			29	71			24	76
	1			13	87	12		25	63			50	50
	0	12		38	50	7	7	7	79				100
16. Negative reinforcement.	6		6	61	33	6	33	44	17	5	14	52	29
	1		29	43	29	13	50	25	12		50		50
	0		25	38	37	39	23	15	23		80		20
17. Six variables of motivation.	6	6	6	33	55			24	76			43	57
	1		13	25	62	13		50	37			50	50
	0		13	50	37	8	8	30	54			20	80

[a]Table entries are percentages.

[b]1 Not at all
2 Very little
3 Somewhat
4 To a great extent

[c]Group Sizes:

Training Group	Weeks	Rome	Hyde
6	19	21	21
1	8	8	3
0	10	15	7

the 17 design aspects.

Weeks and Rome teachers participating in either the 6-week or 1-week Summer training exhibited higher "To a great extent" ratings of focusing on lesson design than teachers attending no Summer training for over half of the 17 aspects of lesson design.

For the Hyde teachers the ratings from the 6-week training group were supportive but mixed in comparison with those of the 1-week and no training groups. This is most likely due to the effect on the percentages of the small number of teachers in the 1-week (N=3)) and no training (N=7) groups (see Table 7, footnote C). In addition, we note that the Hyde staff had previously worked on aspects of Hunter's instructional model, which would tend to make the "no training" group an inappropriate comparison.

Table 8 presents the school by Summer training time group ratings for the extent that teachers were able to implement the 17 aspects of lesson design into their instruction. Differences found in the response patterns across the three schools can be summarized as follows:

Weeks

The highest percentages of "To a great extent" implementation ratings were found for the 6-week Summer training group for half (8) of the 17 aspects of lesson design.

Teachers participating in either the 6-week or 1-week Summer training exhibited higher percentages of "To a great extent" implementation ratings than teachers attending no Summer training for 15 of the 17 aspects of lesson design.

The relationship between Summer training and implementation was not as pronounced at Rome. Using the same analysis strategy as reported above for the Weeks data, the 6-week group was found

Table 8

Teacher Ratings of the Extent of Implementation on Selected Aspects of Lesson Design by School and Summer Training Group[a]

(N=112)

Topics	Training Group	To what extent were you able to implement these into your instruction? Weeks 1	2	3	4[b]	Rome 1	2	3	4	Hyde 1	2	3	4
1. Selecting the objective at the correct level of difficulty.	6			28	72			26	74			43	57
	1			38	62	14			86			50	50
	0			50	50		8	8	84				100
2. Teaching to the objective with relevancy.	6			33	67		5	32	63			24	76
	1			38	62			14	86			50	50
	0			50	50			23	77				100
3. Using an anticipatory set.	6	6	11	39	44			16	84			38	62
	1		13	37	50	14		14	72			100	
	0		13	25	62			46	54			33	67
4. Stating the objective and the purpose to the students.	6			28	72		5	26	69	5		38	57
	1			29	71	14			86			50	50
	0		13	37	50			39	61		25		75
5. Input.	6			44	56		5	16	79			33	67
	1		13	50	37	14		14	72			100	-
	0			75	25			8	92				100
6. Modeling.	6	6		11	83		6		94			14	86
	1		13		87	14		29	57			50	50
	0			75	25			25	75				100
7. Checking for understanding.	6			17	83		5	11	84			10	90
	1			13	87	14			86			50	50
	0		12	13	75			15	85				100
8. Guided practice.	6		6	33	61		5	21	74			10	90
	1			25	75	14	14		72			50	50
	0			57	43			31	69				100

Table 8 (cont.)

Topics	Training Group	To what extent were you able to implement these into your instruction? Weeks 1	2	3	4	Rome 1	2	3	4	Hyde 1	2	3	4
9. Closure.	6	11	17	38	34			53	47		19	38	43
	1			75	25	14		14	72			100	
	0		33	34	33		8	46	46				100
10. Independent practice.	6	6	22	6	66			29	71			33	67
	1			37	63	14		14	72		50	50	
	0		14	43	43		8	31	61				100
11. Signaling.	6	12	35	30	23			35	65	10	10	47	33
	1			43	57	29	14	14	43		50	50	
	0			71	29	17		33	50	33			67
12. Hemisphericity	6	13	6	62	19		8	46	46		10	40	50
	1		14	43	43	33		34	33	50			50
	0	43		43	14		17	25	58			50	50
13. Dignifying incorrect responses.	6			28	72		11	22	67			25	75
	1			25	75	14		14	72			50	50
	0			57	43	15		23	62			67	33
14. Monitoring and adjusting accordingly.	6			17	83		6	24	70			43	57
	1			14	86	14			86			50	50
	0			43	57			15	85			33	67
15. Positive reinforcement.	6		6	6	88		6	24	70			29	71
	1			13	87	14		14	72			50	50
	0			43	57			8	92				100
16. Negative reinforcement.	6		6	59	35	6	35	30	29	5	15	55	25
	1		28	29	43	14	29	14	43		50	50	
	0	14	14	43	29	36		18	46		50		50
17. Six variables of motivation.	6	6	12	18	64		6	24	70		5	38	57
	1		13	25	62	14		29	57			50	50
	0			71	29			25	75		25	25	50

[a] Table entries are percentages.

[b] 1 = Not at all
2 = Very little
3 = Somewhat
4 = To a great extent

[c] Group sizes:

Training Group	Weeks	Hyde	Rome
6	19	21	21
1	8	8	3
0	10	19	7

to have the highest "To a great extent" implementation percentages for only four of 17 lesson design aspects, and the 6-week and 1-week training groups had higher "To a great extent" percentages than the no Summer training group for only five of 17 lesson design aspects. The Hyde teacher data was again found to be mixed due to both the small number of teachers in the 1-week and no training groups (see Table 8, footnote C) and the fact that Hyde teachers had previously been exposed to the Hunter instructional techniques.

Table 9 presents the final set of school level data in this section pertaining to the relationship between Summer training time and the extent that the implementation of aspects of the Hunter lesson design represented a change from previous instructional practice. Differences in response patterns were present among the three schools.

Rome

> The 6-week Summer training group reported higher percentages of "To a great extent" responses than the 1-week or no training groups for 16/17 aspects of lesson design.

For the Hyde data the percentages of "To a great extent" responses tended to be lower than either Weeks or Rome, which is consistent with the fact that the teachers had employed several aspects of the Hunter model prior to the HESI project. Also, the small group sizes may again contribute to the lack of noticeable trends in the 1-week and no training groups' data.

Program Strengths and Weaknesses. Section VI of the survey asked the teachers to list strengths and weaknesses of the Hunter

Table 9

Teacher Ratings of the Extent That Lesson Design was a Change from Previous Techniques by School and Summer Training Group[a]

(N=112)

Topics	Training Group	To what extent did this implementation represent a change from your previous instructional techniques? Weeks 1	Weeks 2	Weeks 3	Weeks 4[b]	Rome 1	Rome 2	Rome 3	Rome 4	Hyde 1	Hyde 2	Hyde 3	Hyde 4
1. Selecting the objectives at the correct level of difficulty.	6	35	12	41	12	11	34	33	22	33	24	33	10
	1	13	25	50	12	43	29	14	14		100		
	0	25	38		37	38	54	8		25	75		
2. Teaching to the objective with relevancy,	6	12	35	41	12	5	42	21	32	14	24	48	14
	1		25	75		29	28	29	14			100	
	0	13	50		37	31	39	23	7		25	50	25
3. Using an anticipatory set.	6	24	18	41	17		25	45	30	5	24	52	19
	1		13	87		14	57	15	14		100		
	0	37	25		38	23	23	31	23		50	25	25
4. Stating the objective and the purpose to the students.	6	18	29	35	18		35	40	25	5	25	55	15
	1			87	13	28	29	29	14			100	
	0	25	37		38	23	31	31	15		67	33	
5. Input.	6	18	24	47	12	20	25	20	35	20	30	35	15
	1		13	87		29	43	14	14		100		-
	0		43	14	43	31	38	8	23	25	25	25	25
6. Modeling.	6	29	24	18	29	16	26	32	26	40	15	25	20
	1		13	87		29	43	14	4		100		
	0	13	50	25	12	25	50	8	17	33	34		33
7. Checking for understanding.	6	23	24	24	29	20	20	20	40	35	15	25	25
	1		25	37	38	29	57		14		100		
	0	25	38	12	25	31	31	23	15	25	25		50
8. Guided practice.	6	23	24	18	35	20	25	20	35	40	15	25	20
	1		37	38	25	29	57		14		100		
	0	25	25	25	25	31	38	23	8		50		50

Table 9 (cont.)

To what extent did this implementation represent a change from your previous instructional techniques?

Topics	Training Group	Weeks 1	Weeks 2	Weeks 3	Weeks 4	Rome 1	Rome 2	Rome 3	Rome 4	Hyde 1	Hyde 2	Hyde 3	Hyde 4
9. Closure.	6	6	47	24	23	11	16	47	26		35	50	15
	1			75	25	29	57		14		50	50	
	0	12	25	37	26	23	38	31	8		50		50
10. Independent practice.	6	29	41	6	24	37	21	16	26	25	35	40	
	1		13	87		29	57		14		100		
	0	25	38	12	25	39	31	15	15	25	25		50
11. Signaling.	6	13	37	25	25	5	11	37	47	10	10	50	30
	1		29	71		29	43	14	14		50	50	
	0	12	62		26	25	33	25	17			67	33
12. Hemisphericity.	6	13	31	50	6		40	33	27	21	10	53	16
	1		14	72	14	29	57		14	100			
	0	25	25		50	33	50		17		100		
13. Dignifying incorrect responses.	6	6	24	23	47		32	26	42	25	20	25	30
	1	14	43	29	14	29	43		28			100	
	0	25	38		37	39	31	15	15		100		
14. Monitoring and adjusting accord'ngly.	6	18	41	23	18	15	30	30	25	25	25	40	10
	1	14	14	43	29	33	34		33		100		
	0	25	38		37	23	31	31	15	25	50		25
15. Positive reinforcement.	6	24	29	12	35	11	17	28	44	35	10	40	15
	1	13	37	25	25	43	29	14	14		50	50	
	0	25	25	13	37	23	31	23	23	25	75		
16. Negative reinforcement.	6	18	35	35	12	18	47	12	23	40	25	30	5
	1	14	43	43		29	29	28	14		50	50	
	0	12	38	12	38	31	39	15	15	75	25		
17. Six variables of motivation.	6	18	24	41	17	11	28	17	44	25	30	35	10
	1		25	75		29	43	14	14			100	
	0	12	38	25	25	15	39	15	31	25	50		25

[a] Table entries are percentages.

[b] 1 = Not at all
2 = Very little
3 = Somewhat
4 = To a great deal

[c] Group sizes:

Training Group	Weeks	Rome	Hyde
6	19	21	21
1	8	8	3
0	10	15	7

model as implemented in their classroom and school. The comments of teachers from all three schools and Summer 1984 training time groups were very supportive of the program. Weaknesses tended to focus on school rather than program factors. Both strengths and weaknesses complement those described by the qualitative data. We include these comments in Appendix B.

Summary: Impact of HESI in Classrooms

There is no doubt that HESI has had a positive impact on teachers, administrators and facilitators in the three schools. First, it has made the improvement of teaching a school wide focus, goal and priority and it has provided the assistance necessary to move toward achieving the goal. The process has enabled teachers to consider their work in a constructive fashion. This is an essential beginning.

Second, the project has increased many teachers' sense of efficacy with respect to their work. They have had an opportunity to practice new techniques; to talk about teaching as professionals. Collegial involvement with the facilitator, a common language, and useful techniques have helped teachers feel more professional. A few suggest that the opportunity to get together was more important than the actual content of the program. We suspect they would be far less positive, however, if the content were poor.

The project has had a negative impact on sense of efficacy for a very small number of teachers. Comparing their teaching with the Hunter model has left them aware of serious deficiencies

in their skills and has led a very few to consider whether to remain in teaching. One teacher always had a diffuse sense that some of what she did was not superior, but prior to HESI she felt that she was competent. Now she says,

> I used to feel really adequate and increasingly I feel inadequate. I'm trying really hard to work on me and I'm trying hard to get an image of myself as a teacher.

This teacher commends both the facilitator and administrator for trying to help her improve. However, she feels overburdened and does not always agree with or understand the administrator's advice.

Third, although the project has had an overall positive impact, facilitators and building administrators had hoped HESI would produce a visible impact on students at the end of this first year. They are a bit disappointed that such an impact is not yet apparent.

> I have seen a growth in vocabulary and in an understanding of it. Teachers are much clearer and they are clearer about the impact that the model can have, but I've not yet seen any impact on the students. Even though it wasn't expected in one year, I really wanted to see it.

A few teachers share the facilitator's desire for a visible impact on students:

> I think the project has had to have an impact on kids, but I don't know what it is and I don't know the degree of impact. These kids came in at minimum competency and now most of them are leaving at minimum competency a year later. Who knows what the effect was.

The teacher is correct. It will take several years to answer questions about student impact. Teachers need to become more skillful in using the model before such an impact should be anticipated. However, it is reasonable to assume that positive reinforcement and feeling tone have a beneficial impact on students' lives in classrooms, if not yet on their academic achievement.

In this regard, two facilitators believe classroom climate has improved as a result of HESI. Attention to motivation has helped teachers alleviate some problems; "preserving dignity" has likewise kept down minor behavior problems and has increased student participation. These facilitators report that some teachers do a better job of whole group instruction as a result of striving for active participation and they provide more coherent lessons as they pay attention to providing and teaching to a clear objective. Although the impact of these changes on students is not yet measurable, facilitators suggest that there is reason to assume an impact.

> A lot of students are benefitting because their teachers are consciously dignifying wrong answers. It is very noticeable when a kid gives a wrong answer how the teacher handles it. Some students feel like, oh god, I'll never answer another question again. But now a lot of kids are being made to feel successful because the teachers are using a lot of this information. And when teaching to the intended objective and using lesson design, a kid can't help but learn. Or at least its increasing the probability that they will learn and really end up liking school.

We agree that the changes described are improvements and they can be attributed to HESI. Whether they are yet of sufficient

magnitude to make a difference to students remains to be seen as the project continues.

SECTION TWO: HESI IN SCHOOLS

The Role of the Facilitator. We noted in the interim report that HESI's success rested heavily on the facilitators. Without exception, facilitators have done an outstanding job this year. They were chosen and trained with great care: their implementation of the role has been superb. Without facilitators, the present and future success of the project would be in great jeopardy.

During this implementation year, with the help of the facilitator coach and project coordinator, facilitators set goals for themselves and for teachers. They decided that by the end of the first year teachers should have 1) a basic knowledge of the model and be able to discuss it, 2) be familiar with the first three steps of Bloom's Taxonomy, and 3) be able to apply the elements of motivation and lesson design. Considerable attention has been spent on positive reinforcement, anticipatory set and teaching to the objective. (See Table 6 of the Teacher Survey for corroboration of this point.) In addition, when teachers wanted help with specific areas such as active participation or dignifying responses, facilitators provided that assistance. During the year, the focus was clear and facilitators kept teachers (and to the extent possible, principals) on task.

Coaching kept the project alive to teachers because it made the facilitators ever present. There were definite benefits to the arrangement. One teacher noted:

> From the frequent sharing and people coming in and observing, it keeps you reminded of how you are to

> do these things. Because [illegible]ould take courses and learn what to do, but [illegible]u don't put the effort into doing it, it's [illegible] it doesn't get you there. The regularity with [illegible]ch the facilitators visit you is like a review.

Both facilitators and teachers benefitted from the continual interaction and conversation around the model. It insured that implementation progressed.

During the year, facilitators have become far more sophisticated in their ability to provide support and instructional assistance to teachers. Although they were giving Type A, positive reinforcement conferences, they found ways to encourage teachers to look critically at themselves. One facilitator described the process:

> We sometimes go in the back door and help them discover things for themselves. We felt that it was the best way, for them to come up with things to talk about. If they weren't pleased with something that had happened, we tried to guide them to look at it. They might say, "That didn't actually go well. I planned something and something happened, or the equipment didn't work." And our response would be "Well, lets look at it and figure out what happened." Sometimes we do different kinds of conferences. Like before vacations, they might be brief, like why did you do that or what did you do or we might focus on one thing pertaining to an objective.
>
> In my opinion we are getting teachers to learn to critique themselves. They are learning how to use the model, to analyze their lessons and to learn to plan their lessons. Some teachers have used video tapes in planning and that also helps. Some teachers used it the first time they were introducing something to a class and they used it to get feedback on how much the kids know. For instance, a first grade teacher had never used a newspaper with her class before. The first lesson in which she used a newspaper, she video taped it and got lots of ideas on how to do it. Another teacher taught fractions to her class for the first time, used the video tape, and got a

> lot of ideas about what things went well and how she could keep building on that because she had never done it before.

As we have stated repeatedly, the presence and the skill of the facilitators are essential components of HESI. Without facilitators there would be no one to promote video taping, conferencing, or reflecting about teaching on a continuing basis.

The facilitators, of course, did not develop their skills without assistance. They have had excellent support over the school year from the facilitator coach, Dee Speese, and the project coordinator, Mary Wilson, both of whom are described as responsive to facilitators' needs and qualified to assist them in the specific as well as general points of implementing the model. They were especially helpful in coaching the facilitators to gain confidence and tolerate the uncertainty intrinsic in the position.

We raise the issue of uncertainty because we want to stress this demanding aspect of the facilitator role and adequately credit facilitators for coping with it.

> I'm not sure what my role is going to entail next year or what kind of an expert I'm supposed to be. Should we have other skills? There's no one really to bounce things off of and a way to measure where to do and what to do. I kind of feel that I need more because I need to stay ahead of the teachers and I don't know if we're far ahead of them. We have a nerve to start coaching people with very little training ourselves and its kind of hard to say all of the things we need...I guess we're all designing this as we go.

This analysis is essentially correct; facilitators (with support) are designing the project as they go. In Year I, the excellent choice and training of facilitators has resulted in individuals who understand the model and can design it without losing the

focus on project goals.

Facilitators have benefitted personally from the opportunity to see education from the perspective of the whole school. It has refreshed them and increased their sense of efficacy. It has made some wonder whether to return to the classroom; others are sure they will return with a greater understanding of teaching, learning and schools as organizations.

> I also got to see what is going on in all these different classrooms. I've learned more of the model and utilized aspects of training people. I've learned a lot about coaching and I've also learned a lot about motivating adults. And I've also learned to work with staff people...it's good to be able to give positive feedback to teachers and its nice to have a specific language that you can share it with.

Participating in HESI helped the facilitators to acknowledge positive aspects of their colleagues' teaching. Like many teachers and the public at large, facilitators when they were teachers sometimes thought negatively about their schools and their peers. Looking for positive teacher behavior and finding it has given them a different perspective on their own and their colleagues' work.

Project Design: Year II. Facilitators have raised important issues about project design for Year II. First, they are concerned about what to provide for teachers who are highly skilled and feel that the project is not providing enough new information to justify the time spent in conferences and additional in-service programs. Facilitators do not know what to provide to make their participation worthwhile.

Second, facilitators are troubled by the teachers

who need something more than HESI. They feel that providing only positive reinforcement and Type A conferences for these teachers is inappropriate. Yet it is not within their authority, role or expertise to describe what is wrong and provide an improvement strategy. That responsibility belongs to building administrators. For both highly skilled and marginal teachers, therefore, facilitators feel that they are not providing sufficiently sophisticated or appropriate assistance. We agree with their assessment. Differentiating and targetting facilitator services may be appropriate in Year II in order to provide teacher with what they need and want and to make optimal use of facilitators' skills.

Third, facilitators are disappointed that they have been unable to get on-going teacher/teacher observations in their schools. Some say coverage was not available; that is the facilitator was unable to provide time for the classroom teacher to observe. This was probably less of a problem than general teacher resistance. There are teachers who do not want to observe or be observed by their peers and others who doubt the value of such observations. A few do want to observe but have simply not gotten around to it. The explanations were similar in all three schools. For those teachers' who want to observe one another, a formal schedule with coverage provided might help initiate and sustain the process.

Fourth, demonstration lessons have also been only modestly successful. They were frequently offered primarily as a way to reimburse teachers for the time they had committed to the project

and secondarily as an opportunity for additional learning. Facilitators demonstrated, but teachers were not required to observe. Accordingly, about half of the teachers who requested demonstration lessons observed; the others left. It is not clear that there was a particular focus to this piece of the model during the first year. (See Teacher Survey, Table 5 for further data on this issue.)

Fifth and finally, facilitators wonder how to make the transition to Type B conferences in which they will note t hing behaviors that merit improvement; they wonder how to hold such conferences and not lose the trust established during Year I. They fear being seen as evaluators when they note negative features of teachers' work. Their concerns about marginal teachers expand and generalize as they think of the coming academic year.

> For a job that is supposed to be non-evaluative we are constantly evaluating in certain ways. Like what do they need and what kind of work do they need to enhance what they are doing. We have marginal teachers in each area. Some who are almost hostile regarding classroom management kinds of things, yet are good at teaching content. And then there are those marginal ones who have a hard time with the content. But I can't come in and tell them, this is what you've got to work on.

Facilitators also wonder whether they will have the skill and ability to help teachers who are already quite good and whether these teachers will perceive the facilitators as authorities who have something constructive to offer.

SCHOOL PROFILES. When we first visited the HESI schools in May 1984, we reported that faculty were generally enthusiastic

about HESI and that each school had its own concerns with respect to both the project and its functioning as a school. At the end of Year I, we find continuing enthusiasm among much of the staff and we find that concerns which existed a year ago and which are unrelated to HESI in origin still exist. We make this point because school-specific factors interact with HESI and influence implementation and attitudes. We do not mean this as criticism; HESI was not designed to solve school problems. However, solving them is necessary if HESI's the full benefit is to be achieved. We begin with brief descriptions of each participating school and conclude with issues that cut across all three. (As in previous reports, school names have been changed to protect confidentiality.)

Weeks A year ago the faculty and administration at Weeks were greatly troubled by serious, ongoing student discipline problems. These problems took up a great deal of administrative time; classroom instruction was difficult to implement because of student misbehavior. Both administrators and teachers state that discipline problems have been worse this year.

Last year, teachers described their principal as spending little time with instruction. He agreed with their assessment. After Summer training, both principal and teachers hoped that he would spend more time doing clinical supervision and attending to instruction. This did not happen: In November the principal was not observing and conferencing; this remains the case at the end of the year. The assistant principal observes, but with major responsibility for discipline problems, this administrator, too,

has little time for classroom work. There is considerable faculty anger and disappointment with these outcomes. They had hoped for increased principal attention to instruction and greater effectiveness with respect to discipline. (See Teacher Survey section and Appendices B and C for additional data on this point.)

Not surprisingly, both the principal and facilitator suggest that HESI is not the school's top priority. Top priority is getting children to settle down and behave. HESI is a priority for a few teachers who believe that they have learned a great deal from both training and facilitator coaching.

Despite these constraints, HESI has had a positive impact. One new teacher, for example, joined HESI in the Fall. She has made dramatic and positive strides in improving her instruction and is pleased with its increased effectiveness. Another teacher has made full use of the facilitator in learning to implement a large number of the model's components.

Strong leadership would have improved the implementation of HESI. It would also have helped teachers to create a cohesive plan for dealing with the issue of student discipline. At present, the school seems to be without strategies for dealing with any of the issues that continue to plague it.

Rome. Last year we described Rome as having scant administrative leadership with respect to instruction. This situation remains largely unchanged; the building principal has spent little time observing classes or conferencing. Facilitator effort is pushing the principal to maintain at least minimal involvement with the project. Facilitator prods remind him to

stop into classes, to do little "pop ins," to give teachers positive reinforcement after they have been observed. In contrast the assistant principal has spent more time in these activities, observing most frequently as part of the formal evaluation procedure, but using HESI as the basis for follow-up conferences.

There seems to be little communication among teachers in this school either about HESI or about other school issues. Few teachers are interested in observing one another and this is the one school in which teachers say that they rarely use HESI language with one another. This results, in part, from the generally low level of communication in the building and in part because some teachers who were not trained remain hostile to the project.

On the positive side, this is the one school that has used video taping to help teachers observe themselves and become reflective about their own teaching. To eliminate the question of confidentiality, each teacher owns his or her tape. As the year went on, teachers recorded onto the same tape and now have a log of their teaching. According to the facilitators, teachers like watching themselves and are often more critical than the facilitators would be. As one said:

> In general teachers have been very pleased with what they have seen on the video tapes and this tends to cause them to act more naturally. Often teachers don't realize how the lessons have gone. They think they have been fumbling and in fact when they see it on video tapes, they are more impressed with themselves.

When teachers have not been happy with what they have seen, they have begun to reflect on what they did not like and on how to

change. This is a creative and helpful merger of technology with the implementation of HESI.

Hyde. Teachers at Hyde remain positive about HESI. Administrators remain interested in implementing it well. Faculty meetings as well as regular evaluation conferences focus on aspects of the model. Teachers and principals agree that administrators have little time to observe and conference other than for evaluation purposes. Both groups are disappointed by this. There are several teachers who would prefer to have both administrator and facilitator observations and conferences.

Despite the limited administrator involvement in coaching, teachers are fully aware that administrators expect them to implement the model and whenever possible are attending to that implementation With respect to administrative attention, Hyde remains different than the other two schools. Administrators are described as pushing for implementation.

Although Hyde teachers had a headstart on knowing the Hunter language, they now seem to be at a similar point with respect to skill level as teachers in Weeks and Rome. They wish to continue with the model, but find other school site problems more compelling than the further improvement of teaching.

Hyde teachers are distressed by the physical layout of their school. They feel overburdened by central office reporting demands passed on to them by the building principal. They lament the lack of teaching materials in the building, noting that they have little supplementary material for any subject. Due to these

issues, for some teachers, HESI has moved to a background position.

CONCERNS ACROSS THE SCHOOLS

The differences in HESI implementation across schools are not great; the similarities are more dominant despite school specific issues of leadership, physical plant and discipline. Therefore, it is not surprising that similar areas of concern arise in all three schools. These require immediate consideration if the project is to move forward.

Pacing versus Mastery. The first issue is the tension between teaching to the correct level of difficulty for mastery and keeping up with a pre-set pace determined by the school system. The Hunter instructional model urges teachers to make sure they are teaching to the correct level of difficulty and that they not move on until children master the material. However, there is also pressure to teach at a brisk pace. Within the Hartford Public School system, according to teachers and administrators, pacing is an instructional priority; children are unable to move onto the next grade level unless they have minimally mastered the content for their current grade. Teachers are experiencing the tension of trying to 1) teach at the correct level of difficulty and for mastery and 2) cover a years worth of material in a year. The issue came up at Hyde when one administrator said,

> Some teachers don't understand that we are not interested in how fast but in how well children learn what is presented.

But the administrator also indicated that he and his colleagues want the children to cover at least one year's worth of material in a year (perhaps more if they are behind grade level). The question is how to teach for understanding at the same time one is being pressed by local and central administration to cover a year's worth of material. The pacing demand does not take into account the different rates at which students learn. It contradicts that HESI emphasis.

At Rome facilitators noted that teachers are very much aware of the district's promotion policy and therefore the necessity of getting children to a certain page in their reading books, for example, by the end of the year. The pressure to provide coverage (and minimize grade retention), is in tension with the pressure to make sure that everyone has mastered the material.

In Weeks and Hyde the issue came up with respect to the new science instruction and its associated curriculum textbooks. According to teachers and facilitators, the grade level textbooks are often too difficult for the children, many of whom have not mastered grade level basal reading. Yet teachers say they have been told to use the science texts regardless of reading level. Therefore, they are faced with the dilemma of having children using books that are beyond their reading level.

We discussed this issue with facilitators, administrators and teachers and can only note that teachers cannot meet both objectives. We are not suggesting that teachers wait until each child has mastered every last bit of information. The way in

which schools are organized precludes that kind of attention to mastery. However, choosing pacing over in depth understanding is a very short term, somewhat cosmetic solution. Lack of understanding is going to crop up over and over again as children move into higher grades. We recommend that this tension be directly addressed by central office administrators and school site personnel not only with respect to HESI schools but for all of the Hartford Public Schools. Teachers are getting mixed messages both of which they cannot respond to; each message has different implications for those children who have the most difficulty learning.

Differentiating HESI. A second issue that is equally difficulty and important concerns differentiating and targetting HESI training. Teaching to the correct level of difficulty and for mastery is critical for students; it is equally so for adults. During Year I, HESI could be described as "whole group instruction." This was appropriate at the point where new information was introduced. Teachers have learned at different rates and to different extents; the same program, therefore, is no longer appropriate for all. For example, there are teachers who were implementing this model prior to training. HESI reinforced what they knew, told them they were doing a good job; and provided supplementary knowledge and insight. Type A positive conferences were supportive during the first half of the year but less valuable during the second. We suggest, along with the facilitators, that the project either develop ways to provide more appropriate facilitation for these teacher -- that is facilitation

at the correct level of difficulty -- that the project find another way to use these teachers' skills -- perhaps as demonstration teachers or subject matter specialists -- or that the project exempt them from further participation if they prefer not to participate. Further thought needs to go into this aspect of the Year III project.

Assisting Marginal Teachers. A third and related issue concerns teachers who we, along with administrators describe as marginal. These are teachers who need much more than HESI can provide. They need basic content knowledge as well as more teaching skill knowledge. Facilitators have great difficulty coaching these teachers. Our suggestion is that administrators coach marginal teachers, freeing facilitators to deal more fully with the large group of teachers for whom HESI is pitched at the correct level of difficulty. This would make better use of both facilitators' and teachers' time.

Teaching versus Telling. A fourth concern centers on teachers' understanding of curriculum and what it means to "teach." In observing teachers during Summer training and then during this academic year, we have been struck by the difficulty some encounter in teaching elementary school mathematics topics. Teachers with the best of intentions seem uncertain about how to help children understand fractions, proportions, and percentages, for example. Lessons end in frustration for teachers as well as students. After discussions with principals and facilitators, we are convinced that what we have seen is not limited to the teachers observed (nor limited to the Hartford Public Schools).

We are equally convinced that unless teachers improve their own knowledge of content as well as how to teach it, the impact of HESI on student achievement will be limited. It will come from better classroom management rather than from better teaching. We also believe that HESI provides a unique opportunity for the school system to attend to teachers' capacity with respect to content.

In an effort to make clear our concerns, and the distinctions we see between understanding and using HESI a.. understanding and teaching curriculum content, we have provided several descriptions of classroom teaching. Conversations with building principals and facilitators suggest that what we have seen are neither isolated instances nor the most extreme cases. We have changed teachers' names and other identifying characteristics to preserve confidentiality. We have described only teachers who taught similarly in the Fall and Spring; we did not include anyone who might have simply had a bad day.

Case I. Intermediate Grade.

George is an enthusiastic supporter of HESI. He was excited by the Summer training, and raves about the facilitator who in turn confirms his enthusiasm. As George sees it:

> The thing is that you want to do things in a scientific manner rather than haphazardly. The teaching strategies that Madeline Hunter uses are an example of this. For example, when you start off, you try to give children a set. You set up something so that they know what you are going to be teaching and your objectives are clearly defined. You are teaching on the correct level of difficulty. In terms of getting the children to respond, you don't always call on the bright one and the signalling you use lets you get an opportunity of knowing whether in fact the

children are learning. Not only that, the signalling keeps them on their toes and you see that they are paying attention. Now you get random sampling of responses, you get group responses and the children don't know when they are going to be called on.

George is an articulate teacher who has grasped the concepts taught by Hunter and is eager to implement them in his classroom. He has made a start in this first year, but will need additional instructional supervision in the coming years if this project is to have the intended outcome of increasing children's learning. The following description suggests areas for further development.

After the children had cleared their desks of all materials except pencil, paper and math book, George said, "This morning I'm going to teach you something you've never had before so you will have to pay close attention if you want to gain on it." Using the overhead projector, George writes, "Objective: Find a percent of a number by using the proportion method." George uses the overhead expertly throughout this lesson, exposing one line at a time as did Rob Hunter during Summer training.

He continues, "Many of you have done percent, but not by this method. We're going to first check you to see if you know how. What's the objective?" A chorus of students answers, "Find a percent of a number by using the proportion method."

On the overhead George writes, "What number is 50% of 75?" He reviews the objective again and says, "Let's just check to see how you would normally do this problem." Someone calls out, "Multiply 50 times 75," and George asks students to show thumbs up if they agree. Most children don't do anything; a few put thumbs up and a few put thumbs down. Another child calls out, "2 times 75." Still another says, " 50 divided into 75."

George says, "I think we are having a little problem," and asks them to think about what they would do if the problem were about fractions, and tell their neighbors what they would do to find the answer. There is suddenly a lot of talking; it is not only about how to solve the problem. George says, "I think you have an idea about how to do it. Let me help refresh your memory. Now it's critical that you pay attention because you haven't remembered this so you have to pay attention."

On the board George writes 50/100 x 75/1. This is the old way they had learned to solve this problem according to George who calls on

a student to explain this method. The child is unable to explain what should be done and George says, "If you can't repeat what I said, you aren't listening." With this comment, George begins to explain the proportion method.

He says, "When you see the percent, what will you put it over?" Someone calls out, "100." George asks why and the student says, "Because you are dealing with percent and percent is 100." With no further comment, George tells the student to write 50/100 = n/75 and indicates that the equal sign means that one side is equal to the other and "100 is the whole thing just like the 75 is."

George then tells the students that the first thing they must always do is put the percent over 100, and he asks "why." A chorus of students respond "Because it's percent and it's 100." Someone else yells, "75 is the whole thing," to which George responds, "but what is "n?" Another child responds, "the number I'm trying to find."

George then explains that the next step is to cross multiply 50 x 75 and 100 x n. He asks the children to do the multiplication and tell him the answers. Someone yells "25," and other children yell other answers. Most are incorrect. George stops the yelling by asking the students to put their thumbs up when they have the answer. He walks around to see what answers they have. Finally he tells them the correct answer and has them multiply 100 x n. No one seems to know how to do this and George tells them the answer. Then he says, "Now you have to get rid of the 100," and he writes 37.50/100 = 100n on the overhead. He concludes by saying," you have to divide both sides by 100."

Having determined that 37.5 is 50% of 75, George says, "Now we'll do some problems together, so pay close attention. Put another problem on your paper." George writes 50% of 20 and then says, "find a percent of a number by using the proportion method. What's the first thing I do?" Students answers reflect their previous, limited understanding of percent; George tells them that they have to use an equal sign first and that they will have to create a proportion. They are to do the work on their papers and as George circulates, he realizes that most students do not know what to do. He then walks them through this problem and another and says, "Now I'm going to give you some independent practice and I'm going to move around and see if you understand."

The problem is 25% of 50. George asks the students to indicate thumbs up if they are going to set up an equal sign; thumbs down if they are going to multiply. Three students indicate with their thumbs what they are going to do. George asks all of the students to respond; two students signal with their thumbs.

Despite good intentions and tenacity, this lesson lacks teaching of the core information. It would be difficult for

students to grasp the concept unless they intuitively understood it and did not need teaching. Further, although it became clear that students did not understand, George continued to tell them what to do rather than explain the meaning behind the procedures. This is a pattern of instruction we have observed in classrooms in all three schools.

Case II: Primary Bilingual

This was a lesson on fractions for which a clear objective was never stated. The content focus did not seem carefully planned, nor was there evidence of positive reinforcement, motivation, or lesson design. Nonetheless, this teacher reports that she is using many elements of the Hunter model and is pleased with the improvement it has made in her teaching.

Maria began by telling the children that they were about to start their mathematics lesson. There was a chorus of "boooo" from the children, but they picked up their chairs and carried them back around the room to their desks. Maria then prepared to use transparencies on the overhead projector. The transparencies were old and wrinkled. As a result, the images projected on the screen were not clean and crisp.

Maria asked the children what they had been talking about in mathematics. They shouted out different answers. Some were playing with pencils, some stared around the room. As yet, there was no coherent focus on the mathematics lesson. Maria then stated that they were talking about fractions and that they were going to continue to do that. She drew the outline of a box on the overhead; it was a box that did not have any straight edges. In part this was because of the poor quality of the transparency; in part it was because the teacher's drawings were not done well. The numbers that the teacher put on the transparency were also sloppy. They were not good models for the children.

Maria drew the box and divided it into three pieces of unequal size. She then asked the children to count the pieces, which they did in unison. There was no mention at this point of fractional

parts. Although the children were supposed to be learning that each piece represented one third, the size of each piece differed.

The teacher continued to divide boxes and circles into parts and have the children count the number of pieces. Finally, she drew a circle and did not divide it at all. She asked the class how many pieces there were there and most of the children shouted out "zero." Someone said "one" and the teacher moved on. She made no effort to correct the lack of understanding or find out what children who said "zero" had in mind. It may have been that some thought she had written a zero on the board rather than a circle.

Maria then wrote the fraction 1/2 on the transparency and asked the children to tell her what this fraction was called. None of them knew how to read it; they called out "one two". Maria told them it was called a half and asked one child to go to the board, draw a circle and shade in one half. The child did this, dividing the circle evenly.

Maria then wrote the fraction 1/4 on the overhead projector and called on a child who did not know how to say 1/4. Maria told him how to say it and then asked him to go to the board, draw a box, divide it into fourths and shade in one fourth. He did this while the other children sat in their seats and either chatted with each other or stared around the room. They did not pay attention to what he was doing.

The next example was very difficult. Maria wrote 1/3 on her overhead and asked a girl to go to the board, draw a triangle and divide it into thirds. Dividing a triangle is not easy, even if one is not thinking about the equality of the parts. The child went to the board, drew a triangle, divided it in half and shaded in one half. This was not the appropriate answer and the teacher asked her to think about drawing it again. The child erased the triangle and drew another one. This time she divided the triangle down the center from top to bottom and then across from side to side. It was divided into four parts and the child was unable to figure out just how to do it or what to color. The rest of the children were waiting quietly. Some were paying attention, some were staring around the room. Others had become engrossed in the problem and were making suggestions. Once again she erased the triangle drew another and divided it in half.

The teacher made no explanation about what to do. Instead she called on another child to do the same task. This child drew the triangle, drew a straight line down the center and then on the left hand side of that half of triangle drew a line that was parallel to the base of the triangle. This was a clever response and the triangle was now divided into three parts although they were unequal.

Maria said "ok" to this response and asked the girl who was originally at the board to shade in one third of the triangle. The child shaded in one of the three pieces, but this was

assuredly not 1/3 of it. Nonetheless the teacher said very good and told them both to sit down.

At this point the lesson seemed to be over. The teacher turned off the overhead projector and told the children to open their books and listen. There was a lot of movement as children scraped their chairs and got out their books.

Maria then opened the workbook and showed the children the pages they were to do. She told them what they had to write and where they had to write it. This was presented quite clearly and succinctly. With a reminder to "think well," Maria left the front of the classroom and the children began to work by themselves. She and her aide walked around the room to help the children find the pages.

Maria then began to talk about the need for equality in fractional parts. She stood at the front of the room and told the children that parts have to be equal in order for them to be fractional parts. She drew a circle on the board and divided it equally in half and told them that each part was called a half. Then she drew another circle on the board and drew a line very close to the right hand edge of the perimeter. She asked if this was a half and then answered her own question by saying "no". She said it was not a half because the two parts were not equal.

The children were paying very close attention as Maria walked back to her desk to get various paper shapes to demonstrate the concept of equality. She put up a large paper circle and showed two equal pieces, and said that each was called a half. She told the children that it was time for them to begin their workbook pages and that she would check whether they understand the work. As the children began their work, the teacher and her aide walked around the classroom to see how they were doing.

Case III: Intermediate Grade

Margaret told the class they would be reviewing how to simplify fractions. The lesson began as Margaret put the problem 6/8 - 4/8 on the board. She then said, "As long as the denominator stays the same, all you work with are the numerators because the denominators remain the same. So 6/8 - 4/8 = 2/8."

She then continued this demonstration by putting 5/6 - 3/6 on the board and called on a girl who said that the answer was 2/6. Margaret asked, "Can you simplify it?" The girl said she could simplify it by two and said 2-2..." The teacher responded by saying "What does simplifying mean?" A boy answered that it meant to reduce the fraction. Margaret said, "It means to bring it to its lowest number. How do we do it?" The boy responded that it was done by dividing and the teacher said "That's the only way, so you divide two by two. What are we going to divide six by?" The boy then answered that he was going to divide the six by three. At this point Margaret's voice raised and she said in a very gruff

tone. "If you divide the top by two you divide the bottom by two and that equals 1/3."

Somebody in the class must have been misbehaving slightly at this point at this point because as Margaret's voice rose at the end of this problem, she sent a boy to stand in the corner.

Margaret then returned to the task at hand, put on the board 4/8 - 2/8 and asked for an answer. She got 2/8 and asked if it could be simplified. A boy answered and said it could be divided by two, he proceeded to subtract two from the denominator. Margaret, her voice rising, said, "If you divide the top by two you divide the bottom by two. What is it?" The boy was able to divide eight by two and get four. The teacher went on to say, "You will have to remember in our going through this, that whatever number you use to reduce the top you have to use the same number to reduce the bottom. You can't change up, it has to be the same number."

The lesson continues in much the same way as Margaret puts 4/9 - 1/9 on the board. A child volunteers an answer of 3/9 and the question one more time is "Can we leave it or can it be simplified?" A boy responds that it can be simplified by dividing by two and the teacher says "Is two a factor of three or nine?" The children in the class are very very quiet and finally one child says, "the answer is 1/3." The teacher says, "You are right. How did you get there, what did you divide by?" This was the first time the teacher tried to get some sense of understanding from the children. The boy answered that he had divided by three and the teacher told him that was correct. Something happened at this point (which I missed) because very quickly the teacher became angry at the boy and said, "Have you seen this before? Is this the first time you've seen this? Give me the answer please!" He once again said that the answer was 1/3. Margaret said this was correct, but her tone had become negative and her voice had risen quite a bit.

The lesson continued through five or six similar problems. A few children must have understood that they were dividing the numerator and denominator by the same factor. For those children who did not know that they were to divide the numerator and denominator by the same factor, I have no sense of what it was that they were learning. when the review lesson on simplifying fractions was over, the class corrected a homework sheet on a different topic. When the teacher was interviewed later in the day, she indicated that the class was now ready to move onto the next mathematics topic. She was satisfied that children understood what they were doing and said that those who did not understand should not hold back the rest of the class.

Case IV: Primary Grade. A Comparative Example

We have included this example to confirm that there are indeed teachers who are using the Hunter model and who are using

it well. We also include it to indicate the difference between classrooms in the three HESI schools.

Kathy is a teacher who runs a very structured traditional classroom and claims to have been using many of the techniques described in the Hunter training. Our observation support her assertion. Kathy's room is task oriented and during all observations has had a very positive feeling tone. Kathy uses positive reinforcement in a genuine way; we have never heard her say something positive while using a negative gesture or tone of voice that contradicts the words.

This lesson took place at the start of the day; children reviewed material they had learned before and got organized for beginning their mathematics and reading small group work. It was noteworthy for being a review in which the children were clearly reviewing rather than learning new material. The lesson also encouraged integration across curriculum areas, something that we rarely saw in any of the classrooms.

At nine o'clock the children were reading in their basal readers alone at their desks. Kathy was sitting at the back of the room filling out a variety of attendance forms. Once in a while a child would go over and ask her a question. The room was quiet and children seemed to be attending to their reading. As Kathy finished her paperwork, she looked up and asked one boy if he had remembered his glasses. The boy shook his head "no" and Kathy asked, "Who comes to school with him and can remind him in the morning?" It turned out that two boys rode the bus with him and Kathy suggested that perhaps tomorrow and other mornings one of these children could remind him about his glasses. This was done in a very pleasant, positive tone.

At the end of the attendance routine, Kathy had the children line up and go to the bathroom. This was done quickly and quietly with no voices raised and no children misbehaving. As the children returned to the room, they silently took seats on the floor at the front facing the chalkboard. There was no pushing, shoving or talking.

Kathy then said, "We have new spelling words. Who wants to read the first one." The first word was "want" and Kathy indicated that she chose this word because it was one the children frequently missed when they were writing and a word that they used quite frequently. She told them that she had chosen the word "from" and the word "write" because they too were words that the children frequently mispelled. Children raised their hands and were called on to read each of the words. They did so very nicely. When they got to the word "write" Kathy asked for its meaning. Children raised their hands and one was called on who said that the word meant to "write with a pencil". Kathy told him that he was correct and then reminded the children that they had had the other word, "right" the previous week. She asked for definitions of that word and several children raised their hands, were called on and gave very good definitions. One for example said that it indicated the difference between right and left hands; another talked about the word meaning correct. Children in this class spoke clearly and in complete sentences. Kathy kept calling on different children by name.

The last word on the spelling list was "grow" and Kathy asked for other words that sound like grow and end in "ow". Again the children raised their hands, many of them at the same time, and when Kathy called on them they had appropriate answers. This indicates that teaching was at the correct level of difficulty and that indeed children were reviewing. Children gave words such as blow, glow, and crow.

Kathy asked the children to copy their spelling words later on during the morning when they had finished other work. At this point they moved into mathematics.

Kathy began by saying "Last week we had started to do something very exciting. We had started to tell time and we are going to do more of it, and then you are going to do two pages in your workbook. She then got out a cardboard clock with an hour hand and a minute hand and asked them to review the names of the hands. Children new that the long hand was called the minute hand and the short the hour hand. Kathy told them that when they were little they could call them the big hand and the little but now that they were older and in school they were learning the appropriate names which were hour and minute hands. The children seemed to know the names of these hands and once more the lesson looked like a review.

Kathy then asked the children to tell her what they had learned about the time when the minute hand was on 12. Many hands went up and the child who was called on said that he knew that when the hand was on the 12 it was "the hour." Kathy then put the hour hand on nine and the minute hand on twelve and then asked the time. In unison the children said it was 9:00. To reinforce the learning, Kathy asked one more time what they had learned about the time, if the minute hand was on noon and the hour hand was on the nine. She called on a child who volunteered that when the

minute hand was on the twelve and the hour hand on the nine he went to sleep. Children laughed and the class got into a digression that related time to the social studies topic of good health and nutrition. Kathy said it was important to get enough sleep because sleep was one of the essential parts of life, and she asked what else was essential to good life. Children talked about shelter, food, warmth, and love. Kathy told them that she was glad that someone had remembered that love was an essential part of life as were the other aspects mentioned. This digression took only a moment or two and revealed that children were thinking as they sat there in front of the room, and that Kathy took their thoughts seriously.

After the review of time on the hour, children were to do two pages in their workbooks in two groups. One group was going to do the workbook immediately and the other was going to work with the teacher on reading first and then do the time worksheets. With virtually no talking, the children moved to their separate groups, got out pencils and workbooks and began working either in reading or in math.

While they were moving to their appropriate places, a girl came up to Kathy and asked her whether she had to do her math work at that point. The teacher's response, in a very pleasant tone, was "remember on Friday we talked about your needing to get more math done? " The child turned around got her mathbook and sat down. The incident was handled quietly, in a low key way and with a very positive feeling tone. There was no question that Kathy was interested in academic work and that the girl had understood that.

The business like academically focused and yet warm feeling in this classroom continued as children worked in the two groups. This is a classroom that is a good example of making use of principals of learning, a positive feeling tone and adequate lesson design.

These descriptions speak for themselves. Some teachers are quite skillful; others would benefit from intensive coaching across several areas. Improving instruction is perhaps more complex a task than originally imagined. It is however, necessary and worthwhile.

Role of the Principal A fifth concern in each of the schools and across them has to do with the role of the principal in implementing HESI. Given the demands on administrators, it is virtually impossible for any principal to personally implement the

model in a substantial way.

As in the Fall principals indicate that they have learned a great deal from HESI and have improved their observation and evaluation skills. They note that now when they observe classrooms, either on the fly or as a part of the formal evaluation procedures, they are more able to pay attention to important features of teaching and learning. For example, one principal, who in the Spring of 1984 felt that he had little idea of what to look for, now says:

> I was very enthused in observing teachers I know what to really look for now, and how it is so easy to help children to feel positive about themselves. Little things like dignifying a youngsters answers without turning them off, providing a feeling tone in the classroom where a child feels comfortable with you when he is having difficulty...I look for different things that I never looked for before.

Teachers agree that this principal is able to talk to them and see things that he did not see before. However teachers also say that he spends no more time in the classroom than he did in previous years, and does not use HESI language in formal evaluation. As one teacher said:

> I don't know what he uses when he observes me. He doesn't come back and talk about it. He'll say it was a good lesson, but he doesn't go into it to the degree that the facilitators do.

We have little doubt that this principal and the others are now more astute observers of teachers. But it is also true that they have neither the time nor the incentive to sit down with teachers and discuss their teaching. As a result, the responsibility falls to the facilitators, each of whom has done an outstanding job in

this first year.

However, in considering the life of the project over the next several years, the Hartford Board of Education must consider whether it will continue to fund facilitator positions and, if not, who will take on that coaching and supervising role. Without facilitators, regardless of who is implementing that role, the project will not remain vibrant for very long. The continuous observations and conferences keeps HESI visible and growing. If this component ceases prematurely, we suspect that teachers would very shortly stop advancing.

SECTION III: TEACHER PERCEPTIONS OF SCHOOL EFFECTIVENESS CHARACTERISTICS

Purpose. Teacher's perceptions of school effectiveness characteristics were assessed Spring 1984 (pre) and Spring 1985 (post). The pre data were presented in a previous report as baseline data for describing pre-project perceptions. These data, along with the post data and amount of HESI training data, will be used to answer three research questions. We note that the first question is the primary research question to be addressed, whereas the second question represents a secondary research question; the final question was included on an exploratory basis.

Primary Research Question

1. To what extent have teachers' perceptions of the school effectiveness characteristics changed from Spring 1984 to Spring 1985?

Secondary Research Question

2. Are there significant differences among the three schools with respect to teacher's perceptions of the school effectiveness characteristics?

Exploratory Analysis

3. What is the relationship between the amount of HESI training received and teachers' perceptions of the school effectiveness characteristics?

Questionnaire Description. The Connecticut School Effectiveness Questionnaire was developed by Villanova, Gauthier, Proctor and Shoemaker (1981) to measure seven school level alterable characteristics which are defined in Table 1. The 100 items are responded to on a 5-point Likert scale (i.e., SD-SA); the sums of the item level responses are used to generate scores in the seven areas listed in Table 2 such that higher scores

Table 1

Connecticut School Effectiveness Questionnaire
Scales and Definitions

. Safe and Orderly Environment. There is an orderly, purposeful atmosphere which is free from the threat of physical harm. However, the atmosphere is not oppressive and is conducive to teaching and learning.

. Clear School Mission. There is a clearly articulated mission of the school through which the staff shares an understanding of and a commitment to instructional goals, priorities, assessment procedures and accountability.

. Instructional Leadership. The principal acts as the instructional leader who effectively communicates the mission of the school to the staff, parents and students and who understands and applies the characteristics of instructional effectiveness in the management of the instructional program of the school.

. High Expectations. The school displays a climate of expectation in which staff believes and demonstrates that students can attain mastery of basic skills and that staff members have the capability to help students achieve such mastery.

. Opportunity to Learn and Student Time on Task. Teachers allocate a significant amount of classroom time to instruction in basic skills areas. For a high percentage of that allocated time students are engaged in planned learning activities.

. Frequent Monitoring of Student Progress. Feedback on student academic progress is obtained frequently. Multiple assessment methods such as teacher-made tests, samples of student work, mastery skills checklists, criterion-referenced tests and norm-referenced tests are used. The results of testing are to improve individual student performance and also to improve the instructional program.

. Home-School Relations. Parents understand and support the basic mission of the school and are made to feel that they have an important role in achieving this mission.

---

reflect higher perceived levels of the school effectiveness characteristics. The rationale and development of the scale have been described by Gauthier (1983) and Villanova (1984).

Reliability Data. Table 2 presents alpha internal consistency stability reliability data generated for several schools by the State Department of Education. Also presented are alpha internal consistency reliabilities for the3 1984 and 1985 HESI teachers. The 67 teachers included in both analyses are the teachers which had complete (i.e., matched) sets of data for both the 1984 and 1985 administrations of the survey. With the exception of the High Expectation characteristic, all of the survey areas are associated with adequate reliability indices.

Data Collection. The Spring 1984 (pre) data were gathered by State Department of Education staff with follow-up of non-respondents handled by HESI evaluators through the building principals. The Spring 1985 (post) surveys were produced by the evaluators and distributed to teachers by the building facilitators. Surveys were returned to the facilitators in sealed envelopes provided by the evaluators.

Survey Returns. Table 3 presents a breakdown of the number of surveys returned for the pre and post administrations. As indicated in the table, 128 staff including teachers and building administrators returned the pre surveys; 125 of the forms contained complete sets of data or no missing responses. For the

Table 2

Reliability Estimates for The Connecticut School Effectiveness Questionnaire (Villanova, 1984)

Characteristics	Number of Items	Alpha Reliabilities[a]	Test-Retest Reliabilities[b]	HESI Spring 1984 Alpha Reliabilities[c]	HESI S 1985 A Reliabil
Safe and Orderly Environment	15	.87	.85	.68	.84
Clear School Mission	14	.90	.90	.77	.83
Instructional Leadership	25	.93	.83	.95	.95
Expectations	12	.55	.69	.55	.66
Opportunity to Learn	12	.66	.74	.75	.77
Monitoring Student Progress	12	.77	.67	.69	.73
Home/School Relations	10	.89	.82	.81	.86

[a] N=423; data collected in 10 schools by State Department of Education

[b] N=60; data collected in one school by State Department of Education

[c] N=67; data represent 67 HESI teachers who had complete sets of Spring 1984 and 85 data

Table 3

Connecticut School Effectiveness Questionnaire

Returns for Spring 1984 (Pre) and Spring 1985 (Post)

School	Pre	Complete Pre	Post	Complete Post	Both Pre-Post	Complete Pre-Post
Hooker	35	33	33	31	23	21
King	56	55	54	51	35	32
Sand	37	37	33	26	14	14
Total	128[a]	125	120[b]	108	72	67

[a]Includes building administrators

[b]Teachers only

post administration only teachers were asked to complete the forms. This resulted in a total of 120 surveys, 108 of which were complete sets of data. Since the perceptions of the school level characteristics were to be addressed on a pre-post basis, the next column in the table indicates that 72 teachers had both a pre and post survey (i.e., matched identification numbers), 67 of these survey pairs contained no missing data. It may appear at first that the 67 teachers represent a smaller number than the potential number of about 125. While this is the case, the proper monitoring of changes in teacher perceptions dictates using this subset of data for the analyses. To support our use of this data set we compared the Spring 1985 survey means for these 67 teachers with the means for the 108 teachers with complete Spring 1985 surveys. For all scales (i.e., characteristics) on the survey, the means were identical to the first decimal. Thus, we are confident in the representativeness of the data set and will present the results at the school level.

Changes in Teacher Perceptions. This section will address our primary research question:

> To what extent have teachers' perceptions of the school effectiveness characteristics changed from Spring 1984 to Spring 1985?

For the combined group of HESI teachers across the three schools no significant differences were found between the pre and post survey data. We note this out of interest only, since the school level analyses are more important. Tables 4-6 present the school level analyses for the total group of teachers within the

school having complete/matched pre and post surveys. Also included is the breakout of the data based upon whether the teachers were in the Summer 1984 6-week, 1-week or no training groups. These training time data will be discussed in a later section of this report.

Focusing on the total group data on the left side of Table 4-6, we note that some significant differences were found between the Spring 1984 and Spring 1985 teacher perceptions. Prior to identifying the characteristics associated with the difference, we note that all of the statistically significant differences were associated with relatively small differences between the pre and post data. Thus, readers may wish to argue the practical significance of the differences, but we do note that for these relatively small sample sizes the following statistically significant differences were found:

Weeks

A significant decrease from Spring 1984 to Spring 1985 was found in teachers' perceptions of the characteristic of school effectiveness labeled Safe and Orderly Environment. (Table 4)

Rome

Significant increases were found between Spring 1984 and Spring 1985 teachers' perceptions for the characteristics of school effectiveness:

- Safe and Orderly Environment
- Instructional Leadership
- Home-School Relations (Table 5)

Hyde

A significant decrease from Spring 1984 to Spring 1985 was found in teachers' perceptions of the characteristic of school effectiveness labeled Instructional Leadership. (Table 6)

Table 4

Connecticut School Effectiveness Questionnaire
Spring 1984 and Spring 1985 Means and Standard Deviations
by Amount of Summer 1984 HESI Training

Weeks School

Characteristic		Total Group N=21			Extent of Summer 1984 Training: 6 Weeks N=10			1 Week N=8			None[a] N=3		
		Pre	Post	Diff	Pre	Post	Diff	Pre	Post	Diff	Pre	Post	Diff
Safe and orderly environment	$\bar{X}$	3.0	2.6	-.4**	2.9	2.5	-.4	3.0	2.7	-.3	3.1	2.5	-.6
	SD	.5	.6		.7	.7		.5	.7		.5	.3	
Clear school mission	$\bar{X}$	3.8	3.8	0	3.6	3.6	0	3.9	4.2	.3	3.1	2.5	-.6
	SD	.5	.5		.6	.4		.5	.4		.2	.5	
Instructional leadership	$\bar{X}$	3.1	2.9	-.3	3.1	2.7	-.4*	3.1	3.1	0	3.6	2.5	-1.1
	SD	.7	.8		.6	.6		.8	.9		.4	.9	
High expectations	$\bar{X}$	3.1	3.2	-.1	3.2	3.1	-.1	3.1	3.3	.2*	3.0	2.9	-.1
	SD	.4	.4		.5	.4		.3	.3		.3	.4	
Opportunity to learn and time on task	$\bar{X}$	3.3	3.3	0	3.2	3.1	-.1	3.4	3.5	.1	3.4	3.0	-.4
	SD	.5	.5		.4	.5		.5	.4		.6	.3	
Frequent monitoring of student progress	$\bar{X}$	3.6	3.6	0	3.5	3.4	-.1	3.6	3.8	.2*	3.7	3.4	-.3
	SD	.4	.4		.5	.4		.3	.4		.1	.1	
Home/school relations	$\bar{X}$	3.0	3.0	0	2.9	2.9	0	3.2	3.3	.1	3.0	2.6	-.4*
	SD	.5	.5		.6	.6		.6	.4		.3	.4	

[a]Small N precludes a meaningful analysis.
*p<.05
**p<.01

Table 5

Connecticut School Effectiveness Questionnaire
Spring 1984 and Spring 1985 Means and Standard Deviations
by Amount of Summer 1984 HESI Training

Rome School

Characteristic		Total Group N=32			Extent of Summer 1984 Training: 6 Weeks N=17			1 Week N=5			None N=11		
		Pre	Post	Diff	Pre	Post	Diff	Pre	Post	Diff	Pre	Post	Diff
Safe and orderly environment	$\bar{X}$	3.2	3.3	.1*	3.3	3.5	.2*	3.2	3.4	.2	2.9	2.9	0
	SD	.5	.6		.6	.7		.4	.3		.4	.4	
Clear school mission	$\bar{X}$	3.7	3.8	.1	3.8	3.9	.1	3.9	4.0	.1	3.6	3.7	.1
	SD	.4	.4		.4	.5		.4	.5		.4	.3	
Instructional leadership	$\bar{X}$	3.2	3.6	.4***	3.3	3.7	.4*	2.9	3.8	.9*	2.9	3.2	.3
	SD	.3	.5		.4	.5		.4	.5		.3	.3	
Opportunity to learn and time on task	$\bar{X}$	3.4	3.5	.1	3.4	3.6	.2	3.4	3.6	.2	3.4	3.3	-.1
	SD	.5	.5		.6	.5		.6	.5		.4	.4	
Frequent monitoring of student progress	$\bar{X}$	3.5	3.7	.2	3.6	3.7	.1	3.7	3.7	0	3.5	3.6	.1
	SD	.4	.4		.5	.5		.3	.3		.4	.4	
Home/school relations	$\bar{X}$	2.8	3.0	.2**	2.9	3.2	.3*	2.9	2.8	-.1	2.6	2.8	.2*
	SD	.5	.6		.6	.8		.4	.6		.4	.4	

*p<.05
**p<.01
***p<.001

Table 6

Connecticut School Effectiveness Questionnaire
Spring 1984 and Spring 1985 Means and Standard Deviations
by Amount of Summer 1984 HESI Training

Hyde School

Characteristic		Total Group N=13			Extent of Summer 1984 Training: 6 Weeks N=9			1 Week N=4			None N=1[a]		
		Pre	Post	Diff	Pre	Post	Diff	Pre	Post	Diff	Pre	Post	Diff
Safe and orderly environment	$\bar{X}$	2.9	2.5	-.4	2.7	2.6	-.1	3.0	2.3	-.7	3.3	2.1	-1.2
	SD	.5	.5		.5	.5		.6	.1				
Clear school mission	$\bar{X}$	3.8	3.9	.1	3.8	4.0	.2	3.8	3.6	-.2	3.7	4.0	.3
	SD	.4	.3		.5	.3		.4	0				
Instructional leadership	$\bar{X}$	3.6	3.4	-.2*	3.7	3.5	-.2	3.3	2.9	-.4	3.8	3.6	-.2
	SD	.5	.6		.4	.6		.6	0				
High expectations	$\bar{X}$	2.9	2.9	0	3.1	3.1	0	2.5	2.6	.1	2.6	2.6	0
	SD	.5	.3		.4	.3		.3	.2				
Opportunity to learn and time on task	$\bar{X}$	3.2	3.0	-.2	3.3	3.0	-.3	3.0	2.8	-.2	3.6	3.5	-.1
	SD	.5	.4		.5	.4		.5	.1				
Frequent monitoring of student progress	$\bar{X}$	3.5	3.6	.1	3.5	3.7	.2	3.3	3.3	0	4.0	3.8	-.2
	SD	.4	.3		.4	.3		.4	.2				
Home/school relations	$\bar{X}$	2.7	2.5	-.2	2.7	2.7	0	2.7	2.2	-.5	2.7	2.5	-.2
	SD	.3	.5		.3	4		.5	.4				

[a]Small N precludes meaningful analysis
*p<.05

In summary, it appears that the frequency and direction of significant changes in teacher perceptions of the school effectiveness characteristics differed among the three schools. Whereas the Weeks and Hyde teachers exhibited a significant decrease for one of the characteristics, the Rome teachers increased their perceptions significantly for three of the school effectiveness characteristics.

Differences Among Schools In Teacher Perceptions. Analysis of covariance techniques were carried out to answer the secondary research question for each of the seven school effectiveness characteristics:

> Are there significant differences among the three schools with respect to teachers' perceptions of the school effectiveness characteristics?

The data employed in the analyses represented the total set of 67 complete pre-post (matched) data as follows: Weeks, N=21; Rome, N=32; Hyde, N=14. For each analysis the independent variable was school (i.e., Weeks, Rome and Hyde), the dependent variable was one of the seven Spring 1985 (post) school effectiveness characteristics, and the covariate was the respective Spring 1984 (pre) school effectiveness characteristic. Although the Planning Phase Evaluation Report (July, 1984) noted that there were no significant Spring 1984 differences among the three schools with respect to any of school effectiveness characteristics, the correlations between the seven pre-post measure ranged from .49 to .63 as would be expected. Thus, the ANCOVA technique was used as a more powerful technique than ANOVA so that the Spring 1985

school level means could be adjusted for any minor differences in the Spring 1984 survey means.

Table 7 contains the ANCOVA F values and the adjusted Spring 1985 survey school level means for the three characteristics in which significant differences were found among the schools: Safe and Orderly Environment, Instructional Leadership, and Opportunity to Learn and Time on Task. Since the ANCOVA F values indicated that differences were present among the three schools, follow-up Scheffe' tests were carried out to ascertain which pairs of schools were difference in teacher perceptions. The asterisks listed below the adjusted means indicate that Rome teachers' perceptions of Safe and Orderly Environment and Instructional Leadership were significantly higher (i.e., more positive) than Weeks or Hyde teachers. No differences existed between the perceptions of the Weeks and Hyde teachers. For the Opportunity to Learn and Time on Task characteristic the perceptions of the Rome teachers were found to be significantly higher than the Hyde teachers.

The Relationship of the Amount of HESI Training and Teacher Perceptions of School Effectiveness Characteristics. The HESI teachers had the opportunity to participate in either 6 weeks or 1 week of training during the summer of 1984. In addition, seven full-day training sessions were held during the 1984-95 school year. For the group of 67 teachers with complete Spring 1984 and Spring 1985 data for the Connecticut School Effectiveness Questionnaire, the following exploratory research question was

Table 7

Summary of Differences Among School For
Spring 1985 Teacher Perceptions of
School Effectiveness Characteristics

Characteristic[a]	Ancova F	Adjusted Spring 1984 Means		
		Hooker N=21	King N=32	Sand N=14
Safe and Orderly Environment	11.82***	2.65	3.26	2.59
		**	**	
		Hooker <	King >	Sand
Instructional Leadership	10.93***	2.96	3.65	3.10
		**	**	
		Hooker <	King >	Sand
Opportunity to Learn and Time on Task	5.8**	3.27	3.49	3.04
			**	
			King >	Sand

** p < .01
*** p < .001
[a]No differences were found for the remaining four characteristics

examined:

> What is the relationship between the amount of HESI training received and teachers' perceptions of school effectiveness characteristics?

This question was examined from two perspectives. First, Spring '84 (pre) to Spring '85 (post) changes in teacher perceptions were examined for teachers with complete pre-post (matched) data to ascertain if the level of change on the characteristics differed for the 6-week, 1-week or no training groups. Second, the relationship of the number of training sessions attended during the 1984-85 school year and changes in teacher perceptions was examined.

The Summer 1984 training data were presented in an earlier section. Included were the pre-post change data for the Weeks, Rome and Hyde teachers attending the 6-week, 1-week or no training groups. While the data sets appear small, we do note that the alpha internal consistency reliability indices presented earlier for the Spring 1984 and Spring 1985 data indicate that the teachers are internally consistent in their ratings of the sets of items defining the respective characteristics. This situation certainly argues against the presence of "random responses" by teachers.

The Weeks data presented earlier in Table 4 indicates that for the 6-week group a significant decrease was found in teacher perceptions of the level of Instructional Leadership, the 1-week group exhibited significant increases in perceptions of High Expectations and Frequent Monitoring of Student progress; the no

training group exhibited a significant decrease in teachers, perceptions of Home-School Relations. The Rome school change data presented in Table 5 indicates that the 6-week teachers exhibited significant increases in perceptions of Safe and Orderly Environment, Instructional Leadership, and Home/School Relations; the 1-week group increased significantly in their perceptions of Instructional Leadership; and the no training group increased significantly in their perceptions of Home-School Relations.

Finally, Table 6 presented the Hyde teacher data which suggests that no changes in perceptions of the school effectiveness characteristics were present for the 6-week and 1-week groups; the no training groups only contained one teacher with complete pre-post data so no statistical analysis was run.

In summary, the relationship between the amount of HESI summer training and changes in teacher's perceptions of school effectiveness characteristics differed among the three schools. The highest degree of relationship was found for the Rome school where the teachers participating in 6-weeks of training exhibited significant increases for three of the seven characteristics, whereas the 1-week and no-training groupls each exhibited significant change for one characteristic. At the Weeks and Hyde schools no identifiable trend in the relationship was observed for these data.

The 1984-1985 school year training data are summarized in Table 8. Note that these data indicate how many 1984-1985 training sessions were attended by the teachers in the group with matched pre-post school effectiveness characteristic data. The

Table

Number of 1984-1985 Training Sessions

Attended by Teachers With Match Pre-Post Data

Number of Sessions Attended	Number of Teachers[a]
0	9
1	1
2	12
3	4
4	1
5	2
6	12
7	15

[a]Teachers represent 56 of the 67 pre-post matched group who indicated how many sessions they attended during the school year.

data set is based upon 56 teachers, since 11 teachers did not record the number of sessions they attended.

A frequency distribution was created for the number of sessions attended. Based upon the distribution, the number of sessions attended served as the independent variable with the number of teachers in each level for these analyses as follows: no sessions, N=9; 1-3 sessions, N=17; 4-6 sessions, N=15; and 7 sessions, N=15. Prior to examining the Spring 1985 data, a one-way analysis of variance was run to ascertain if the four training time groups differed in their Spring 1984 scores. Although no Spring 1984 differences were present, a one-way analysis of covariance was carried out for each of the seven Spring 1985 school effectiveness characteristics (i.e., dependent variable) with the Spring 1984 data serving as the respective covariate in each analysis. Given the relatively small number of teachers in each training category, no school level analyses were performed. Prior to presenting the results, we note that no other breakouts of the independent variable (e.g., no training versus attended 7 sessions or 0-2 sessions versus 6-7 session) produced any significant outcomes.

The analysis indicated that significant differences were present among the training time groups for the Safe and Orderly Environment and High Expectations characteristics. Table 9 contains the adjusted means and indicates that for both characteristics the highest ratings were found for those teachers attending either no training sessions or seven sessions. Since the groups did not differ in their Spring 1984 perceptions, these

data are somewhat puzzling. In an attempt to explain these findings, we will focus first on the group attending no training. Follow-up Scheffe' tests indicated that the no training group exhibited significantly more positive change than either the 1-3 sessions or 4-6 sessions groups on the Safe and Orderly Environment scale and significantly more positive change than the 4-6 session group on the High Expectations scale (see Table 9). While for some reason these teachers did not attend any of the training sessions, it could be that other positive HESI experiences in the schools other than training sessions contributed to more positive Spring 1985 perceptions. Focusing now on the three groups who attended some of the training, we see that the group of teachers attending all seven sessions exhibited significantly higher levels of positive change in their perceptions of High Expectations than the 1-3 sessions or 4-6 sessions groups.

In summary, the relationship between the amount of training sessions attended and changes in teacher perceptions is not clear in this data set. While the relationship appears to exist for the High Expectations characteristic for those attending some of the training, high levels of positive change for the no training group suggest the relationship may be moderated by some other variable. Project staff should discuss this exploratory finding further.

Table 9
Adjusted Spring 1985 Means for
Four Training Time Groups[a]

Characteristic	Number of Sessions 0 N= 9	1-3 N=17	4-6 N=15	7 N=15
Safe and Orderly Environment	3.41	2.93	2.65	3.19
	*			
	**			
High Expectations	3.30	3.05	2.99	3.37
		*		
			**	
				**

* p< .05
** p< .01

[a]No differences were found for the remaining five characteristics.

SECTION IV: STUDENT ACHIEVEMENT

It is well known through the school improvement literature that raising student achievement is a long term process which may involve at least a five year process. It would be inappropriate to place emphasis on achievement outcomes during the first year of the project. Rather, our Year I evaluation has emphasized process concerns regarding program implementation issues. Program outcomes such as student achievement data will be presented in such a manner to facilitate a longitudinal sustained achievement effects study.

In our Planning Phase Evaluation Report we presented a description of the Metropolitan Achievement Test (MAT) Spring 1984 achievement levels for the three HESI schools. Data were presented at the classroom level and were broken out by the amount of Summer 1984 training received by teachers (i.e., 6-weeks, 1-week, none). During the 1984-1985 school year several teachers attended up to seven HESI training sessions and all teachers had the opportunity to share HESI ideas with colleagues during the school year, as well as work with the principal and facilitator. It was thus decided not to continue monitoring student achievement based upon the amount of Summer 1984 teacher training. Instead, we will present descriptive achievement status data over the one year period which can be used for the longitudinal sustained effects study to be conducted by the Hartford schools at a later time.

Data Gathering and Analysis. The MAT data were gathered by the Hartford Public Schools as part of their normal city-wide testing program and supplied to the evaluators.

The data will be portrayed in three ways. First, we will present school level Spring 1984 and Spring 1985 data by grade level. These data will describe, for example, how grade 2 Spring 1984 student achievement compares with grade 2 Spring 1985 (different students) achievement. Second, we will present MAT data for the Spring 1984 - Spring 1985 cohort groups so that the achievement levels of the same students can be followed over time. These data represent the beginning (i.e., baseline data) of the long term study of the sustained achievement effects of HESI. Finally, for the grade level cohort data we will present the percent of students in each school below the 30th percentile, below grade level (i.e., below the 50th percentile), normal curve equivalent scores (NCE) and grade equivalent scores (GE).

To review the data we note that the tests are administered during the seventh month of school. Therefore, grade level performance for grade 2 would be 2.7. Also, a percentile and NCE score of 50 would indicate grade level performance relative to the national norm group. The data in Tables 1-3 suggests that, in general, the overall Spring 1984 and Spring 1985 achievement levels at Rome and Hyde were at or slightly above grade level, while the overall achievement levels at Weeks tended to be below grade level.

Tables 4-6 present the MAT data for the grade level cohort groups. For example, Table 4 lists achievement levels for 45

Weeks students who were in grade 2 at the Spring 1984 test time and in grade 3 the following year. Also included are levels of change in achievement based upon the NCE scores. A positive change index indicates that relative achievement based upon national norms has increased, a negative change index indicates that relative achievement has declined, and a zero change indicates the relative achievement level has remained the same from Spring 1984 and Spring 1985.

Over the one year period it appears that there are several fluctuations present in the data. Since these data are presented as baseline data for a longer sustained achievement effects study, it would be appropriate for project staff and Hartford administrators to discuss the apparent achievement fluctuations present in the data.

Tables 7-9 present the grade level cohort data for each school indicating the percentage of students achieving at the following levels: below the 30th percentile, below grade level, and above grade level. The ideal situation for each grade level cohort group would be a decrease in the percent of students below the 30th percentile and below grade level from Spring 1984 and Spring 1985, and an increase in the percent above grade level. Consistent with the data in the prior tables, we again note that there were several fluctuations in the data.

Summary. In summary, end of year one achievement data for each school was presented as baseline data for a long term (i.e., five year) student achievement growth. No short term causal relationships between the one year HESI project and student achievement were discussed. We did suggest, though, that Hartford staff review the achievement of students during the first year of the project to identify those schools and grade levels where the basic skill progress of students (a) exceeded expectations, (b) met expectations, and (c) was below expectations. Once progress is categorized in this manner, instructional programs should be analyzed by school and grade level to identify specific aspects or features of these programs which teachers believe affected the levels of student achievement exhibited. Through this process directions for instructional improvement for the next school year can be identified on the basis of student progress during the initial project year.

Table 1

Metropolitan Achievement Test Scores for
Spring 1984 and Spring 1985 by Grade Level

Weeks

Grade		Reading		Math		Language		Total	
		1984	1985	1984	1985	1984	1985	1984	1985
2	N							50	50
	%ile	40	28	35	30	35	28	37	30
	NCE	45	36	42	39	42	36	43	37
	GE	2.4	2.1	2.5	2.4	2.1	2.0	2.3	2.1
3	N							43	47
	%ile	34	30	33	42	35	30	37	32
	NCE	41	39	41	46	42	40	43	40
	GE	2.8	2.7	3.1	3.5	3.0	2.8	3.0	3.0
4	N							44	47
	%ile	35	28	29	34	38	40	34	32
	NCE	42	39	38	42	44	44	41	41
	GE	3.5	3.2	3.9	4.2	4.1	4.2	3.9	3.9
5	N							47	45
	%ile	37	38	35	42	51	48	44	44
	NCE	43	43	42	47	51	50	47	47
	GE	4.7	4.7	5.1	5.5	5.9	5.8	5.4	5.5
6	N							59	46
	%ile	43	40	41	46	51	56	45	46
	NCE	46	45	45	48	51	54	47	49
	GE	6.2	5.8	6.0	6.3	6.7	7.2	6.3	6.4

Table 2

Metropolitan Achievement Test Scores for
Spring 1984 and Spring 1985 by Grade Level

Rome

Grade		Reading		Math		Language		Total	
		1984	1985	1984	1985	1984	1985	1984	1985
2	N							113	117
	%ile	55	50	53	58	57	54	55	54
	NCE	53	50	52	54	54	52	53	52
	GE	2.8	2.6	2.9	3.0	2.9	2.7	2.8	2.7
3	N							91	104
	%ile	49	46	53	54	58	50	57	50
	NCE	50	48	52	53	54	50	54	50
	GE	3.4	3.2	3.9	3.9	4.2	3.7	3.9	3.7
4	N							129	81
	%ile	43	44	46	46	51	54	50	46
	NCE	46	47	48	49	51	52	50	49
	GE	4.1	4.1	4.7	4.7	4.9	5.1	4.7	4.7
5	N							100	111
	%ile	46	50	52	46	51	56	51	54
	NCE	48	50	51	49	51	53	51	52
	GE	5.5	5.8	5.9	5.6	5.9	6.2	5.8	6.0
6	N							120	99
	%ile	45	46	53	54	59	56	51	52
	NCE	47	49	52	53	55	55	51	52
	GE	6.4	6.5	6.8	6.9	7.7	7.3	6.9	6.9

Table 3

Metropolitan Achievement Test Scores for
Spring 1984 and Spring 1985 by Grade Level

Hyde

Grade		Reading		Math		Language		Total	
		1984	1985	1984	1985	1984	1985	1984	1985
2	N							68	48
	%ile	44	46	49	48	55	62	47	52
	NCE	47	48	50	50	53	57	48	52
	GE	2.5	2.6	2.8	2.8	2.8	3.1	2.6	2.7
3	N							54	53
	%ile	40	34	69	77	54	56	53	52
	NCE	45	41	60	66	52	53	52	51
	GE	3.0	2.8	4.6	5.1	4.0	4.0	3.7	3.8
4	N							47	51
	%ile	35	38	49	72	43	54	41	52
	NCE	42	44	50	63	46	52	45	52
	GE	3.5	3.7	4.8	6.0	4.4	5.1	4.3	5.0
5	N							35	39
	%ile	35	38	35	56	51	48	51	48
	NCE	42	43	42	54	51	49	51	49
	GE	4.5	4.7	5.1	6.2	6.1	5.7	5.8	5.7
6	N							37	30
	%ile	42	38	50	48	51	44	48	42
	NCE	46	44	50	50	51	47	49	46
	GE	6.0	5.5	6.7	6.5	6.7	5.9	6.5	6.1

Table 4

Metropolitan Achievement Test Scores for
Spring 1984 and Spring 1985 Cohorts by Grade Level

Weeks

Grade[a]				Reading			Math			Language		
1984	1985	N		1984	1985	Change	1984	1985	Change	1984	1985	Change
2	3	45	%ile	40	28		40	40		42	30	
			NCE	45	38	-6	45	45	0	44	39	-5
			GE	2.4	2.6		2.6	3.4		2.3	2.7	
3	4	36	%ile	36	28		40	36		38	40	
			NCE	43	38	-5	45	43	-2	44	44	0
			GE	2.9	3.2		3.4	4.3		3.2	4.2	
4	5	37	%ile	36	38		36	44		46	48	
			NCE	43	44	+1	44	47	+3	48	49	+1
			GE	3.6	4.7		4.3	5.5		4.5	5.7	
5	6	39	%ile	42	42		42	46		52	56	
			NCE	46	47	+1	46	48	+2	51	55	+4
			GE	5.1	6.0		5.4	6.4		6.0	7.3	

[a]

1984 Grade	Number of Retentions (not included)
2	3
3	1
4	7
5	7

Table 5

Metropolitan Achievement Test Scores for
Spring 1984 and Spring 1985 Cohorts by Grade Level

Rome

Grade[a]				Reading			Math			Language		
1984	1985	N		1984	1985	Change	1984	1985	Change	1984	1985	Change
2	3	87	%ile	52	48		46	56		58	52	
			NCE	52	49	-3	49	53	+4	54	52	-2
			GE	2.7	3.3		2.8	4.0		2.9	3.8	
3	4	62	%ile	48	46		52	48		60	54	
			NCE	49	48	-1	52	50	-2	55	52	-3
			GE	3.3	4.2		3.9	4.8		4.3	5.1	
4	5	90	%ile	44	52		48	48		56	54	
			NCE	47	50	+3	50	49	-1	53	52	-1
			GE	4.2	6.0		4.8	5.7		5.2	6.1	
5	6	78	%ile	48	48		52	56		54	60	
			NCE	49	50	+1	50	54	+4	53	56	+3
			GE	5.6	6.7		5.9	7.0		6.2	7.6	

[a]

1984 Grade	Number of Retentions (not included)
2	3
3	4
4	4
5	3

Table 6

Metropolitan Achievement Test Scores for
Spring 1984 and Spring 1985 Cohorts by Grade Level

Hyde

Grade[a] 1984	Grade[a] 1985	N		Reading 1984	Reading 1985	Reading Change	Math 1984	Math 1985	Math Change	Language 1984	Language 1985	Language Change
2	3	46	%ile	44	32		44	77		54	54	
			NCE	48	40	-8	47	65	+18	52	52	0
			GE	2.5	2.8		2.7	5.1		2.8	3.9	
3	4	41	%ile	38	42		70	78		58	56	
			NCE	44	46	+2	61	66	+5	55	53	-2
			GE	2.9	3.9		4.6	6.3		4.2	5.2	
4	5	32	%ile	40	38		56	60		50	48	
			NCE	45	43	-2	53	55	+2	49	49	0
			GE	3.8	4.7		5.1	6.3		4.8	5.7	
5	6	25	%ile	34	40		32	52		44	46	
			NCE	41	45	+4	41	51	+10	47	48	+1
			GE	4.4	5.7		5.0	6.7		5.5	6.1	

[a]

1984 Grade	Number of Retentions (not included)
2	3
3	3
4	7
5	2

Table 7

Percent of Cohorts in MAT Percentile Ranges
for Spring 1984 and Spring 1985 Grade Levels

Weeks

Grade 1984	Grade 1985	N	Achievement Level	Reading 1984	Reading 1985	Reading Change	Math 1984	Math 1985	Math Change	Language 1984	Language 1985	Language Change
2	3	45	Below 30th %ile	34.1	52.3	+18.2	40.3	28.6	-11.7	40.0	42.2	+2.2
			Below Grade Level[a]	63.6	77.3	+13.7	66.7	67.7	+1.0	60.0	71.1	+11.1
			Above Grade Level	36.4	22.7	-13.7	33.3	32.3	-1.0	40.0	28.9	-11.1
3	4	36	Below 30th %ile	33.3	47.2	+13.9	27.8	33.3	+5.5	30.6	25.0	-5.6
			Below Grade Level	83.3	94.4	+11.1	69.4	75.0	+5.6	69.4	66.7	-2.7
			Above Grade Level	16.7	5.6	-11.1	30.6	25.0	-5.6	30.6	33.3	+2.7
4	5	37	Below 30th %ile	27.0	37.8	+10.8	36.1	25.0	-11.1	37.8	27.0	-10.8
			Below Grade Level	81.1	62.2	-18.9	72.2	55.6	-16.6	59.5	54.1	-5.4
			Above Grade Level	18.9	37.8	+18.9	27.8	44.4	+16.6	40.5	45.9	+5.4
5	6	39	Below 30th %ile	15.4	23.1	+7.7	25.6	17.9	-7.7	17.9	5.1	-12.8
			Below Grade Level	74.4	61.5	-12.9	61.5	64.1	+2.6	51.3	35.9	-15.4
			Above Grade Level	25.6	38.5	+12.9	38.5	35.9	-2.6	48.7	64.1	+15.4
TOTAL		157	Below 30th %ile	26.3	39.1	+12.8	32.0	24.8	-7.2	31.8	25.5	-6.3
			Below Grade Level	75.0	72.4	-2.6	65.4	65.4	0	59.9	57.3	-2.6
			Above Grade Level	25.0	27.6	+2.6	34.6	34.6	0	40.1	42.7	-2.6

[a]Grade level performance is the 50th %ile.

Table 8

Percent of Cohorts in MAT Percentile Ranges
for Spring 1984 and Spring 1985 Grade Levels

Rome

Grade 1984	Grade 1985	N	Achievement Level	Reading 1984	Reading 1985	Reading Change	Math 1984	Math 1985	Math Change	Language 1984	Language 1985	Language Change
2	3	87	Below 30th %ile	16.1	20.7	+4.6	29.9	16.1	-13.8	17.4	19.8	+2.4
			Below Grade Level[a]	37.9	52.9	+15.0	49.4	42.5	-6.9	39.5	40.7	+1.2
			Above Grade Level	62.1	47.1	-15.0	50.6	57.5	+6.9	60.5	59.3	-1.2
3	4	62	Below 30th %ile	13.8	24.1	+10.3	25.8	30.6	+4.8	9.8	19.7	+9.9
			Below Grade Level	58.6	63.8	+5.2	50.0	53.2	+3.2	26.2	49.2	+23.0
			Above Grade Level	41.4	36.2	-5.2	50.0	46.8	-3.2	73.8	50.8	-23.0
4	5	90	Below 30th %ile	22.2	15.6	-6.6	24.7	19.1	-5.6	13.5	16.9	+3.4
			Below Grade Level	62.2	48.9	-13.3	55.1	42.7	-12.4	47.2	48.3	+1.1
			Above Grade Level	37.8	51.1	+13.3	44.9	57.3	+12.4	52.8	51.7	-1.1
5	6	78	Below 30th %ile	17.9	15.4	-2.5	14.1	17.9	+3.8	16.5	11.4	-5.1
			Below Grade Level	57.7	52.6	-5.1	43.6	43.6	0	44.3	32.9	-11.4
			Above Grade Level	42.3	47.4	+5.1	56.4	56.4	0	55.7	67.1	+11.4
TOTAL		320	Below 30th %ile	16.6	18.2	+1.6	21.8	20.3	-1.5	14.6	16.8	+2.2
			Below Grade Level	52.1	52.1	0	48.4	44.9	-3.5	40.3	42.5	+2.2
			Above Grade Level	47.9	47.9	0	51.6	55.1	3.5	59.7	57.5	-2.2

[a]Grade level performance is the 50th %ile.

Table 9

Percent of Cohorts in MAT Percentile Ranges
for Spring 1984 and Spring 1985 Grade Levels

Hyde

Grade 1984	Grade 1985	N	Achievement Level	Reading 1984	Reading 1985	Reading Change	Math 1984	Math 1985	Math Change	Language 1984	Language 1985	Language Change
2	3	46	Below 30th %ile	21.7	47.8	+26.1	23.9	6.5	-17.4	17.4	17.4	0
			Below Grade Level[a]	63.0	78.3	+15.3	67.4	23.9	-43.5	45.7	41.3	-4.4
			Above Grade Level	37.0	21.7	-15.3	32.6	76.1	+43.5	54.3	58.7	+4.4
3	4	41	Below 30th %ile	29.3	36.6	+7.3	17.5	12.5	-5.0	12.2	9.8	-2.4
			Below Grade Level	78.0	65.9	-12.1	37.5	20.0	-17.5	34.1	29.3	-4.8
			Above Grade Level	22.0	34.1	+12.1	62.5	80.0	+17.5	65.9	70.7	+4.8
4	5	32	Below 30th %ile	40.6	31.3	-9.3	15.6	9.4	-6.2	15.6	21.9	+6.3
			Below Grade Level	78.1	81.3	+3.2	59.4	21.8	-37.6	68.8	62.5	-6.3
			Above Grade Level	21.9	18.7	+3.2	40.6	78.2	+37.6	31.2	37.5	+6.3
5	6	25	Below 30th %ile	24.0	32.0	+8.0	48.0	20.0	-28.0	32.0	8.0	-24.0
			Below Grade Level	84.0	72.0	-12.0	60.0	36.0	-24.0	56.0	52.0	-4.0
			Above Grade Level	16.0	28.0	+12.0	40.0	64.0	+24.0	44.0	48.0	+4.0
TOTAL		144	Below 30th %ile	27.1	37.5	+10.4	24.5	11.2	-13.3	18.1	14.6	-3.5
			Below Grade Level	74.3	72.9	-1.4	53.8	25.9	-27.9	49.3	44.4	-4.9
			Above Grade Level	25.7	27.1	+1.4	46.2	74.1	+27.9	50.7	55.6	+4.9

[a]Grade level performance is the 50th %ile.

SECTION FIVE: PARAPROFESSIONAL SURVEY 1984-1985 SCHOOL YEAR

The paraprofessionals assisted in evaluating the HESI program through the completion of the 1984-1985 School Year Paraprofessional Survey (see Appendix A). Sections of the survey addressed paraprofessional training and asked for any recommendations regarding program improvement.

Table A presents a summary of the amount of 1984 Summer training received by the 36 paraprofessionals from each school completing the survey. From this group 22/36 or 61% participated in the full 6-week Summer training program, while 9/36 or 25%s indicated they have never received any HESI training. This latter group did not complete the remaining sections of the survey.

HESI Training. Table B summarizes the responses of the paraprofessionals to several of the questions on the survey. When asked how much of the HESI training received during the Summer or school year they were able to use, half (50%) of the group indicated "some" and about a third (27%) noted "very much." Only 23% of the group responded either "very little" or "none." When asked what made it easy for them to use what they had learned, comments were as follows?:

Motivation

The material of the printed handouts was very meaningful and helpful.

Having five or ten students.

Some of the discipline tactics.

The opportunity of being able to work in small groups and having the freedom of working with the groups on my own.

Table A

Summer 1984 HESI Training for Paraprofessionals as Indicated by Spring 1985 Survey Respondents

N=36

HESI Summer Training	Weeks	Rome	Hyde	All Schools
1 week		1		1
6 weeks	5	12	5	22
Did not attend summer training but did receive training during the school year		2	2	4
Never received training				9[a]

[a]Did not complete remaining parts of the survey.

Table B

Paraprofessional Evaluation of HESI Training[a]

Topic	Weeks N=5				Rome N=15				Hyde N=7				All Schools N=27			
	1	2	3	4[b]	1	2	3	4	1	2	3	4	1	2	3	4
Amount of training used during school year?			100			29	50	21	29		14	57	8	15	50	27
			Yes				Yes				Yes				Yes	
Percent attending the April 27 HESI training session			60				60				86				67	
Percent of those attending finding session helpful.			100				100				100				100	
Percent Finding text Aiding in Education helpful.			80				64				100				77	
Percent attending any of the full day HESI teacher training sessions.			20				27				33				27	

[a] Table entries are percentages.

[b] 1 = None
2 = Very little
3 = Some
4 = Very Much

There are times when I work individually with children as their needs occur.

Working as a team.

It was easy knowing that I have been doing some of the things for years.

Some teachers used HESI with some success. I worked with a teacher that used the Hunter model. With some students it works.

Unfortunately, I do not have the opportunity to interact with the children very often. I have tried to use the HESI method when I've been involved with discipline.

I have learned to listen to the children more and be more patient with them. I have learned different ways to help the slower ones and also what ways I can help the more aggressive children.

Because the children have learned how to stay on task.

The paraprofessionals also commented on what made it hard for them to use what they had learned. Comments were as follows:

When you have a child and no matter what you do it just won't work, even with one to one help.

Because of the different substitutes that have been in my room this year.

Having 28 students.

Having children with emotional problems and special education that have to have their attitudes changed toward making them feel positive about themselves.

Different working conditions.

With behavioral problems it was difficult to have positive reinforcement at times.

It would make it more easy for new bilingual teachers if the training would be given in Spanish.

Team teaching combination of both classes together; sizes of groups 10-12 children at a time; changing of groups every 1/2 hour; the elevation of children to or from higher group-level of learning. The change-over is high.

> Team teaching. Approximately 90 children rotating every 1/2 hour from 8:30-2:30. Discipline problems, too short periods, immature students.

Returning to Table B we note that 18/27 or 67% of the paraprofessionals indicated that they attended the Saturday, April 27 paraprofessional training session and all (100%) attending felt it was helpful. Two paraprofessionals offered the following comments:

> Paraprofessionals had more structure and motivation. Working with small groups and close contact is more of a challenge to help students without getting burned out.

> Sessions made me aware of how special I am. How hard I've worked with the 80-90 children. It was a good workshop and I got a lot out of it.

An additional training topic addressed in the survey was whether the paraprofessionals found the textbook Aide-ing in Education by Madeline Hunter helpful. Across the three schools 21 of 27 or 77% of the group felt it was helpful. A couple of paraprofessionals commented that they did not read the text and two others noted that it was full of good ideas.

The paraprofessionals were also asked if they attended any of the full day HESI teacher training sessions. Seven of the 27 or 27% indicated that they had attended one or two of the sessions and one commented that she wished she had been included in all of the teacher sessions.

Finally, the paraprofessionals were asked to provide additional suggestions for improving the HESI program next year. While two commented that they had no comments at this time, nine paraprofessionals offered the following suggestions:

Provide this program (training) in Spanish for bilingual teachers who have some difficulty in English.

Include paraprofessionals in the WHOLE program.

I would like to see more programs on HESI offered to the paraprofessional so they can be better equipped to work with the teacher in using the program.

I think if for two weeks Sand would have their sessions and the following two weeks Hooker and then King and take all of the best parts from the three schools and combine them together.

Give us some time to go and see how HESI is working out at the other two schools.

Paraprofessionals can bed more involved in the programs besides on Saturday sessions.

More material, less students and more training.

More discipline strategies.

We need more good ideas on what to do with the very bad behavioral problems.

SECTION VI: SUMMARY

At the end of this evaluation report, we want to reiterate that Year I of HESI has been very good and in some ways quite remarkable. Teachers and principals continue to praise the quality and content of the project. Not only have they kept their initial positive reaction to the Summer training and clinical experience, they have remained enthusiastic about the in-service provided during the academic year. Teachers should be recognized for their commitment to the project; the project coordinator and trainers should be recognized for the outstanding design and implementation of the model. It is not easy to sustain a staff development project of this intensity and teachers and project personnel have done an outstanding job.

Building facilitators have likewise been superb. Their skill and commitment resulted in a level of attention to teaching that is needed but ordinarily difficult to achieve. As a result, teachers became more comfortable being observed; in many cases they wished they could have had more coaching than what was available. The isolated, closed door attitude of many gave way to a desire for support and assistance. This is a major step forward in the effort to improve teaching.

With respect to implementation, we found teachers using the language extensively and incorporating components of the model into their teaching. The sophistication with which they use these components varies as a function of previous teaching style and level of expertise. This is to be expected. It reveals that the project is proceeding along the expected three to five year

implementation time table described by Hunter.

We did note areas of concern that have arisen during the year. Some teachers find the coaching and conferencing insufficiently sophisticated; facilitators struggle with how to use the model with teachers their principals describe as marginal. These are difficult issues and we have suggested differentiating the training in Year II to meet the needs of individual teachers. Such an approach is compatible with the Hunter model which reminds us to select learning objectives at the correct level of difficulty and be aware of the learning style of the student. Teachers, as participants in HESI, are most assuredly students; they deserve the kind of instruction that is most likely to result in high levels of learning.

In the course of completing this evaluation we uncovered problems that are not a result of HESI but which will influence 1) the extent to which HESI has the intended impact and 2) the fair evaluation of HESI. First, we noted in the Interim Report that teachers and principals were uncertain that central office administrators were committed to HESI for the foreseeable future. They reported little overt support from the Superintendent or his associates and felt reluctant to wholeheartedly embrace the project if the next academic year would see its demise. We anticipated limited implementation due to teachers' perceptions that HESI would end and they would be asked to do something different next year.

To some extent, these concerns were alleviated when central office personnel visited the schools in the Spring, tried the

model in HESI classrooms and participated in conferences. Teachers were pleased when the Superintendent made a public commitment to the project at the start of an in-service training day. If the district is committed to the project, these kinds of activities should continue.

Second, because the evaluation team as well as the project staff were paying close attention to classroom teaching, we became aware that a number of teachers have professional development needs that HESI is not designed to address. Some of these are described as marginal; others have a great deal of difficulty explaining particular subject matter material to children. HESI can help these teachers, but we end the year wondering whether even this intensive program can improve their teaching sufficiently to make a significant difference to children.

We urge caution, therefore, when eventually evaluating HESI on the basis of improvements in students' achievement test scores. As a result of our evaluation this year, we would expect differential achievement score outcomes as a function of teachers' skill and ability at the start of the project. We urge continued attention to and evaluation of the program as it is implemented during the next year or two in order to accurately assess what was implemented, the extent and quality of that implementation, and the associated impact on test scores. The Board of Education has initiated a sustained effects study of achievement; we recommend that it be continued throughout the life of the project in order to accurately assess the connections between HESI and student achievement.

APPENDIX A

1984-1985 SCHOOL YEAR TEACHER SURVEY

Hartford Effective Schools Initiative

During this school year you participated in the implementation of the Essential Elements of Effective Instruction model developed by Madeline Hunter. Please assist us in evaluating the year's program by completing this confidential survey, sealing it in the envelope provided and returning it to your facilitator. The evaluation findings will assist us in better planning your HESI program for the 1985-1986 school year. Thank you for your help.

I. PARTICIPANT DESCRIPTION

1. School: Hooker _____ King _____ Sand _____

2. HESI Summer 1984 Training (Please check one)

_____ Attended 1 week only

_____ Attended 6 weeks

_____ Did not attend summer training but did receive training during the school year

_____ Have never participated in any HESI training (If you checked this line, please do NOT complete this survey but return it for our record.)

II. HESI TRAINING DURING SCHOOL YEAR

During the 1984-1985 school year the HESI program sponsored seven full day training sessions in the Essential Elements of Effective Instruction.

1. Please check (✓) those sessions you attended.

Mon., Oct. 8, 1984	___	Sat., Dec. 8, 1984	___
Fri., Oct. 26, 1984	___	Sat., Jan. 12, 1985	___
Sat., Nov. 10, 1984	___	Fri., Mar. 22, 1985	___
Mon., Nov. 12, 1984	___		

Question 2 should be answered by teachers who attended the Summer 1984 HESI Training. (If you did not attend, please proceed to question 3.)

---

2. Please put a check next to the one statement which you feel best describes the type of training you received at these sessions. (Check only one statement.)

_____ Received the same material presented during the summer training.

_____ Extended and refined material presented during the summer training.

_____ Presented new material in addition to the summer material.

3. Training Presenters

Please evaluate the quality of the HESI trainers by indicating the extent to which you agree or disagree with the following statements.

SD Strongly Disagree
D Disagree
U Undecided
A Agree
SA Strongly Agree

a. Clearly presented the material	SD	D	U	A	SA
b. Maintained liveliness in discussions	SD	D	U	A	SA
c. Used good examples to illustrate points	SD	D	U	A	SA
d. Responded clearly to questions	SD	D	U	A	SA
e. Modeled the described behaviors	SD	D	U	A	SA
f. Used good transparencies.	SD	D	U	A	SA
g. Allocated time well to topics covered	SD	D	U	A	SA
h. Provided the opportunity to ask questions.	SD	D	U	A	SA

4. Training Content

Please rate the quality of the training content using the following scale:

1 Very Poor
2 Poor
3 Acceptable
4 Good
5 Very Good

a. Sequence of topics	1	2	3	4	5
b. Quality of information presented	1	2	3	4	5
c. Variety of topics presented	1	2	3	4	5
d. Depth of the topic presented	1	2	3	4	5

III. TEACHER INVOLVEMENT WITH THE FACILITATOR, PRINCIPAL AND OTHER TEACHERS

1. On the average, how many times each month were you observed by the following people?

Your Facilitator _____

Your Principal _____

2. How often were you involved in selecting the focus of the observation (i.e., the particular aspect of the Hunter model)?

a. When observed by the facilitator: (Circle one)

Never Rarely Sometimes Very Often Always

b. When observed by the principal: (Circle one)

Never Rarely Sometimes Very Often Always

3. Were you offered the opportunity to observe other teachers this year?

Yes No

If yes, about how many times? _____

If yes, would you want more opportunities to observe teachers?

Yes No

4. Did your building facilitator present any demonstration lessons in your classroom?

Yes No

If you answered yes,

a. What subjects were demonstrated?

b. Were the demonstrations useful?

Yes No

IV. STAFF MEETINGS

During the school year, what proportion (on the average) of staff meeting time was devoted to discussions of effective teaching strategies from the Hunter model? (Circle one)

0 1/4 1/2 3/4 or more

Any comments?

V. USE OF MESI TRAINING LESSON DESIGN

During the school year you have been working on some of the aspects of lesson design listed below. Please answer these three questions by circling the appropriate number from the following scale:

1 Not at all
2 Very little
3 Somewhat
4 To a great extent

Topics	To what extent did you focus on these during this school year?	To what extent were you able to implement these into your instruction?	To what extent did this implementation represent a change from your previous instructional techniques?
1. Selecting the objective at the correct level of difficulty	1 2 3 4	1 2 3 4	1 2 3 4
2. Teaching to the objective with relevancy	1 2 3 4	1 2 3 4	1 2 3 4
3. Using an anticipatory set	1 2 3 4	1 2 3 4	1 2 3 4
4. Stating the objective and the purpose to the students	1 2 3 4	1 2 3 4	1 2 3 4
5. Input	1 2 3 4	1 2 3 4	1 2 3 4
6. Modeling	1 2 3 4	1 2 3 4	1 2 3 4
7. Checking for understanding	1 2 3 4	1 2 3 4	1 2 3 4
8. Guided practice	1 2 3 4	1 2 3 4	1 2 3 4
9. Closure	1 2 3 4	1 2 3 4	1 2 3 4
10. Independent practice	1 2 3 4	1 2 3 4	1 2 3 4
11. Signaling	1 2 3 4	1 2 3 4	1 2 3 4
12. Hemisphericity	1 2 3 4	1 2 3 4	1 2 3 4
13. Dignifying incorrect responses	1 2 3 4	1 2 3 4	1 2 3 4
14. Monitoring and adjusting accordingly	1 2 3 4	1 2 3 4	1 2 3 4
15. Positive reinforcement	1 2 3 4	1 2 3 4	1 2 3 4
16. Negative reinforcement	1 2 3 4	1 2 3 4	1 2 3 4
17. 6 Variables of motivation	1 2 3 4	1 2 3 4	1 2 3 4

VI. PROGRAM STRENGTHS/WEAKNESSES

1. Now that you have worked with the Hunter model, please describe any particular strengths of the program as implemented in:

   a. Your school

   b. Your classroom

2. Please describe any particular weaknesses of the program as implemented in:

   a. Your school

   b. Your classroom

VII. RECOMMENDATIONS

What changes, if any, would you like to see made in next year's program?

Please seal your survey in the envelope provided and return it to your facilitator. Thank you again for your assistance in evaluating the program.

1984-1985 SCHOOL YEAR PARAPROFESSIONAL SURVEY

Hartford Effective Schools Initiative

During this school year you participated in the implementation of the Essential Elements of Effective Instruction model developed by Madeline Hunter. Please assist us in evaluating the year's program by completing this confidential survey, sealing it in the envelope provided and returning it to your facilitator. The evaluation findings will help us in better planning your HESI program for the 1985-1986 school year.

I. PARTICIPANT DESCRIPTION

1. School: Hooker _____ King _____ Sand _____

2. HESI Summer 1984 Training (Please check one)

   _____ Attended 1 week only

   _____ Attended 6 weeks

   _____ Did not attend summer training but did receive training during the school year

   _____ Have never participated in any HESI training (If you checked this line, please do NOT complete this survey but return it for our record.)

II. HESI TRAINING

1. Last summer or during this year you participated in HESI training. Approximately how much of what you learned have you been able to use during this school year? (Circle one answer)

   None Very Little Some Very Much

2. Please describe what it was that made it easy or difficult to use what you learned.

a. Made it easy:

b. Made it difficult:

3a. Did you attend the Saturday, April 27th HESI training session for paraprofessionals?

Yes No

If yes, did you find it helpful?

Yes No

Any comments?

b. Did you find the textbook Aide-ing in Education by Madeline Hunter helpful?

Yes No

Any comments ?

4a. During the school year did you attend any of the full day HESI teacher training sessions in the Essential Elements of Effective Instruction?

Yes No

b. If yes, how many of the sessions did you attend?

_____

Overall, did you find the training useful?

Yes No

III. RECOMMENDATIONS

Please provide us with any additional suggestions which would help improve the HESI program next year.

Please put your survey in the envelope provided and return it to your facilitator. Thank you for your assistance in evaluating HESI.

APPENDIX B

Program Strengths and Weaknesses as reported on the Teacher Survey

Program Strengths

At the classroom level representative comments were as follows:

"Having the training has given me the vocabulary to talk about teacher/student behavior, etc. It also helped me to be more aware of what I do, to grow, and be a better teacher. I think the Hunter model is excellent. I feel that I have always practiced a lot of Hunter so the training has helped me to know that much of what I am doing is good and should be continued. It also helped me to label what I do and understand, re-evaluate and strengthen what I do."

"Redefining and follow-up in using the model as taught rather than just taking a course and then closing the books. by the facilitator working with me and giving immediate feedback on a lesson or lessons, the children gained through teacher improvement."

"Positive reinforcement and dignifying of answers have made a tremendous impact on student behavior, motivation, and participation."

"I have always followed these teaching procedures but they were never "labeled" this way. I was more aware of what I was doing while teaching>"

"Pupils more active in class participation; pupils eager to do daily homework; pupils level of concern is higher than before."

"Better lesson organization. More conscious of screening out irrelevant material and presenting less material per lesson."

"I was really able to reach some students. It made teaching meaningful."

"Allowed us to apply new and old ideas and strategies to test out the model ourselves and make our own "discoveries." Allowed us to fit the model to our own style of teaching in the classroom in a relaxed and positive manner."

"I was aware of the program 11 year through my two facilitators. Staff who did not take the training were asking about the Hunter model. The program has many strengths in my classroom and with the behavior of my students."

"Some facets of the model are now clearer after conferencing with

the facilitator (i.e., closure, check for understanding, etc.)"

"It has helped me become aware of what I do in the classroom for children as well as what i could do to improve things."

"Teaching to an objective-lesson planning. Active participation, raising the level of concern, task analyses."

"Motivation theory was used a great deal in my classroom. Students responded to negative and positive reinforcement schedules and the sue of behavior modification program were utilized."

"Positive reinforcement has worked very well. Children at the session cooperate more with each other and I feel they feel good about themselves and their successes."

"Work habits of children have improved."

"I learned how to teach better. (How, when and what)."

"Active participation techniques, actually checking for understanding in ways other than asking, "Any questions" or "..everyone understand?"

"I enjoyed the observations by my facilitator and ensuing evaluation. Observations increased teacher awareness."

At the <u>school level</u> representative comments were as follows:

"The Hunter model has helped the staff somewhat. I think attitudes have changed. The behavior problems of the kids have been stable. Good parent involvement with this model."

"Morale is better. Greater awareness of student needs. Administration and facilitators giving positive reinforcement to staff. Finally, I know what thinks I do are admired by administration."

"Staff seems to be working closer."

"Gave a common vocabulary which is helpful to me in talking to others, made people more aware and interested in changing."

"consistent language aids ability to discuss/share with peers. Professionalism-language, terms, concepts. Emphasize positive and quality work makes it very productive and enjoyable. Refocuses our goals as one unit."

"The facilitator and vice principal are trying to get teachers to practice Hunter. These two people are the strengths - not enough teachers are practicing Hunter."

"It created unity among the different teaching techniques used.

In some cases it created a positive attitude with teachers that participate."

"Teachers are able to discuss what they do in clear terms."

"Some teachers appear to be more pleasant to the children."

"Teachers were able to use the language (vocabulary) of the teaching process."

"Positive reinforcement, feeling tone when the principal, vice principal, facilitator or some other staff members commented to the whole class about something that they did right, ex: walking in corridor."

"In our school we lived the Hunter model. The facilitators kept us aware of the model each day. They were there every time we needed them. They ran a content on the Hunter model."

Program Weaknesses.

Program weakness comments in most cases pertained to the school level and not a particular classrooms and several teachers offered critical comments which in some cases were quite specific to their school. For this reason the Program weakness comments are grouped by school. We do note that each comment listed was a statement from a different teacher. The critical comments from a few teachers in a school may not represent the 37 Weeks, 44 Rome and 31 Hyde teachers returning completed surveys.

Weeks

Administration

"The principal did not model the essential elements with the teachers at all and seldom with the children. Lack of discussion at staff meetings and inservices."

"I was a bit disappointed in most of the administrative leadership and support for the program. I felt there might have been some misinterpretation of parts of the model by some of the administration. Also our teachers participating in the training and facilitation did not have opportunity to share things themselves that worked in their classes. This continuation of sharing of ideas, experiences, strategies and concerns might have helped us develop new relationships with each other and further understanding of the model within our own school."

"Administration has not complied with the model attitude (not change in relations between supervisors and teachers."

"Although the model is being used by individual teachers, I don't feel it has been used by our principal. Positive reinforcement is never given, teachers are not observe often as we were to expect. I was only visited for my evaluation. Never was I visited to see "what is going on." Teachers need POSITIVE COMMENTS FROM ADMINISTRATION!!"

"The principal went through the training but is still focusing on negatives. He never has once told me I'm doing a good job or that he appreciates me. He picks on people, he criticizes, he backs down, he does not run the school effectively. Discipline is at its worst."

"Principal should have become more involved in HESI."

Teachers

"The staff's morale in this school is terrible. Teachers try to start something new and there hasn't been much cooperation."

"The one weakness I see is that the teachers that are "open" to Hunter are the teachers who were already practicing it to some extent. The teachers who need Hunter cannot be made to practice it. There has to be some way to get all teachers to be involved in the Hunter method."

"Not enough cooperation from teachers in order for the program to work."

"Our staff doesn't work together for the good of the school. Many wish to do their own thing. We need togetherness on the job not social life."

Discipline

"Use of Hunter model did not help with discipline."

"Faces with extreme discipline problems and a perception of lack of commitment from the principal, many seemed to lose morale significantly throughout the year, partly because there was so much emphasis on HESI. We feel all the more despair at not seeing real improvements in the school as a whole."

HESI Program - General

"The class is too large to use many concepts I have learned. Hopefully in the future with declining class size implementation will be easier."

"Hard to maintain many of the important Hunter aspects at the conscious level - to be able to make use of on a regular basis."

"I feel that with any model or program that is being utilized in your classroom it must be used with consistency."

"Trainers and facilitators are not in my class frequently enough to maintain a sense of continuity and to reinforce information. I find it difficult to recall information because it is not reviewed often enough. Administration, in general, does not appear to be utilizing Hunter approach or reinforcing training."

"The jargon of the program and it's various categories has caused some confusion among teachers. As a whole I can't say as I see much change in the school performance. There was very little discipline this year at Weeks that was noticeable."

"Lack of time to share with other teachers techniques or methods, or even to observe others at work to see the methods utilized."

"Active participation of students."

"It was an ideal model but not the reality of the school environment. The same thing happened in the classroom setting."

"The program is not realistic."

Rome

Administration

"In retrospect, one reason for weakness is the elimination of a vice principal. This limited the principal's ability to monitor teachers and the HESI program to the extent necessary and to make needed adjustments such as students entry and dismissal procedures for orderly environment. Not having additional administration eliminated needed grade level meeting which would enhance sharing."

"I'll like to see classroom modeling from the facilitators, and principals."

"Not enough positive feedback given by school administration."

"The program needs more reinforcement by the administration. I would like to see 100% participation by teachers and administration."

"In some cases the discipline needs improvement."

Teachers

"Too positive. You've taken terrible teachers and given them so much positive reinforcement, that they now believe they're the greatest. When you're not in the room, they're their same old selves - no teaching and sometimes destroying egos. Even when you're there, they believe they're doing everything right and nothing wrong. Yes, positive reinforcement is NECESSARY - we've

lived too long without any. We also need OBJECTIVE-CONSTRUCTIVE CRITICISM to see where we can do better."

"Some teachers in Summer program seemed to burn out in the fall."

"Not enough participation from the entire staff."

"It's not spreading to rest of staff and too little communication."

Discipline

"Lack of follow-through in discipline problems."

"Discipline in large group settings."

HESI Program - General

"Was harder to transfer techniques with an ideal number of 15 students in classroom last Summer (plus 1 teacher and para) to 28 students and no extra help in the fall."

"During the Summer two of us worked together sharing, adjusting and monitoring feedback. Not having team teaching was one major handicap, particularly since there are so many different levels of instructions in my classroom. Not having administrative influence in committing teachers to teaming was definitely a weakness. Too much individualization - "no classroom is an island."

"The scheduling of the HESI training during school year. The time frame was not acceptable for me."

"Lack of time and many demands. Ne programs need additional time and effort to implement. It cannot be an add on additional program and expect good results."

"Everyone did not participate - school too big."

"A weakness in my class is waiting their turn to speak."

Hyde

Administration

"lack of principal involvement."

"Principal is far too busy in fact to be the instructional leader, despite his best efforts. In theory that's the way it should be, but in practice it just isn't possible in our situation."

Teachers

"One difficulty is the egocentricity of teachers who take any suggestions as a threat to their ability and authority. We need

school wide support for any improvements to be sustained and continued."

HESI Program - General

"Tensions created by coaching and scripting techniques. Too much emphasis on technology."

"The facilitator didn't have a chance to expose the program to other teachers that didn't participate in the program."

"No opportunity was provided to visit other classroom teachers. There was not a clear communication among teachers to know what was going on with the program. The level of concern and motivation seemed to slightly decline."

"Our whole school environment is so unstructured (loosely structured) that even the best made plans were frequently unattainable. Just too many other things going on to give HESI the type of time/commitment it deserves."

"Over-emphasis on terminology and "what word am I thinking of" mentality."

"Too little consistent effort in using learning techniques."

APPENDIX C

Recommendations as Reported on the Teacher Survey

Teachers were asked to offer suggestions which would contribute to an improved HESI program next year. The recommendations which follow represent all of those offered; each statement was made by a single teacher. For maximum utility the statements have been organized by school and, where possible, by common themes. The recommendations were as follows:

Weeks

Administration

"I would like to see the Administrators use more of the techniques, especially with the teachers! We're supposed to provide lots of positive reinforcement with the children. It would be so nice if we got a little positive reinforcement (as teachers), too! How about administrators displaying better feeling tone? I don't like the quizzes we get during our conferences with our facilitators! I've already spent five years in college taking exams, finals and quizzes. I don't need them any more. Just tell me what you see in my teaching that relates to the Hunter model."

"I think the program should be implemented first through the principals. The principal needs to be thoroughly committed, well-versed in terms, actively involved in application (i.e., his participation should be more commensurate with that of the facilitators), otherwise, how can you expect the program to succeed?"

"More principal participation; more teacher recognition; meet with new staff members and explain the model to them. Include Art, Music and Gym and Librarian to the model. Teachers should respect and meet with paras before children start school. Ladies at the cafeteria should use positive reinforcement (tickets, line). Teachers and paras should agree so students won't feel confused."

Training/Facilitators

"That more teachers be made (encouraged) to be involved in using Hunter. I feel that each teacher does not need the same amount of help with Hunter. Some teachers need more help than others. I think it is very hard to tell an individual teacher that he or she

needs to improve or do better. But, if Hunter is to really make an impact, more has to be done to force poor teachers to learn Hunter and implement it. I think time was spent with teachers who were already using Hunter, when more time could have been spent with those teachers who need it before."

"I would like to see not only the positive but the negative things that we are doing in order to better ourselves."

"New training, more frequent training (at least once a month). I'd like a compliment."

"I would like to see one approach from the Hunter model implemented using the Owl squads or any other approach that would be beneficial to reinforce discipline problems. Therefore the negative approach would be less useful."

"Continue inservice workshops."

"Concentrate on specific areas in which teachers request."

"I feel "script taking" is generally not at all helpful to me and a waste of time. I'd rather see, and would benefit more from, general comments about my teaching with a few specific examples to back it up."

"Less facilitator observation for teachers who have incorporated the model and are suing it successfully."

"Present different strategies with our school reality. Give more workshops where the teachers will have the opportunity to prepare and share materials in the different areas. Discuss other models besides Madeline Hunter."

"I would like the facilitator to present a demonstration lesson; I would like to see more interaction among staff during faculty meetings concerning their feelings about HESI> I would like teachers to be free to attend workshops (professional days)> I would like to see more POSITIVE interaction with the administration."

"More discussion among staff with facilitators about successes and failures and how to cope with implementation. Review of certain areas teachers would like to zero in on and follow-up grade level discussions."

"I would like to have all staff follow school rules."

"I would like to see the next year program to be more realistic. To show us examples (real ones) of classrooms with the different discipline problems, work problem, etc. and how we as teachers by using the model can deal with these problems without losing our temper. I would like to see more training on discipline."

"More opportunities to observe demonstration lessons."

"More of an opportunity to observe other teachers in their classroom; more focus on how to erase original learning that was incorrect; small group ✓lp of teachers working on a particular ✓ common goal for the next school year using the model as a guide."

"I would like to see "master" teachers at work, on tape if necessary. Need more assertive discipline coaching; not so much concern re: learning the many lists which relate to areas of the Hunter model."

"I think teachers should have a certain time to compare or explore other techniques with other teachers' sit-in on other classrooms only by those that expect it; show what other schools are working with the model; don't let the model fade away. Keep it active."

"Examples, demonstrations and solutions to discipline problems (from mild level to drastic level)."

"I think that teachers should have an opportunity to observe other teachers who are using good techniques in an informal observation."

"More guided practice given <u>after</u> the introduction of a lesson or a learning. Too much time elapsed between the actual study of parts of the model and its implementation or "independent practice" and facilitators observations of checking for understanding. Staff had <u>no</u> time to share ideas among themselves with relation to their new learning in their own school. I felt this could have been an excellent opportunity (a few times a month during staff meeting or after) to strengthen staff relationships, improve attitudes, etc."

<u>General</u>

"Less surveys and interviews. I've gone through at least <u>six</u> during 1984-85 and I get tired of answering the same questions. Just like I get tired of hearing the same topics. I'm ready for something completely new and innovative."

"Please keep up the good work!"

"Good program hard working leaders. I feel I from the program."

<u>Rome</u>

<u>Administration</u>

"If you want an administrator involved, release the vice principal from other duties. He cannot do everything that is expected of him. One vice principal to 1000+ kids is not sufficient. More variety in in-service programs. <u>Do not</u> schedule Saturday and Monday holiday in-services. My time out of school is too valuable, and oh amount of stipend is enough for me to give it up.

Make sure classes have materials they are supposed to have."

8Training/Facilitators

"Facilitators teaching in the classroom to teach us what they would like to see in our room; give demonstration schedule ahead of time."

"I'd like taped of Carole's sessions; make tapes available especially Carole's sessions for teachers (even if we have to buy them). She's fantastic! To me she is Madeline Hunter! I wonder if Madeline Hunter can do as well?"

"Keep a check on teachers, but don't waste their precious planning time. If a teacher is doing well and doesn't care for the meetings with facilitator, leave them alone. Let these people come to the facilitator. This was presented as a choice and now I feel dictated to."

"School wide discipline plan; suing learning theory on units in my curriculum; more information on learning theory."

"Teachers have now gone through the first phase and need opportunity to share on a regular basis. Bring together key personnel classroom teachers, facilitator, resource people (acting consultant, math resource, ESL, Migratory, IRIT and in-house administrators for bimonthly meetings, one for primary teachers and the second for intermediate. During these meetings Hunter's model "update" sharing on the part of each key person can occur."

"Not enough information."

"More interchange with staff in our school."

"I would like to see it dropped. The old maxim "you can't teach an old dog new tricks" seems to hold to teachers. I don't think that even the Hunter model can turn a bad teacher into a model educator. Monies could be better spent and so could teachers' inservice day!"

"Fewer conferences, incentives for being coached. (extra money, inservice credits, etc.)"

"More training/workshops/sharing time during the school year and day." Less demands on participating schools for other things - stressing Hunter as our main objective; incentives, credits, etc. for implementing model."

"Efforts made to team teachers in the program. (Inservice time used on HESI). More facilitators modeling of various teaching strategies. Grade level meetings to share concepts and plan together. (Particularly orderly learning environment). More time spent with this staff on the model. This year, with all the other projects, we tend to get lost in focusing on which goals are

primary (prioritize a must). From the top it must be stated clearly that this school is committed to this model. The facilitators can only cajole people to participate. Administrators can demand their participation."

"Could use an outline (overview) of the topics discussed, in chart form, that could be put up on the wall and could easily be referred to."

"I would like to see 100% of the teachers using the Hunter model. I would like to visit other schools in the city or elsewhere that are using the Hunter model program."

100% participation of staff with Hunter model. Would like to visit other Hunter programs in the city."

"The program is adequate the way it is. I would like to see all staff video taped instead of a few. I felt fine in front of cameras."

Sand

Administration

"Greater cooperation between HESI administration and staff."

Training/Facilitators

"Definitely, fewer observations, but perhaps a beginning grade level meeting to review techniques and strategies for a successful beginning year. Successive meetings to brainstorm about behavior would be helpful."

"More facilitators should be trained for the classroom and staff. Also paras should be trained as a sub-facilitator along with the teacher if the program is expanded. Other sources should be implemented in the model. Principals and teachers should practice the model daily. Something should be set up where the children should be aware of the model. Why it is important in acting out the models."

"Less observations and follow-up discussions."

"An atmosphere that will facilitate the use of the learning technique."

"A continuation of what was done this year, basically. A little less concentration if facilitator/teacher meetings on "drilling" for terminology and more true criticism of content. Terminology review and efforts to make teachers more influence in the "HESI LANGUAGE" should be reserved for small group settings in a relaxed, unhurried environment. Teachers, like all other people, often "draw a blank" when they are time pressured and under the gun. Groups of 3 - 5 teachers should be brought together for

theory discussions and perhaps more productive "r ssions"> Thanks for asking!"

"Workshops should not be held on weekends; hours of teacher training should be limited; more areas of teaching should be concentrated on more such as discipline; teachers should be allowed more time to respond to topics being discussed."

"Teachers should be made to feel they are involved in a cooperative effort and not another observation."

"Will observations be continued next year? Is this really necessary?"

"Make the selection of facilitator a staff decision. Give us more time to implement. Take away some of the paper work."

"More demonstrations by administration and facilitators. Would like to have the opportunity to visit other HESI schools to see their program in action. Would like to have time for teachers to get together to exchange thoughts and ideas."

"More communication between staff; more informal observations; more participation of the facilitator in classroom activities; less designs and demonstration should be prepared by the facilitator so the teachers can grasp new ideas; even though the person occupying the facilitators position is a great manager and has done a good job, somebody else should have the opportunity to participate in such a position. Changes are good for the sake of a system. By bringing up variations, the program will continue growing. Teachers should have opportunity to observe other teachers. A committee of teachers should participate in such decisions to enhance in this way communication; more teachers participation (i.e., share ideas, materials, give workshops)."

"Rotate facilitators each year. A new facilitator should be chosen so that all participants will get a better command of the Hunter model."