DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 347 671 EA 024 117

AUTHOR Whitsett, Maria D.; And Others
TITLE A Statewide Evaluation of Parent Education and Parent Involvement Pilot Programs.
PUB DATE Apr 92
NOTE 168p.; Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the American Educational Research Association (San Francisco, CA, April 20-24, 1992).
PUB TYPE Speeches/Conference Papers (150) -- Reports - Research/Technical (143) -- Tests/Evaluation Instruments (160)

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC07 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS Elementary Secondary Education; Parent Attitudes; *Parent Education; *Parent Participation; *Parent School Relationship; *Program Effectiveness; Program Implementation; State Action; *State Programs
IDENTIFIERS *Texas

ABSTRACT

Findings of a study that evaluated the implementation and effectiveness of 10 state-authorized parent education and involvement pilot programs in Texas are presented in this paper. Data were derived from demographic report forms, 369 parent opinion surveys, student opinion surveys, 105 teacher opinion surveys, cost surveys, and final evaluation reports. Findings indicate that the programs as yet have had no positive influence on student academic performance and that all required a substantial, upfront time investment. An obstacle to implementation was developing trust between parents and the schools and defining activities "permissible" for schools to conduct. Overall, parents and teachers evaluated the programs favorably. Appendices include copies of instrumentation and a sample set of site-specific project descriptors. (31 references) (LMI)

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

ED347671

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

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

☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality

• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

M. D. Whitsett

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

A STATEWIDE EVALUATION OF PARENT EDUCATION AND PARENT INVOLVEMENT PILOT PROGRAMS

Maria D. Whitsett, Angélica Gaytán,
and Robert Woodson
Texas Education Agency
1701 North Congress Avenue
Austin, Texas 78701-1494
512/463-9524

The views expressed herein are those of the authors and do not reflect official sanction of the Texas Education Agency.

This paper was presented at the annual meeting of the American Educational Research Association, San Francisco, CA April, 1992

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

EA 024 117

A STATEWIDE EVALUATION OF PARENT EDUCATION AND PARENT INVOLVEMENT PILOT PROGRAMS

Objectives

This evaluation was directed towards gaining a better understanding of the implementation and effectiveness of a variety of parent education and/or parent involvement pilot programs, as authorized by the 71st session of the Texas Legislature. Specifically, the study was directed towards the following broad avenues of inquiry:

1) How were parents served, and/or how did they participate in their children's education and development?

2) What were the costs associated with implementing these programs?

3) What impact did the programs have upon the children of parents served, in terms of academic performance, attendance, and so on?

4) What were parents' opinions of the programs?

5) What were the opinions of teachers and other school district staff about the pilot programs?

6) To what extent were other agencies and organizations involved in delivery of the pilot programs?

7) What were the main implementation difficulties encountered by participating school districts, and how did the districts cope with them?

Background/Perspective

In an effort to continue promoting the educational reforms of the early 1980s, the Texas Legislature authorized eight distinct types of pilot programs, one of which--parent education/parent involvement--is examined by the present study. Although the eight programs were broad-ranging (from prekindergarten for three-year-olds to teacher induction), most directly targeted children's learning and were truly intended to be test cases that would yield information about the programs' relative effectiveness, costs, generalizability, and so forth.

The authorizing legislation contained requirements for an evaluation of the programs, due to be reported to the 72nd Legislature--representing a span of only two years. The Texas Education Agency (TEA) developed requests for proposals for all eight types of pilot programs and competitively awarded funds to sites (N = 151) across the state for the spring and summer of 1990; only ten of these were parent education/ parent involvement sites. School districts, regional education service centers, and even state colleges and universities were allowed to submit

proposals. One condition for receipt of these funds was an agreement, up front, that sites provide TEA with data necessary to complete a state-level evaluation of the programs. Continued funding for the 1990-91 school year was not automatic; the sites had to reapply for funds, and awards were (at least in principal) made contingent upon evidence of satisfactory implementation during that first semester of operation. This formed the backdrop for the current study.

Overview of Relevant Literature

Much of the literature pertaining to parent education and/or parent involvement in children's education appears to revolve around three (non-mutually exclusive) themes: 1) descriptions of implementation at specific sites in various levels of the education system ("Here's what we did"); 2) prescriptions (philosophies and/or paradigms) for implementing effective parent education/involvement programs, including identification of common barriers to be overcome ("Here's how it ought to be done, and here's what to avoid or transcend"); and, 3) research and evaluation reports that focus either on program processes or impact upon parents, students, teachers, and others ("How did it work and/or what difference did it make?"). While it is not possible to comprehensively review the literature within the confines of this report, a brief overview might illuminate the current status of parent education/parent involvement programs.

Descriptions of implementation. Both popular and practitioner-oriented literature contain descriptions of parent involvement/parent education programs, as implemented in various locales. A sample of these descriptions will be reviewed here.

The implementation/description theme is perhaps best exemplified by a book from the Barbara Bush Foundation for Family Literacy, First Teachers (1989), which presents synopses of ten selected programs. No criteria for inclusion in the book were identified. However, a quick-reference summary chart near the back of the book conveniently and succinctly presents information concerning the programs' goals, target populations, outreach strategies used, funding sources, and so on. The programs typically were begun on a small scale by an individual, and later expanded to multiple sites. Among those included are, for example, the HIPPY program, the Avance program, and the Parents as Teachers program.

A synopsis of the Family Math program is provided by Thompson and Cittadino (1991) and by Hart (1988), including a description of its rather humble beginnings in two sites in California, its goals and characteristics, and a discussion of the mechanisms to which its success is attributed. These include an emphasis upon mathematical processing (or problem solving) in a relaxed atmosphere, where class leaders serve as facilitators rather than engaging in stereotypic modes of direct instruction (e.g., "It's NOT a teacher standing in front and lecturing," p. 196).

Coming from an organizational research orientation, Comer (1991) provided a retrospective description of the Yale Child Study Center's

model school intervention program since the late 1960s. A theory-based, nine component program (including three mechanisms or organizational structures, three operations, and three guidelines) was described, specifying the changes to be made in school structure and functioning. These were enabling outcomes that, in turn, made it possible for parents and school staff to interact in new, more effective ways (with effectiveness being assessed in terms of improved student achievement over time).

Neilson (1991) described his efforts at institutionalizing a home visit program for an elementary school on an Indian reservation. What began as one teacher's somewhat desperate attempt to "maintain some modicum of order" (p. 208) in the classroom, became a school-wide home visit program the following year--owing in part to its success at nearly eliminating the verbal and behavioral problems that had been occurring in the previously unruly classroom. That program has been in place for over ten years now.

D'Angelo and Adler (1991) discuss parent involvement in the context of federally-funded (Chapter 1) programs. Elements of successful Chapter 1 parent involvement programs from across the country are described, and a thumbnail sketch of efforts in the McAllen (Texas) Independent School District outlines information about staffing and administration, community/business partnerships, five major types of program activities, and linkage to district-wide efforts, including other categorically funded programs. Similarly, Warner (1991) describes district-specific strategies of the Parents in Touch program, also administered in concert with efforts funded by Chapter 1 monies. Salient features include the following: "Dial-a-Teacher" and the "Homework Hotline," both designed to help students who need extra assistance with homework; a computerized telephone system that gives callers access to 140 tape-recorded messages; and workshops and/or seminars for parents, both at school and at the parents' work sites, among others.

Cross, LaPointe and Jensen (1991) describe projects funded through the Family/School Partnership program, which is a subsidiary of the federal program entitled "Fund for the Improvement and Reform of Schools and Teaching" (FIRST). Unlike Chapter 1, whose funding is reflective of district and campus demographics, the FIRST Family/School Partnership program involves competitive awards of grant monies to districts--and competition is intense, with only about 7% of applying districts receiving awards in 1990. The authors provide over 40 one-paragraph descriptions of projects across the nation, and include the name and address of a contact person for each. The majority of the projects (over 30) incorporate activities that foster parenting and child-rearing skills; half concentrate on home/school communications, and at least half "address the most difficult type of involvement and the one for which parents request the most help: *assisting children at home.*" (Cross, LaPointe & Jensen, 1991, p. 388.) According to the authors, "One of the most promising features of the projects is that all will give serious attention to evaluation (p. 388)." However, they did not state when a summary report of those evaluations might be anticipated.

Chrispeels (1991) provides an overview of the parent involvement efforts occurring in an urban school district from a "policy-into-practice" framework. (A similar approach was used by Solomon, 1991.) Chrispeels recounts the development of a state-level policy initiative, the county-level support for implementation, and the policy development process at the local district level. This is followed by a detailed description of implementation within the district, which would appear to have been carefully planned and supported with a variety of follow-up efforts. Individual schools were awarded innovative grants to develop creative, locally appropriate family/school partnerships; two of these school-level programs are briefly described. Ironically, however, Chrispeels (1991, p. 371) notes that "neither the state, the county, nor the district has given serious consideration to documenting and evaluating its efforts. The limited funds... do not include resources for research."

In apparent contrast to Chrispeels' experience in California is Chapman's (1991) description of the Urban Education Partnership Grants program in Illinois. In that case, projects were to be evaluated by objective measures of outcomes such as student attendance, class grades, and discipline referrals. Two school-level programs funded through the grants program were described: One was at the elementary level and concentrated on promoting student literacy through a whole language approach with parental support. The other was at the junior high level and instituted a homework lab, individual "improvement contracts" with students, and a video bank with a complete parent education tape series. Information about the two projects' intended outcomes, key program components/mechanisms and typical activities, was all included. Unlike the Texas pilot programs, Illinois awarded multi-year grants (as did the FIRST project grants) to assure that districts would have requisite time for observing progress. Similar to Texas, the Illinois projects were required to consider multiple outcomes, not strictly student performance on standardized achievement tests. External evaluators were used in Illinois; Chapman (1991, p. 358) reports that "data showed that 87% of the schools in the program accomplished more than 90% of their stated goals." The author concludes (*ibid.*), "This evidence that such low-cost strategies yield relatively high returns is very encouraging."

Prescriptions. A substantial portion of the literature concerning parent education and parent involvement consists of what one might generically refer to as "shoulds" (and perhaps some corresponding "should nots!"). These prescriptions may be targeted to any of several levels, from that of classroom teacher (e.g., Teacher/Parent Partnerships Handbook, 1989) to that of the campus and district (Epstein's five steps to maximize success, 1991, p. 302), to that of state education agencies (Epstein, 1987). The advice may be largely practical, such as that contained in Parent and Community Involvement: Practitioner's Guide Series No. Four (1989), or it may be philosophically or theoretically grounded and tested through programmatic research, often reflective of systems-level thinking and reform (e.g., Comer, 1991; Davies, 1985, 1990, 1991; Epstein, 1991; and Rich, 1991).

Among the few articles encountered by these authors, that truly described and conceptualized philosophies of parent involvement, was one prepared by Swap (1990). She identifies three philosophies underlying parent education/parent involvement efforts, and describes courses of action that necessarily flow from them. In the school-to-home transmission philosophy, the primary expectation is that parents will support school personnel by reinforcing learning at home, and by fostering the transfer of so-called "cultural capital" (Swap, 1990, pp. 10-11). The philosophy of interactive learning calls for the incorporation of "the views, values, history, and learning styles of minority families into the fabric of the school and the curriculum." (*ibid.*, pp. 12-13). Finally, the partnership for success philosophy views parents as valuable resources in the search for strategies that will achieve success for all children. Mutual respect, shared power, and fundamental restructuring directed towards a unified mission of success for all school children embody this philosophy (*ibid.*, p. 15).

Based on Swap's labels, Rich (1987, 1991) clearly espouses a partnership philosophy. She provides at least one whole chapter (1987, pp. 26-35 and pp. 113-117) of recommendations for action for the various players in education (family, teachers and schools, community, and in a separate appendix, policymakers). Hart (1988) employed a similar strategy, listing recommendations by role group (e.g, "What parents can do," "What teachers can do," "What school boards can dc," etc., pp. 35-38). Rich's more recent work (1991) makes it clear that she views the tri-part strategy (consisting of a parent workshop delivery system, a family education information base, and home learning curricula) that resulted from the Home and School Institute projects of the late 1980s, as a "Blueprint for Achievement (p. 189)."

Zeldin's (1990) examination of policy implications resulting from home-school-community partnerships programs is perhaps the most simple, yet in some ways most elegant prescription: policies and structures must be consistent for shared responsibility to develop. Consequently, "the best strategy for policy-makers may be to mandate formation of decision-making bodies, with the concurrant directive that earmarked funds be allocated... for the purpose of implementing... [a] plan." (Zeldin, 1990, p. 63).

Krasnow's teacher researcher model, as employed in the Schools Reaching Out project, certainly contains elements directly reflective of Zeldin's recommended strategy: she calls (1990, p. 31) for strong administrative support, use of discretionary funds, and adaptations in school schedules/structures to provide time for meetings, interviews, and the development of new initiatives. Similarly, Davies (1990, p. 68-69) shares lessons from the Schools Reaching Out project, that "school-family-community collaborations... would have a far greater chance of working in an educational system that is transformed along the lines suggested by most cutting-edge advocates of change." However, Davies recommends three mechanisms (parent centers, home visitors, and teacher action research teams) that can be implemented in districts prior to massive restructuring efforts, so that progress can be made while "we wait for the revolution." (Davies, 1990, p. 68.) Thus, as often seems to be the case in human psychology (e.g., everything from the whole

collection of so-called twelve-step-programs directed at recovering addicts, to the popular "Just do it" television commercials for sports shoes), it may be time to start taking actions as individuals even before organizational belief systems have changed; and it is clear even from this cursory review that an abundance of suggested actions exists in the literature.

For those ready to take action, a variety of barriers or impediments to implementation of parent education and parent involvement programs have been identified. Whether or not they are reflective of a fundamental conflict, as Lightfoot (1978) suggested, they have been described frequently enough to warrant mention here. Chrispeels (1991, p. 368), among many others (Chavkin and Williams, 1988; Comer, 1991; Krasnow, 1991; and Epstein, 1991, to name only a few), notes that low expectations and negative attitudes on the part of school staff, particularly regarding low-income or non-English-speaking families, impedes both program development and implementation. Sociocultural and demographic changes (e.g., increasing numbers of children living in poverty, increasing numbers of single-parent families, and increasing proportions of minority children in schools staffed by largely Anglo faculties) also mitigate against the ease with which parent involvement programs may be developed. Davies (1990) and Epstein (1991) both describe the need to make schools hospitable to parents, often in ways as simple as providing a place for parents to gather that is equipped with a telephone. Other barriers reported include the following:

> ...lack of transportation, lack of time for involvement on the part of both parents and teachers, inadequate child care arrangements, inflexible employer leave policies,... lack of access to parent and community involvement materials, lack of knowledge and information about the best practices for involvement, and lack of sufficient funding for programmatic involvement efforts. (Parent and Community Involvement: Practitioner's Guide Series No. Four, 1989, p. 13.)

If it is true that to be forewarned is to be forearmed, then individuals desiring to take action while waiting for the revolution (to borrow the phrase from Davies) should be well-equipped by this knowledge. That brings the reader to the third theme, concerning how well various parent education/parent involvement projects have worked.

Research and evaluation reports. Several extensive reviews of research studies exist on the topic of whether or not parent involvement or parent education improves student achievement. Among the most commonly cited is Henderson's annotated bibliography of about 50 studies, The evidence continues to grow: Parent involvement improves student achievement (1987). Bempechat's more recent review (1990), which considers Henderson's work as well as others, is organized around four topics: socialization practices that foster academic achievement, parent education, parent involvement, and the role of the teacher in parent involvement. Her conclusions are much more tempered than Henderson's statement that "the evidence is beyond dispute: parent involvement improves student achievement" (1987, p. 1). To wit, the following statement:

> Thus, the accumulated evidence supports the importance of parent involvement in children's education... The research shows that when teachers and educational administrators are strongly committed to drawing parents into their children's education, the academic outcomes for children can be very positive.

A recent possible exception to the theme that parent involvement generally yields dividends of improved student performance, as expressed by Henderson (1987), Hart (1988), the Texas Parent and Community Involvement: Practitioner's Guide (1989, p. 11), and Bempechat (1990), was provided by White, Taylor, and Moss (1992). Of immediate importance is that the studies analyzed by these authors were strictly limited to those about early intervention programs for children who are handicapped, disadvantaged, or at risk (1992, p. 92). Their work is germane to this review, however, because the pilot programs in Texas were directed to youngsters generally considered to be at risk because of low familial socioeconomic status or limited proficiency in English, and because several focused upon early childhood and/or child development. After examining effect sizes for about 250 studies, categorized by the types of children served (handicapped, disadvantaged or at risk), by the degree of internal validity (high/low), and by the degree of parent involvement (extensive/moderate versus little/no), they stated the following:

> Thus, it would be inappropriate to conclude... that parent involvement in early intervention is not beneficial. Just as important, however, is the fact that no information exists in this admittedly indirect type of evidence to argue that parent involvement in early intervention will lead to any of the benefits that are often claimed. (White, Taylor, & Moss, 1992, p. 109.)

In sum, much has been learned over the last 25 years about parent involvement and parent education. These are no longer topics that fail to generate much interest; instead, many educators and educational researchers are expanding their views of schools and schooling to actively include parents. Available literature is replete with examples for others to emulate, with sage counsel about mechanisms that may be used and philosophies that may guide, and with instances where parent involvement and/or parent education are thought to have greatly benefited young learners. In an attempt to determine whether or not such benefits might also be observed in Texas, the ten pilot projects were implemented in the spring of 1990. A discussion of the methods used by the pilot projects follows.

Methods

Participation. Ten school districts were awarded grants to implement parent education/parent involvement pilot programs in the spring 1990 semester. In that first semester of operation, 1,354 parents (1129 of whom were women) were reached. In the 1990-91 school year, nearly 2,000 parents (1618 women and 330 men) and over 227 infants

of teen parents were reached. Typically, the parents were low-income and in ethnic minority groups: 65% were Hispanic, 24% were African American, 10% were Anglo, and less than 1% were from other ethnic groups; some 63% of the students whose parents participated were eligible for free and reduced-price school lunches. Many of the parents headed single-parent households. Also, more than one-quarter of the children (28%) whose parents participated were limited English proficient (LEP). In three sites, the parents were teen parents who were enrolled in school (N = 242); in six sites, enrollment was limited to parents with children younger than three years of age. One site extended enrollment to include those expecting their first child, and another used a multi-generational approach so that teen parents, their babies, and the parents of the teens were all receiving services.

Instrumentation. A variety of reporting forms and questionnaires were developed for the evaluation of the parent education/parent involvement pilot programs. These included: snapshot report forms, which requested demographic information about the students whose parents were participating, in relation to all other students on the same campus (where appropriate); parent opinion surveys; student opinion surveys (in cases where enrolled teen parents were served); teacher/staff opinion surveys; cost surveys; and campus-level final evaluation report forms that collected descriptive, performance-related, and narrative information about the ten projects. Copies of the forms are presented in Appendix A.

Design of the Projects. TEA intentionally called for a wide array of creative project designs when it solicited proposals, so that local district staff could have maximum latitude in structuring projects to meet local needs. Consequently, a variety of project structures and service components existed within the ten sites that were selected. Five sites used the Parents as Teachers program as the main educational project component; two used the Practical Parenting program developed by the Texas Association of School Boards; two implemented locally-developed parenting and child development components, and one integrated parent involvement into an existing district-level character education program. All the Parents as Teachers sites included family resource centers, with checkout materials, developmental screenings and referrals available. The Practical Parenting sites offered workshops on network and coalition building. Additional services provided by sites included features such as: transportation to the program, school, social service and/or health appointments (3 sites); formal case management and counseling (2 sites); literacy training (2 sites); peer support groups and tutors (1 site); and even emergency food and clothing supplies (1 site).

School facilities were used in all ten sites for at least a portion of pilot project activities, most commonly for group meetings, for housing the parent resource centers, and for developmental screenings and parent education or literacy classes. Community locations, including churches and housing projects, were also the scene of project activities for half the sites. Seven of the ten projects conducted regularly scheduled (most often monthly) home visits. However, sites often indicated that upon encountering families in crisis, intensive case management

services--sometimes necessitating daily contacts--were provided. Efforts were made to accommodate parents' schedules, so most sites held program activities after school and work hours, and/or on weekends. All sites kept some service components active year-round. See Appendix B for a sample set of site-specific project descriptions.

Evaluation Design, Procedures and Data Analysis. Because the pilot projects were so diverse in structure and design, a fairly generic evaluation strategy had to be devised that would capture commonalities across sites; limited evaluation resources compounded this need. Parallel process and product matrices (Whitsett, 1991), somewhat similar in technique to cluster evaluation (Barley, 1991) but on a broader scale, were generated to accomplish this. The resulting evaluation was structured around the role groups involved in the pilot projects: students and/or very young children, parents, teachers or parent educators, and other agencies and organizations. This structuring is evident in the main areas of inquiry identified at the beginning of this paper. Of course, within those broad areas, numerous specific evaluation questions existed. For example, within the first area, some of the specific evaluation questions were as follows: Did students whose parents were served through the project have better class grades, on average and over time, than other students on campus? Did students whose parents were served through the project attend school more often than other students assigned to the same campus? Were students whose parents were reached less likely to be suspended than other students on campus? Were they more likely to be promoted into the next grade level than other students?

Snapshot report forms, which requested demographic and entry characteristic information about the children whose parents were being served, and/or about the teen parents, as appropriate, were distributed each March. School districts had about two months to return the completed forms, whereupon the data were entered in a LOTUS 1-2-3 file on a DOS-type IBM-compatible personal computer. Simple descriptive statistics and percentages were computed and placed into a summary table for the project manager.

Very simple, brief parent opinion surveys with a cover letter from the Deputy Commissioner for Research and Development were printed in both English and Spanish. The surveys were administered in the spring of each year; school districts were asked to distribute the copies supplied by TEA. Parents circled answers to structured questions (three-point response scale), and were invited to write comments on the backs of those surveys. Prepaid return envelopes were supplied, so that parents could mail completed surveys directly back to the Texas Education Agency; this was done to protect the confidentiality and anonymity of their responses. Despite this, in 1991 the observed response rate was only about 30 percent; and among these, almost half of the respondents had been unaware of the fact that the program was a pilot being studied by the state. The opinion survey data were keyed by data entry staff into a file on the TEA mainframe computer (an Amdahl 5890-300E), and descriptive statistics were generated through the statistical package SAS. Comments written by parents on the backs of the surveys were keyed

into an ASCII file on a DOS-type IBM-compatible personal computer, and were analyzed with the software package called "The Ethnograph."

Similar procedures were used with the surveys given to teen parents, although in their case, the surveys were distributed at the start of a class period and collected by a classmate. The student was instructed to place the forms in an envelope and seal it before handing it over to the teacher, who in turn would mail the envelope back to TEA.

Teacher/staff opinion surveys, generally using five-point response scales, were administered only one time near the end of the 1990-91 school year. Teachers were asked to use NCS scannable documents to anonymously record their answers to the questions, though they were invited to write comments anonymously on the backs of the printed surveys. These documents, batched by school district, were scanned at a regional education service center in the central Texas area; a magnetic tape with the data was delivered to TEA and uploaded for analysis via SAS on the Agency mainframe.

Cost survey forms were mailed to all 10 sites approximately two weeks prior to the scheduling of a telephone interview. The interviews, which served to collect the information requested by the cost survey form, were conducted by the TEA project manager with the assistance of an intern from an area university during the summer and fall of 1990. In most cases, the local project administrator in the school district responded to the cost survey, which examined expenditures by object category over time. Data were obtained from all ten sites, and were entered into a file maintained on DOS-type personal computer that was networked with the TEA mainframe.

Final evaluation report forms were distributed in the spring of each school year, and were due back to TEA during the summer months (although delays necessitated acceptance of forms for the spring 1990 semester as late as September 17, 1990). Each campus involved in the pilot program was required to complete the two final evaluation forms. The forms requested participation and performance information about the number of students, whose parents were either served or not served, by grade level (the heading, "EE," served as a designator for children too young to be enrolled in district prekindergarten programs); the number of parents reached in any of several ways, and materials used by parents; the number of staff involved, and amounts and kinds of training provided to staff; listings of other agencies and organizations involved in the project on each campus, and so on. Districts were also asked to furnish narrative responses to a detailed outline prompt about critical features of the project. All quantitative information was keyed and verified by data entry personnel into a file maintained on the TEA mainframe, and later analyzed with the statistical package SAS. The qualitative information was content analyzed by an intern from a nearby university, with the assistance of the evaluator.

In the case of student performance data on the final evaluation forms, pre/post and between-groups measures were requested whenever possible, so that fairly rigorous tests of relative impact over time could be applied to the quantitative data via the statistical package SAS (e.g.,

repeated measures between-within MANOVAs). For instance, in response to the evaluation question, "Did students whose parents were served through the project have better class grades, on average and over time, than other students on campus?," student grades were examined with the MANOVA by grade level for the first and last grading periods of the school year, for students whose parents had been reached and those whose parents were not served by the pilot project.

Limitations

A number of constraints sharply curtailed the quality and utility of this evaluation.

First of all, evaluation resources were severely limited. There was one full-time equivalent (FTE) evaluator dedicated to the evaluation of all 151 pilot projects, and the ten parent education/parent involvement pilot programs represented less than one percent of them. The matrix approach to the evaluation design, while rendering the task manageable for the evaluator, necessarily meant that some vital information was excluded from study.

Second, because diversity within each type of pilot program was encouraged--yet only ten sites were selected--clear statistical contrasts among the variety of approaches embedded within the ten sites were simply not possible. By the same token, aggregation of data across diverse types of interventions probably only served to muddy the evaluative waters. Yet the evaluation resources were too limited to permit ten, site-by-site detailed studies of specific outcomes which ould be synthesized after the fact using meta-analytic techniques.

Third, while the ten sites in this type of pilot program were incredibly cooperative with TEA about supplying evaluation data, none were able to supply contrast group data for the very youngest children being reached (those from birth to three years of age). As a result, it was impossible to check for short-term, developmental impact among those youngsters *relative* to children whose parents were not receiving services.

A fourth, crucial limitation that simply cannot be escaped is the fact that the pilot program intervention was likely of insufficient duration (a little over one school year) for the study to detect observable improvements in students' academic performance. Therefore, two logical "next steps" exist. On the one hand, a longitudinal study of the impact of parent involvement programs upon academic performance of school children would address the above limitation, and permit some conclusions to be drawn about the value of having parents work in partnership with schools. On the other hand, it would behoove us to examine, five years from now, the school performance of infants and toddlers whose parents were reached in these programs. Only then will true dividends of the program (if they exist) likely be identifiable. In an era where schools appear to be increasingly burdened with "at risk" students, how can educators afford to overlook a follow-up evaluation of programs that are fundamentally preventive in nature?

A fifth and final known limitation to the present study is its failure to directly examine change in parental knowledge or behaviors. There were several reasons for this: TEA staff felt that an assessment of parenting was too invasive and went beyond the appropriate domain of this study. Instead, given the severely limited evaluation resources that could be brought to the task, testing for improvement in current (and future) students in Texas schools seemed most appropriate. Secondly, because curricula were not uniform and because content delivery generally was predicated upon the needs of parents and/or developmental needs of the children, parental changes appeared to be too diverse to be efficiently or effectively captured in a state-level evaluation. However, districts engaging in future parent education/parent involvement pilot programs might well consider, at the local level, developing adequate and appropriate measures of change in parents and/or in parenting behaviors, so that impact upon students can be quantifiably related to changes on the part of parents. Such an approach would, of course, require individual level data (for both parents and students) rather than the campus- and grade-level aggregations that were actually collected.

Results

Findings pertaining to each of the seven broad areas of inquiry--services/participation, costs, impact, parent opinions, staff opinions, involvement of other agencies and organizations, and implementation difficulties--will be described in turn.

1. Services/participation. The most common forms of parent participation, after notification and having conferences with teachers or school staff, were 1) training in parenting or child development (N = 1141), and 2) guided or structured activities together with children (N = 1070). On average, as many as 16 parents might be in attendance at the training sessions, which were either held at centralized locations or in the families' homes. Over 2,100 hours of such training was delivered to the parents during the 1990-91 school year. Nearly one-fourth of the parents were members of school task forces or school committees, a possible indicator that the level of parent involvement had progressed beyond passive and/or supportive levels most commonly reported in literature concerning parent involvement, and reflective of a partnership philosophy (Swap, 1990). However, in the 1990-91 school year, as many as 19% of the parents or other adults who were served by the pilot program chose to stop participating before the conclusion of the year (reasons unknown).

Handouts and worksheets were the most commonly used materials, followed by books and instructional manipulatives or kits. This was true whether the parents were enrolled teenaged students or not, and true whether one considered the frequency with which materials were used or the counts of persons using each type of material. Heavy materials usage may be reflective of the care with which staff in the projects selected them, taking steps to assure that the materials were linguistically and culturally appropriate (e.g., nine of the sites had materials available in Spanish).

2. Program costs. Cost survey data were collected from eight of the ten sites operating parent education/parent involvement pilot programs. Of these, the three sites offering services to enrolled, teen-aged parents had combined funds from another type of pilot program with these funds; consequently data from those sites are not being reported here.

The average annual program cost was $110,535 with individual programs ranging from $56,166 to $185,633.

On average, 45% of program costs went into direct instructional activities while planning, training, and administration accounted for an additional 44% of costs. However, one program incurred as much as 78% of its costs in planning, training, and administration while another only incurred 20% of its costs in such activities. Similarly, some programs incurred more than half their costs in direct instructional activities while others incurred less than a third of their costs in direct instruction.

These differences in the pattern of program costs followed no obvious pattern with regard to district type (urban, suburban or rural), district or program size, or the program's geographic location in Texas. Proportionately higher planning-training-administration costs seemed to be associated with the adoption of standard parenting curricula for local use, while greater instructional costs typified programs that created parenting curricula from locally available sources, or programs whose extended curricula included not only parenting but also literacy and employment preparation.

3. Impact. Performance-related data (pre/post average grades, pre/post standardized test scores in reading and mathematics, promotions, suspensions and expulsions, average percent attendance, locally established criteria for "making satisfactory progress," and so on) were obtained at the campus and grade level unit of analysis for children whose parents were served through the program, and for contrast groups of children on campus at the ten sites. In the case of projects serving teen parents, similar performance data were collected on the enrolled teens, at the campus and grade level unit of analysis. Multiple analysis of variance procedures (MANOVAs) failed to show any statistically significant between-groups differences or interaction effects.

4. Parent opinions. Results from the opinion surveys indicate highly favorable regard for these pilot programs *among parents returning the surveys (N = 369)*. Fully 98% of the respondents, and the same percentage of teen parents, indicated that schools should continue to have such programs, and that other school districts in Texas should have similar programs. About 93% responded that program participation was worth their time and energy, and that participation had been helpful. Another 83% indicated that schools were working better with their families because of the programs. Among teen parents who responded, 32% said they had dropped out prior to enrolling in the program, and 85% said they felt it more likely they would stay in school because of the program. When comments written on the backs of the surveys were

analyzed (there were 130 coded statements), the largest percentage of parents' comments (25%) pertained to improvements they had witnessed in their children or, in some cases, in themselves.

5. Teacher/staff opinions. Like the parents, teachers and staff were positive about the projects; unlike the parents, virtually all of them (N = 105) returned completed surveys. Among the respondents, 81% believed that children's needs for learning and development were better met by virtue of the parents' participation in the program, and 87% felt that the children would have better future learning experiences in school because of the program. Similarly high percentages of respondents said the program was worth their time and energy, and schools and families were working together better as a result of the program's implementation. Remarkably, 96% felt that services provided to parents were either somewhat or much better coordinated than they were in the past.

6. Involvement of other agencies and organizations. Data pertaining to the fourth broad study objective were limited. Districts reported the name of each other program, agency or organization that in some way contributed to their pilot program's operation, and indicated the nature of that involvement by placing a check mark under a coded heading. A total of 11 codes for forms of involvement (or project support) were available, and districts were instructed to check as many as applied for each organization listed.

Across all ten sites, a total of 129 other agencies and organizations were reported to have contributed to, or been involved in, the pilot projects (non-duplicated count; over 180 entries were made). These included such diverse programs and organizations as the following: the federally-supported Early Childhood Intervention program operated through the Texas Department of Health; a variety of community mental health agencies; service organizations, such as the Kiwanis and Rotary Clubs; the Texas Department of Human Services; community medical clinics and/or hospitals; area housing authority offices; and so on.

The most common form of support or involvement by other agencies and organizations in the pilot programs was that of providing advisory services, usually to help coordinate parental access to social and support services beyond those provided by limited pilot program resources. Figure 1 (see next page) displays the "type of activity" coding categories that districts used, in descending order of their reported frequency.

7. Implementation difficulties and coping strategies. Narrative data from the program sites indicated that one of the most common implementation problems had to do with lack of transportation for parents. The parents either had to walk to meeting locations, take city buses (when those were an option) or, in several cases, were given rides by the parent educators or teachers in their own cars.

Another common implementation problem, presumably at least somewhat linked to the transportation issue, was parent attendance. Several sites reported difficulties recruiting parents into program activities,

Figure 1. Rank Order of Forms of Support or Involvement by Other Agencies or Organizations in Parent Education/Parent Involvement Pilot Projects

1. Advisory services
2. "Other"
3. Donations of human resources (e.g., labor)
4. Counseling services
5. Case management services (e.g., Child Protective Services)
6. Medical/clinic services
7. Cash donations *(tie)*
8. Testing services *(tie)*
9. Donations of equipment
10. Child care services
11. Transportation services

and subsequent difficulty maintaining that involvement. This was believed to be, in part, a function of initially unrealistic recruitment goals. It was also suspected to be a function of parental wariness of home visits by school personnel, particularly among parents whose own school experiences could be considered less-than-optimal and whose most recent contact with school staff often concerned problems with their enrolled children. Program response to these difficulties included expansion of service areas and contact with more parents to fill program rosters; providing educationally-related incentives for parents to join in program activities; and scheduling home visits only after parents had participated in program activities in less intimate settings, for which both transportation and child care were provided.

A third common local implementation problem was a direct reflection of state-level implementation: delays in actual receipt of funds from TEA, after receiving notice of selection in January, 1990, meant that many of the sites did not actually commence serving parents until April, 1990--a net loss of about two and one-half months' time. In a similar vein, state-level restrictions on expenditures were felt to cramp the programs' potential: for instance, the sites could not expend grant money to purchase food for parents to consume at meetings and training sessions; this was perceived by the districts as hampering the "drawing power" of the program. Other implementation difficulties mentioned by pilot program sites had to do with management issues that one might anticipate in beginning any new program: finding qualified parent educators, scheduling sessions for parents (day versus evening meetings), and so forth.

Finally, several sites remarked upon a relative lack of materials that were culturally and/or linguistically appropriate for the parents they were serving. Pending their securing such materials, project staff in those sites often displayed remarkable ingenuity in modifying and/or producing materials for parents who spoke no or limited amounts of English.

Discussion and Conclusion

Results from the present evaluation appear to be inconsistent with the wealth of academic benefits noted by Henderson (1987) and Bempechat (1990). That is, no evidence *to date* has accrued to indicate that the ten pilot program sites in Texas were able to substantively, positively influence student academic performance, in any of several ways. However, the reader is urged to use extreme caution in interpreting these results: the study was frankly too severely constrained for a summary judgment of "no impact" to be made. At the very least, it seems reasonably clear that no negative impact upon students occurred; at most, one must suspect that "fatal" limitations to the study (with the all-too-brief time frame being one major culprit) are responsible for the lack of statistical evidence of positive effects. One is also reminded that a lack of statistically significant effects cannot be equated with a lack of experientially significant effects, i.e., the glowing commentary and written expressions of gratitude from some of the parents in the projects.

A second observation to be made is that the projects all seemed to require a substantial, up-front time investment on the part of school staff if the projects were to have any opportunity to succeed. Further, the time investment did *not* appear to drastically abate as implementation progressed. One is reminded that it takes considerable time and energy to change deeply ingrained human behavior patterns; therefore it seems reasonable to anticipate that districts may not be able to conduct parent education/parent involvement programs even marginally well if they in any way short-change the time investment (e.g., the human resources) required. This sentiment echoes the words of Epstein and Dauber (1991, p. 303): "School and family connections are ongoing investments that require continuous attention and support."

Just as the implementation/change process requires a considerable time investment, so too, a considerable amount of time may be needed to detect program effects (intended as well as unintended). Unlike many other types of educational interventions, there is an intentional but nonetheless vast expanse between the level or point of intervention--the parents--and the point where impact is ultimately to be assessed--the academic performance of school children. This relatively remote coupling of intervention and impact is inherently problematic in the evaluation of parent education/parent involvement programs, particularly in a world where "quick fixes" and near-immediate "proof" of worth are highly desired. Ironically, the dilemma becomes particularly important in a world of limited monetary resources: Those seeking funds need to be able to furnish prompt evidence of results or else they risk the loss of further funding. As such, the need to develop clear lists of enabling objectives (e.g., intermediate or facilitating behaviors/ indicators that can be monitored long before assessing "final" outcomes), accompanied by sound process evaluations, becomes paramount. The words of Zeldin (1990, p. 62) apply: "The importance of 'process' often gets lost in our desire for a quick product, yet the formation of collaborative orientations and productive interpersonal relations among diverse stakeholders is dependent on process." The benchmark work by

Epstein and her colleagues in the last decade is exemplary in this regard.

Another observation that can be made from the site visits and the narrative data supplied by project sites is that some of the same barriers already well-reported in the literature (e.g., Chavkin and Williams, 1988) were encountered in these ten sites. One begins to wonder if, in the project development process, both parents and school staff must come to terms with some sort of emotional "demilitarized zone (DMZ)" surrounding school children that has been the implicit norm for decades. That is, *in loco parentis* may somehow be seen as a narrowly constrained band of "permissible" activities which parents trust the schools to carry out, which at the same time the schools trust parents to support. Lightfoot (1978, p. 68) summarized it thusly: "Families and schools are engaged in a complimentary sociocultural task yet they find themselves in great conflict with one another;" while Comer (1991, p. 184) noted there existed an "alienation between home and school... that was only vaguely apparent and routinely misunderstood." For instance, while parents may be wary of school staff due to adverse past experiences, school staff may have negative stereotypes of parents as being uncaring, disinterested, and/or unable to help their children with schoolwork. The negative stereotypes can mutually reinforce one another. Enough attempts at parent involvement programs have gone awry for the analogy to the DMZ, where some of the bloodiest attacks of the Viet Nam war occurred, to hold some merit--though it is admittedly a far from perfect analogy. Perhaps the single most critical shortcoming to the analogy is that, in the case of parent involvement and parent education programs, there is a shared, if somehow overlooked, goal of supporting the healthy growth and development of our nation's children. Teachers, administrators, and parents who remind themselves that there truly is a fundamental unity of purpose in their efforts can overcome all manner of obstacles.

In summary, early indications are that the parent education/parent involvement pilot programs were well-received by most parents, who often anecdotally reported improvements in their children's performance, development, and/or the quality of their interactions with the children. The programs apparently paved the way for some parents to move into partnership roles with the schools, by fostering parental participation on task forces and working committees. The projects also functioned in a way that helped some parents to access critically needed social services, though it is impossible to know how many potential problems in children's schooling and learning were thereby averted. Attendance and transportation were revealed to be critical problems facing districts interested in implementing parent education and parent involvement programs. Other problems were typically either logistical in nature, or were directly reflective of the manner in which TEA implemented these particular pilot programs. Finally, data analyses concerning impact upon students failed to show any short-term, statistically significant benefits at any grade level, relative to children whose parents were not served in the program.

Post Script: Where Are They Now?

The grants awarded by TEA for implementing the pilot programs concluded at the end of the 1991 fiscal year. Of the ten sites that were originally selected to test out parent education/parent involvement pilot programs, staff at eight have been successfully contacted by the TEA program specialist who had worked with them in the 1990-91 school year. One of the sites reported having discontinued its project for the 1991-92 school year. Of the remaining seven, all indicated that their districts have managed to continue operating the projects. One had to reduce the number of project staff as a function of the conclusion of grant funding. All sites are relying upon a combination of funding sources (e.g., local district, JTPA, Carl Perkins, other TEA grants, Texas Department of Human Services grants, etc.) in order to continue project operations. Three of the seven have even been able to expand their scope (greater numbers of participants, expanded forms of service, etc.) by having established cooperative arrangements with other agencies and by having tapped into diverse funding sources; one of these plans to continue expansion in the 1992-93 school year. No further evaluation efforts by TEA are anticipated in the near future, however.

References

Barley, Z. A. (1991). Strengthening community-based project evaluations and deriving cross-project findings. Paper presented at the annual meeting of the American Evaluation Association, Chicago.

Bempechat, J. (1990). The role of parent involvement in children's academic achievement: A review of the literature. Trends and Issues (no. 14), New York: ERIC Clearinghouse on Urban Education, Institute for Urban and Minority Education.

Chapman, W. (1991). The Illinois experience: State grants to improve schools through parent involvement. Phi Delta Kappan, 72(5), 355-358.

Chavkin, N. F., & Williams, D. L., Jr. (1988). Critical issues in teacher training for parent involvement. Educational Horizons, 66, 87-89.

Chrispeels, J. H. (1991). District leadership in parent involvement: Policies and actions in San Diego. Phi Delta Kappan, 72(5), 367-371.

Comer, J. P. (1991). Parent participation: Fad or function? Educational Horizons, 69(1), 182-188.

Cross, C. T., LaPointe, R. T., & Jensen, C. (1991). The FIRST grants: Federal leadership to advance school and family partnerships. Phi Delta Kappan, 72(5), 383-388.

D'Angelo, D. A. & Adler, C. R. (1991). Chapter 1: A catalyst for improving parent involvement. Phi Delta Kappan, 72(5), 350-354.

Davies, D. (1985). Parent involvement in the public schools in the 1980s: Proposals, issues, opportunities. Philadelphia: Research for Better Schools, Inc.

Davies, D. (1990). Shall we wait for the revolution? A few lessons from the Schools Reaching Out project. Equity and Choice, 6(3), 68-73.

Davies, D. (1991). Schools Reaching Out: Family, school, and community partnerships for student success. Phi Delta Kappan, 72(5), 376-382.

Epstein, J. L. (1987). Parent involvement: State education agencies should lead the way. Community Education Journal, 1987, 14(4), 4-10.

Epstein, J. L. (1991). Paths to partnership: What we can learn from federal, state, district, and school initiatives. Phi Delta Kappan, 72(5), 344-349.

Epstein, J. L., & Dauber, S. L. (1991). School programs and teacher practices of parent involvement in inner-city elementary and middle schools. The Elementary School Journal, 91(3), 291-305.

First Teachers (1989). Washington, D.C.: The Barbara Bush Foundation for Family Literacy.

Hart, T. E. (1988). Involving parents in the education of their children (Vol. 32, no. 3). Eugene, OR: Oregon School Study Council, ISSN 0095-6694.

Henderson, A. T. (1987). The evidence continues to grow: Parent involvement improves student achievement. Columbia, MD: National Committee for Citizens in Education.

Krasnow, J. (1990). Building new parent-teacher partnerships: Teacher researcher teams stimulate reflection. Equity and Choice, 6(3), 25-31.

Lightfoot, S. L. (1978). Worlds apart: Relationships between families and schools. New York: Basic Books.

Nielson, S. (1991). Enhancing home-school links through home visits. Educational Horizons, 69(1), 206-210.

Parent and Community Involvement: Practitioner's Guide Series No. Four (Fall 1989). Austin, TX: Texas Dropout Information Clearinghouse, Texas Education Agency Publications Office, Publication No. GE0-315-04.

Rich, D. (1987). Schools and families: Issues and actions. Washington, D. C.: National Education Association.

_____. (1991). Blueprint for achievement: New solutions for today's education. Educational Horizons, 69(1), 189-194.

Solomon, Z. P. (1991). California's policy on parent involvement: State leadership for local initiatives. Phi Delta Kappan, 72(5), 359-362.

Swap, S. M. (1990). Comparing three philosophies of home-school collaboration. Equity and Choice, 6(3), 9-19.

Teacher/Parent Partnerships Handbook (1989). New York: IMPACT II, the Teachers Network.

Thompson, V., & Cittadino, M. J. (1991). Joining home and school through Family Math. Educational Horizons, 69(1), 195-199.

Warner, I. (1991). Parents in touch: District leadership for parent involvement. Phi Delta Kappan, 72(5), 372-375.

White, K. R., Taylor, M. J., & Moss; V. D. (1992). Does research support claims about the benefits of involving parents in early intervention programs? Review of Educational Research, 62(1), 91-125.

Whitsett, M. D. (1991). Applying process and product matrices to design partially customized evaluations for an array of pilot programs. Paper presented at the annual meeting of the American Evaluation Association, Chicago.

Zeldin, S. (1990). The implementation of home-school-community partnership policies: Policy from the perspective of principals and teachers. Equity and Choice, 6(3), 56-67.

APPENDIX A: COPIES OF INSTRUMENTATION

Texas Education Agency
1701 NORTH CONGRESS AVENUE AUSTIN, TEXAS 78701-1494 (512) 463-9734

March 29, 1991

TO THE ADMINISTRATOR ADDRESSED:

SUBJECT: Snapshot Data Reports for Pilot Programs

Enclosed please find one copy of the "Snapshot Data Report for Pilot Programs Authorized by 71st Session of the Texas Legislature." You are asked to compile the information required by the Snapshot Data Report form using *April 24, 1991* as the target date. Return the completed form to the Agency by May 10, 1991. Should you have any questions about the completion of the Snapshot Data Report form, please contact the appropriate program specialist for the type of pilot project in the district this spring (see attached table). Thank you for your effort in complying with this requirement of the pilot projects.

Sincerely,

Lynn M. Moak, Deputy Commissioner
for Research and Development

Enclosure

PROGRAM SPECIALISTS FOR EACH TYPE OF PILOT PROJECT

Prekindergarten for three-year-olds	Andrea England 512-463-9067
Elementary at-risk	Kathleen Burke 512-463-9512
Academic/below grade level	Boyd Jackson 512-463-9067
Parent education and parent involvement	Angélica Gaytán 512-463-9067
School-aged pregnancy and parenting	Bill Nance Karen Alarcón 512-463-9501
Technology demonstration	R. Lane Scott Karen Kahan 512-463-9087
High school equivalency/GED	Carolyn Klein 512-463-9447

1991 - S

District Name

County/District Number

REPORT OF SNAPSHOT DATA FROM PILOT PROGRAMS AUTHORIZED BY 71ST SESSION OF THE TEXAS LEGISLATURE

Authority for Data Collection: Pilot program authorization, as per S.B. 417, H.B. 1292, and S.B. 650.

Planned Use of Data: Compile descriptions of the participants being served in the pilot programs.

Instructions: Complete one snapshot data report form for *each campus* in the district with a pilot project in operation this school year. The target date to be used in compiling these data is April 24, 1991; for all items, use the roster of all students on campus actively enrolled in the pilot project on that date. Enter the district name and the appropriate TEA county/district/campus numbers in the labeled spaces at the top of each page of this form. If you have no data to report for a particular item on this form, leave the item blank. Return the completed form to the contact person and address shown below.

Name/Address/Title of Contact Person	Date	Telephone

Return this form by *May 10, 1991* to:

Dr. Robert Woodson
Division of Planning Coordination
Texas Education Agency
1701 North Congress Avenue
Austin, Texas 78701-1494
Telephone: 512-475-3422

District Name

-- --
County/District/Campus Number

PART A. GENERAL INFORMATION

1. Indicate the type of pilot for which snapshot data are being reported (put an "X" in the space next to the appropriate pilot):

Prekindergarten/3-yr.-olds.....1 - _____

Elementary at-risk.....2 - _____

Academic/below grade level.....3 - _____

Parent education/involvement.....4 - _____

Pregnancy, education and parenting.....5 - _____

Technology demonstration.....6 - _____

In-school high school equivalency/GED..7 - _____

2. Indicate which grade levels are involved in the pilot project by placing an "X" next to each, as appropriate:

Early Education (all ages below PK)...EE - _____
Prekindergarten (4-year-old).....PK - _____
Kindergarten.....KG - _____
First grade.....01 - _____
Second grade.....02 - _____
Third grade.....03 - _____
Fourth grade.....04 - _____
Fifth grade.....05 - _____
Sixth grade.....06 - _____
Seventh grade.....07 - _____
Eighth grade.....08 - _____
Ninth grade.....09 - _____
Tenth grade.....10 - _____
Eleventh grade.....11 - _____
Twelfth grade.....12 - _____
Other (specify:_____).....NG - _____

INSTRUCTIONS FOR ITEM 3

ON APRIL 24, 1991, THE TARGET DATE DESIGNATED BY THE TEXAS EDUCATION AGENCY:

A. Enter the district and campus names in the space at the top left-hand side of the page, and the county-district-campus number in the space at the top right-hand side of the page.

B. Complete the following information for each of these items:

Line 1. Count the total number of all students actively enrolled in the pilot project, at *all* grade levels on campus that are involved in the pilot project. Enter this number in line 1 of the table, under the heading, "Pilot Participants (All Grades)." Then, at the same grade levels as were involved in the pilot, count the number of all other students on campus who were actively enrolled on the target date, but **NOT** in any way participating in the pilot project. Enter this number in line 1, under the heading, "Non-Pilot Participants (Same Grades as Pilot)." For Parent Education/Parent Involvement pilots, if the true target of your pilot is children from 0 to 3 or 4 years of age, consider the children as the students actively enrolled in the pilot.

Line 2. Out of the above total numbers (from step 1), determine the number of students who met the criteria for being considered limited English proficient (LEP). Enter the number of pilot participants considered LEP in line 2, under the heading, "Pilot Participants (All Grades)." Enter the number of non-pilot participants considered LEP in line 2, under the heading, "Non-Pilot Participants (Same Grades as Pilot)."

Line 3. Follow the same procedure as you did for item 2, this time reporting the numbers of pilot and non-pilot participants who were *eligible for free or reduced-price lunches (F/RPL)*.

Line 4. Follow the same procedure as you did for item 2, this time reporting numbers of pilot and non-pilot participants who were *identified special education students*.

Line 5. Follow the same procedure as above, except use this line to report the numbers of pilot and non-pilot participants who were *female*.

Line 6. Follow the same procedure as above, except use this line to report the numbers of pilot and non-pilot participants who were in the ethnic category of *American Indian or Alaskan Native* (see the federal definitions for clarification of the ethnic categories in this table).

Lines 7-10. Follow the same procedure to report the numbers of pilot and non-pilot students in each of the remaining ethnic categories: *Asian or Pacific Islander; Black; Hispanic;* and *White*.

Line 11. Follow the same procedure to report the numbers of pilot and non-pilot participants who were also active *participants in extracurricular activities* at any time this year.

District Name

-- --
County/District/Campus Number

Campus Name

3. Total numbers of students, and numbers of students matching various criteria:

	PILOT PARTICIPANTS (ALL GRADES INVOLVED)	NON-PILOT PARTICIPANTS (SAME GRADES AS PILOT)
1. TOTAL NUMBER		
2. LEP		
3. F/RPL		
4. Special Education		
5. Female		
6. American Indian/ Alaskan Native		
7. Asian or Pacific Islander		
8. Black, *not* Hispanic		
9. Hispanic		
10. White, *not* Hispanic		
11. In extracurricular activities		

INSTRUCTIONS FOR ITEM 4

ON APRIL 24, 1991, THE TARGET DATE DESIGNATED BY THE TEXAS EDUCATION AGENCY:

A. Determine the year of birth of each pilot project participant who was actively enrolled on the target date. In the case of Parent Education/Parent Involvement pilots which have children from 0 to 3 or 4 years of age as the true target of pilot services, count the children as pilot participants.

B. For each birth year listed in the table (from 1991 back to those born in or before 1968), count the number of pilot project participants who were actively enrolled on the target date.

C. Enter the count in the appropriate box of the table in item 4.

D. If there are no pilot project students actively enrolled on the target date for a given year of birth, leave the box next to that year *blank*.

District Name

-- --
County/District/Campus Number

Campus Name

4. Pilot project students actively enrolled on target date by year of birth:

Year of Birth	No. of Participants	Year of Birth	No. of Participants
1991		1979	
1990		1978	
1989		1977	
1988		1976	
1987		1975	
1986		1974	
1985		1973	
1984		1972	
1983		1971	
1982		1970	
1981		1969	
1980		1968 & prior	

PARENT EDUCATION/PARENT INVOLVEMENT PILOT PROGRAM
PARENT OPINION SURVEY

Spring 1991

Authority for Data Collection: Authorization of pilot programs passed by the 71st session of the Texas Legislature, in S.B. 417, H.B. 1292, and S.B. 650.

Planned Use of Data: Conduct a state-level evaluation of the pilot programs and report results to the State Board of Education as well as the 72nd session of the Texas Legislature.

General Instructions: Please have parents or guardians, *who are not themselves enrolled students in the district*, complete these forms by the date shown below. Respondents should mail completed surveys directly to the Texas Education Agency, in the enclosed, postage-paid envelopes. Please complete the questions #1 and 2 on this page, and complete the contact information block below. Return this page to the Texas Education Agency, together with any unused surveys and/or return envelopes, by the date shown below to the address shown. If you have any questions or need additional surveys/return envelopes, please contact the person shown below. *Thank you for your help.*

1. How many opinion surveys, printed in English, did you distribute? Enter the number in the box provided.

2. How many opinion surveys, printed in Spanish, did you distribute? Enter the number in the box provided.

Name/Title/Address of Contact Person	Date	Telephone

Return the completed form, together with unused copies of the survey and unused return envelopes, by *May 3, 1991*, to this address:

Dr. Robert Woodson
Director of Programs II
Division of Planning Coordination
Texas Education Agency
1701 North Congress Avenue
Austin, Texas 78701-1494
512-475-3422

Texas Education Agency
1701 NORTH CONGRESS AVENUE AUSTIN, TEXAS 78701-1494 (512) 463-9734

March 4, 1991

TO THE PARENT ADDRESSED:

The Texas Education Agency (TEA) is studying many new programs for students, so that the schools can do the best possible job of teaching them. Your child's school is participating in one of these programs. Please take a few minutes to answer the attached survey, so that the Agency may have your opinion of the program.

Your answers to the survey are voluntary. All answers will be kept confidential and anonymous, so that you may be frank. Please return the completed survey to TEA, in the envelope provided, by May 3, 1991.

Thank you for your time and help.

Sincerely,

Lynn M. Moak, Deputy Commissioner
for Research and Development

Enclosures

_____
District Name

OPINION SURVEY FOR PARENTS

The Texas Education Agency (TEA) is studying new programs for parent education and parent involvement. Please help us study the program by circling your answers to the questions below. If you have no opinion about a question, please do not mark any answer. Your responses to this survey are strictly voluntary, and they will be kept confidential and anonymous. Thank you for your help.

1. Did you know the parent education program was being studied by the Texas Education Agency?.....Yes No Don't know

2. Did you meet with the teacher, parent educator, or with other school staff members this year?.....Yes No Don't recall

3. Was it worth your time and energy to be in a program for parents?.....Yes No Don't know

4. Were the teachers or parent educators enthusiastic about the program?.....Yes No Can't say

5. Are families and schools working together better this year?.....Yes No Don't know

6. Was it helpful to be in a program for parents?.....Yes No Don't know

7. Should schools continue to have programs for parents?.....Yes No Don't know

8. Should other school districts in Texas have programs for interested parents?.....Yes No Don't know

9. Did the teacher or parent educator show you ways to help your child learn?.....Yes No Don't know

10. Is your child currently an enrolled, public school student?.....Yes No

IF YOU ANSWERED "No" TO QUESTION 10, YOU SHOULD SKIP THE NEXT THREE QUESTIONS.

11. Were you kept informed of your child's progress this year?.....Yes No Don't recall

12. Do you think your child is doing well in school because of this program?.....Yes No Don't know

13. Did you learn some ways to help your child with his or her school work?.....Yes No Don't know

Please feel free to write any comments on the back of this page.

PARENT EDUCATION/PARENT INVOLVEMENT PILOT PROGRAM
STUDENT OPINION SURVEY

Spring 1991

Authority for Data Collection: Authorization of pilot programs passed by the 71st session of the Texas Legislature, in S.B. 417, H.B. 1292, and S.B. 650.

Planned Use of Data: Conduct a state-level evaluation of the pilot programs and report results to the State Board of Education as well as the 72nd session of the Texas Legislature.

General Instructions: Please have enrolled STUDENTS, *who are parents and were served directly by the pilot project as parents*, complete these forms by the date shown below. Because the survey should take only a few minutes to complete, it may be administered at the start or conclusion of a class period or parent education meeting. Students should NOT write their names on the survey, as their responses are to be kept confidential and anonymous. Please mail completed surveys directly to the Texas Education Agency, in the enclosed envelope. Please complete questions #1 and 2 on this page, as well as the contact information block below, and return this page with the surveys in the return envelope. If you have any questions or need additional surveys, please contact the person shown below. *Thank you for your help.*

1. How many opinion surveys, printed in English, did you distribute? Enter the number in the box provided. [ ]

2. How many opinion surveys, printed in Spanish, did you distribute? Enter the number in the box provided. [ ]

Name/Title/Address of Contact Person	Date	Telephone

Return the completed form, together with the surveys, by *May 3, 1991* to this address:

Dr. Robert Woodson
Director of Programs II
Division of Planning Coordination
Texas Education Agency
1701 North Congress Avenue
Austin, Texas 78701-1494
512-475-3422

District and Campus Names

OPINION SURVEY FOR ENROLLED STUDENTS IN PARENT EDUCATION/INVOLVEMENT PROGRAMS

The Texas Education Agency (TEA) is studying new parent education programs for students enrolled in school who are parenting one or more children. Please help us study these programs by circling your answers to the questions below. If you have no opinion about a question, please do not mark any answer. Your responses to this survey are strictly voluntary, and they will be kept confidential and anonymous. *Please feel free to write any comments on the back of this page*. Thank you.

1. Did you know your school was in a study about parent education or parent involvement programs for students who are raising children?.....Yes No Unsure

2. Was it worth your time and energy to participate in the parent education program?.....Yes No Unsure

3. Did the program meet your needs in parenting a young child (or children)?.....Yes No Unsure

4. Do you think you had a better year in school this year?....Yes No Unsure

5. Do you think you will be a better parent because of your participation in this program?.....Yes No Unsure

6. Were you kept informed of your progress this year?.....Yes No Don't recall

7. Were the teachers and principal enthusiastic about the program?.....Yes No Can't say

8. Is the school working better with your family because of this program?.....Yes No Unsure

9. Was it helpful to be in a program designed for students who are raising their own children?.....Yes No Unsure

10. Do you think it more likely that you will stay in school because of this program?.....Yes No Unsure

11. Should the school continue to have programs designed for students who are raising their own children?.....Yes No Unsure

12. Should other school districts in Texas have programs designed for students who are raising their own children?.....Yes No Unsure

13. Had you dropped out of school before you enrolled in the parent education program?.....Yes No

14. *If you answered "yes" to #13*, place a check mark next to the reasons why you had dropped out (as many as applied). *If you answered "no" to #13*, place a check mark next to the reasons why you might consider dropping out in the next school year.

_____ - 1. needed to work full-time
_____ - 2. needed to take care of child
_____ - 3. failing grades in school
_____ - 4. was bored in school
_____ - 5. needed transportation
_____ - 6. needed housing
_____ - 7. social/emotional reasons
_____ - 8. poor attendance
_____ - 9. was too old for school
_____ - 10. other:_____

PARENT EDUCATION/PARENT INVOLVEMENT PILOT PROGRAM
TEACHER/STAFF OPINION SURVEY

Spring 1991

Authority for Data Collection: Authorization of pilot programs passed by the 71st session of the Texas Legislature, in S.B. 417, H.B. 1292, and S.B. 650.

Planned Use of Data: Conduct a state-level evaluation of the pilot programs and report results to the State Board of Education as well as the 72nd session of the Texas Legislature.

General Instructions: Please have certified professional teachers and staff, who were directly involved in the pilot program, complete and return the enclosed surveys by the date shown below. Respondents should mark their answers on the enclosed scannable documents (green and white answer sheets), using #2 PENCIL ONLY. Respondents should NOT complete the grid for names, as all answers are to be kept confidential and anonymous. Group all scannable answer sheets by campus. On top of the answer sheets for each campus, place a clean answer sheet which has the Texas Education Agency's county-district-campus number (nine digits) for that campus entered in the section labeled "IDENTIFICATION NUMBER." Return this completed page, all completed answer sheets grouped by campus, all survey forms, and all surplus answer sheets to the Texas Education Agency, in that order, in the enclosed return envelope. If you have any questions or need additional surveys/answer sheets, please contact the person shown below. *Thank you for your help.*

Name/Title/Address of Contact Person	Date	Telephone

Return this page, the completed answer sheets grouped by campus, all survey forms, and unused answer sheets (in that order) by *May 24, 1991* to this address:

Dr. Robert Woodson
Director of Programs II
Texas Education Agency
Division of Planning Coordination
1701 N. Congress Avenue
Austin, Texas 78701-1494
512-475-3422

OPINION SURVEY FOR TEACHERS AND STAFF

The Texas Education Agency is studying parent involvement and parent education pilot programs. Please help us with this study by answering the questions on this survey.

Do NOT write your name on the answer sheet; your responses to this survey are voluntary, and they will be kept confidential and anonymous. Use ONLY a #2 pencil to complete your answer sheet.

Find the section on the answer sheet labeled "Special Codes" (a heavily shaded section on Side Two). In the first two columns of this section, fill in the numbers "04" in the first two (left-most) boxes, and then fill in the circles with the corresponding numbers, beneath the boxes.

In the third box in this section, enter a:

"1" - if you are a certified professional teacher with a classroom assignment,
"5" - if you are neither a certified teacher with a classroom assignment, nor a certified parent educator;
"6" - if you are a certified parent educator.

Fill in the corresponding circle underneath the third box of the "Special Codes" section.

Turn the answer sheet back over to Side One. Please fill in the circles corresponding to your answers to the survey questions on the scannable sheet. *If you have no opinion about a question, please do not mark any answer.*

Please feel free to write any comments about the program, that you wish to share with the Texas Education Agency, on the back of this page.

Thank you for your help.

OPINION SURVEY FOR TEACHERS AND STAFF

1. Did you know your school district was participating in a special parent education program not generally available in other schools?

A - Yes
B - Unsure
C - No

2. Was it worth your time and energy to be involved in the pilot program?

A - Definitely worth it
B - Probably worth it
C - Unsure
D - Probably not worth it
E - Definitely not worth it

3. Did you meet with the parents who participated in the pilot program?

A - Met with most of the parents
B - Met with many of the parents
C - Met with some of the parents
D - Met with a few of the parents
E - Did not meet with parents

4. Were parents kept informed of progress made by their children during the program?

A - Yes
B - Don't know
C - No

5. Are families and schools working together better this year than in the past?

A - Much better
B - Somewhat better
C - About the same as in the past
D - Somewhat worse
E - Much worse

(If the parent education program in your district served only parents of children too young to be enrolled in school, please skip item #6 and go directly to #7.)

6. Do you think the *students* whose parents were involved in the pilot program generally had a better year in school this year, than in years past?

A - Definitely YES
B - Probably YES
C - Unsure
D - Probably NOT
E - Definitely NOT

7. Were childrens' needs for learning and/or development better met by virtue of their parents' participation in the pilot program?

A - Definitely YES
B - Probably YES
C - Unsure
D - Probably NOT
E - Definitely NOT

Please Turn Over for Remaining Items

8. Do you think the children will have better future learning experiences in school because of their parents' participation in the pilot program?

A - Definitely YES
B - Probably YES
C - Can't say
D - Probably NOT
E - Definitely NOT

9. Were the parents' needs in fostering their children's education and development met by virtue of their participation in the pilot program?

A - Definitely YES
B - Probably YES
C - Can't say
D - Probably NOT
E - Definitely NOT

10. Were the services provided to parents coordinated better than they have been in the past?

A - Much better
B - Somewhat better
C - About the same as in the past
D - Somewhat worse
E - Much worse

11. Were the school administrators supportive of the pilot program?

A - Definitely supportive
B - Moderately supportive
C - Unsure of their supportiveness
D - Moderately obstructive
E - Definitely obstructive

12. Were you aware of the accomplishments of the program during the course of the year?

A - Definitely aware
B - Somewhat aware
C - Unsure
D - Not very aware
E - Not at all aware

13. Should the school continue to have parent education or parent involvement programs?

A - Definitely should
B - Probably should
C - Can't decide
D - Probably should not
E - Definitely should not

14. Should other school districts in Texas offer parent education or parent involvement programs?

A - Definitely should
B - Probably should
C - Can't decide
D - Probably should not
E - Definitely should not

Pilot Programs Established by the 71st Legislature

Cost Survey

Program Descriptions and Worksheets: Directions and Examples

NOTE: THE PURPOSE OF THE SURVEY IS TO IDENTIFY THE COSTS OF THOSE COMPONENTS THAT TOGETHER CONSTITUTE THE PILOT PROGRAM REGARDLESS OF HOW EACH COMPONENT IS FUNDED. THIS SURVEY IS NOT AN AUDIT OF WHERE AND HOW THE STATE PILOT FUNDS HAVE BEEN SPENT. IT IS A SURVEY TO DETERMINE HOW MUCH A GIVEN PROGRAM WOULD COST TO REPLICATE.

These directions and the attached examples are provided as guides to generating descriptions of program components and using the cost survey worksheets for identifying personnel and non-personnel costs.

Narrative Description of Program Components: A brief description should be generated for each of the program's components. This description provides the framework against which expenditures are viewed. The following passages describe the components of a fictional parent education program in Example ISD:

> INSTRUCTION: This program's instructional component includes parent workshops and after school tutoring provided at the project site and field trips for parents and children. The school counselor acts as a facilitator during the parent workshop. The program operates during the school year and the summer.
>
> CHILD CARE: Babysitting is available during parents' workshops and field trips.
>
> TRANSPORTATION: The program contracts with the district to provide buses for the field trips.
>
> PROGRAM PLANNING: The program director sets the schedule for field trips and, in conjunction with the school counselor, plans the sequence of parent workshops.
>
> STAFF TRAINING: The program director provides orientation and refresher sessions to the program's tutors. The director also attends parent involvement workshops throughout the year.
>
> PROGRAM ADMINISTRATION: The program director is responsible for generating budgets, communicating with the program's advisory council, and responding to TEA report requests. A secretary assists the program director in these administrative tasks.

Please prepare comparably detailed descriptions of your program's components. Refer to "Notes on Program Components" for definitions and illustrations of components.

Once the descriptions have been completed, the form entitled "PROGRAM COST-COMPONENT MATRIX" can be used to chart the cost categories that are involved in providing each of the program components. This form serves

as a road map to remind the user to consider all possible cost categories for each program component. Refer to "Notes on Non-Personnel Costs" for definitions of non-salary cost categories. The Example ISD form indicates that the various components of the fictional program incur costs in a mixture of categories including personnel, supplies/materials, equipment, facilities, contracted services, and travel.

Once the pattern of program costs has been mapped, then the specific costs associated with each component can be identified. These costs can be separated into personnel and non-personnel costs.

Personnel Costs: Identifying personnel costs involves two steps. First, use the form entitled "POSITIONS THAT CONTRIBUTE TO PROGRAM" to list each position filled by a salaried employee with a district contract that in any substantial way contributes to the program and its components. (Non-contract positions should be treated as Contracted Services.) Name the position and then use percentage values to indicate the extent to which that position is involved with various program components. The last column is labeled "Non-Pilot Activities" to allow a position to be listed that has duties beyond its contribution to the pilot program. Each row of the form should add up to 100% since even a part time position must be wholly engaged in some combination of pilot and non-pilot activities. Note that three of the four positions in the Example ISD program have non-pilot activities.

Now use the "PERSONNEL COST WORKSHEET" to provide employment and staffing information for each of the positions listed on the previous form. Since a program title may not be the same as the job title that appears on the district employee's contract, give both the district and the program job titles for each position. Next indicate whether the position is full or part time and the length of its contract. Then indicate the number of individual staff contracted at the position. Finally, indicate whether or not the position is incremental (i.e., added to the district's payroll because of the program). Note that the Example ISD program utilizes a variety of full and part time staff with differing lengths of contract. Also, note that a position's program job title need not resemble its district job title.

Non-Personnel Costs Worksheet: Use the "NON-PERSONNEL COST WORKSHEET" to identify the non-personnel costs incurred in providing each of the program's components. List all costs associated with one component before listing those associated with the next component. Refer to "Notes on Program Components" for names and illustrations of program components and to "Notes on Non-Personnel Costs" for names and definitions of cost categories.

Use the third column to briefly describe or characterize the item(s) for which the cost was incurred.

Indicate in the fourth column whether or not a cost is incremental (i.e., incurred only because the pilot program exists).

Use the next-to-last column to indicate whether or not a cost is recurring. A recurring cost arises repeatedly during the life of a program while a non-recurring cost is expected to be incurred only once during the life of the program. As seen in the first two rows of Example ISD's worksheet, note that a cost category in a single component can have both recurring and non-recurring costs.

Estimate the dollar amount for each cost. For recurring costs, this estimate should cover a "year" of the fully implemented program's operation - whether a program's year is 9 or 12 months. Dollar estimates below $2500 should be to the nearest $250 while those above $2500 should be to the nearest $500.

District: Exampk ISD

PROGRAM COST-COMPONENT MATRIX

PROGRAM COSTS	PROGRAM COMPONENTS: Instruction	Guidance Counseling	Case Managemen	Child Care	Transport	Program Planning	Staff Training	Program Admin	Other
Personnel	✓					✓	✓	✓	
Supplies/Materials	✓							✓	
Equipment								✓	
Facilities	✓								
Contracted Services				✓	✓	✓			
Travel							✓		
Costs to Clients									
Other									

District: Example ISD

POSITIONS THAT CONTRIBUTE TO PROGRAM

POSITION	PROGRAM COMPONENTS: Instruction	Guidance Counseling	Case Managemen	Child Care	Transport	Program Planning	Staff Training	Program Admin	Other Pilot Activities	Non-Pilot Activities
Program Director	10%					20%	10%	10%		50%
Tutors	100%									
Parent Meeting facilitator	10%					5%				85%
Secretary								75%		25%

<< EACH ROW SHOULD SUM TO 100% >>

<< DUPLICATE IF NECESSARY >>

PERSONNEL COST WORKSHEET (duplicate if necessary)

District Example ISD Page 1 of 1

DISTRICT JOB TITLE	PROGRAM JOB TITLE	FULL OR PART TIME?	LENGTH OF CONTRACT	NUMBER OF STAFF	INCREMENTAL
Teacher	Director	Full	225 days	1	yes (no)
Instructional Aide	Tutor (school Yr.)	Full	183 days	2	(yes) no
Instructional Aide	Tutor (summer)	20 hrs/wk	40 days	4	(yes) no
Counselor	Parent Mtg. Facilitator	Full	183 days	1	yes (no)
Administrative Clerk	Secretary	Full	225 days	1	(yes) no
					yes – no
					yes – no
					yes – no
					yes – no
					yes – no
					yes – no
					yes – no
					yes – no
					yes – no
					yes – no

A-23

NON-PERSONNEL COST WORKSHEET (duplicate if necessary) District _____ Page ____ of ____

Component	Cost Category	Description of Item	Incremental	Recurring	Cost
Instruction	Supplies / Mat.	Parent Ed. Library	(yes) - no	yes - (no)	7500
"	"	Parent Ed. Lib. Updates	(yes) no	(yes) - no	600
"	Facilities	Site Renovation	(yes) - no	yes - (no)	25000
Child Care	Con. Services	Babysitting Fees	(yes) - no	(yes) - no	250
Transport	"	Field Trips - Bus	(yes) - no	(yes) - no	1250
Program Planning	"	Parent Ed. Consultant	(yes) - no	yes - (no)	500
Staff Training	Travel	Workshop Attendance	(yes) - no	(yes) - no	90
Program Administration	Supplies / Mat.	office supplies from	yes - (no)	(yes) - no	400
"	Equipment	office supplies } district	yes - (no)	yes - (no)	500
"	"	P.C.	(yes) - no	yes - (no)	2900
"	"	Phone Purchase / Install	(yes) - no	yes - (no)	300
"			yes - no	yes - no	
			yes - no	yes - no	
			yes - no	yes - no	
			yes - no	yes - no	
			yes - no	yes - no	
			yes - no	yes - no	57

Pilot Programs Established by the 71st Legislature

Cost Survey

Notes on Program Components

***

Each site should prepare a brief narrative description of the components that constitute its pilot program. That description should include one or more of the following eight components.

***

1) **INSTRUCTION**

Instruction includes all organized, planned attempts at the systematic transfer of information to pilot program participants regardless of the instructor(s), audience, setting, frequency, or duration of instruction, and excluding normal academic curriculum. Hence, instruction could include:

- organized courses conducted by certified teachers for enrolled students when such courses are made possible or required by the pilot program,
- informal, occasional, special, tutorial, remedial, or supplementary classes offered to pilot program participants because they are enrolled in the program,
- visits to homes or venues outside of the school at which pilot program staff (e.g., parent educators, social workers), through discussion and/or demonstration, seek to inform those they visit about topics and/or activities relevant to the goals of the pilot program,
- group meetings whose primary purpose is to increase the participants' knowledge of topics and/or activities relevant to the goals of the pilot program, and/or
- pilot participants' attendance at conferences when that attendance is intended to increase those participants' knowledge of topics and/or activities relevant to the goals of the program.

Essentially, this category covers all instructional opportunities made possible or required by the pilot program outside of those that pilot program participants would be entitled or required to take by virtue of their status as enrolled students in an independent school district.

2) **GUIDANCE AND COUNSELING SERVICES**

Any academic, vocational, or personal counseling, guidance, or placement provided to pilot program participants by virtue of their enrollment in the pilot program whether such services are provided by a school counselor, social worker, school psychologist, physician, nurse, LPC, trained professional, or volunteer, whether the setting is individual or group, and regardless of the frequency of the service.

The emphasis for this category is on direct contact between counselor and program participant(s).

3) **SERVICE COORDINATION AND CASE MANAGEMENT**

Activities of or on behalf of the pilot program that enable pilot program participants to utilize health, human services, family, legal, employment, advocacy, and/or shelter services.

4) **CHILD CARE**

Supervised care provided to offspring of pilot program participants by virtue of their enrollment in the pilot program or that enables parents to participate in activities sponsored by the pilot program. Care can be provided by pilot staff in pilot-funded facilities, by organizations contracted by the pilot program to provide child care in district-owned facilities, and/or through contract with community providers. Child care services include child minding during parent meetings.

5) **TRANSPORTATION**

Transport services that are available to pilot program participants and/or their family members by virtue of their enrollment in the pilot program or that enable them to participate in activities sponsored by the pilot program. Included in this definition are tokens or reimbursements for public or private transportation.

6) **PROGRAM PLANNING**

Activities devoted to planning the delivery of program services and/or the conduct of program activities. Examples would include scheduling home visits or field trips and producing manipulatives and handouts. While each type of activity should be noted, a distinction should be made between one-time and repeat activities (e.g., writing a curriculum over two weeks at the start of a program versus scheduling field trips during the life of the program).

7) **STAFF TRAINING**

Specialized preparations that qualify staff to deliver the services or use the resources of the pilot program. This category excludes training leading to certifications and endorsements that educators must possess in order to conduct courses normally offered by school districts.

8) **PROGRAM ADMINISTRATION**

Administrative activities not involved in the direct delivery of program services but essential for the delivery of such services. While each type of activity should be noted, a distinction should be made between one-time and repeated administrative activities in support of a program (e.g., writing the grant application or interviewing and hiring staff versus filing quarterly expenditure reports or participating in advisory council meetings).

Pilot Programs Established by the 71st Legislature

Cost Survey

Notes on Non-Personnel Costs

1) **SUPPLIES/MATERIALS**

Consumable supplies and materials used in program activities and/or the provision of program services. (Class Object Code 6300 - Supplies and Materials)

Supplies and materials should be described in generic categories rather than detailed terms (e.g., office supplies, instructional materials, child care supplies).

In the case of donated supplies, a best estimate should be made of what comparable supplies would have cost the program.

2) **EQUIPMENT**

Depreciable equipment and furniture whose purchase enables program activities to take place and/or program services to be provided. (Class/Object Code 6630 - Capital Outlay - Furniture and Equipment)

Equipment and furniture should be described in generic categories rather than detailed terms (e.g., classroom or office furniture, computer or playground equipment).

In the case of donated equipment or furniture, a best estimate should be made of what comparable equipment or furniture would have cost the district.

3) **FACILITIES**

Buildings or portions of buildings where program activities and/or delivery of program services occur excluding facilities that an ISD would provide to enrolled students whether or not the pilot program existed. (Class/Object Code 6620 - Capital Outlay - Building Purchase, Construction, or Improvements)

Facilities should be described in generic categories rather than detailed terms (e.g., classroom, office, child care, multi-purpose).

In the case of a facility that is donated or loaned, an estimate should be made of what a comparable facility would have cost the program.

4) **CONTRACTED SERVICES**

A service the purchase or contract of which enables program activities to occur or program services to be delivered. Examples include hiring consultants to train program staff, contracting for transportation, counseling, or child care services, leasing facilities or equipment, and paying for the upkeep of program facilities or equipment. (Class/Object Code 6200 - Purchased or Contracted Services)

Such services should be described in generic rather than detailed terms (e.g., consulting, transport, child care, instructional equipment).

In the case of donated services, an estimate should be made of what comparable services would have cost had the program purchased or contracted such services.

5) **TRAVEL**

Travel costs incurred in the operation of program activities or the delivery of program services. NOTE THAT TRAVEL IS A COST THAT CAN BE INCURRED BY ANY PROGRAM ACTIVITY WHILE TRANSPORT IS A PROGRAM ACTIVITY THAT IS AVAILABLE OR PROVIDED TO PROGRAM PARTICIPANTS. THE TRANSPORT PROVIDED BY A PROGRAM MAY OR MAY NOT INVOLVE TRAVEL COSTS. Travel costs include mileage reimbursements for use of personal vehicles and per diem allowances during program-related travel.

Travel costs should be described in terms of the program activity or service that they support (e.g., home visits by parent educator, travel for staff training).

In the case of donated travel, an estimate should be made of what comparable travel would have cost the program.

6) **COSTS TO CLIENTS**

This item includes any cost incurred by participants in the pilot program. Examples include tuition for summer school, in-kind contributions such as serving as a classroom or child care aide, and client-borne child care or transportation costs.

An attempt should be made to describe such costs in terms comparable to the preceding examples.

Where feasible, estimates should be made of the dollar value of those client costs that are covered by donations or scholarships or that have been specially waived for program participants.

7) **OTHER**

Any cost of a program activity or service not covered by the preceding cost items.

District: _____

PROGRAM COST-COMPONENT MATRIX

PROGRAM COSTS	PROGRAM COMPONENTS: Instruction	Guidance Counseling	Case Managemen	Child Care	Transport	Program Planning	Staff Training	Program Admin	Other
Personnel									
Supplies/Materials									
Equipment									
Facilities									
Contracted Services									
Travel									
Costs to Clients									
Other									

A-30

District: _____

POSITIONS THAT CONTRIBUTE TO PROGRAM

POSITION	PROGRAM COMPONENTS: Instruction	Guidance Counseling	Case Managemen	Child Care	Transport	Program Planning	Staff Training	Program Admin	Other Pilot Activities	Non-Pilot Activities

60

<< EACH ROW SHOULD SUM TO 100% >>

<< DUPLICATE IF NECESSARY >>

PERSONNEL COST WORKSHEET (duplicate if necessary)

District _____ Page____ of ____

DISTRICT JOB TITLE	PROGRAM JOB TITLE	FULL OR PART TIME?	LENGTH OF CONTRACT	NUMBER OF STAFF	INCREMENTAL
					yes – no
					yes – no
					yes – no
					yes – no
					yes – no
					yes – no
					yes – no
					yes – no
					yes – no
					yes – no
					yes – no
					yes – no
					yes – no
					yes – no
					yes – no
					yes – no
					yes – no

NON-PERSONNEL COST WORKSHEET (duplicate if necessary) District _____ Page ____ of ____

Component	Cost Category	Description of Item	Incremental	Recurring	Cost
			yes – no	yes – no	
			yes – no	yes – no	
			yes – no	yes – no	
			yes – no	yes – no	
			yes – no	yes – no	
			yes – no	yes – no	
			yes – no	yes – no	
			yes – no	yes – no	
			yes – no	yes – no	
			yes – no	yes – no	
			yes – no	yes – no	
			yes – no	yes – no	
			yes – no	yes – no	
			yes – no	yes – no	
			yes – no	yes – no	
			yes – no	yes – no	
			yes – no	yes – no	
			yes – no	yes – no	

Texas Education Agency
1701 NORTH CONGRESS AVENUE AUSTIN, TEXAS 78701-1494 (512) 463-9734

March 11, 1991

TO THE ADMINISTRATOR ADDRESSED:

Enclosed please find one copy of the form to use for reporting evaluation data from the pilot project in your district. Should you need any assistance in completing the form, a table attached to this letter lists appropriate contact persons and telephone numbers for the various types of pilot projects. The evaluation reports are required under the terms of each project's application, and will form the basis of the Texas Education Agency's reports to the State Board of Education and the Texas Legislature.

Note that all evaluation report forms are due on June 14, 1991. This date is different from those published in the Requests for Application. Changes incorporated into Senate Bill 1 made it necessary to shift the due date for the evaluation reports. Please telephone the appropriate contact person for the pilot program in your district if the due date cannot be accommodated.

Thank you for responding to this requirement.

Sincerely,

Lynn M. Moak, Deputy Commissioner
for Research and Development

Attachment

Attachment

CONTACT INFORMATION FOR EACH TYPE OF PILOT PROGRAM

For this type of Pilot Program:	Contact:
Prekindergarten for Three-Year-Old Children	Andrea England 512-463-9067
Elementary At-Risk	Kathleen Burke 512-463-9512
Academic Programs for Children Below Grade Level	Boyd Jackson 512-463-9067
Parent Education and Parent Involvement	Angélica Gaytán 512-463-9067
Pregnancy, Education and Parenting	Bill Nance Karen Alarcón 512-465-9501
Technology Demonstration	R. Lane Scott Karen Kahan 512-463-9087
High School Equivalency Examination	Carolyn Klein 512-463-9447
Teacher Induction	Jean Holden 512-463-9327

PARENT EDUCATION/PARENT INVOLVEMENT
PILOT PROGRAM EVALUATION REPORT

Spring 1991

Authority for Data Collection: Authorization of pilot programs passed by the 71st Session of the Texas Legislature, in S.B. 417, H.B. 1292, and S.B. 650.

Planned Use of Data: Conduct a state-level evaluation of the pilot programs and report results to the State Board of Education as well as the 72nd session of the Texas Legislature.

General Instructions: Complete and return this form, including the contact information block on this page, by the date shown below to the contact person shown. Please read the more detailed instructions that accompany each item. *Throughout this document, when items mention "significant adults," it should be understood that this is being used as a short term of reference. In fact, parents, guardians, extended family members, or possibly even neighbors or other individuals who are not blood relatives of the enrolled students may be included in counts of "significant adults," if those people have been involved in the child's education through the pilot program.*

Name/Title of Contact Person	Date	Telephone

Return the completed form by *June 14, 1991* to this address:

Dr. Robert Woodson
Director of Programs II
Texas Education Agency
Division of Planning Coordination
1701 North Congress Ave.
Austin, Texas 78701-1494
512-475-3422

District and Campus Names

-- --
County/District/Campus Number

GENERAL INFORMATION

1. Place a check mark in the space provided if the pilot program in your district will continue to operate during the summer:

Yes, active in summer...1 - _____

2. Using the list below, place a check mark next to the type of approach used by the pilot program:

School-based.....1 - _____
Community-based.....2 - _____
Parents-as-teachers/home-based..3 - _____
Combination model.....4 - _____

3. Place a check mark in the blank space next to each grade level(s) of enrolled students whose significant adults were targeted specifically by the pilot program:

Early education (3-year-old & younger).....EE - _____
Prekindergarten (4-year-olds).....PK - _____
Kindergarten.....KG - _____
First grade.....01 - _____
Second grade.....02 - _____
Third grade.....03 - _____
Fourth grade.....04 - _____
Fifth grade.....05 - _____
Sixth grade.....06 - _____
Seventh grade.....07 - _____
Eighth grade.....08 - _____
Ninth grade.....09 - _____
Tenth grade.....10 - _____
Eleventh grade.....11 - _____
Twelfth grade.....12 - _____
Non-traditional grade levels/other.....NG - _____

INSTRUCTIONS FOR PART A (ITEMS A1 THROUGH A12): INFORMATION ABOUT STUDENTS WHOSE SIGNIFICANT ADULTS PARTICIPATED IN PILOT

Students: In this section of the document, the Agency is concerned with data pertaining to all ENROLLED STUDENTS WHOSE SIGNIFICANT ADULTS WERE SERVED *by the pilot program. Note that a school-aged parent may only be counted here as an enrolled student if his or her significant adults were involved in the pilot project.*

Campuses and Grade Levels: If the pilot program targeted more than one campus, duplicate the pages for items 4 through 17 so that there will be one set of pages with these items for each of the campuses involved. Then, to report the data by campus, use one set of pages for all data pertaining to a given campus; start a new copy for each campus after that. Be sure to fill in the appropriate county/district/campus number in the upper right-hand corner of every page, and write in the district and campus names in the upper left-hand corner of every page. Report data ONLY for the grade levels targeted by the pilot program; leave all other grade levels blank. Example: the parent involvement program was conducted on a K-6 elementary campus, but only grades 1 through 3 were actually targets of the parent involvement pilot program. In this case data would only be reported for grades 1-3. When reporting data by grade level, group all "Participant Group" students (those whose significant adults were involved in the pilot) who were too young to be enrolled in regular prekindergarten, under the grade level heading "EE," for Early Education. "Contrast Group" students must be a matched sample of students, whose significant adults were not in any way served by the pilot program. Matching should reflect overall number of students, grade levels, and so forth. IF THERE IS NO POSSIBLE WAY TO OBTAIN A CONTRAST GROUP OF STUDENTS, LEAVE ALL SPACES FOR CONTRAST GROUP DATA BLANK.

Instructions for Item A1:

a. If at all possible, grades are to be averaged using a 100-point scale. If this is not possible, then use a 4-point scale. In either case, round all computations to one decimal place.

b. For each grade level, record the Participant Group students' grades for the first six-week period of this school year as a group. Place the first six-week period grades of Contrast Group students at the same grade levels into a second group. Compute the average of the grades for each group at each grade level: sum the grades for the group at that grade level and divide by the number of grades that went into the sum. Use the same procedure to compute the last six-weeks' average grades for each group at each grade level.

c. Record the number of students in the Participant Group at each grade level in the first row of the table. Record the first six-weeks' average grades of Participant Group students at each grade level in the second row of the table, and the last six-weeks' average grades in the third row of the table. Record the number of Contrast Group students at each grade level in the fourth row, the first six-weeks' average grades of Contrast Group students at each grade level in the fifth row, and the last six-weeks' average grades in the last row of the table.

NOTE: Data about students in most of this section will continue to rely upon the "Participant" and "Contrast" groups created for item A1. Also, it should be understood that while grades generally are not appropriate or available for use in evaluating programs at very early grade levels, districts may be required to track student performance into grade levels where such data are both available and appropriate.

District and Campus Names

-- --
County/District/Campus Number

PART A. INFORMATION ABOUT STUDENTS WHOSE SIGNIFICANT ADULTS PARTICIPATED IN THE PILOT

A1. Number of students in Participant and Contrast Groups at each grade level and their respective grade point averages (rounded to one decimal place) for the first and last six-week grading periods of the 1990-1991 school year:

	Participant Group Grade Levels:											
	01	02	03	04	05	06	07	08	09	10	11	12
No. students in group												
First six-weeks grade point average												
Last six-weeks grade point average												

	Contrast Group Grade Levels:											
	01	02	03	04	05	06	07	08	09	10	11	12
No. students in group												
First six-weeks grade point average												
Last six-weeks grade point average												

Instructions for Item A2:

In the space provided, describe the limitations of your Contrast Group: in what ways (if any) does it systematically differ from your Participant Group on "entry" characteristics, such as ethnicity, percentages of Special Education students, percentages of Limited English Proficient students, percentages of students eligible for free/reduced-price meals, and so on? List all concerns that pertain to the validity of the Contrast Group.

Instructions for Item A3:

Place a check mark by your rating on the next page to indicate, in your estimation, how well the Contrast Group serves as a statistical comparison group.

District and Campus Names

-- --
County/District/Campus Number

A2. Brief description of Contrast Group limitations:

A3. Your rating of the adequacy of the Contrast Group (check one):

(1) A true (randomly assigned) control...._____
(2) A closely matched comparison group...._____
(3) A reasonable post-hoc contrast group.._____
(4) The only contrast possible: marginal..._____
(5) No confidence in the contrast....._____
(6) No contrast group existed....._____

Instructions for Item A4:

a. Based on the testing cycle of your district, identify which reading/language arts test scores can most appropriately be used as pretest scores. Example: The district is on an annual testing cycle, using the California Achievement Test Form E (CAT-E) each April for the last two years. (The testing cycle is spring-to-spring.) An appropriate pretest score for the students whose significant adults were involved in the pilot program might be the CAT-E total reading scores from April 1990. In the spaces above the table, write the name, form/subtest, and administration dates (month/year) of the pretest and posttest.

b. Use a parallel procedure to identify which "matched" reading/language arts test scores can most appropriately be used as posttest scores. The term "matched" means that posttest scores *must* come from the same form/subtest of the same standardized achievement test used for the pretest scores. Continuing from the example above, the CAT-E April 1991 total reading scores would be the most appropriate posttest scores to use. *If the only appropriate posttest scores have come from a different form of the achievement test than was used at pretest, or are from a different achievement test altogether, DO NOT FILL IN THIS PORTION OF THE TABLE.*

c. At each grade level targeted by the pilot program, sort the students into the same two groups as before ("Participant" and "Contrast").

d. Within the Participant Group, check to see how many students have both reading pretest and posttest scores on the standardized achievement test. Record this number for each grade level in row 1 ("# students w/ matched scores") of the table. Then, using only the reading/language arts pretest scores of Participant Group students who have both pre- and posttest scores, compute the *average pretest score in Normal Curve Equivalents (NCEs)* for the Participant Group students at each grade level; record these averages in the second row of the table. Next, using only posttest reading/language arts scores of students who have both pre- and posttest scores, compute the *average posttest score in NCEs* for the Participant Group at each grade level; record these averages in the third row of the table. Round all averages to the nearest whole number (do not report decimals).

e. Follow the same procedure for the Contrast Group students as you did with the Participant Group (see step d) and record the information in the lower half of the table. If obtaining Contrast Group data poses an inordinate data collection burden upon the district, then *this half* of the table may be left blank.

District and Campus Names

-- --
County/District/Campus Number

A4. Average standardized achievement test scores in Normal Curve Equivalents (NCEs; do not use decimals) in reading/language arts:

Reading/language arts pretest scores came from the _____
Name/Form/Subtest of Standardized Achievement Test

that was administered in _____; reading/language arts posttest scores came from
Month/Year

the _____ administered in _____.
Name/Form/Subtest of Standardized Achievement Test Month/Year

	Participant Group Grade Levels: 01	02	03	04	05	06	07	08	09	10	11	12
1. No. of students with matched scores												
2. Average pretest reading score in NCEs												
3. Average posttest reading score in NCEs												

	Contrast Group Grade Levels (Optional): 01	02	03	04	05	06	07	08	09	10	11	12
4. No. of students with matched scores												
5. Average pretest reading score in NCEs												
6. Average posttest reading score in NCEs												

Instructions for Item A5:

Use the same procedure as detailed in item A4, with MATHEMATICS scores from standardized achievement tests, to report results for this item. Again, if collecting the Contrast Group data poses an inordinate burden, then the districts may treat the latter half of the table as optional.

District and Campus Names

-- --
County/District/Campus Number

A5. Average standardized achievement test scores in Normal Curve Equivalents (NCEs; do not use decimals) in mathematics:

Mathematics pretest scores came from the _____ that was
Name/Form/Subtest of Standardized Achievement Test

administered in _____; mathematics posttest scores came from
Month/Year

the _____ administered in _____.
Name/Form/Subtest of Standardized Achievement Test Month/Year

	Participant Group Grade Levels: 01	02	03	04	05	06	07	08	09	10	11	12
1. No. of students with matched scores												
2. Average pretest mathematics score in NCEs												
3. Average posttest mathematics score in NCEs												
	Contrast Group Grade Levels (Optional): 01	02	03	04	05	06	07	08	09	10	11	12
4. No. of students with matched scores												
5. Average pretest mathematics score in NCEs												
6. Average posttest mathematics score in NCEs												

Instructions for Item A7:

At each grade level targeted by the pilot program:

a. Count the number of students whose significant adults participated (count a student only once, no matter how many of his/her significant adults were involved and no matter how many times they participated in pilot program activities). Enter these numbers in the first row of the table for this item ("# of students w/ adults involved").

b. Out of those students counted in the first row:

(1) Using a definition specific to the district (explain this definition in the space provided underneath the table for this item), determine how many enrolled students with significant adults involved in the pilot program "*made satisfactory progress*" during the course of the program. You may count a student who has made such progress only once. Enter the numbers in row 2 of the table for this item.

(2) Determine how many were promoted to the next grade level (or, if 12th graders, graduated) at the end of the 1990-1991 school year. Enter these numbers in row 3 of the table.

(3) Determine how many were placed into the next grade level at the end of the 1990-1991 school year; enter these numbers in row 4 of the table.

(4) Determine how many withdrew from the school or district by the end of the 1990-1991 school year; enter these numbers in row 5 of the table.

(5) Determine how many dropped out by the end of the 1990-1991 school year; enter these numbers in row 6 of the table.

(6) Determine how many were suspended one or more times, for any length of time, during the 1990-1991 school year; enter these numbers in row 7 of the table.

(7) Determine how many were expelled during the 1990-1991 school year; enter these numbers in row 8 of the table.

District and Campus Names

-- --
County/District/Campus Number

A7. Number of students at each grade level whose significant adults participated in the pilot, and who met various outcome criteria:

	Participant Group Grade Levels: EE	PK	KG	01	02	03	04	05	06	07	08	09	10	11	12
1. # Students w/ adults involved															
2. # Making satis-factory progress*															
3. # Promoted or graduated															
4. # Placed at next grade															
5. # Withdrew															
6. # Dropped out															
7. # Suspended															
8. # Expelled															

A-47

* District definition of "making satisfactory progress:"

Instructions for Item A8:

At each of the same grade levels as are targeted by the pilot program, report the numbers of Contrast Group students who met each of the same outcome criteria as in item A7.

District and Campus Names

-- --
County/District/Campus Number

A8. Number of students at each grade level whose significant adults did *NOT* participate in the pilot, and who met various outcome criteria:

	Contrast Group Grade Levels														
	EE	PK	KG	01	02	03	04	05	06	07	08	09	10	11	12
1. # Students in group															
2. # Making satis-factory progress															
3. # Promoted or graduated															
4. # Placed at next grade															
5. # Withdrew															
6. # Dropped out															
7. # Suspended															
8. # Expelled															

Instructions for Item A9:

At each grade level targeted by the pilot program and for each day that students were scheduled to be in school:

a. Determine the average number of Participant Group students in attendance each day. If this information is *not* already on file or automated, you may:

(1) Find out the percentage of students in the Participant Group at each grade level (see row 1 of Item A7) were actually in attendance each day.

(2) Sum the percentages obtained in step (1), and divide the sum by the number of days that the students were scheduled to be in attendance.

(3) Enter the result under the correct grade level heading in row 1 of the table for Item 13 (round to three decimal places).

b. Determine the average number of Contrast Group students in attendance each day, by using the same procedure with Contrast Group students as you did in step a., above.

Instructions for Item A10:

a. Determine how many Participant Group students (across *all* grade levels targeted by the pilot program, including EE) had significant adults who participated in each type of involvement shown in the table. *You can count a Participant Group student whose significant adults participated in a given pilot program activity one time in each row. If an enrolled student's significant adults participated in more than one type of activity, you can count the student once in each of the rows representing those types of involvement.* Enter the number of students whose significant adults participated in each type of pilot program activity in the column adjacent to the description.

b. If the pilot program implemented in the district allowed for a specific type of parent involvement/parent education activity NOT already listed in the table, you may identify that activity or type of involvement in Row 10 of the table for this item and enter the number of Participant Group students, whose significant adults participated in that activity, in the adjacent column.

District and Campus Names

-- --
County/District/Campus Number

A9. Average percent attendance, by grade level of students whose significant adults either did or did NOT participate in the parent involvement/parent education pilot program:

	Grade Levels: EE	PK	KG	01	02	03	04	05	06	07	08	09	10	11	12
1. Average % Attendance, Participant Group															
2. Average % Attendance, Contrast Group															

A10. Number of enrolled students whose significant adults were involved in each of the following types of pilot program activities:

Types of Involvement	# Enrolled Students with Significant Adults Involved
1. Notification of student eligibility	
2. Attendance at open house	
3. Conferences with teachers, instructional staff, principal	
4. Counseling (with/without enrolled student)	
5. Social work (with/without enrolled student)	
6. Training in parenting/child development	
7. Guided/structured activities with enrolled students at school, home, or in community	
8. Member of school task force or committees	
9. Other (specify:_____)	

Instructions for Item A11:

a. Determine the nonduplicated count of Participant Group students (across *all* grade levels targeted by the pilot program, including EE) had significant adults who took home each type of material shown in the table. *You can count a student one time in each row. If a student's significant adults have used more than one type of material, he or she may be counted once in each of the rows representing those types of materials.* Enter the number of Participant Group students whose significant adults used each type of take-home material in the column adjacent to the description of the materials. In the case of "Handouts, worksheets," indicate the number of Participant Group students whose parents received handouts or worksheets through the pilot program.

b. If the pilot program implemented in the district provided for a specific type of take-home material NOT already listed in the table, you may identify that type of take-home material in the last row of the table for this item and enter the number of Participant Group students whose significant adults used them in the adjacent column.

c. Indicate the total number of times that books (row 1), manipulatives and kits (row 2), and video/audiotapes (row 3) were checked out for use with a Participant Group student, and enter those counts in the right-most column of the table for this item.

District and Campus Names

-- --
County/District/Campus Number

A11. Nonduplicated counts of Participant Group students whose significant adults used take-home materials, and estimates of the number of times certain types of material were used:

Type of Take-Home Material	# Students Whose Signif. Adults Used the Materials	Number of Times Items Were Checked Out
Books		
Manipulatives, instructional kits		
Video/audio tapes		
Computers, computer software		
Handouts, worksheets		
Other equipment such as infant car seats, VCRs, etc.		
Other materials-- specify:_____)		

Instructions for Item A12:

Using information available to the district, enter your responses to each of the items in the boxes provided.

District and Campus Names

-- --
County/District/Campus Number

A12. Disparity between numbers served and numbers eligible:

a. Best estimate of number of students in the district whose significant adults met current eligibility criteria for the pilot program: A12-a

b. (Best estimate) Number of students within the attendance boundary of this campus (if different from step a), whose significant adults met current eligibility criteria for the pilot program: A12-b

c. Total number of students whose significant adults were actually served through the pilot in 1990-1991 *(this should be the sum of the numbers shown in row 1 of item A7)*: A12-c

d. Number of students whose significant adults were NOT served, by primary reason (the sum of these numbers CANNOT exceed the number entered in A12-a):

Reason for Not Serving	Number of Students Whose Adults Were Not Served
Pilot didn't have resources	
Students' significant adults were in contrast group	
Students' significant adults declined services	

INSTRUCTIONS FOR PART B (ITEMS B1 THROUGH B6): INFORMATION ABOUT ENROLLED STUDENTS WHO WERE PARENTS AND WERE SERVED DIRECTLY, AS PARENTS, BY THE PILOT

Students: In this section of the document, the Agency is concerned with enrolled students who were themselves parents, and who were being served directly, as parents through the pilot project (regardless of whether or not the school-aged parents' significant adults were involved). Do NOT include enrolled students who were reached ONLY in an indirect manner (that is, those with non-school-aged, non-enrolled significant adults); they should all have been reported in Part A of this evaluation report. If your pilot program did not serve any enrolled, school-aged parents directly, as parents, then leave this entire portion of the evaluation report BLANK.

Campuses and Grade Levels: If the pilot program targeted more than one campus, duplicate the pages for Part B so that there will be one set of pages with these items for each of the campuses involved. Use the same procedure as you followed for Part A to report data separately for each campus involved. The teens who were served directly, as parents, constitute the Participant Group for this section of the report.

Instructions for Item B1:

a. Count the number of school-aged parents who were enrolled students being served directly through the pilot program (count a student only once, no matter how many times he or she received services from the pilot program). Enter these numbers in the first row of the table for this item (# of students as parents").

b. Out of those students counted in the first row, and using the same local definition as you used in item A7:

(1) Determine how many of them made satisfactory progress during the course of the program. You may count a student who has made such progress only once. Enter the numbers in row 2 of the table for this item.

(2) Determine how many were promoted to the next grade level (or, if 12th graders, graduated) at the end of the 1990-1991 school year. Enter these numbers in row 3 of the table.

(3) Determine how many were placed into the next grade level at the end of the 1990-1991 school year; enter these numbers in row 4 of the table.

(4) Determine how many withdrew from the school or district by the end of the 1990-1991 school year; enter these numbers in row 5 of the table.

(5) Determine how many dropped out by the end of the 1990-1991 school year; enter these numbers in row 6 of the table.

(6) Determine how many were suspended, one or more times for any length of time, during the spring semester of the 1990-1991 school year; enter these numbers in row 7 of the table.

(7) Determine how many were expelled during the spring semester of the 1990-1991 school year; enter these numbers in row 8 of the table.

District and Campus Names

-- --
County/District/Campus Number

PART B. INFORMATION ABOUT ENROLLED STUDENTS WHO WERE PARENTS AND WERE SERVED DIRECTLY, AS PARENTS, BY THE PILOT

B1. Number of school-aged parents who were enrolled students participating in the pilot program, at each grade level, and who met various outcome criteria:

	Participant Group Grade Levels: 07	08	09	10	11	12
Row 1. # of students served as parents						
Row 2. # making satisfactory progress						
Row 3. # Promoted or graduated						
Row 4. # Placed at next grade						
Row 5. # Withdrew						
Row 6. # Dropped out						
Row 7. # Suspended						
Row 8. # Expelled						

Instructions for Item B2:

a. Determine how many Participant Group students (across *all* grade levels) participated in each type of activity shown in the table. *You may count an enrolled student one time in each row, regardless of the number of times he or she engaged in that pilot program activity. If an enrolled student participated in more than one type of activity, you may count the student once in each of the rows representing those types of activities.* Enter the number of enrolled students who participated in each type of pilot program activity in the column adjacent to the description.

b. If the pilot program implemented in the district allowed for a specific type of parent involvement/parent education activity NOT already listed in the table, you may identify that activity or type of involvement in Row 7 of the table for this item and enter the number of enrolled students who participated in that activity in the adjacent column.

District and Campus Names

-- --
County/District/Campus Number

B2. Number of enrolled students who were involved, as school-aged parents, in each of the following types of pilot program activities:

Types of Involvement	# Enrolled Students Involved as Parents
Row 1. Counseling	
Row 2. Social work	
Row 3. Training in parenting, child development, etc.	
Row 4. Guided/structured activities with their dependent children at school, home, or in community	
Row 5. Member of school task force or committees	
Row 6. Other (specify:_____)	

Instructions for Item B3:

a. Determine how many school-aged parents who were enrolled students (across *all* grade levels targeted by the pilot program) took home each type of material shown in the table. *You may count a student one time in each row. If a student used more than one type of material through the pilot program, he or she may be counted once in each of the rows representing those types of materials.* Enter the number of school-aged parents, who were enrolled students and who used each type of take-home material, in the column adjacent to the description of the materials.

b. If the pilot program implemented in the district provided for a specific type of take-home material NOT already listed in the table, you may identify that type of take-home material in the last row of the table for this item. Enter the number of school-aged parents who, while they were enrolled students, borrowed the materials in the adjacent column.

c. Determine the number of times that books (row 1), manipulatives and kits (row 2), and video/audiotapes (row 3) were checked out for use with dependent children of enrolled students, and enter those counts in the right-most column of the table for this item.

Instructions for Item B4:

a. Count the number of enrolled students who participated as parents in the parent involvement/parent education pilot program at one time, but have not continued their participation for any reason. Enter this number in the box provided.

District and Campus Names

-- --
County/District/Campus Number

B3. Nonduplicated counts of school-aged parents who were enrolled students and who used take-home materials, and estimates of how often each type of material was used per week:

Type of Take-Home Material	# School-Aged Parents Who Checked Out the Material	# Times Checked Out
Books		
Manipulatives, instructional kits		
Video/audio tapes		
Computers, computer software		
Handouts, worksheets		
Other equipment such as infant car seats, VCRs, etc.		
Other materials-- specify:_____		

B4. Nonduplicated count of school-aged parents who were enrolled students, and who left the program (stopped their involvement) for any reason:

B4 [ ]

Instructions for Item B5:

a. Using the criteria for participation in the pilot program this year, and needs assessment information available to the district, ESTIMATE the number of school-aged parents who were enrolled students, district-wide, who were eligible for participation in the pilot (regardless of whether or not they actually participated). Enter the number in the box provided.

b. Using a procedure parallel to that for step a., ESTIMATE the number of school-aged parents who were enrolled students, in the attendance zone for this *campus*; enter the number in the box provided.

c. Transfer the sum of Row 1, item B1, to the box provided to show the number of enrolled, school-aged parents who were served during 1990-1991 through the pilot program.

d. Out of the estimated number of all enrolled, school-aged parents who were NOT served in any way by the pilot program this year, indicate how many were not served for each of the reasons shown in this table.

District and Campus Names

-- --
County/District/Campus Number

B5. Disparity between numbers served and numbers eligible:

a. Best estimate of number of school-aged parents, who were enrolled students in the *district* and met current eligibility criteria for the pilot program: B5-a

b. (Best estimate) Number of students within the attendance boundary of this *campus*, who were school-aged parents: B5-b

c. Total number of students who were school-aged parents and actually served through the pilot in 1990-1991 *(this should be the sum of the numbers shown in row 1 of item B1)*: B5-c

d. Number of students who were school-aged parents but were NOT served, by primary reason (the sum of these numbers CANNOT exceed the number entered in B5-a):

Reason for Not Serving	Number of Student-Parents Who Were Not Served
Pilot didn't have resources	
Students were in contrast group	
Students declined services	
Other (specify:_____)	

Instructions for Item B6:

a. Enter the total number of hours of special training that was provided to Participant Group students, during the 1990-1991 school year only, in the box labeled B6-a (round to the nearest whole hour). For this section of the report, "special training" consists solely of training sessions provided to the student-parents that were outside the scope of services to which they were legally entitled by virtue of being enrolled public school students (for instance, parenting sessions held on Saturday mornings or family living classes provided in addition to the regular curriculum).

b. Record the total number of Participant Group students, who received special training, in the box provided.

c. Record the *typical* number of Participant Group students in attendance at each special training session, in the box provided (an average is appropriate but not required).

District and Campus Names

-- --
County/District/Campus Number

B6. Information about special training (beyond regular school curriculum and/or hours) provided to enrolled, school-aged student-parents through the pilot program during the 1990-1991 school year:

a. Total number of hours of special training provided to Participant Group students: B6-a

b. Total number of Participant Group students who received special training through the pilot program: B6-b

c. *Typical* number of Participant Group students in attendance at any given training session (an average is appropriate but not required): B6-c

A-65

PART C (ITEMS C1 THROUGH C3): INFORMATION ABOUT INFANTS/CHILDREN OF SCHOOL-AGED PARENTS WHO WERE SERVED THROUGH THE PILOT PROGRAM

Students: None. This section of the evaluation is concerned with the dependent infants or children of enrolled, school-aged parents who were served through the parent involvement/parent education pilot programs.

Instructions for Item C1:

a. For each year of birth shown in the table, beginning with 1991 and going back to 1980, count the number of dependent infants or children of enrolled, school-aged parents who were served through the pilot program. Enter the numbers underneath the appropriate years. If, for any given year shown in the table, there were no dependent infants or children served, leave the corresponding space in the next column blank.

b. Sum the numbers that you entered in Step (a), and enter the sum in the space labeled "Total" at the end of the table for item C1.

Instructions for Item C2:

If any of the children counted in item C1 have received child care services by virtue of their enrolled, school-aged parents' participation in the pilot program, they should be counted here. You may count a child only ONE time, regardless of how many times he or she has been given child care services. Enter the count in the box provided.

Instructions for Item C3:

Estimate the average number of hours of child care services that have been provided per week to the children counted in item C2. Enter the number in the box provided.

District and Campus Names

-- --
County/District/Campus Number

PART C. INFORMATION ABOUT INFANTS/CHILDREN OF SCHOOL-AGED PARENTS WHO WERE SERVED THROUGH THE PILOT PROGRAM

C1. By year of birth, the number of infants or children of enrolled, school-aged parents served through the pilot program:

Birth Year:	1991	1990	1989	1988	1987	1986	1985	1984	1983	1982	1981	TOTAL
# children:												

C2. Number of dependent infants and children of enrolled, school-aged parents who have received child care services by virtue of their parents' participation in the pilot program:

C2 [ ]

C3. Estimated average number of hours of child care services provided per week to children counted in item C2, per week, in the box provided:

C3 [ ]

A-67

PART D (ITEMS D1 THROUGH D5): INFORMATION ABOUT THE SIGNIFICANT ADULTS INVOLVED WITH THE PILOT PROGRAM

Students: None. Report all information about significant adults of enrolled students, who participated in the pilot program, in this section. Do NOT include any enrolled students who were parents in this section; all data pertaining to them should have been reported in Part B of this evaluation form.

Instructions for Item D1:

a. Count the number of *male* significant adults of enrolled students who participated in any way in the pilot program. You may count each person once, regardless of how many times or ways they participated in pilot program activities. Enter the number in the box provided.

b. Count the number of *female* significant adults of enrolled students who participated in any way in the pilot program. You may count each person once, regardless of how many times or ways they participated in pilot program activities. Enter the number in the box provided.

Instructions for Item D2:

Using the following suggested criteria, estimate the numbers of *male* and *female* significant adults who were rarely, moderately, or frequently involved in pilot program activities. (NOTE: *Your estimates for each row should add to the numbers reported in D1-a and D1-b.*)

Rare: Participated in less than 20 percent of activities scheduled for significant adults during the course of the program.

Moderate: Participated in roughly 20 to 60 percent of activities scheduled for significant adults during the course of the program.

Frequent: Participated in better than 60 percent of the activities scheduled for significant adults during the course of the program.

Enter the numbers in the table for this item.

District and Campus Names

-- --
County/District/Campus Number

PART D. INFORMATION ABOUT THE SIGNIFICANT ADULTS INVOLVED WITH THE PILOT PROGRAM

D1. Number of male and female significant adults who participated in the pilot program:

D1-a. Males: [ ]

D1-b. Females: [ ]

D2. Estimated percentages of male and female significant adults who were rarely, moderately or frequently involved in pilot program activities (EACH ROW SHOULD SUM TO THE NUMBERS REPORTED IN D1-A AND D1-B):

	Level of Involvement		
	Rare	Moderate	Frequent
No. of Males			
No. of Females			

Instructions for Item D3:

a. Enter the total number of hours of special training that was provided to Participant Group significant adults, during the 1990-1991 school year only, in the box labeled D3-a (round to the nearest whole hour). For this section of the report, "special training" consists solely of training sessions provided to significant adults, who were not enrolled students, that were outside the scope of services normally provided by the district to parents and/or legal guardians (for instance, parenting sessions held on Saturday mornings or family living classes provided in the evenings or on weekdays).

b. Record the total number of significant adults, who received special training, in the box provided.

c. Record the *typical* number of significant adults in attendance at each special training session, in the box provided (an average is appropriate but not required).

District and Campus Names

-- --
County/District/Campus Number

D3. Information about special training (beyond regular school curriculum and/or hours) provided to significant adults through the pilot program during the 1990-1991 school year:

a. Total number of hours of special training provided to significant adults: D3-a

b. Total number of significant adults who received special training through the pilot program: D3-b

c. *Typical* number of significant adults in attendance at any given training session (an average is appropriate but not required): D3-c

A-71

Instructions for Item D4:

a. Determine how many significant adults of enrolled students were participants in each type of involvement shown in the table. *You may count a significant adult who participated in pilot program activities one time in each row. If a significant adult participated in more than one type of activity through the pilot program, you may count the adult once in each of the rows representing those types of involvement.* Enter the number of significant adults who participated in each type of pilot program activity in the column adjacent to the description.

b. If the pilot program implemented in the district allowed for a specific type of parent involvement/parent education activity NOT already listed in the table, you may identify that activity or type of involvement in Row 11 of the table for this item and enter the number of enrolled students who participated in that activity in the adjacent column.

Instructions for Item D5:

In the box provided, enter the number of significant adults who left the program (stopped their involvement in the program) for any reason.

District and Campus Names

-- --
County/District/Campus Number

D4. Number of significant adults who were involved in each of the following types of pilot program activities:

Types of Involvement	# Significant Adults
Row 1. Notification of eligibility	
Row 2. Attendance at open house	
Row 3. Conferences with teachers, instructional staff, principal	
Row 4. Check out/borrowing of school materials	
Row 5. Counseling (beyond what would normally be available to any parent in the district)	
Row 6. Social work/case management services (provided by or through the pilot program)	
Row 7. Training in parenting/child development	
Row 9. Guided/structured activities with students/children	
Row 10. Member of school task force or committees	
Row 11. Other (specify:_____)	

D5. Number of significant adults who left the program (stopped their involvement in the program) for any reason:

D5 [ ]

PART E. STAFF INVOLVED IN THE PILOT PROGRAM (ITEMS E1 THROUGH E3)

Staff: This section is concerned with teachers and staff who worked directly with the pilot project, such as parent educators, teachers who taught classes exclusively for pilot project participants, and those with portions of their work time dedicated strictly to pilot project activities.

Instructions for Item E1:

a. Enter the number of certified professional teachers, who worked directly with the pilot project (regardless of the funding source for their salaries), in the box provided.

b. Compute the average number of years of teaching experience held by those certified professional teachers who worked directly with the pilot project (round to one decimal place); enter the number in the box provided.

c. Indicate the least number of years of teaching experience held by any one certified professional teacher who worked directly with the pilot project; enter the number (to one decimal place) in the box provided.

d. Indicate the most number of years of teaching experience held by any one certified professional teacher who worked directly with the pilot project; enter the number (to one decimal place) in the box provided.

A-74

Instructions for Item E2:

a. Record the total number of volunteers, who contributed in any way to the pilot project, in the box provided.

b. Record your best ESTIMATE of the total number of hours (rounded to the nearest whole hour) contributed to the pilot project by the volunteers counted in step a.; enter the time in the box provided.

112

District and Campus Names

-- --
County/District/Campus Number

PART E. STAFF INVOLVED IN THE PILOT PROGRAM

E1. Description of experience of certified professional teachers working directly with the pilot project, regardless of the funding source for their salaries:

a. Number of certified professional teachers who worked directly with the pilot project: E1-a

b. Average number of years of teaching experience (to one decimal place) held by certified professional teachers who worked directly with the pilot project: E1-b

c. The least number of years of teaching experience (to one decimal place) held by any one certified professional teacher who worked directly with the pilot project (do NOT list the name of the individual): E1-c

d. The most number of years of teaching experience (to one decimal place) held by any one certified professional teacher who worked directly with the pilot project (do NOT list the name of the individual): E1-d

E2. Number of volunteers involved in or contributing to the pilot project in any way, and approximate total number of hours contributed by them:

a. Total number of volunteers, who contributed in any way to the pilot project: E2-a

b. Best ESTIMATE of the total number of hours (rounded to the nearest whole hour) contributed to the pilot project by the volunteers: E2-b

Instructions for Item E3:

a. Record the total number of hours of staff development, provided during the 1990-1991 school year to staff working directly with the pilot project, in the box provided.

b. Record the total number of staff, who received the staff development/training included in step a., in the box provided. Count each person only one time, no matter how many hours of staff development he/she received.

c. Indicate what percentage of the staff development hours, from step a., counted for Advanced Academic Training (AAT) credits; enter the percentage in the box provided.

District and Campus Names

-- --
County/District/Campus Number

E3. In-service education/staff development provided to pilot program staff during the 1990-1991 school year:

a. Total number of hours of staff development, provided to staff working directly with the pilot project (rounded to the nearest whole hour): E3-a

b. Total number of staff who received the staff development/training: E3-b

c. The percentage of all staff development hours that counted for Advanced Academic Training (AAT) credits: E3-c

A-7

PART F (ITEM F1): OTHER AGENCIES AND ORGANIZATIONS INVOLVED IN PILOT PROGRAM

Instructions for Item F1:

a. If there were more than 15 other agencies or organizations involved in your pilot program, you may duplicate this table to accommodate your reporting needs.

b. In the first column of the table, list the name of each agency or organization (e.g., university, business, community agency, PTA/PTO, and so on) that was involved in any way in the pilot program.

c. In the second column of the table, list the *approximate* total number of hours of involvement of that agency in the pilot program (round to the nearest whole hour). For some organizations or types of involvement, time may be irrelevant (for instance, donations of equipment); in those cases, enter "N/A" in column two.

d. Using the following list, identify the types of contact that were representative of the interaction between the other agency/organization and the pilot program. Place a check mark in the appropriate coding space(s) for each organization or agency included in the table.

01 - medical/clinic services
02 - child care services
03 - transportation services
04 - counseling services
05 - case management services (e.g., Child Protective Services)
06 - donations of equipment
07 - cash donations
08 - advisory services
09 - donations of human resources (e.g., labor needed to build project facilities)
10 - testing services
11 - other

District and Campus Names

-- --
County/District/Campus Number

PART F. OTHER AGENCIES AND ORGANIZATIONS INVOLVED IN PILOT PROGRAM

F1. Other agencies and organizations involved in the pilot program:

1. Name of Organization or Agency	2. Approx. Total # Hours	3. Type of Involvement Code (check as apply): 01	02	03	04	05	06	07	08	09	10	11
1.												
2.												
3.												
4.												
5.												
6.												
7.												
8.												
9.												
10.												
11.												
12.												
13.												
14.												
15.												

YOU MAY DUPLICATE THIS TABLE AS NECESSARY.

A-79

PART G. PROGRAM DESCRIPTION

Instructions:

Describe the pilot program *as it was actually implemented* in the district. Be sure to address each of the topics listed in the outline on the next page. Try to limit your response to 1/2 PAGE for each heading in the outline (A., B., and so on), but do not sacrifice necessary information. It is perfectly acceptable to use lists, bullets, and other styles that condense maximum amounts of clear, specific information into a minimum of space. Please use a typeface *no smaller than* 10-point.

If you wish, you may furnish this information in an ASCII file saved on a double-sided, double density floppy diskette, DOS formatted for an IBM-compatible personal computer, with a label displaying your TEA county-district number and the type of pilot being described (e.g., PARENT EDUC). The diskette will be returned to you after the information is loaded onto computers at the Agency.

PART G. PROGRAM DESCRIPTION

G1. Describe the following features of program implementation.

A. Coordination activities: How were each of the following handled?
- Entry/exit criteria applied to pilot programs
- Transition to/from other programs
- Planning within/across programs in district
- Coordination with other agencies/community resources
- Procedures for recruiting participants into pilot

B. Nature of services provided: What did the program "look" like?
- Grouping of parents for service delivery
- Use of linguistically/culturally appropriate materials
- Methods/techniques used to deliver services
- Frequency/nature of feedback given to participants
- Strategies for determining participant needs (MAY include testing)
- Ratio of parents to teachers or case workers, as appropriate
- Follow-up services

C. Progress toward program goals: What has been accomplished so far?
- List each objective from district's proposal, and indicate when each was completed (use "on-going" ONLY for those that are continual in nature)
- Other indicators of pilot program success: measures of change in attitudes, motivation, self-esteem, or other moderating variables associated with success
- Products resulting from pilot: handbooks, media, pamphlets
- Promise of continued funding from local district?

D. Implementation issues: Where were snags? How were they handled?
- Problems related to formal rules, regulations
- Local implementation difficulties
- Modifications made in program design as a result of difficulties
- Issues/problems affecting transportability to other districts
- Recommendations regarding program refinement

E. Additional information about the program that you want to share?

PART H (ITEMS H1 AND H2): ADDITIONAL INFORMATION

H1. Use the attached page, labeled "PEIMS Identification Numbers of Students Whose Significant adults Were Involved," to provide a list of PEIMS student identification numbers for enrolled students whose significant adults participated in the pilot program. You may duplicate the page to accommodate your reporting needs.

H2. Use the attached page, labeled "PEIMS Identification Numbers of Students Served Directly" to provide a separate list of PEIMS student identification numbers for enrolled students who were school-aged parents, and were served directly, as parents, in the parent education/parent involvement pilot program.

Alternative: Provide the ID numbers in an ASCII file on a double-sided, double density diskette that is DOS formatted for use in an IBM-compatible personal computer. Be sure that the diskette is labeled with your TEA county-district number and the letters, "PARENT ED IDS." The file should be structured as follows:

columns 1-9:	the TEA county-district-campus number where the student was enrolled;
column 10:	blank;
columns 11-12:	the code "04";
column 13:	blank;
columns 14-22:	the PEIMS ID number for the student (right justify if necessary);
column 20:	blank;
column 21:	enter a "1" if the student was an enrolled school-aged parent served directly through the pilot; a "2" if the significant adults of the enrolled student were served through the pilot; or, a "3" if both conditions were true for that student.

District and Campus Names

County/District/Campus Numbers

PEIMS Identification Numbers of Students Whose Significant Adults Were Involved:

PEIMS Identification #	PEIMS Identification #
1.	21.
2.	22.
3.	23.
4.	24.
5.	25.
6.	26.
7.	27.
8.	28.
9.	29.
10.	30.
11.	31.
12.	32.
13.	33.
14.	34.
15.	35.
16.	36.
17.	37.
18.	38.
19.	39.
20.	40.

YOU MAY DUPLICATE THIS PAGE
TO REPORT ADDITIONAL PARTICIPANT PEIMS IDENTIFICATION NUMBERS.

District and Campus Names

County/District/Campus Numbers

PEIMS Identification Numbers of Students Served Directly:

PEIMS Identification #	PEIMS Identification #
1.	21.
2.	22.
3.	23.
4.	24.
5.	25.
6.	26.
7.	27.
8.	28.
9.	29.
10.	30.
11.	31.
12.	32.
13.	33.
14.	34.
15.	35.
16.	36.
17.	37.
18.	38.
19.	39.
20.	40.

YOU MAY DUPLICATE THIS PAGE
TO REPORT ADDITIONAL PARTICIPANT PEIMS IDENTIFICATION NUMBERS.

APPENDIX B:
SAMPLE SET OF SITE-SPECIFIC PROJECT DESCRIPTIONS

Cost Survey
Pilot Parent Education and Parent Involvement Program
Fort Worth ISD

Program Description

This program operates during the fall and spring semesters, serving parents whose children attend or will attend school on one of 14 campuses. Three of these elementary campuses are among the district's five poorest neighborhoods.

Instruction

The instructional component of this program is derived from the Parents as Teachers curriculum, adapted for use with a population confronted by situations of risk and checked for cultural sensitivity. Instruction takes place during monthly home visits and group meetings. The instructional component of group meetings is complemented by "make it and take it" workshops and presentations by guest speakers. Meetings convene in various locales, including school campuses, the district's early childhood center, day care centers, and community rooms in housing projects. Meeting times are adapted to parents' needs, so program classes operate before, during, and after school as well as on weekends.

Support Activities

Parent educators from the program offer personal guidance to participating parents on both an individual basis and in groups. These educators also conduct developmental and language assessments of the children of participating parents while district staff provide hearing and vision screens.

The program's parent educators refer parents to appropriate district or community agencies when and as needs arise.

Volunteers provide child care during group meetings and program workshops.

Planning, Training, and Administration

Planning for meeting topics, guest speakers, and workshop activities is accomplished during weekly meetings of the program's parent educators. These educators also plan and present community presentations as part of the program's recruitment effort. Planning activities also include review and adaptation of the Parents as Teachers curriculum.

Parent educators attend district inservice as well as statewide symposia and inservice. Besides being responsible for maintaining a Parent Resource Center and Toy Lending Library, the lead parent educator conducts refresher sessions in screening techniques with the other parent educators during the year.

The lead parent educator assists the district's Early Childhood Education Coordinator in program administration, completes program reports, supervises program volunteers, and maintains communications with the program's advisory committee and community agencies.

Pilot Parent Education and Parent Involvement Program
Harlingen ISD

Program Description

Instruction

The instructional activities of this program take place on school campuses, in community settings, and in the homes of program participants. These settings include three elementary schools.

A parenting curriculum, derived from the Practical Parenting Education program of TASB, is delivered on each of three school campuses by district parent education staff with program parents and parent educators in attendance. Sessions of an hour's duration are held weekly during a six week period each school year.

Parenting Centers established on each of the three campuses offer program participants opportunities to develop both a sense of ownership of and competence in school activities. Such activities include preparing manipulatives and other materials to be used in the classroom during a science unit, constructing crafts whose sale at a school fair generates funds for school activities, and providing clerical assistance in the school office.

During home visits conducted approximately every other week throughout the year, parent educators from the pilot program follow up topics initiated at the parent education classes and activities begun at the campus Parenting Centers.

Program participants can attend GED preparation classes that meet three nights per week. These classes are taught by district staff and meet in both district and community facilities.

Various instructional activities take place at the housing projects where program families reside. Seminars on topics of interest to parents are offered approximately every two weeks throughout the year. These seminars feature presentations by service providers and other professionals on issues such as nutrition, health care, and self-improvement.

The program's parent educators also teach ESL classes at the housing projects. These classes meet in day and evening sessions three times each week throughout the year.

During summer months, high school students provide tutoring to program parents.

The program designates certain parents as "block captains" whose task it is to inform other parents of the program's activities, including instruction. Approximately one captain is selected for every ten families, with selection based largely upon the geographic location of program families within the housing projects.

The program's instructional activities are coordinated with the district's annual parent involvement conference.

Support Services

Informal counseling occurs during home visits while peer support and counseling is available during parenting education sessions and at the Parenting Centers. The program does not engage the services of professional counselors.

Family service, education, and employment needs are assessed during the program's initial home visit and reviewed during subsequent visits throughout the year. Parent educators assist parents in accessing services and model for parents effective techniques for dealing with service providers and educators. Presentations by service providers during topical seminars complement the program's service coordination efforts.

Volunteer parents, PTA members, and students provide supervised child care while parents attend parenting and ESL classes.

The program contracts with the district to provide transportation for parents attending school-based activities such as GED classes, open houses, and PTA conferences. The program also transports parents to service providers on an as needed basis.

Local support for the program includes donations by the Junior Service League to cover the costs of GED testing and a donation from the non-profit Harlingen Education Foundation to the district parent involvement conference.

Planning, Training, and Administration

The program coordinator meets weekly with parent educators to review program objectives, evaluate program implementation, and make necessary adjustments to the program.

The program modified the Practical Parenting Education curriculum prior to applying it in parenting education classes. This modification is ongoing and involves regular meetings between program administrators and parent educators.

Parent educators attend TASB training for delivering the Practical Parent Education curriculum. These staff also attend conferences and workshops on topics relevant to parent education and parent involvement. The program coordinator trains the parent educators in topics relevant to parent education and involvement.

The program coordinator collects information required by the TEA for program evaluation purposes and deals with program relevant issues within the district administration.

Pilot Parent Education and Parent Involvement Program
Houston ISD

Program Description

This program serves three campuses and operates during the fall and spring semesters. Most program activities take place during school hours with one Saturday field trip per campus during the year.

Instruction

The program's instructional component includes monthly parent workshops and field trips for parents and students. The workshops are of two hours duration and meet in the school's cafeteria. The initial workshop is an orientation session to introduce parents to the school's culture and practices. Subsequent workshops include presentations by speakers from community agencies. Topics covered during workshops include those relevant to child rearing (e.g., study skills, discipline, health tips, emotional development, peer pressure) as well as those of more general interest to adults (e.g., sewing, cake decoration). An agenda distrib .ed at each workshop contains contact information for the presentation (e.g., health care agenda contains telephone numbers and addresses of local community health clinics). As with the program's newsletter and flyers, all printed material distributed at workshops is provided in English and Spanish. Each campus also maintains a parent resource center stocked with materials, manipulatives, books, and activity sheets that complement the topical workshops.

The program's field trips include visits to museums (e.g., Fine Arts, Science) as well as an end-of-year boat trip for families and school staff.

Support Activities

Parents travel on their own to school-based activities. The program contracts with the district for field trip transportation.

Planning, Training, and Administration

Program planning begins with an interest survey of parents to identify topics for presentation in program workshops. Program staff then plan the year's workshops and field trips. The plan is reviewed and coordinated with each school principal before implementation.

The program produces a monthly newsletter containing a calendar of coming events as well as contributions from school staff (e.g., counselors). The newsletter is distributed through student take home, as are flyers reminding parents of upcoming workshops.

Staff training goes on throughout the year in workshops sponsored by the district and the regional service center and in monthly meetings of the mental health association. Program staff also make workshop presentations.

The program director is responsible for the program's budget and correspondence with the TEA. Program staff are responsible for the completion of reports required by the agency. A secretary provides assistance on program-related tasks.

Pilot Parent Education and Parent Involvement Program
Morton ISD

Program Description

Instruction

This program is based at the "Parents Plus" center, a three-room structure some distance from the district's elementary campus. The center operates during the fall and spring semesters and is staffed by a coordinator-teacher and an assistant.

The program's instructional activities are based on the Parents as Teachers (PAT) curriculum. Since the PAT curriculum is designed for the 0-3 age group, the program uses portions of the "Building Bridges" curriculum to provide supplemental activities for older preschoolers.

Instructional activities take place during home visits, group meetings at the center, and meetings held at the high school campus for student parents. Home visits are conducted weekly, group meetings for parents and children occur daily during morning and afternoon sessions at the center, and meetings for student parents take place twice weekly during the homeroom period.

While structured parent-child activities are the heart of the program's instructional component, a variety of other activities complement this instruction. The program conducts physical, perceptual, and language screenings, offers informal English-as-a-Second-Language classes for parents and children, utilizes computer programs to reinforce language development and foster cooperative parent-child interaction, and invites speakers to address parents on topics such as nutrition and child safety. The program also operates a Toy Lending Library and Resource Center from which participants may borrow toys, video and audio tapes and equipment, books, and infant car seats.

Support Activities

Although counseling on issues in parenting and child development is implicit in many of the program's instructional activities, the program does not include a formal counseling component.

The program does not offer a case management component but does include in its Resource Center informative material on support services for families with young children.

Child care is provided during parent meetings.

Limited transport between to and from the center is provided on an as needed basis by program staff who use their private vehicles.

Planning, Training, and Administration

The coordinator-teacher prepares a monthly schedule of parent-child activities to be conducted during home visits and meetings at the Parents Plus center. This preparation includes the construction of manipulatives and the development of instructional materials in English and Spanish.

The program also prepares and circulates a monthly newsletter and calendar of events to notify participants and potential participants of activities and services of the program. Radio spots concerning the program are prepared for broadcast on the local radio station while bulletins concerning special activities and meetings are placed in local businesses and the weekly local newspaper.

Support, advice, referrals, and ideas for program activities are provided by a Community Advisory Board. This board meets twice yearly and is made up of business, parent, district, and community representatives. Additional planning guidance comes from the county extension home economist, surveys of parents, and school personnel.

PAT certification of the coordinator-teacher requires initial training at the national or state center followed by approved inservice training for yearly recertification. In addition, the district administrator supervising the pilot program attends an overview of PAT program goals and curriculum. Program staff attend regional and state conferences and workshops on topics such as teen parenting and working with three-year-olds.

The primary administrative duties for the program rest with the district's administrative assistant who supervises the pilot program. These duties include interviewing and hiring staff, record keeping for fiscal and evaluation purposes, reporting on the program to district trustees and the TEA, organizing Advisory Board meetings, and responding to other schools' enquiries about the program.

Pilot Parent Education and Parent Involvement Program
Ysleta ISD

Program Description

This program operates during the fall and spring semesters, serving parents whose children attend or will attend a neighborhood elementary school. Many of the program's activities take place at the housing project where the majority of the program's parents live.

Instruction

This program's instructional activities include parent workshops and after school tutoring at the housing project site, field trips for parent and children, "staff development" presentations by school faculty in which parents are encouraged to become involved in school activities, a parents' conference in the summer, and parents' attendance at district and regional conferences.

Support Activities

Child care is provided at the housing project site during program meetings and field trips. Children receiving care include toddlers, preschoolers, and enrolled students. (Some enrolled students receive tutoring during parents' meetings and/or field trips.)

Parents assemble at the housing project site to be transported by bus to off-site program activities.

Planning, Training, and Administration

Planning for parents' meetings, field trips, and related activities is the responsibility of the program director.

The program director trains child care aides on an as needed basis while tutors used by the program receive training through a district-wide program.

The program director administers the program in conjunction with district and campus administrators.