A REMEDIAL READING INSTRUCTION PROJECT TO IMPROVE THE SKILLS OF HIGH SCHOOL DROPOUTS IS EVALUATED. CENTERS WERE ESTABLISHED AT THREE SITES TO SERVE 750 DROPOUTS REFERRED BY VARIOUS COMMUNITY AGENCIES. THE PROJECT WAS STAFFED BY SIX REMEDIAL READING TEACHERS, SEVEN COMMUNITY AIDES, AND ONE LIAISON WORKER. INDIVIDUALIZED INSTRUCTION USING A VARIETY OF TEACHING MEDIA AND MATERIALS WAS OFFERED. THE EVALUATION IS BASED ON A SAMPLE OF 75 STUDENTS RANGING IN AGE FROM 13 TO 22 YEARS AND ENROLLED IN THE PROJECT FOR AN AVERAGE OF ABOUT 60 DAYS. DATA WERE OBTAINED FROM THE GATES READING SURVEY, TWO STAFF QUESTIONNAIRES, TWO RATING SCALES, AND SOME CASE STUDIES. RESULTS SHOW THAT THE SAMPLE STUDENTS WHO PARTICIPATED REGULARLY MADE SIGNIFICANT GAINS IN READING ABILITY. HOWEVER, HIGH STUDENT TURNOVER RATES AND IRREGULAR ATTENDANCE WERE TYPICAL AMONG ALL THE PARTICIPANTS. THE GREATEST BENEFITS WERE IMPROVEMENT IN READING AND STUDENT ATTITUDES. THE FEATURES OF THE PROGRAM WHICH NEED IMPROVEMENT ARE THE INSTRUCTIONAL MATERIALS AND SUPPLIES, THE AVAILABLE TIME FOR TEACHING, STUDENT RECRUITMENT AND SELECTION PROCEDURES, MOTIVATION TECHNIQUES, AND POSSIBLE PROJECT EXPANSION. TEACHERS JUDGED THAT ABOUT ONE-FOURTH OF THE STUDENTS SHOWED MARKED IMPROVEMENT IN BASIC SKILLS, AND STUDENTS RATED THE PROGRAM POSITIVELY. (NH)
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INTRODUCTION

The purpose of the BOA Remedial Instruction Project for High School Dropouts in the Oakland Public Schools was to improve the reading skills of high school dropouts who were deficient in those skills to a level which would enhance their opportunities for further education or steady employment. Another purpose was to actively seek and encourage dropouts to enroll in the program. It was planned that the project could serve 750 students.

The project operated under the direction of Dr. Lawrence Kelly, Principal of Dewey High School. Teachers with special training in the area of remedial reading provided the instruction. Aides were employed to assist the teachers with clerical duties, production of materials, and other tasks designated by the teachers. Teaching was individualized and instructional materials as well as instructional media devices were furnished by the Oakland Public Schools.

Students were enrolled almost exclusively as a result of referrals by various community agencies. They were non-high school graduates and, to a large extent, were students who had been exempted, excluded, or expelled from high school.

The project included a provision for motivational counseling by two youth counselors funded by the project and operating through the Urban League of Oakland.

Initial plans provided that two of the three remedial centers would be housed in Youth Opportunity Centers operated by the Youth Employment Service and that the third center would be housed at Dewey High School. Housing at the Youth Opportunity Centers was not possible during the school year 1965-66, and as a result, the centers obtained accommodations in churches. Those accommodations proved to be less than satisfactory largely because of the lack of adequate heating, and therefore, the centers had to move several times during the year.

In 1966-67, accommodations were opened at Youth Opportunity Centers. Early in January, 1967, a program change occurred resulting in an arrangement whereby the remedial centers cooperated with the Thurgood Marshall School and the John F. Kennedy School in providing remedial reading instruction to students enrolled in those schools. Instructional supplies and materials were also shared.

As with other compensatory education programs, a number of factors emerged as obstacles to the measurement of student progress. Irregular student attendance and a high rate of student turnover were characteristic of the program.

PROCEDURE

Program Description

Remedial reading centers were located at three sites, the East Oakland Reading Center, located at the East Oakland Youth Opportunity Center, 4801 East 14th Street; the West Oakland Reading Center, located at the Youth Opportunity Center, 1905
Adeline Streets and a third reading center, known as the "Mobile Unit", which consisted of traveling teachers.

The West Oakland Reading Center provided remedial reading and basic education for the City Neighborhood Youth Corps program, dropouts in the West and North Oakland areas, and students referred from the Thurgood Marshall School program which was also housed at the West Oakland Youth Opportunity Center.

The East Oakland Center opened in December, 1966. High school dropouts from East Oakland, the Spanish-speaking community, and students referred from the John F. Kennedy School, located at the East Oakland Branch Y.M.C.A., were served at this center.

The mobile unit provided remedial reading and basic education at job sites for students employed under auspices of the Neighborhood Youth Corps program with the Department of Streets and the Department of Parks.

The staff consisted of six trained remedial reading teachers, seven community aides, and one liaison representative.

**Instructional Techniques and Materials**

Instruction was highly individualized, and a combination of the auditory, visual, and kinesthetic teaching methods was used with no one method prevailing, generally, except the kinesthetic method which seemed to be more effective with the lower-achieving students.

Continued inservice training in the proper use of equipment and materials was provided for the community aides. Equipment and supplies were shared with the Thurgood Marshall School in the West Oakland Center and the John F. Kennedy School in East Oakland.

The instructional media which were used included (EDL) controlled readers, tachistoscopes, record players, tape recorders, filmstrips, and overhead projectors.

**EVALUATION DESIGN**

**Subjects**

To obtain an assessment of the effectiveness of the program, a sample of 76 students was selected. This sample consisted of all of those students who had attended instruction for ten hours or more and for whom complete test data were available. The sample included 22 girls and 54 boys. They ranged in age from 13 to 22 years with an average age of 16.46 years. The number of years of school completed by these students ranged from 6 to 12 with an average of 9.67 years. Records indicated that they had been enrolled in the program for periods ranging from 10 to 155 days, for an average of 59.75 days. Attendance records indicated that absences ranged from 0 to 59 days with an average of 16.47 days absent during the period of their enrollment. In basic reading skills these students fell largely into the upper elementary school grade levels, but the total range extended from the beginning of the second grade to the twelfth grade.

**Evaluation Instruments**

**Gates Reading Survey:** The Gates Reading Survey, Form 3, was administered to all students upon enrollment. The results obtained became the pre-test data used for this study. Form 1 of the same survey was administered as a post-test to the sample in early May.
The Gates Reading Survey consists of three tests—speed and accuracy, reading vocabulary, and level of comprehension. Separate grade scores were obtained for each test plus an average grade score for the entire survey. Scores were expressed in grade equivalents.

Questionnaires: Two forms of questionnaires were designed to obtain the reactions of those persons closely associated with the project.

One form was completed by the project teachers. That form sought to obtain certain statistical and operational information, an overall rating of the project, the teachers' opinions as to what benefits the students derived from the project, and suggestions for program improvement. The form, with totals of responses and percentages, is included as Appendix A.

The second form was submitted to staff members of the John F. Kennedy School and the Thurgood Marshall School and sought to obtain an overall rating of the project. It also sought their opinions as to benefits from the project, the weaknesses of the project, and suggestions for improvement. That form, with totals and percentages is included as Appendix B.

Rating Scales: Two rating scales were designed. A teachers' rating scale sought to obtain teachers' ratings in terms of the effect the program had upon student achievement in reading skills and also upon selected student attitudes. That scale, with totals of responses and percentages, is included as Appendix C. In addition, a student rating scale was designed to obtain the ratings of students as to improvement in reading skills and in self-confidence. The student rating scale, with totals of responses and percentages, is included as Appendix D.

Case Studies: Case studies of students considered to be representative of the enrollees in the program are included as Appendices E, F, G, H, I, and J.

FINDINGS

Gates Reading Test Survey

Means, standard deviations, and ranges of scores on the three tests and the average of the three tests are presented in Table A.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Speed &amp; Accuracy</th>
<th>Vocabulary</th>
<th>Comprehension</th>
<th>Average Score</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Pre-</td>
<td>Post-</td>
<td>Pre-</td>
<td>Post-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M</td>
<td>6.10</td>
<td>7.13</td>
<td>5.47</td>
<td>6.10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S.D.</td>
<td>2.26</td>
<td>2.64</td>
<td>2.20</td>
<td>2.43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Range</td>
<td>2.0-12.0</td>
<td>2.4-12.7</td>
<td>2.0-12.8</td>
<td>2.0-13.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>76</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Test results indicate a gain of over one year in speed and accuracy and gains of approximately .63 and .33 years in vocabulary and comprehension, respectively. The average total score gain for this group of students is shown to be .66 of one year.

Table B indicates that the gains in the subtests and the average gain reached the .01 statistical level of significance.

**TABLE B**

Mean Gains, Standard Deviations, And Critical Ratios for Gates Reading Survey

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Speed &amp; Accuracy</th>
<th>Vocabulary</th>
<th>Comprehension</th>
<th>Average Score</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Mean Gain</strong></td>
<td>1.03</td>
<td>.63</td>
<td>.33</td>
<td>.66</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>S.D.</strong></td>
<td>1.02</td>
<td>1.46</td>
<td>.97</td>
<td>2.15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Critical Ratio</strong></td>
<td>3.78 *</td>
<td>3.33 *</td>
<td>3.41 *</td>
<td>4.64 *</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Significant beyond the .01 level.

Enrollment and Attendance

Enrollment: Records showed that the total number of students served by the project reached 968 by April 30, 1967. That number of students were interviewed and pretests were administered to them. A sampling of records indicated that approximately 15% did not return for enrollment. In addition, some failed to return after attending one or two classes, and many did not remain for the full 10 hours of instruction which was established as a minimum attendance requirement before post-tests would be administered.

This study, like many other studies of local compensatory projects, again demonstrated the high degree of mobility prevalent within the population receiving these specialized services.

Table C. presents enrollment data for the students in the sample.

**TABLE C**

Numbers of Students and Number of Days They Were Enrolled in The Remedial Instruction Program

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Days Enrolled</th>
<th>No. of Students</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>151-160</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>141-150</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>131-140</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>121-130</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>111-120</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>101-110</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>91-100</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>81-90</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>71-80</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>61-70</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>51-60</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41-50</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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TABLE C (Cont.)

Numbers of Students and Number of Days They Were Enrolled in
The Remedial Instruction Program

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Days Enrolled</th>
<th>No. of Students</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>31-40</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21-30</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11-20</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

$M = 59.75$ days

Table D presents information as to the number of hours of instruction received by the students in the sample.

TABLE D

Number of Students and Number of Hours
Of Remedial Instruction Received

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Number of Hours of Instruction Received</th>
<th>No. of Students</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>151-160</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>141-150</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>131-140</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>121-130</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>111-120</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>101-110</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>91-100</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>81-90</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>71-80</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>61-70</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>51-60</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41-50</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31-40</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21-30</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11-20</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1-10</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

$M = 32.27$

An examination of the average number of hours of instruction received indicates that students in the sample received instruction, on the average, amounting to 18.1% of a regular school year.

A comparison of the average period of enrollment (33.6% of a year) with the average gain (.66 of a year) indicates that the students in the sample gained nearly two times the normal expectancy, for students having average ability. A further comparison of this achievement with average attendance of approximately 73% as reflected by Table E which follows, would indicate that the gains made by these students were much beyond normal expectations.

Attendance: Table E, reflects the amount of absenteeism among the students in the sample.
TABLE E
Number of Students and Number of Days Of Absence from Remedial Instruction

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No. of Days Absent</th>
<th>No. of Students</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>56-60</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>51-55</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>46-50</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41-45</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36-40</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31-35</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26-30</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21-25</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16-20</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11-15</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6-10</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0-5</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

M = 16.47

76

A comparison of the average period of enrollment (59.75 days) with the average days of absence (16.47 days) indicates that students, on the average, were absent approximately 27% of the time.

Sources of Student Referral: Records were examined for the purpose of determining the source of referrals for the sample. The results are presented in Table F.

TABLE F
Sources of Referral of 76 Students in the Sample Used in This Study

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Referring Agency</th>
<th>No. of Students</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Oakland Public Schools</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neighborhood Youth Corps</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Locally recruited (by the Remedial Centers)</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>John F. Kennedy School</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>California Youth Authority</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Total 76

It appears from Table F. that the greatest number of referrals were from agencies of the Oakland Public Schools (39.47%). Additional referrals were from the Neighborhood Youth Corps (25.00%), locally recruited by the Remedial Centers (23.68%), John F. Kennedy School (10.53%), and California Youth Authority (1.32%).

Questionnaire Results

Teachers' Questionnaire: For detailed results, the reader is referred to Appendix A. Five of six project teachers rated the program "good" while one rated the program "fair". They also reported that a total of 373 students had received remedial help during the school year, and that, on the average, each one of the teachers had provided approximately 1,200 hours of instruction. Approximately 200 hours
of counseling, tutoring, testing, and allied services were provided by the teachers. They also reported a total of 208 visits to students' homes.

The teachers also indicated that a large measure of the effectiveness of the program might be attributed to the fact that it was possible to teach the students on an individual basis or in very small groups. An analysis of the responses to a question which attempted to identify the most effective instructional media device revealed that no single device emerged as the most effective. The teachers indicated that they found no single device, book, or method to be the most effective for every student—that devices, books, and methods need to be tailored to the needs of the individual student.

The teachers also indicated that the gains students made in reading and in improved attitudes resulted from working on a basis of one teacher to one student and that those gains were the most significant benefits from the project. They reported that they had observed gains in reading skills, in self-confidence, and in attitudes toward school.

A number of program improvements were also suggested by the teachers. The most frequently mentioned were (1) the need for more materials of greater variety, (2) the need to develop techniques for improving student motivation for learning, (3) the need for more time per student, and (4) the need to expand the program to include other school subjects besides reading.

Questionnaire to Staff Members of the John F. Kennedy School and the Thurgood Marshall School: For detailed results, the reader is referred to Appendix B.

Three of the seven respondents rated the program as "good"; two indicated a rating of "very good"; and single ratings of "excellent" and "fair" were noted.

In response to a question regarding the three most significant benefits from the program, the following were mentioned most frequently:

1. Improvement in reading skills.
2. Improvement in attitudes
3. Improvement in motivation

Responding to a question as to the three most significant weaknesses of the program, the following were mentioned most frequently:

1. Recruiting practices
2. Time allotment
3. Lack of attendance
4. Insufficient supplies and materials
5. Student selection criteria

Rating Scales

Teachers' Rating Scale: For detailed results, the reader is referred to Appendix C. Scales in which teachers rated the effects the program had upon individual students were completed by teachers on 137 students. Teachers' opinions indicated that "marked improvement" was made by a small number of students and that "moderate improvement" was made by approximately one fourth of the students in oral reading.
skills, word attack skills, word recognition, and word meanings. The balance of the teacher ratings indicated that students made "little improvement", that there was "no change", or that there was insufficient information to rate student progress.

Student Rating Scale: For detailed results, the reader is referred to Appendix D. Fifty-three students completed a rating scale which was designed to obtain the ratings of students as to the improvements they felt they had made in reading and in self-confidence. Nearly one half of the students indicated that they were "much better" in all reading skills, and more than one half of the students indicated that their feeling toward school was "much better" as a result of the program.

Administrator Interviews

Project administrators were interviewed, and they provided the following information:

A. It was planned that the project would be funded during the Summer of 1965, to allow time for planning. Instead, the project was not funded until October, 1965, so that the employment of teachers was delayed until a month after school began. This delay affected the program throughout the first year of its operation.

B. The original project was written as a cooperative venture with the Department of Employment which was to provide space in Youth Opportunity Centers for the remedial program. The Youth Opportunity Centers did not open during the first year so that quarters had to be found in churches. The difficulties involved in moving in and out of these temporary, usually inadequate quarters, hindered the program's effectiveness. The West Oakland Youth Opportunity Center was available for the remedial program in the Fall of 1966, while the East Oakland Center did not open until December of 1966.

C. Supplies, because of funding practices, were available in sufficient quantities at times, but resupply was difficult which caused a periodic lack of supplies. It was not possible to furnish all the books and workbooks requested by the teachers, and while there were sufficient numbers of books and workbooks for the Centers, there were not enough to permit students to take books home nor to use workbooks on a consumable basis. However, there was an adequate supply of consumable notebooks.

D. Staff members reported that a recommendation had been made to the Department of Individual Guidance of the Oakland Public Schools that 57 of the project students be considered for fall, 1967 placement in regular Oakland High Schools.

CASE STUDIES

Six case studies, considered to be representative of the type of population being served, were prepared by teachers and are included in the Appendix. The studies reflect to some degree teacher reactions toward the program.

DISCUSSION

The results of the evaluation of the EOA Remedial Instruction Project for High School Dropouts indicate that a significant gains were made in reading ability by those students who participated regularly in the instructional program. The average period of enrollment of the sample of students was approximately one third of the school year, and students attended classes, on the average, only 73% of the time. Nonetheless, tests indicated an average gain of approximately
.7 of a year. This gain, compared with the high rate of absenteeism and the short period the students were enrolled, is rather substantial.

The problem of irregular student attendance emerged rather prominently along with the lack of continuous enrollment. The sample indicated that school agencies were the largest source of referrals for the program.

Results of questionnaires indicated that the most significant benefits from the project were improvement in reading and improvement in student attitudes. The aspects of the program which need review are the instructional materials and supplies, the time available for instruction, student recruitment and selection procedures, techniques of motivation, and possible program expansion.

Results from rating scales indicated that in the teachers' judgment, one fourth of the students had improved markedly in certain basic reading skills, while the balance of the students had made little improvement or that teachers had insufficient information to make the determination. Student ratings of the program were positive.

CONCLUSIONS

It is understood by the writer that this project will terminate on June 30, 1967, as will other projects funded under the Economic Opportunity Act and operated by the Oakland Public Schools.

It does appear, however, that the two broad objectives of the project, as stated earlier in this report, were met.

Edward A. Hakkarainen  
Teacher on Special Assignment  
Research Department

Approved:  
Alden V. Badal  
Director of Research  
June 19, 1967
APPENDIX A

OAKLAND PUBLIC SCHOOLS
Research Department

(Responses of 6 teachers are included)

EVALUATION OF EOA REMEDIAL INSTRUCTION FOR HIGH SCHOOL DROPOUTS
(Teacher's Form)

1. In general, how good a job do you feel was done in the Remedial Instruction for High School Dropouts Program?

   Excellent ___ Very Good ___ Good ___ 5 Fair ___ 1 Poor ___
   83.3% 16.7%

2. How many students received instruction from you during the 1966-67 school year? 373

3. How many hours of actual instruction does the number in question 2 represent?
   6877

4. How many additional hours did you spend with the students in supervised study, counseling, testing, interviewing, etc? (Include only the hours during which you were in contact with the student.) 211

5. How many contacts did you make with the students' homes? 208

6. Which teaching method or methods were the most effective?
   a. Direct teaching of phonics, word recognition techniques, syllabication, etc.
   b. Individual or one-to-one ratio teaching or small group (no more than 4) teaching.
   c. A combination of the visual, auditory, and kinesthetic.

7. Which instructional media devices were the most effective?
   Workbooks, dittoed materials, use of easy readers, Civil Service Practice Tests

8. Which instructional aids were the most effective?
   a. McCall-Crabbs Readers
   b. S. R. A. Reading Laboratory
   c. Eye and Ear Fun
   d. Basic Reading Skills (Jr. High) (Scott-Foresman)
   e. Tactics, I & II (Scott-Foresman)
   f. Reader's Digest
   g. Reading for Meaning, (4-8)
   h. Webster Word Wheels
   i. Phonics We Use
   j. Cowboy Sam
   k. Teen Age Tales
9. Please cite what you consider to be the most significant benefit(s) for the students from the Remedial Instruction Program.

a. Personalized instruction tailored to individual student needs.
b. Instilling self-confidence and self-image
c. Adjusting behavior so that students may return to public schools.
d. Opportunity to develop and practice reading skills.
e. The students gained from working in a one-to-one relationship.
f. To be in a very informal but structured atmosphere.
g. The students did not feel they were forced into doing their lessons.
h. Receiving individual attention which helped the youngsters to overcome some of their fears and apprehensions about reading.

10. Please cite the areas or aspects of the Remedial Instruction Program that should be reviewed so that this program might be even better and indicate what the improvements might be.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Area to be reviewed</th>
<th>Suggested Improvement</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Public Relations</td>
<td>Public relations should have started much earlier in the school year.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student readiness for reading</td>
<td>Only those students who can benefit from the program should attend--it should not be a place for students with extreme behavior problems.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Diagnostic Procedures and Instruments</td>
<td>Use of more than one diagnostic Reading Test, e.g., Silent, Oral phonics, would be desirable.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Personnel</td>
<td>Provide enough personnel to take care of both remedial and developmental reading.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Equipment and materials</td>
<td>Audio-visual materials and more materials relevant to the lives of culturally deprived students. A need for a complete reading laboratory exists. Selection should be by teachers and materials should be available early.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Techniques of motivation</td>
<td>Stimulate interest through cultural enrichment programs and community interest.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>More space</td>
<td>Larger facilities are needed.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Area to be reviewed</td>
<td>Suggested Improvement</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>More realistic approach to selection of students</td>
<td>Suggest age 17 and up because motivation below 17 is low.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community aides needed earlier</td>
<td>Good community aides are very necessary at beginning of program.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
EVALUATION OF BOE REMEDIAL INSTRUCTION PROGRAM FOR HIGH SCHOOL DROPOUTS

Your responses to the following questions will become an important part of the District's evaluation of the program of Remedial Instruction for High School Dropouts. We hope that you will take the time to give us your frank answers.

1. In general, how good a job do you feel was done in the Remedial Instruction Program for High School Dropouts?

   Excellent 14.3%  Very Good 28.6%  Good 42.9%  Fair 14.3%

2. What were three most significant benefits from the Remedial Instruction Program?

   There was noticeable improvement in their reading and grammar.

   With the practice Civil Service Examination we have used, the enrollees have made great improvement in their ability to pass them.

   It has given some of the enrollees new hope for passing the GED test for their high school diplomas.

   Closer student-teacher relationship which fosters more interest from pupil.

   Opportunity for J. F. Kennedy students to get 1 to 1 remedial reading instruction.

   Re-testing to determine progress and achievement.

   Motivational milieu in small classes.

   A chance for drop-outs to relate to regular reading teacher.

   That there were not rigid rules for behavior put on the student.

   That much of their misbehavior and lack of motivation was tolerated.

   It helped students to read faster for the purpose of taking examinations for jobs.

   It helped students who wanted to go back to a regular high school or continue their education by attending college.

3. What, if any, were the three most significant weaknesses of the Remedial Instruction Program?

   Recruitment of students.

   The attendance of the students and their co-operation.
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Not enough supplies for the student's convenience.

Not enough persons understood what the program was really about and this is why there was little participation.

There was not enough time spent with each enrollee.

Keeping some enrollees in the class who showed little or no interest whatsoever in improving themselves.

Failure to reach hard-core students.

No opportunity for teachers at J.F.K. to follow through and build on lessons from Reading Center with poor readers.

Could have gained from soliciting more interest from the parents in regards to pupil absences.

4. What suggestions, if any, do you have for improving the program?

Greater variety of subjects taught.

Use of consultants to test students as to cause of reading difficulties.

Give more time to the enrollee who wants to study rather than the one who goes to class just to get out of work.

Give more time to passing an examination.

Feeder program from all schools in area.

Homogeneous grouping for small classes (graded) and the lengthening of time per student for other academic weaknesses, possibly mathematics.

Having more supplies for the purpose of more co-operation from the student.

Much more space for the convenience of the student.

More co-operation from the student.
Please indicate your rating of the general effectiveness of the instructional program on each student by checking the appropriate box for each area below:

Name of Student

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Area to Be Rated</th>
<th>Marked Improvement</th>
<th>Moderate Improvement</th>
<th>Little Improvement</th>
<th>No Change</th>
<th>Insufficient Information</th>
<th>No Response</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>N</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reading Comprehension</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>10.2</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>16.1</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>27.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oral Reading Skills</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3.6</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>21.9</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>29.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Speed in Reading</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>12.4</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>13.9</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>24.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Word Attack Skills</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>5.8</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>23.4</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>28.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Word Recognition</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3.6</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>25.5</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>28.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Word Meanings</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>12.4</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>20.4</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>22.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>General Attitudes Toward School</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>15.3</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>15.3</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>19.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Desire to Learn to Read</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>13.9</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>18.2</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>21.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interest in Recreational Reading</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>4.4</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>5.1</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>8.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interest in Libraries</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Home Assistance in Reading</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Employability</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>5.8</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>19.7</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>15.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Readiness for Further Education</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>8.0</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>19.0</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>22.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Emotional Adjustment</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>13.9</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>9.5</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>10.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Motivation for Self-Improvement</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>15.3</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>12.4</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>16.1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Student Rating Scale
#### BOA Remedial Instruction Program

(Responses of 53 Students)

(To be completed by each student at time of withdrawal from the program or at the end of the year)

Please place an X before the best answer.

Because of the instruction I've received in the special reading class,

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question</th>
<th>Much Better (%)</th>
<th>Somewhat Better (%)</th>
<th>A Little Better (%)</th>
<th>No Better (%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>I now read</td>
<td>41.5%</td>
<td>28.3%</td>
<td>15.0%</td>
<td>30.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I enjoy reading</td>
<td>43.4%</td>
<td>30.2%</td>
<td>16.0%</td>
<td>20.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I understand what I read</td>
<td>45.3%</td>
<td>30.2%</td>
<td>16.0%</td>
<td>22.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I can figure out new words</td>
<td>49.1%</td>
<td>30.2%</td>
<td>16.0%</td>
<td>20.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I think I can find a job</td>
<td>49.1%</td>
<td>22.6%</td>
<td>12.0%</td>
<td>13.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I think I can do my classwork in regular school</td>
<td>49.1%</td>
<td>22.6%</td>
<td>12.0%</td>
<td>24.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>My feeling toward school is now</td>
<td>58.5%</td>
<td>31.0%</td>
<td>13.2%</td>
<td>18.9%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
This student is seventeen years old and was an enrollee in both the Remedial Instruction for Dropouts and in Dewey Continuation High School. The student was born in Oakland, lives with the mother and two brothers, and attended several schools in California but mostly in Oakland. The student's problems in reading as all other fields started very early in grammar school days. The student was given a hearing test in junior high school and a slight loss in hearing was discovered. This handicap may have been in some measure the cause of failure in scholastic progress and an extremely poor attendance record. Wide Range Achievement Test results showed that the grade levels upon which the student operated were Reading, 2.1; Spelling, 2.0; and Arithmetic, 5.0. They probably reflect an inability to benefit from school.

The student, for all practical purposes is a non-reader. The Gates Reading Survey grade average on the pretest was 3.5 and post-test grade average was 2.4. Attendance record is extremely poor. The student was suspended from Dewey High School for one week because of constant disruption in class. However, at the Reading Center behavior was good and the student was always pleasant and cooperative. If the student had attended the Reading Center on a regular basis, indications are that benefits would have been derived. The student lacks basic word attack skills and self-confidence and motivation necessary to improve in reading.

The student was given programmed reading materials which were done orally with the teacher. This method was used to focus on reading attack skills and also to provide for immediate successes.

The student seemed well aware of the reading handicap and always promised to come on a more regular basis. However, after repeated talks with the mother, including a home visit, attendance did not improve.
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CASE STUDY NUMBER 2

The student is a 16 year old high school dropout, referred to the Reading Center by the California Youth Authority two months ago.

The student is typical of the type of young person who drops out of the public schools. The student dropped out of the tenth grade, got into trouble, and spent time in juvenile hall. The student lives with the mother, and the father lives out of the state.

When the student started the Reading Center, grade level in reading was 6.6. A retest recently showed a score of 7.2. This improvement in the reading score probably represents increased self-confidence more than actual reading improvement, since the student's true abilities have been obscured by emotional problems and poor self-concept. In this case there is no acute reading problem but instead a problem of emotional adjustment. If the student gains enough emotional maturity soon enough in life, we believe that the above average potential that the student seems to possess will be developed.

The following comments were made by the teacher-aide who spent time working with the student:

"The student is very quiet, indifferent, and shy. During the first session we worked on the student's reading. The student seemed to be fairly bright, so I pushed a bit to see what the student could do. The student kept pace and seemed to like my approach. Occasionally we would stop and chat and we would talk about education, future, and likes and dislikes. The student is extremely shy and lacks self-confidence. Once we switched roles of student and teacher. This we liked and we kept at it for a week or so. The student began to smile and became much more receptive to my questions. We smoked and talked and read together. The student liked this attention and I continually reminded the student of brightness and potential.

I've given the student a lot of time and effort and at times we have played "who psyches out whom" games together. We visited the Civil Rights Commissions Hearing which was enjoyed. We saw an educational movie, "The Quiet One", which seemed to be of interest to the student.

The student's reading has improved a full grade. In my opinion, this is not as significant as the emotional improvement. The student's progress, I think is evident in these words: "I might like to go to this college". The student was referring to Laney College, which we have visited twice.
The student was born out of state and grew up in institutions and foster homes. The student also spent some growing up years with other relatives.

The student did not attend public school, but went to a parochial school through the third grade. Fear of school caused a rebellion against further attendance. The student then spent several years in institutions learning work skills, but reading, writing, arithmetic and other regular school subjects were not taught. Because of refusal to attend school or to attempt learning, the student was placed in foster homes with relatives.

The student speaks a foreign language, but the lack of basic skills is not due to a language problem but rather to emotional problems in early childhood.

The student was married, but marital discord arose due to differences in educational background. This brought the student to the Reading Center. When interviewed, the student stated that for the first time in life the student was interested in learning how to read and write because the student's marital happiness was at stake. The student indicated a dislike to school and learning but was ready now to learn as much as possible.

The student began attending the Reading Center for one hour a day. At first, the student was very nervous during the sessions and we proceeded very slowly. By the end of the first two weeks, the student was considerably calmed down and even stayed with us from two to three hours. At the end of the first month the student was so accustomed to us that the student began to arrive at noon and leave at 3:30 p.m.

The student did not begin to make rapid progress in learning to read until the student felt more relaxed in the learning situation. When the student started at the Center, the student knew only a few letters of the alphabet, could neither tell time, nor do the simplest arithmetic problems. In a few weeks remarkable progress appeared in all these areas and is continuing to improve. Psychometric data is not available and we do not have a reading test which can measure progress. The student is now reading three and four letter words, simple sentences and phrases. The student has completed one textbook and reader in the Sullivan Programmed Reading, Series I, and Phonics We Use Book A, as well as several pages of Let's Read, by Leonard Bloomfield. After every reading session, we worked on arithmetic and telling time for about half an hour.

The student reported that the home situation has changed for the better. The most outstanding improvement that we see is in the student's own self-concept. This is manifested by a pride in appearance, making friends more easily, and being more involved with surroundings. The student feels more security in the marriage, talks about the family, and hopes to have a high school diploma.

Probably the most significant thing we have done for the student at the Reading Center has been to provide the confidence that was needed to continue the process of education. We have every reason to expect the student to continue to attend school motivated by a desire for improvement, by greater self-awareness, and by newly found successes. We have made arrangements for the student to continue school this summer, and plans were made for enrollment in adult school in the fall.
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CASE STUDY NUMBER 4

The student lives with the mother and sister, and apparently does not know the whereabouts of the father. I visited the home once to discuss the lack of significant progress in the student's reading class. The mother was extremely friendly and courteous and appeared to be genuinely concerned with the student's progress in school. She also attended the Open House at the Reading Center to talk with her child's instructors and indicated that she would try to assist in any way that she could. When I visited the home, I saw no reading material there, but she said that she would encourage the reading of newspapers and magazines at home.

The student was exempted from high school this year for fighting in class. At that time, the student was totally out of control and, according to authorities, had to be physically removed from the classroom. Apparently, it was impossible for anyone to reason with the student at that time and so exemption resulted. Prior to that time, such an outburst had not been exhibited and it seems that previous behavior was fairly normal.

At the time of dismissal, the student's grades were the following: Physical Education, A; World History, F; English, D; Typing, D; and Music, C. Attendance was fairly regular and main interests were sports and music.

The only test score which was available was the Lorge-Thorndyke on which the student scored in the fifth percentile.

The student appears to be making only slight progress in reading. On entrance to the remedial reading program, the student was given the Gates Reading Survey, Form 3, on which the average reading grade score was 4.8. Two months later the student was given the Gates Reading Survey, Form 1, and the average reading grade score was 4.1. According to the latter test, speed had increased but reading comprehension and vocabulary dropped. It is impossible to account for this drop. Most of the work that the student completed was concentrated on improving comprehension and reading vocabulary.

According to other instructors, the student is doing relatively well in mathematics and social studies. Attendance has been regular and a severe discipline problem has not arisen. It is difficult, however, to get the student to do more than one or two exercises in the workbook. The student wastes time, lacks motivation, and must be continually supervised. No great change in attitude toward school has been observed, but the staff members have encouraged the student to enroll in a regular high school next year. Since the student has not been a discipline problem in the remedial reading class, it is possible that behavior has improved; however, unless the student is properly motivated and able to increase reading skills, it is highly unlikely that the student will continue to attend school.
APPENDIX I

CASE STUDY NUMBER 5

The student was born in Oakland, California. Between his birth and the present, he has lived in other nearby cities as well as Oakland.

The student's home life, seemingly, has never been very pleasant. The father was a heavy drinker, who often came home drunk and beat the mother. The father has no college education, but the student feels that he is as smart as someone with three years of college. The mother has a limited education and was learning to read at the time that the student was in grammar school.

The student stated that as a child, there often was no breakfast; however, the father would have a "big feast."

The student also indicated an embarrassment with school clothes because other school children had nice clothing.

At home, the student was given little or no help in school work. If any questions were asked, the student was called "dumb" or "stupid" or told to "shut up". One of the teachers commented that the father once said that if his child was going to get an education, it would have to be at school, because there would be no help at home.

The student's parents are now divorced. They both still live nearby. The student doesn't see the mother (they don't get along) and only occasionally sees the father. The student is living with other female relatives. The student has a brother who is younger.

The student has attended various schools in the Bay area.

Attendance in grammar school was quite poor, but improved in Junior High and High School and until the student was enrolled in classes for the mentally retarded.

Special Services of another school district said that in 1957 the student was given the Wechsler Intelligence Scale which indicated an I.Q. of 69. In 1961 the Peabody Test reflected an I.Q. of 71.

We gave the student the IPAT (A culture free test by R.B. and A.K.S. Cattell). On this non-verbal test the student scored an I.Q. of 75. It should be pointed out that the student was extremely nervous during the test which was also constantly interrupted by other students entering the room. The validity of this test is unknown. The student seems much more alert and of a higher intelligence than any of these tests have shown.

Reading

On entering the West Oakland Reading Center, the student was a "non-reader" and was unable to take the Gates Reading Survey Test (Form 3); however the Gray Oral Reading Test was administered on which a Grade Equivalent score of 1.0 was made.

As a "non-reader," a complete program of re-teaching in basic phonics, vocabulary, and word-recognition techniques was initiated. The student has, with diligence,
progressed at this point to a fairly good mastery of the long and short vowels, the consonant blends and diagraphs, and will soon undertake work in the vowel diagraphs, diphthongs, prefixes, suffixes, word syllabication techniques, and vocabulary building.

The student is slowly building up self-confidence as a reader, a confidence which has been lacking throughout school life. The student perceives the progress being made, although, as a virtual beginner in reading, the student continues quite naturally to backslide occasionally. Hopefully, with continued instruction in the time left, and self-help on the student's part, confidence as a reader and as a person will gradually solidify.

The major limitation on further progress is the time element. Unless the student receives continued instruction, practice, and/or reinforcement during the summer months and beyond, it is feared that there will be a loss of gains so far made. The student has inquired several times concerning future grade-level attainment in reading which indicates, perhaps, both a latent lack of self-confidence and fears concerning possible future achievement. To state the obvious, there presently are no answers that we can give.

Remedial Program—Reading:

Materials Used:

a. Dittoed materials (phonics, word recognition drills, etc.)

b. Sullivan Reading Program

c. Webster Word Wheels

d. McCall-Crabbs Standard Test Lessons in Reading.

Results:

The student's attitude toward self and toward school have changed considerably. When the student first came here, it was only because it was necessary to do so as part of the Neighborhood Youth Corps Program. Because the student had met with continued failure in school, it was felt that there was no ability to learn to read. This attitude has changed to the point where the student is speaking of getting a high school diploma.

The student is still unsettled as to a career and says that the field of music is interesting, as a singer or a leader of a combo. Any other job that pays well also appears to be interesting. But the student feels that learning to read is the first step before deciding upon a career.

The student's attendance pattern has been very good. Special arrangements were made with the N.Y.C. for attendance in the basic education classes four hours a week rather than the prescribed two hours. Out of a possible 48 hours, the student has attended 42 hours.

Behavior has been no problem at all. The student is quiet, responsive and very cooperative.
APPENDIX J

CASE STUDY NUMBER 6

A. Home History

1. Birthplace - Oakland, California.

2. Parents - Live with mother; sees father occasionally without mother’s knowledge; father employed as longshoreman; parents formerly from out of state; mother attends school.

3. Length of time in Oakland: From birth.

4. Brothers and sisters: Two older brothers and three younger sisters.

B. School History

1. Elementary: Kindergarten through May or June, 6th grade (incomplete.)


   a. Was a "non-reader"; therefore, did poorly in all school subjects, including Arithmetic; liked Art, P.E., and Rhythms.

4. Behavior Record:

   Long history of misbehavior in school, resulting finally in expulsion before the end of the sixth grade. According to own admission, the student likes to fight, and got into fights either for lack of anything better to do, or in self-defense. ("About 20 fights or more," through the grades.)

   Upon expulsion, troubles mounted. The mother reacted in a predictable manner, and to compound the troubles, the student had a fight with a sister. Thereafter, the student ran away from home, was picked up by the police after dark, and then chose detention rather than to return home. The student was then committed to a reform school. The stay there was approximately two years.

   Surprisingly enough, the student indicates an enjoyment of detention. The writer's guess is that a regulated life in the hill country, three square meals a day, outdoor work, recreation, some basic education, professional guidance, and supervision, all combined, gave the student a new experience and a new outlook on life. The student enjoyed the outdoor life and stated that treatment was good.

   Upon release in February of 1967, the student was enrolled in a private school. Attendance has been excellent, but general deportment and attitude somewhat uneven.
C. Present Skills Status

1. Reading

On entrance to the private school, the student was unable to take the Gates Reading Survey Test (Form 3). However, the Gray Oral Reading Test was administered (3-14-67) by the writer and the grade equivalent attained was 1.0.

The student is at present still greatly retarded in reading ability, but is progressing well enough under the circumstances.

2. Mathematics

According to the instructor, the student is functioning at approximately the 2nd - 3rd grade level, unsure of addition and subtraction, and has barely begun to learn the multiplication facts. Furthermore, the student has shown very little effort in this subject.

3. Social Studies

As a "non-reader," the student is not asked to read aloud in social studies class. Because of reading deficiencies, the student has frequently disrupted the class and has been reprimanded accordingly.

4. Remedial Program (Reading)

a. Materials Used:

1. Dittoed materials (phonics, word recognition drills, etc.)
2. Sullivan Reading Program
3. Webster Word Wheels

b. Since the student is functionally a non-reader, the writer began a complete program of re-teaching in the basis of phonics, word-recognition techniques, vocabulary development, etc. As for the instructional approach, the greatest emphasis has been put on oral exercises and drills; the obvious objective is to lay a solid foundation for student's eventual and hoped-for mastery of sound-symbol relationships. Along with daily oral (and spelling) drill, the student has been working, more or less faithfully, on basic sight vocabulary. At this point, the student has almost mastered the long and short vowel sounds, but there is still much to be done. The two principal limitations on further progress are that time is running out, and concomitantly, that there is so much that still needs to be learned. In my opinion, the student does perceive progress in reading and spelling ability, and I feel sure that the student fully desires to improve self, not only in reading, but also in general behavior.
D. Results

The student is highly desirous of entering a regular school again, specifically the 10th grade (due to age). Experience at reform school has changed the student's attitude and outlook on life for the better. It is unfortunate that the student is so far behind in academic standing and achievement.