

DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 041 852

24

SP 004 110

AUTHOR Bowman, David L.
TITLE Quantitative and Qualitative Effects of Revised Selection and Training Procedures in the Education of Teachers of the Culturally Disadvantaged. Volume I. Final Report.
INSTITUTION Wisconsin State Univ., Oshkosh.
SPONS AGENCY Office of Education (DHEW), Washington, D.C. Bureau of Research.
BUREAU NO BR-9-0007
PUB DATE 70
GRANT OEG-0-8-077946-1734
NOTE 74p.

EDRS PRICE MF-\$0.50 HC-\$3.80
DESCRIPTORS *Academic Standards, Communication Skills, Creativity, Educational Attitudes, *Educationally Disadvantaged, Group Counseling, Imagination, Individual Differences, Paraprofessional School Personnel, Personal Growth, *Preservice Education, Remedial Programs, Self Concept, Seminars, Study Centers, *Teacher Education, *Teacher Education Curriculum, Teaching Techniques, Work Experience Programs

ABSTRACT

This is the first part of a four-part report on the second year of a project designed to help students with scholastic difficulties become successful in college, and either competent teachers or effective paraprofessional school personnel. The project was originally intended to extend over an 8- to 10-year period, but because of budget cuts it became necessary to plan instead to assimilate the components into the main stream of the university's teacher education program. The project provided 1) different emphases in academic concentration and individualized, imaginative teaching of the course sections in which the students were enrolled; 2) academic standards which were realistic in terms of the student at the time they were applied, with appropriate assistance in remediation when needed; 3) more concern for such essentials of teaching success as ability to communicate, appropriate attitudes, real concern for the individual and individual differences, imagination, and creativeness; 4) a strong professional orientation toward teaching the academically disadvantaged. The pilot activities included personal development seminars, group counseling, learning center activities, and paraprofessional work experience. Results showed that project pilot students achieved consistently higher grades than matched groups of non-project students. Curriculum details are included in volumes 2 and 3. (See also SP 004 109, SP 004 111 and SP 004 112.) (MBM)

ED041852

BR 9-0007

PA 24

SP

**FINAL REPORT
VOLUME I**

**Project No. 9-0007
Contract No. OEG-0-8-077946-1734**

**QUANTITATIVE AND QUALITATIVE EFFECTS OF REVISED SELECTION
AND TRAINING PROCEDURES IN THE EDUCATION OF TEACHERS
OF THE CULTURALLY DISADVANTAGED**

**David L. Bowman, Dean
School of Education
Wisconsin State University-Oshkosh
Oshkosh, Wisconsin**

**U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION
& WELFARE
OFFICE OF EDUCATION**
THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED
EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR
ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF
VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECES-
SARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL OFFICE OF EDU-
CATION POSITION OR POLICY.

June 1970

The research reported herein was performed pursuant to a contract with the Office of Education, U.S. Department of Health, Education, and Welfare. Contractors undertaking such projects under Government sponsorship are encouraged to express freely their professional judgment in the conduct of the project. Points of view or opinions stated do not, therefore, necessarily represent official Office of Education position or policy.

**U.S. DEPARTMENT OF
HEALTH, EDUCATION AND WELFARE**

**Office of Education
Bureau of Research**

SP00410

TABLE OF CONTENTS

VOLUME I

| | |
|---------------------------------------|----|
| SUMMARY | 1 |
| INTRODUCTION | 11 |
| METHODS, FINDINGS, AND ANALYSES | 21 |
| Methods, Findings & Analyses | |
| Semester I, 1968-1969..... | 22 |
| Methods, Findings & Analyses | |
| Semester II, 1968-1969..... | 36 |
| Methods, Findings & Analyses | |
| Summer Session, 1969..... | 47 |
| Methods, Findings & Analyses | |
| Extension Period..... | 64 |
| CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS | 67 |

VOLUME II

| | |
|---|-----|
| APPENDIX A: Sample Spread of the Experimental Teachers Education Program Proposal..... | 70 |
| APPENDIX B: A Structured Curriculum for a Course Entitled "Social Science Semester"... | 76 |
| APPENDIX C: A Structured Curriculum for a Course Entitled "Elementary Music Practicum"..... | 136 |
| APPENDIX D: Elementary Teacher Lecture and Studio Practicum in Art..... | 194 |

VOLUME III

| | |
|---|-----|
| APPENDIX E: Biological Science Course Proposal... | 226 |
| APPENDIX F: Earth Science Proposal..... | 246 |
| APPENDIX G: Physical Science Course..... | 255 |

TABLE OF CONTENTS - Cont'd

VOLUME III

| | | |
|-------------|--|-----|
| APPENDIX H: | General Psychology 86 301 Report..... | 259 |
| APPENDIX I: | Evaluation of Psychology 86 301 Report..... | 271 |
| APPENDIX J: | English Composition Report..... | 274 |
| APPENDIX K: | Student Profiles..... | 277 |
| APPENDIX L: | Seminar Reports..... | 284 |
| APPENDIX M: | Work Experience Program..... | 292 |
| APPENDIX N: | College Descriptive Inventory..... | 308 |
| APPENDIX O: | Incorporation of Personal Development Seminar into Education Curriculum.... | 314 |
| APPENDIX P: | Proposal to the Executive Council of Wisconsin State University-Oshkosh... | 316 |
| APPENDIX Q: | Academic Advancement Cooperative..... | 324 |
| APPENDIX R: | A Selected Bibliography of Materials Concerning College Student Attrition, Underachievement, and Talent Loss.... | 327 |

SUMMARY

The U.S.O.E. Bureau of Research Grant for September 15, 1968 to September 15, 1969, provided support for the piloting of activities developed during the 1967-1968 planning year of the same project - also funded by the U.S.O.E. Bureau of Research.

The objectives during this second year were to:

- 1) identify and recruit a group of students similar to those identified and described during 1967-1968. These students would begin the program in June, 1969.
- 2) further develop and refine curriculum concepts--identified and described during the 1967-1968 planning year--and prepare these concepts for implementation beginning June, 1969.
- 3) continue program of faculty development through involvement in all phases of curriculum building within the experimental teacher education model.
- 4) involve students (20-25), identified during 1967-1968, in pilot programs in the areas of a) personal development seminars - regularly scheduled meetings designed to help students understand themselves, set goals, build positive self-images, develop skills including "schoolmanship", and keep channels of communication open between students and faculty members; b) learning centers - study and media centers located in various departments and containing materials of a review, remedial, and reinforcement nature, designed to aid in course work and skill development; and c) paid para-professional work experiences - student assistant positions designed to develop skills related to teaching and education, e.g. teacher-aid and audio-visual technician.
- 5) make necessary administrative arrangements for smooth commencement of the teacher preparation program as of June, 1969.

This year of the project and the preceeding planning year (1967-1968) were but the beginning of a longitudinal study originally designed to spread over an eight to ten year period. Had continued funding been assured, the third year (starting in the summer session of 1969) would have initiated a four-year and five-year teacher education program with a two year follow-up program for a group of at least 100 students with control groups of at least another 100 students. As the prospects for funding the original longitudinal study became more remote the 1968-1969 year served as a transition stage for moving from planning and development into some sort of operational phase

within the regular teacher education framework at Wisconsin State University-Oshkosh. For additional background, perspective, and information beyond the contents of this report the reader is referred to the Final Report for the 1967-1968 year, Project No. 9-0007, Grant No. OEG-0-8-077946-1734, entitled QUANTITATIVE AND QUALITATIVE EFFECTS OF REVISED SELECTION AND TRAINING PROCEDURES IN THE EDUCATION OF TEACHERS OF THE CULTURALLY DISADVANTAGED, and submitted December, 1968 and accepted by the Bureau of Research, United States Office of Education, United States Department of Health, Education, and Welfare.

Considerable piloting of project components took place during the year, and although the formal research originally planned did not materialize, several of the basic hypotheses were tested on a pilot basis. Pilot findings provided strong suggestions for further research and for implementing project components on a wider scale. The major hypotheses dealt with include:

- 1) students can be recruited to participate in a venture to make them more academically successful than before;
- 2) student's grade-point averages can be significantly raised through employment of project components;
- 3) project student attitudes toward higher education, professors, study, and teaching the disadvantaged will be positive and will suggest a positive increase over their attitudes before joining the project; and
- 4) faculty members can be encouraged to examine existing courses in terms of behavior objectives, to modify these courses, to develop innovative approaches to both teaching techniques and curriculum development, to build resource materials (including video tapes, auto-instructional devices, etc.) for student learning centers, and to look favorably upon course development involving interdisciplinary approaches and less traditional content.

Methods Used

In fulfilling the objectives of the second year and testing the hypotheses noted above, volunteer students from the large group of probationary or "dropped" students were recruited to pilot the project components. Approximately 50 students were involved during the 1968-1969 academic year. The major recruitment devices were the prospects of 1) being aided in achieving a better scholastic record and 2) being assured of admission second semester or the following year regardless of earned grade-point average. During the 1969 summer session approximately 100 students were involved. Twenty-one of these were "qualifiers" -- incoming freshmen with poor prognoses for success who must obtain a summer session grade-point average of 1.50 to be

admitted in September. Two of the experimental sections of existing courses designed in connection with the project were piloted during the 1969 summer session (General Psychology and English Composition).

Data regarding grade-point averages at time of entrance to the project were gathered for each group and for 39 of the first semester group. Data for three matched groups not in the project were also gathered. These control groups were from the School of Education, the School of Letters and Science, and the School of Business Administration. Records of course work taken and grades received were kept for all three groups. Resulting grade-point averages were computed and comparative analyses made.

Inventories, taped staff and student discussion sessions, and staff judgment were used to note attitudes and attitude changes. Only during the 1969 summer session was an attempt made to get a pre-test and post-test attitude inventory.

The University encouraged faculty participation in the curriculum development component of the project by 1) providing released time for certain faculty members cooperating with the project and 2) allowing funds from a Board of Regents allocation for curriculum research during the summer to be used by certain faculty members cooperating with the project. The project encouraged faculty participation through utilization of certain faculty members during periods when not employed by the University and available for intensive work on project components related to curriculum development.

Results Obtained

Forty-six students were enrolled in project pilot activities for the first semester. All were experiencing academic difficulties. Personal Development Seminars - designed to help students understand themselves, build positive self-images, set goals, develop skills, and keep channels of communication open between students and faculty--were organized for four groups of from ten to thirteen students. A Learning Center was established and many activities and materials of a review, remedial and reinforcement nature were made available to the students. Paid Paraprofessional Work Experience was organized and made available to students on a voluntary basis. Thirty-five students participated. Work assignments were made on the basis of student interest, job availability and relevancy to education. Payment was at the rate of \$1.40 per hour and students worked from 8 to 10 hours per week, most frequently in teacher-related duties.

An analysis of the grade results for Semester I, 1968-1969 of 39 project students - carrying an average of 12.5 credits per student plus the project activities revealed the following data:

1. Eight students received eleven A's involving 25 credits of course work.

2. Twenty-six students received forty B's involving one-hundred and nine credits of course work.
3. Thirty-eight of the thirty-nine students received at least one "C" grade. These thirty-eight students received ninety C's involving two-hundred and fifty-three credits of course work.
4. Only five students received a grade of "F", or a total of seven "F" grades involving twenty-two credits of course work.
5. Twenty-two students made a 2.0 or better Grade Point Average (G.P.A.):

| G.P.A. 1st. Sem. 68-69 | No. of Students | Range of Previous Cumulative GPA Each Class of Students | |
|---------------------------|--------------------|--|---------------|
| | | <u>Highest</u> | <u>Lowest</u> |
| 3.0 and above | 2 | 1.8 | 1.5 |
| 2.5 and above | (a) 8 | 2.2 | 1.5 |
| 2.2 and above | (b) 17 | 2.2 | 1.4 |
| 2.0 and above | (c) 22 | 2.2 | 1.2 |

- (a) Six of these students have never before achieved a 2.0 G.P.A.
- (b) Thirteen of these students have never before achieved a 2.0 G.P.A.
- (c) Eighteen of these students have never before achieved a 2.0 G.P.A.

6. Twenty-six students raised their cumulative G.P.A. as a result of this first semester's work. The average G.P.A. raise was .28 and the average difference between this semester's G.P.A. and the previous cumulative G.P.A. was .63. Five students achieved a G.P.A. for the first semester which was one full letter grade above their previous cumulative average.
7. There were several rather dramatic individual cases of improved grade point averages. Some of these are listed below for illustrative purposes.

| | <u>Previous Cumulative G.P.A.</u> | <u>G.P.A. for 1st. Semester, 1968-1969</u> |
|-----------|---------------------------------------|--|
| Student A | .80 | 1.85 |
| Student B | 1.44 | 2.45 |
| Student C | 1.51 | 3.40 |
| Student D | 1.80 | 3.06 |
| Student E | 1.39 | 2.41 |

| | <u>Previous Cumulative G.P.A.</u> | <u>G.P.A. for 1st. Semester, 1968-1969</u> |
|-----------|---------------------------------------|--|
| Student F | 1.72 | 2.50 |
| Student G | 1.23 | 2.16 |
| Student H | 1.62 | 2.42 |
| Student I | 1.55 | 2.23 |
| Student J | 1.26 | 2.00 |

8. Fifteen students in the pilot group ended the first semester with a cumulative G.P.A. of 2.0 or better. Prior to this semester only seven students had achieved a cumulative G.P.A. of 2.0.
9. The average of G.P.A. for the group for the first semester was 1.91. The average cumulative G.P.A. for the group just prior to first semester was 1.71. The average cumulative G.P.A. for the group after the first semester was 1.86.

Analysis of first semester grade reports of project and non-project students recalled differences all of which favored the project group. More specifically, the project students recorded 28% of their grades in the A or B category, while their counterparts in business, letters and science, and education recorded 10%, 17%, and 16% (A or B grades) respectively. On the other end of the grade scale, differences again favor the project group. Project students received 20% D or F grades, while the business students received 56%, and the education and letters and science students received 33% and 35% respectively.

Generally, the attitudes of pilot students toward higher education, professors, and academic pursuits seemed to be more positive and supportive after substantial involvement in the project than before. Pilot students have volunteered testimony to recruit additional students and have completed attitude inventories, written letters, and oral reports (some are recorded) regarding these attitude changes.

In addition to the curriculum components mentioned above - personal development seminars, learning center, paid paraprofessional work experiences -- curriculum and instructional revision took place in the following courses: English Composition - 3 credits, Physical Science - 4 credits, Biology - 4 credits. New course developments not yet piloted include: 1) a 14-credit interdisciplinary social science (including 2 credits of social science methods) full semester entitled Poverty in American Society; 2) a 12 credit Art-Music semester utilizing a spiral approach to fundamentals, appreciation, and methodology; 3) a 4 credit earth science general education course; and 4) a modified approach to educational psychology.

Some fifty faculty members including twenty-five or more from schools other than the School of Education were involved directly or indirectly in the curriculum development component.

Findings

The second year's activity disclosed the following findings:

1. Significant numbers of students having scholastic difficulty are interested in a program designed to make them successful in college and prepare them as competent teachers of the disadvantaged.
2. Significant numbers of students having scholastic difficulty give indications (rank in high school class, ACT scores, some college grades, etc.) of ability to succeed in college.
3. The recruits for the teacher education program being developed in the project tend to be much like any group of randomly selected freshmen at this university as far as background and ability indicators are concerned.
4. Imaginative university curriculum revisions result from attempts to better meet the needs of these students.
5. Faculty participation from widely diverse disciplines is important in the development of these curriculum revisions.
6. Only certain faculty members in each discipline have both interest and competence in developing curriculum to meet the needs of these students.
7. Attitudes of the pilot group of students toward college, professors, and academic pursuits were more positive than before.
8. Attitudes of the pilot group of students toward teaching and toward the disadvantaged seem to be positively influenced by the activities of this project.
9. Pilot student grade point averages were significantly raised.
10. Pilot students raised grade-point averages more than matched non-project students in education, letters and science, or business administration.

11. Pilot students who were summer session "qualifiers" were more successful than those not in the project. A higher percentage than usual qualified.
12. Pilot students were effective as paraprofessionals after short-term training sessions.
13. Pilot students find project curriculum revisions and additions more relevant to their needs than other curriculum experiences.
14. The project has implications for reducing student unrest on college campuses.
15. The project has implications for meeting the compensatory education needs of black students.
16. The project has implications for encouraging faculty development among trainers of teachers.

Conclusion and Recommendations

The project undertaken during the 1968-1969 year and continued during the 1969-1970 year as an extension period to utilize unexpended balances was designed as a transition from the 1967-1968 exploratory year to an operative phase of several years duration. This phase would ideally have built in evaluation systems and controls such that conclusions and recommendations might have the full support of research evidence. Insufficient Federal or State support precluded the possibility of this phase of the project.

However, the various pilot activities and analyses of project dimensions made during the 1968-1970 period suggest several conclusions and recommendations of importance to this University in particular and higher education in general. They are not listed in a particular order of importance.

1. At the outset it is concluded that University students experiencing academic difficulty can be helped to succeed through utilization of the three major components developed in this project, namely, the personal development seminars, the learning center, and the paid work experience. WSU-O and many similar institutions throughout the nation have been and are each year failing or placing on probation large numbers of students under the guise that these students can not benefit from a university education because of their inability to achieve academically. Many of these students can be helped to achieve and can become independent, positive, supportive, academically successful university students with an excellent prognosis for graduation and a successful career. These

students will be more successful than similarly educationally disadvantaged students not involved in the project activities. Project pilot students were consistently more successful than matched groups of non-project students from various schools of the University. WSU-O and other institutions of higher education should develop programs similar to the one developed in this project to better conserve the human resources who are pursuing an education beyond high school.

2. Probably each student, but certainly any student experiencing academic difficulty, needs a faculty contact -- an advocate and supporter -- with whom he feels sufficiently at ease and with whom he can effectively communicate to ensure the highest possible academic success.

3. Project components such as the personal development seminar need to be employed over significantly long periods of time. Students having one summer experience only with the project were not as successful as students who had one summer plus a semester or two. As the period of contact with project activities increased so did the academic success of pilot students.

4. Project components need to be employed for different lengths for different students. Some students felt that small group counseling sessions were helpful for a summer session, others for a semester, others for part of one or two semesters. Similar student reactions were expressed with regard to paid professional work experiences and learning center activities. Students generally supported the idea of the unifying and central personal development seminar component for as long a period as the project had run. (This was 2 years and 2 summers for a few students.)

5. As student participation in the project components continues, students' roles tend to change from passive recipients of the help provided to active participants frequently assuming leadership roles and innovating for the improvement of the particular component. Some students with the project for a year and summer became heavy contributors to the project. Almost all students after one semester or summer session become personally committed to its goals and felt responsible for bringing its merits to the attention of other students.

6. Project components should be available to any student admitted to college as funds permit. Although some pilot project students were lost despite all efforts the number was limited. Students with very poor records made significant gains in academic success.

7. Project components should be available to students regardless of career goals. Pilot students from the Schools of Letters and Science and Business Administration responded equally

well to project components when compared with education students.

8. Varying degrees of "schoolsmanship" are essential to achieving academic success in the typical large public university. Project staff members and other faculty have observed significant increases in academic sophistication (schoolsmanship) among project students as they proceeded through the various components.

9. University students need a greater role in planning and evaluating their curricular experiences. Involvement of project students appears to speed maturity and build enthusiasm.

10. Faculty working with project components should expect early disappointment. Students tend to look for a panacea and are difficult to reach at first. It takes time, diligence and sometimes ingenuity to reach these students and develop motivation.

11. Rewards are extremely important at first. The external rewards such as encouragement, assistance in programming and effecting "drops" and "adds", and paid work experiences tend to sustain students until they are more intrinsically motivated.

12. Faculty members are not as prone to examine and redesign general education courses to better meet the needs of students experiencing academic difficulty as they are to examine and redesign courses for students pursuing a major or minor in their field. Rewards in terms of consultant monies, released time and administrative commendation are important in effecting curriculum development of this sort. Curriculum development in general education and in professional areas should be continued with the same intensity made possible by this project grant. Local stimulation substitutes should be sought on campus or through Board of Regents action. The provision of special budget funds for curriculum development is seen as a desirable means of achieving such stimulates.

13. Most faculty members seem to have difficulty in suggesting or developing specific review, reinforcement and remediation materials in connection with their courses and for use in learning centers. Again, local stimulation substitutes should be found for those project activities which encouraged the development of learning center materials directly related to courses in the curriculum.

14. The small cassette-type tape recorder is an excellent aid to the student in improving the effectiveness of his notetaking and as a device for individual review. Most project students found the tape recorder a valuable asset. Several purchased their own as a result of using those available through the project. Such recorders should be available to students on campus in increasing numbers.

15. Although the project was not continued for a long enough period to test its impact upon producing excellent teachers for the disadvantaged it is interesting to note that almost all of the pilot students in education became concerned about disadvantaged children and youth and many indicated a strong commitment to teach disadvantaged children.

Summary

In summary, the process of assimilating project components, begun during the third (extension of grant) year, should continue so that the effect of these components on larger numbers of teacher education and non-teacher education students can be evaluated. Other schools of this University and other institutions of higher education should be encouraged to pursue experimentation with the various components of this project. Finally, it is strongly recommended that related or replicative research activities in the areas with which this project has been concerned be supported locally, at the state level and through Federally sponsored programs.

INTRODUCTION

Background for the Study

Attempts to meet the need for more teachers of the academically disadvantaged have been made by 1) recruiting liberal arts graduates into programs especially designed for them; 2) encouraging Peace Corps returnees to enter this particular dimension of teaching; 3) building corps of teacher aids; and 4) recruiting those in regular teacher preparation programs. Attempts to meet the need for better teachers of the academically disadvantaged have been made through: 1) the introduction of courses on the disadvantaged -- their nature, their environment, the cultures that produce them; 2) the introduction of special methodology courses; 3) the provision of increased and varied laboratory or clinical experiences with academically disadvantaged children before, during and following student teaching. Dr. Harry Rivlin, Chairman of the AACTE Sub-committee on the Preparation of Teachers for Urban Areas, in a 1965 address to the National Association of State Boards of Education summarized the status of teacher preparation to meet the national need in the area of academic deprivation when he said, "we must change our methods of selecting teacher material and must change the way we train them."

This project represents an attempt to look at a new method of recruiting and selecting teacher material and a rather radical change in the training we provide for this teacher material. It is hypothesized that significant numbers of teacher education students who withdraw for academic reasons have greater potential scholastically than they may have demonstrated and that this potential can be salvaged for the teaching profession. It is further hypothesized that these students can more readily be recruited into a program for preparing teachers of the academically disadvantaged than can be students who are enjoying academic success in college. Finally, it is hypothesized that with some imaginative approaches to selection procedures, curriculum offerings, clinical experiences, and university instruction, these students can be prepared as effective teachers of the academically disadvantaged. Thus, this project is designed to provide evidence that 1) valuable human resources, now scrapped, can be salvaged to meet the growing national need for teachers of the academically disadvantaged, and 2) rather sharp modifications of typical teacher education programs need to be made to train effectively these particular resources as teachers of the academically disadvantaged.

Objectives

1. Tap the large reservoir of university students who have met admission requirements, have past records of scholastic achievement, and interest in teaching, but who withdraw or are dropped from

the university for academic reasons.

2. Recruit, screen and select from this group those students with the potential to be successful teachers of the academically disadvantaged in the elementary and junior high school. Attempt to determine why these students have been scholastically unsuccessful thus far. Use this information both in screening students and in planning the curriculum.

3. Design a curriculum for these students in terms of their specific needs as effective teachers of the academically disadvantaged. Take into account their past scholastic difficulties and those identified in the on-going program.

4. Ascertain the quantity of effective teachers of the academically disadvantaged that can be recruited and trained from those students who withdraw or are dropped for academic reasons.

5. Explore the possibility of paraprofessional training for those who can not successfully complete the teacher education program leading to a degree and certification.

Rationale

1. There are increasing numbers of classrooms and schools where high percentages of academically disadvantaged children are enrolled.

Martin Deutsch suggests that we can expect in the not too distant future from 40 to 70 percent of all elementary school pupils to be from minority groups. Riessman in a study of 14 large cities found one academically disadvantaged child in ten in 1950, one in three in 1960, and he projects that this will be increased to one in two by 1970. There are limited numbers of teachers interested in, available for, or adequately prepared for, teaching in these classrooms and schools.

2. Most teacher education students who have little difficulty in meeting typical university academic standards are not interested in teaching in schools where high percentages of the children are academically disadvantaged.

As one of the largest producers of teachers at the undergraduate level in Wisconsin, the School of Education graduated over 500 teachers in 1964-1965; yet placement records at Wisconsin State University-Oshkosh over the past decade indicate that less than five percent of all teacher graduates take positions in urban depressed areas.

Teacher personnel directors of Milwaukee and Chicago, for example, report long waiting lists of teachers interested in transferring from "inner city schools" to schools in "nice" residential areas. They also report that prospective teachers want

assurance of the particular school to which they will be assigned before signing a contract for fear of being assigned to an "inner city" school.

Typical university teacher education programs with heavy emphases upon verbal intelligence, high grade point averages, deep and intensive academic concentration, and rigorous development of the "finer" cultural appreciations, tend to encourage those enrolled to apply for teaching positions where they work with academically advantaged children with whom they can associate easily because of their preparation.

3. Tremendous wastes of human resources -- representing a potential supply of teachers of the academically disadvantaged -- may be taking place through the high attrition rates of freshmen and sophomores in public colleges and universities.

In The American College, Summerskill (1962) reviewed 40 years of college dropout research. Citing 35 studies conducted between 1920 and 1960, Summerskill disclosed, in a decade-by-decade analysis, a 53 percent dropout rate for the 1920's and a 50 percent rate for the 1930's. During the 1940's and 1950's, the rates of attrition were 49 percent and 51 percent, respectively. For the aggregate of these 35 studies, a median student loss of 50 percent was reported.¹ The rate of attrition at Wisconsin State University-Oshkosh is presently consistent with the 50 percent median student loss reported in the 1950's.

A probation and dropout analysis provided by the Wisconsin State University-Oshkosh admissions office (Appendix) indicated that in Semester 1 of 1965-1966, 910 of 2,699 (or 33.7 percent) regular full-time freshmen and 242 of 1,598 (or 15.1 percent) sophomores were on probation (grade point average less than 2.00). The same analysis revealed that 207 freshmen and 235 sophomores were dropped for academic reasons.

4. Many university students who withdraw for academic reasons have considerable native intelligence.

According to Getzels and Jackson,² "The student with a higher I.Q. who is doing poorly in school and the student with a lower I.Q. who is doing well appear too often for the I.Q. to stand as the only predictive measure of intellectual ability... Moreover, it is commonly observed that many children high in intelligence as measured by I.Q. are not concomitantly high in such other intellectual functions as creativity, and many children who are very high in creativity are not concomitantly high in intelligence as measured by I.Q."

¹Boyer, Ernest L.; Michael, William B. "Outcomes of College." Review of Educational Research, American Educational Research Assc., October, 1965, Vol. XXXV; No. 4; Page 277.

²Getzels and Jackson, "Creativity and Intelligence." London-New York, Wiley, 1962.

Numerous studies were cited in Chapter I by Getzels and Jackson to substantiate the above quote and the rationale for this proposal. A careful study of the academic achievements of the students who entered Wisconsin State University-Oshkosh in September, 1963³, reveals some startling facts and also supports the rationale for this proposal. After three semesters 26 percent of the brightest students who ranked at or above the 69th percentile of their high school class had been lost and 18 percent of the remainder were on probation. This suggests a loss of 40 percent in two years.

This loss was almost uniformly distributed among all ability levels. Twenty-five percent of those ranking above the 98th percentile (I.G. above 148) of their high school class; 21 percent of those at or above the 93rd; 30 percent of those at or above the 69th percentile but below the 84th. Among the remainder those on probation were fewer at the top but still alarmingly high; four percent of those above the 93rd percentile were on probation at the end of the third semester; 16 percent of those from the 84th to the 93rd; 25 percent of those from the 69th to the 84th. Among the average students the mortality was even greater. In the group from the 50th percentile to the 69th, (less than one half standard deviation from the mean) 43 percent had been lost after three semesters and 51 percent of the remainder were on probation. Among those less than half a standard deviation below the mean (the mean grade point average was exactly the same, 1.93, as the group less than a half standard deviation above the mean) 60 percent had been lost and 51 percent of the remainder were on probation.

It is clear from these figures that we are losing, in a two year span, 40 percent of our brightest students and 75 percent of the average. Although some are leaving for reasons other than scholastic, many represent attrition due to lack of scholastic success.

It is also noteworthy that in spite of this adverse climate 40 students who came from the groups ranging from the 7th percentile to the 31st have managed to survive the first two years. This tends to support the contention of the Wisconsin Legislature that all above the 25th percentile should be allowed to try and that some below the 25th can succeed.

5. Personality qualities, attitudes, creativeness, ability to communicate, and commitment may be more important in terms of potential success as a teacher of the academically disadvantaged than ability to maintain a relatively high grade point average in college.

Holland (1961) and Locke (1963) challenged directly the use of grades as the only measure of academic progress. Holland developed an achievement scale based on the number of original papers published, prizes won, and inventive projects completed by
³Hadley, C.M. "Study of Academic Achievements of Students Entering Wisconsin State University-Oshkosh in 1963." (Study incomplete at time of this writing.)

the student and found that these creative achievements were unrelated to grades. In parallel findings, Locke reported that academic success as judged by self-initiated activities performed outside the classroom did not correlate with academic performance in the structured classroom situation. Both writers called for the development of more adequate student achievement criteria.⁴

The BRIDGE PROJECT⁵ seems to support this rationale in its listing of "characteristics of the good teacher of the culturally disadvantaged." The listing follows:

1. He should be emotionally mature. He must, in effect, be a person who has attained self-understanding and a fairly firm set of values which will give direction to his work and sustain him in his difficulties.
2. He should have unusual physical stamina and be able to work harder and longer than the teacher in a middle-class school finds necessary.
3. He should have the ability to feel interest and enthusiasm for his subject and to project this interest. He must personify for these children the good results of what it means to have mastery of the knowledge and skills which he seeks to teach the pupils.
4. He should be capable of considerable objectivity, able to see the behavior of the children as symptomatic of their problems and not as threats to his dignity. He should also be able to accept assistance and be inclined to experiment and innovate. Though well informed in his subject, he should be committed more to the teaching-learning task than to scholarly achievement.
5. He should be able to individualize his classroom procedures. If he is to do so, he will have to have some training in the techniques of individualization and must have materials which make it possible.

⁴Boyer, Ernest L.; Michael, William B. "Outcomes of College." Review of Educational Research, American Educational Research Assoc. October, 1965, Vol. XXXV; No. 4; Page 280.

⁵Cooperative Research Project No. 935, "The Preparation of Teachers for Schools in Culturally Deprived Neighborhoods." Queens College of the City University of New York. 1965, Page 215-216.

6. He should be able to use the arts as useful stimulants to learning the academic subjects.

6. For Wisconsin State University-Oshkosh as a whole, of the 500 freshman and sophomore students dropped for academic reasons and of the 1,150 freshman and sophomore students on probation (grade point average less than 2.00), at least 100 can be recruited who have an interest in, and aptitude for, a specially designed teacher education program for teachers of the academically disadvantaged.

Approximately 3,500 students were enrolled in the School of Education of Wisconsin State University-Oshkosh in the 1965-1966 school year. The projected enrollments suggest that this number will be closer to 5,000 by 1968. In spite of the fact that this institution produces a large number of teachers at the undergraduate level in the State of Wisconsin, the attrition rate due to withdrawal or transfer remains at about 30 percent. Local studies have indicated that significant numbers of students placed on probation or dropped for academic reasons have high school ranking and ACT scores that indicate capability to do college level work.

7. A carefully selected university-wide committee representing the various disciplines would work with the staff appointed to this project in designing general education, specialization, and professional education sequences that will better fit the needs of these selected students, as potential teachers of the academically disadvantaged, than the present curricula available at the university. Furthermore, these sequences can be designed so as to justify the awarding of the Bachelor of Science Degree in Elementary Education to students upon their successful completion and to justify a university recommendation to the State Department of Public Instruction for general certification as an elementary teacher in the State of Wisconsin with limited certification at the junior high school level.

It should be noted at this point that this study is not suggesting a weak curriculum with low standards for weak students as preparation to teach academically disadvantaged children. Rather, it is suggesting: a) different emphases in academic concentration and individualized, imaginative teaching of the course sections in which these students are enrolled; b) academic standards that are realistic in terms of the student at the time they are applied with appropriate assistance in remediation when needed; c) increased concern for other essentials in teaching success such as ability to communicate, appropriate attitudes, a real concern for the individual and individual differences, imagination, creativeness; d) a strong professional orientation toward teaching the academically disadvantaged throughout the program.

The general education requirements will remain essentially the same for the experimental group as for regular elementary education students, though more flexibility of requirements will be provided on the basis of examination of students background and appropriate guidance. Many existing programs which are training teachers for the academically disadvantaged are utilizing flexible, new approaches. The Brooklyn College of City University⁶ suggests that their courses "represent a new synthesis of subject matter" adaptable to the specific needs of the teachers in training.

It is assumed that the establishment of remediation centers in 1) language arts 2) science-mathematics, 3) social science, and 4) humanities will have a significant effect upon the success of the students in their course work. The plan of this project to control class size, handpicked instructors and provide consultant services for the improvement of instruction will reinforce the effect of the remediation center. Programs such as the Syracuse Program⁷ utilize remediation and individualization in training teachers of the disadvantaged. They recommend close careful supervision and guidance along with smaller more individualized classes. Project APEX⁸ in its first year of operation has had some success with a compensatory curriculum for 60 high school graduates of the "general" (non-college preparatory) curriculum in New York City. Through skill building seminars focusing primarily upon diagnostic, remedial and acceleration programs the intention is to systematically produce successful experiences in school, to obtain maximal gains during the year's work at New York University, and to increase both feelings of self-confidence and the competence to do academic work in college.

The specialization requirement of a minor area of concentration (of from 22 to possibly 43 semester hours) will be retained for the experimental group. However, it is assumed that the careful selection of the concentration from courses in sociology, anthropology, psychology, speech correction, reading, health education and special education-mental retardation-emotionally disturbed, will provide a needed background for effective teachers of the academically disadvantaged. Passow⁹ suggests the need for teachers of the disadvantaged to have a background in such areas as anthropology, sociology, and

⁶"The Preparation of College Graduates for Teaching in Urban Elementary Schools in Economically Disadvantaged Areas." An unpublished brochure by the Department of Education of Brooklyn College of the City University of New York.

⁷"Urban Teacher Preparation Program." An unpublished report from Syracuse University and the Syracuse Public School System.

⁸A Program for Excellence in Urban Teacher Education; a New York University Experimental Program to Prepare Teachers of Culturally Deprived and "Peace Corps Type" High School Teachers in Urban Areas of Poverty. (Manuscript December, 1964) Report on program in process.

⁹Passow, A. Harry, Editor "Education in Depressed Areas." Bureau of Publications Teachers College, Columbia University, New York. 1963.

social psychology. Others suggest 10, 11, 12 the need for background in such areas as psychology, social problems, research, special education and communication skills.

It is assumed that by teaching all required professional education courses with an orientation toward the problems of the academically disadvantaged, a real feeling for the problems and competency for dealing with them can be achieved. Since professional courses at this institution have a laboratory requirement, the opportunities are many for first hand experiences with academically disadvantaged children during each of the college years. Student teaching done in the "center city" schools of Milwaukee, Racine, Kenosha or even Chicago will provide a most important dimension of the program. It has been established that laboratory experiences including student teaching can be provided for Wisconsin State University-Oshkosh students in urban depressed areas. A feasibility study of such a student teaching program in Milwaukee during the 1965-1966 school year, conducted under a Wisconsin Board of Regents grant, revealed that arrangements for these laboratory experiences can be readily made. Supervision by the University staff and relationships with the university program can be easily maintained. Cooperative arrangements with other universities (in this case University of Wisconsin, Milwaukee) can be established.

The regular contact during each semester with academically disadvantaged children in both in and out-of-school settings plus intensive summer programs of observation and participation in depressed areas are crucial to successful student teaching and subsequent teaching in schools for academically disadvantaged. Many theorists have suggested need for courses oriented toward problems of the academically disadvantaged. Storen¹³ suggested that teacher education should include observation and experience in working with the disadvantaged in field work. As to curriculum, Storen recommends specialized, more rigorous classes for teachers of the disadvantaged, oriented towards the unique needs of the disadvantaged. She also

¹⁰Educational Policies Commission of the NEA, and the American Assc. of School Administrators. "The Education of Teachers of the Disadvantaged." National Education Association Journal, Vol. 54, September, 1965, P. 12.

¹¹Bahnham, Dorsey "The Great Cities Project." The National Education Association Journal, 1963, Vol. 52 (4), Page 17-20.

¹²Grotberg, E.H. "Learning Disabilities and Remediation in Disadvantaged Children." Review of Educational Research, Vol. XXXV, No. 5, December, 1965.

¹³Storen, Helen F. "Educating Teachers for Underprivileged Schools." AST.

suggests that the students should be acquainted with the cultural problems of the under-privileged to help them to overcome fears and misconceptions. Masoner and Lofthouse ¹⁴ encourage the teaching of such areas as unemployment, discrimination, crime and delinquency, illiteracy, air and water pollution, taxation, social and cultural backgrounds, etc. The BRIDGE ¹⁵ project also makes similar recommendations. These are the types of topics which will be integrated into the specialized curriculum of this project.

8. If some of the experimental group can not successfully complete the program leading to a degree and certification, they can be prepared for positions as paraprofessionals thus encouraging university and state department of public instruction consideration of non-degree training programs and modified certification opportunities.

Some of the 100 selected for this project may not be able to successfully complete the collegiate program despite the special curricular arrangements provided in the project. The increasing demand for paraprofessionals in depressed area schools suggests another level of salvage operation for those in the experimental group whose college work continues at such a low level as to make questionable the awarding of a degree and a recommendation for certification. Such students might be encouraged to accept one of the various non-or paraprofessional positions available in depressed area schools. The experience of this project might suggest a new type of paraprofessional training and certificate for those persons unable to complete the college teacher education program but yet having interest in working with children in depressed areas and certain useful training and ability.

Summary

The Background for the Study, Objectives, and Rationale that was outlined in the Introduction section of this report encompasses the total scope of an eight to ten year longitudinal study. The U.S.O.E. Bureau of Research grant for August 1, 1968, to September 15, 1969, provided support for the pilot phase of this longitudinal study. The objectives during this period were to:

1) identify and recruit a group of students similar to those identified and described during 1967-1968. These students would begin the program in June, 1969.

¹⁴ Masoner, Paul and Lofthouse, "Implications of Urbanization for Professional Laboratory Experiences." AST

¹⁵ Cooperative Research Project No. 935, op. cit.

2) further develop and refine curriculum concepts--identified and described during the 1967-1968 planning year--and prepare these concepts for implementation beginning June, 1969.

3) continue program of faculty development through involvement in all phases of curriculum building within the experimental teacher education model.

4) involve students (20-25), identified during 1967-1968, in pilot programs in the areas of a) personal development seminars - regularly scheduled meetings designed to help students understand themselves, set goals, build positive self-images, develop skills including "schoolmanship", and keep channels of communication open between students and faculty members; b) learning centers - study and media centers located in various departments and containing materials of a review, remedial, and reinforcement nature, designed to aid in course work and skill development; and c) paid para-professional work experiences - student assistant positions designed to develop skills related to professions in education, e.g. teacher-aid and audio-visual technician.

5) make necessary administrative arrangements for smooth commencement of the teacher preparation program as of June, 1969.

1968-1969 METHODS, FINDINGS, AND ANALYSIS
SEMESTER I, SEMESTER II, AND SUMMER SESSION 1969

Because of the inter-relationships of methods, findings, and analysis of each semester and summer session group of students, it has been decided - after consulting the project office and receiving approval - to reproduce the Semester I, Semester II, and Summer Session reports as completed for each period.

It should be noted that there were some changes in pilot student personnel from Semester I to Semester II, and even greater changes in matched control groups, thereby making inferences from collected data difficult. It was important, nevertheless, to continue pilot activity for purposes of improving techniques within the various components, maintaining Project momentum on the campus, and recruiting students for the expected and hoped for June Project initiation for 100 students.

Late grant approval by U.S.O.E. (March, 1969), resultant State expenditure reluctance, and a serious state-wide fiscal condition promising an austerity 1969-1971 biennium budget (not passed until August 1969) caused the University to cancel plans to operate the entire Project program for 100 students as of June, 1969. In fact, the recruitment of students for the summer session had to be done on a pilot basis again, since the State budget had not been passed by the legislature. It was therefore decided to continue pilot activity during the summer. A group of qualifying freshmen (students not quite meeting entrance standards and given a chance to demonstrate their ability in a pre-freshman year summer session) were added to those groups with which the Project had already gained experience. It was also decided to assume that the total Project could not be operated and that the alternative of assimilating Project components into the regular program should be followed.

METHODS, FINDINGS, AND ANALYSES SEMESTER I, 1968-1969

General Background - Pilot Students

Forty-six students (26 girls and 20 boys) were enrolled in project pilot activities for the first semester. Ten of the twelve students in the summer pilot program were continued in the fall pilot group. Approximately $\frac{2}{3}$ of the group were classified as freshmen and $\frac{1}{3}$ held sophomore class standing. Only three students in the group were beginning college students. Forty-two of the students listed Wisconsin as their home state and the majority of this group came from within a ninety mile radius of campus.

All students in the pilot group were experiencing academic difficulties in at least one area (a high percentage in all areas) when they were enrolled in the project. Not counting the three entering freshmen and one transfer student, all but one student in the pilot group had either been on probation and/or dropped from the university because of academic deficiencies. In other words, the breakdown would look as follows:

- 3 entering freshmen;
- 1 transfer;
- 1 non-probation;
- 1 entering on probation, but removed at end of first semester of college work;
- 10 dropped at some time by the university;
- 30 on probation at some time.

The composite scores of the American College Test ranged from 01 to 95 percentile. However, the average composite score on the ACT was slightly below the mean on national norms. In terms of high school rank, approximately 45% of the pilot group ranked in the upper half of their graduating class. Approximately 60% of the group were enrolled in elementary education, approximately 24% were in secondary, one student was in special education, one student was in the school of business, and three students were undecided as to a major.

Pilot Activities

Pilot activities for the group during the first semester included personal development seminars, group counseling, learning center activities, and paraprofessional work experience. The personal development seminars and group counseling activities were scheduled together as a three-credit course; however, university credit was not awarded for this program activity.

Personal Development Seminars. Four groups of 10 to 13 students each met for one hour, twice a week with a member of the project staff. This activity served as the center of operation for the students and staff in the program. This component of the program was designed to help students understand themselves, build a positive self image, set their goals, develop various skills including "schoolsmanship", and keep channels of communication open between themselves and faculty members. Program inputs included orientation to campus resources, development of individual study skills, skills in writing course examinations, skill development in written and oral communication, general discussions of the teaching process and the teaching profession, and discussions of problems that students encounter in their pursuit of higher education. A sub-pilot program utilizing specially designed tape recorders to improve written composition was implemented during the first semester. Those students who used the program received grades of C or better in English courses. Also, extensive academic advisement was available through this facet of the program.

Group Counseling. In this component of the program project students met as small groups (6 to 8 students each) for one hour a week with a pair of professionally trained counselors. The major objective of this component was to assist the student in his development of a more realistic perception of himself and the world around him.

Learning Center. Although still in its infancy of development, many activities and materials of a review, remedial, and reinforcement nature accompanying various required courses in the curriculum were made available to project students in one centrally located Learning Center. These resources included video tapes (prepared by WSU-O professors), reference materials, workbooks, audio tapes, portable tape recorders, auto-instructional materials, and programmed materials. An additional resource that was administered through this component was student tutorials. Approximately 75 tutors representing all disciplines were recruited to volunteer their services for academic tutoring of project students. Also, the learning center was staffed one evening a week primarily to serve project students who had acute need for remedial assistance in written communication.

Paraprofessional Experience. This component was designed to prepare each student in a relatively short time to become some type of educational technician of value and use in classrooms, with children, or with educational equipment. Twenty-nine students worked as student assistants in this facet of the program during the first semester. The listing below illustrates the various kinds of experiences that the 29 project students accrued during this semester.

| <u>Activity</u> | <u>No. of Students Experiencing Activity</u> |
|---|--|
| I. CLERICAL | 15 |
| Typing | 10 |
| General Clerical-Filing.. | 4 |
| Compiling Research Data.. | 1 |
| II. TEACHING AND CLASSROOM RELATED..... | 20 |
| Coaching | 1 |
| Playing with children.... | 2 |
| Tutoring | 2 |
| Correcting tests..... | 6 |
| Entering teacher grades.. | 4 |
| Preparing teaching materials | 4 |
| Bulletin boards..... | 1 |
| III. OPERATION OF EQUIPMENT | 11 |
| Computer center | 1 |
| Office machines | 5 |
| A-V (VTR, movie projectors etc.)..... | 5 |
| IV. LIBRARY RELATED | 5 |
| Cataloging books | 3 |
| Processing library books. | 1 |
| Preparing books for class levels | 1 |
| V. MISCELLANEOUS | 4 |
| Cleaning | 2 |
| Painting | 1 |
| Running Errands | 1 |

A questionnaire was administered to students involved in this component at the close of the semester. The objective was not only to have the students evaluate their experience but also to assess their attitudes toward job, teaching, and school. Only two students in the group indicated that they felt less positive about teaching. Not a single student indicated that he felt less positive about school. Generally speaking, the pilot group involved in this component felt that their attitudes toward job, teaching, and school were more positive at the close of the semester than they were at the start.

Analysis of First Semester Grades

Our pilot group for the first semester of 1968-1969 was comprised of 46 students. First semester grade reports for 39 students

were obtained from the Registrar's Office. Seven students were excluded from this analysis for the following reasons: (a) four students lost through university expulsion, and (b) three students remained on project roster, but did not participate in project activities often enough to justify inclusion in this type of analysis.

These 39 students carried an average of 12.5 credits (plus the non-credit seminar that was scheduled as a three credit course) for the semester. Four-hundred and ninety-six credits were attempted with 173 grades being reported. One, three credit incomplete was reported for the total group. The breakdown of credits pursued in the five main areas follows:

| <u>Area</u> | <u>Percent</u> |
|---------------------------------|----------------|
| Fine Arts | 11.8 |
| Mathematics-Science | 19.4 |
| Social Sciences-Education | 43.4 |
| English-Speech | 20.4 |
| Physical Education | 5.0 |

Significant grade results on the pilot group follow:

1. Eight (8) students received eleven (11) A's involving 25 credits of course work.
2. Twenty-six (26) students received forty (40) B's involving 109 credits of course work.
3. Thirty-eight of the thirty-nine students received at least one "C" grade. These 38 students received 90 C's involving 253 credits of course work.
4. Only five (5) students received a grade of "F", or a total of seven (7) "F" grades involving twenty-two (22) credits of course work.
5. Twenty-two (22) students made a 2.0 or better G.P.A. this past semester. A more detailed breakdown of G.P.A.'s can be noted below.

| <u>G.P.A.</u> <u>1st. Sem. 68-69</u> | <u>No. of</u> <u>Students</u> | <u>Highest Previous</u> <u>Cumulative G.P.A.</u> | <u>Lowest Previous</u> <u>Cumulative G.P.A.</u> |
|---|----------------------------------|---|--|
| 3.0 and above | 2 | 1.8 | 1.5 |
| 2.5 and above | (a) 8 | 2.2 | 1.5 |
| 2.2 and above | (b) 17 | 2.2 | 1.4 |
| 2.0 and above | (c) 22 | 2.2 | 1.2 |

- (a) Six (6) of these students have never before achieved a 2.0 G.P.A.

(b) Thirteen (13) of these students have never before achieved a 2.0 G.P.A.

(c) Eighteen (18) of these students have never before achieved a 2.0 G.P.A.

6. Twenty-six (26) students raised their cumulative G.P.A. as a result of this past semester's work. The average G.P.A. raise was .28 and the average difference between this semester's G.P.A. and the previous cumulative G.P.A. was .63. A more detailed breakdown can be noted below.

| <u>Semester I G.P.A. Compared With Previous Cumulative G.P.A.</u> | <u>Number of Students</u> |
|---|-------------------------------|
| +1.0 or more | 5 |
| + .75 or more | 8 |
| + .50 or more | 17 |

In other words five (5) students achieved a G.P.A. for the past semester which was one full letter grade above their previous cumulative average. Some of the more dramatic individual cases are listed below for illustrative purposes.

| | <u>Previous Cumulative G.P.A.</u> | <u>G.P.A. for 1st. Semester - 1968-69</u> |
|-----------|---------------------------------------|---|
| Student A | 80 | 1.85 |
| Student B | 1.44 | 2.45 |
| Student C | 1.51 | 3.40 |
| Student D | 1.80 | 3.06 |
| Student E | 1.39 | 2.41 |
| Student F | 1.72 | 2.50 |
| Student G | 1.23 | 2.16 |
| Student H | 1.62 | 2.42 |
| Student I | 1.55 | 2.23 |
| Student J | 1.26 | 2.00 |

7. Fifteen (15) students in the pilot group now have a cumulative G.P.A. of 2.0 or better. Prior to this semester only seven (7) students had achieved a cumulative G.P.A. of 2.0.
8. The average G.P.A. for the group this past semester was 1.91. (This will change slightly when the 3-credit incomplete is removed.) The average cumulative G.P.A. for the group just prior to first semester was 1.56 (1.71 after corrections were made for repeat courses).

The average G.P.A. for the group after last semester's experience was 1.86. It might be noted that our earlier report on the twelve pilot students in the summer program recorded a 1.60 average cumulative G.P.A. before summer school and a 1.81 average cumulative G.P.A. after the summer experience.

An analysis of pilot students' grades by academic area provides another means of descriptive analysis. This information on our pilot group is detailed below.

Breakdown of Grades by Subject Area

| <u>Area</u> | <u>Grade</u> | <u>No. Grades</u> | <u>No. Credits</u> | <u>Grades as a % of Credits</u> |
|-----------------------|--------------|-------------------|--------------------|---------------------------------|
| 1. Fine Arts | A | 2 | 4 | 6.9 |
| | B | 7 | 15 | 25.9 |
| | C | 11 | 21 | 36.2 |
| *Music | D | 7 | 15 | 25.9 |
| | F | *1 | 3 | 5.1 |
| Total | | <u>28</u> | <u>58</u> | |
| 2. Math-Science..... | A | 0 | 0 | 0.0 |
| | B | 4 | 20 | 20.4 |
| | C | 11 | 41 | 41.8 |
| *Math, Physical | D | 8 | 27 | 27.6 |
| Geography & | F | *3 | 10 | 10.2 |
| Botony | | <u>26</u> | <u>98</u> | |
| 3. Education-Social | A | 4 | 9 | 4.2 |
| Science | B | 11 | 30 | 14.0 |
| *Psychology and | C | 42 | 133 | 62.2 |
| History | D | 12 | 36 | 16.8 |
| | F | *2 | 6 | 2.8 |
| Total | | <u>71</u> | <u>214</u> | |
| 4. English-Speech | A | 3 | 9 | 9.0 |
| | B | 11 | 33 | 33.0 |
| | C | 16 | 47 | 47.0 |
| *English | D | 2 | 6 | 6.0 |
| | F | *1 | 3 | 3.0 |
| | I | 1 | 3 | 3.0 |
| Total | | <u>34</u> | <u>101</u> | |
| 5. Physical Education | A | 2 | 3 | 12.0 |
| | B | 8 | 15 | 60.0 |
| | C | 3 | 6 | 24.0 |
| | D | 1 | 1 | 4.0 |
| | F | 0 | 0 | 0.0 |
| Total | | <u>14</u> | <u>25</u> | |

It can be noted from the above information that the highest percentage of D and F credit grades was recorded in the area of math-science. By the same token, when physical education is excluded the lowest percentage of D-F credit grades was recorded in the English-speech area with the number of credits attempted in each area being approximately the same (98-101 respectively).

Questions concerning students' abilities, prior knowledges, and previous academic success are frequently raised when we attempt to analyze achievement of such a group at a particular point in time. The questions are certainly germane and deserve inspection at this time. Since American College Test scores and high school rank represent the criteria that are applied at this university for admission, these two variables have been selected for analysis. Thus, the pilot group was dichotomized using a 2.0 G.P.A. as a base for this past semester. This permits us to examine the question of how high school rank and ACT composite score relate to our pilot group's success during first semester. This information is presented below.

Pilot Students - 2.0 G.P.A. or Above (N=22)
1st Semester only

| | <u>*ACT Composite</u> | <u>*H. S. Rank</u> |
|----------------|-----------------------|--------------------|
| Upper Quartile | 0 | 2 |
| 3rd " | 5 | 6 |
| 2nd " | 11 | 9 |
| Lower " | 4 | 3 |

*Data missing from 2 students' records

Pilot Students - Below 2.0 (N=7)
1st Semester only

| | <u>*ACT Composite</u> | <u>*H. S. Rank</u> |
|----------------|-----------------------|--------------------|
| Upper Quartile | 2 | 2 |
| 3rd " | 2 | 6 |
| 2nd. " | 7 | 6 |
| Lower " | 5 | 3 |

*Data missing from 1 student's record

It can readily be observed from the above data that high school rank and ACT scores have contributed little if any to our understanding of the academic success of the pilot group. Of the 22 students who achieved a 2.0 G.P.A. or better, well over 50 percent were in the bottom half of the ACT national norm group and nearly 50 percent were in the bottom half of their high-school graduating class. On the other side of the coin it can be noted that of the 17 students who made below a 2.0 G.P.A., approximately 25 percent were

in the upper half of the ACT national norm group and nearly 50 percent were in the upper half of their high school class. If nothing else this information strongly suggests that there are variables other than high school rank and ACT scores which are equally important in determining academic success for this type of student.

Further investigation was made to determine if there was any relationship between the students' cumulative G.P.A. prior to last semester and the G.P.A. achieved last semester. A rank order correlation of the student rankings produced a .08 correlation coefficient. This would lead one to conclude that such a relationship did not exist.

Curriculum Development and Revision

Each curricular area in the general education program that is to be revised for the five year elementary teacher training program has proceeded toward various stages of completion during the past semester. The Curriculum Subcommittees will continue on their assigned tasks during second semester with a view toward implementation or piloting their respective component during the coming academic year. Some departments have been able to provide released time to faculty for this work. Where departments were unable to provide released time, committee members are willingly proceeding with their assignments on an "overload" basis. When possible and necessary faculty members have been put on a consultant basis to accomplish certain tasks during university vacation periods. Very little has been accomplished on the professional sequence and the minor specialization area. This will receive attention during the second semester.

More specific developments in the respective components follow.

1. Experimental English I. A three credit course replacing 38-101, English Composition. This is the first course in a nine credit sequence that will focus primarily upon the development of communication skills, particularly those of reading, writing, speaking, and listening. Revised syllabus for the course was refined this past semester and the course has been placed in the summer session schedule for 50 beginning freshmen project students. The professor assigned to teach the course will work with project staff and subcommittee members during second semester to develop materials for course and learning center, refine evaluation design, and plan those segments of the course that will be articulated with learning center and personal development seminars. Plans have been developed to produce a series of short video tapes on written communication during second semester.

2. Experimental General Psychology. A three credit revised course to replace 86-301. Course revision is nearing completion and it has been placed in the summer session schedule for 50 project students. The professor assigned to teach the course has developed plans for video taping certain course concepts that can be used in the learning center. Development of special course materials and video taping will be done second semester.
3. Social Science Semester. A 14 credit interdisciplinary block entitled Poverty in American Society will replace 50-111, Cultural Geography; 92-201, Sociology; 57-301 and 302, U.S. History; and, Social Studies Methods. This semester's work is being placed in the first semester 1969-1970 schedule for 50 project students. Department chairmen from the respective departments met during the Christmas vacation to assess departmental allocations to project needs and discuss implementation problems. The course which includes emphasis from each of the disciplines and provides foundational and relevant material on poverty in this nation and the "disadvantaged" has been reviewed and approved by the State Department Supervisor. The Subcommittee will spend second semester developing the various field and laboratory experiences and selecting course materials.
4. Art-Music Practicum. A new 12 credit block encompassing 6 credits of art and 6 credits of music. Each area will combine the fundamentals, appreciation, and methods. Selected topics based on the allied aural and visual arts will be inserted at appropriate points throughout the semester and presented jointly to all project students enrolled in the semester. Course will replace the regular fundamentals, appreciation and methods courses in both areas.

Both departments have mapped out plans for next semester to develop materials, video tape, and arrange field experiences for the course. Budgets have been submitted for learning center materials and the course is being placed in first semester 1969-1970 schedule for one section of "pilot" students.

5. Science Semester. Three four credit courses in biology, physical science, and earth science and the two credit methods. Biology has been revised and the course material is to be essentially ecological in nature. Experimental course will replace 26-101 for project students. Physical science course revision is nearing completion. Earth science course which will replace 50-107, Physical

Geography is under development by committee members from the Geology and Geography departments. The committee spent one full day during semester break visiting the "core" area schools in Milwaukee. This trip was made in order to gain a better understanding of the preservice needs of elementary teachers in the inner city. The Science semester is planned for implementation during second semester 1969-70 for project students. However, one section may be "piloted" during first semester 1969-70.

The above represents the major thrusts of curriculum developments through the project during the first semester. However, other areas have received attention. For example, representatives from the health education and physical education departments are examining the health and physical education requirements for elementary teachers in terms of their relevancy for our five-year program. Also, the child growth and development and learning courses are under revision by members of the Education Psychology Department. This planning is being undertaken with a view toward merging the two existing courses and building in appropriate laboratory and field experiences to make the course more relevant for project students.

The most satisfying development to date has been the cooperative manner in which committee members from the various disciplines have worked together. Frequently we hear lip service given to the need for revision and relevance in the curricula of higher education. Seldom is this need met through meaningful action programs. However, it is our judgment that the various subcommittees working through the project are on the threshold of producing what others have talked about producing for all too long!

A Comparative Grade Analysis - Semester I, 1968-1969

At the close of the first semester 1968-69 a random sample of non-project students was drawn from the School of Business, School of Education, and School of Letters and Science. Subjects for the non-project samples were controlled on the following variables: credits earned, cumulative grade point average, and credits attempted first semester 1968-69. Education and Letters and Science samples were also controlled on sex. (Lack of girls in the School of Business prohibited control of this variable for the Business sample.)

Description of Subjects

| Sample Numbers | <u>Project</u> | <u>Bus.</u> | <u>Educ.</u> | <u>L & S</u> |
|---|----------------|-------------|--------------|------------------|
| Boys | 16 | 41 | 13 | 14 |
| Girls | <u>23</u> | <u>0</u> | <u>26</u> | <u>25</u> |
| Total | 39 | 41 | 39 | 39 |
| Entrance Test Scores | | | | |
| Mean Composite ACT (Standard Scores) | 18 | 19 | 18 | 20 |
| High School Rank | | | | |
| Median HSR (%ile) | 50 | 44 | 42 | 49.5 |
| Range HSR (%ile) | 2-86 | 10-91 | 11-83 | 9-87 |
| Cumulative Grade Point Average | | | | |
| Mean Cumulative GPA before 1st. semester | 1.56 | 1.54 | 1.55 | 1.58 |

The above information shows that the project group and non-project samples do not differ significantly in terms of entrance test scores, high school rank and previous college achievement.

Percent of Credits Attempted by Area - 1st Semester 1968-69

| Area | <u>Project</u> | <u>Bus.</u> | <u>Educ.</u> | <u>L & S</u> |
|--------------------|----------------|-------------|--------------|------------------|
| Business | -- | 15.0 | -- | -- |
| Education | 4.2 | -- | 3.8 | 1.5 |
| English-Speech | 20.4 | 20.6 | 23.3 | 25.1 |
| Fine Arts | 11.8 | 3.2 | 10.5 | 5.5 |
| Math-Science | 19.4 | 16.2 | 17.6 | 24.2 |
| Physical Education | 5.0 | .8 | 5.6 | .4 |
| Social Sciences | 39.2 | 43.5 | 38.0 | 42.5 |
| Other | -- | .7 | 1.2 | .8 |

It can be noted above that over 80% of the credits attempted last semester by project and non-project students were in English-Speech, Fine Arts, Math-Science and Social Sciences. And, the percentage of credits attempted within these major areas does not differ appreciably among the samples. (The largest variance - 8.6% - being in the Fine Arts area which represents the smallest proportion of courses attempted in the four areas.)

Comparison of Grade Point Averages

| | <u>Project</u> | <u>Bus.</u> | <u>Educ.</u> | <u>L & S</u> |
|--|----------------|-------------|--------------|------------------|
| ^a Mean cumulative GPA before 1st semester | 1.56 | 1.54 | 1.55 | 1.58 |
| Mean GPA - 1st semester only | 1.91 | 1.17 | 1.67 | 1.558 |
| ^b Mean cumulative GPA after 1st semester | 1.86 | 1.497 | 1.62 | 1.64 |
| ^c Mean number credits attempted | 12.5 | 13.4 | 13.6 | 13.5 |

- a. Averages not corrected for repeat courses.
- b. Averages corrected for repeat courses.
- c. Project students scheduled in a non-credit seminar that meets as a three credit course.

GPA Breakdown for 1st Semester Only

| | <u>Project</u> | <u>Bus.</u> | <u>Educ.</u> | <u>L & S</u> |
|---------------------------------|----------------|-------------|--------------|------------------|
| Number of students 3.0 or above | 2 | 0 | 0 | 1 |
| Number of students 2.5 or above | 8 | 1 | 1 | 3 |
| Number of students 2.2 or above | 17 | 4 | 7 | 9 |
| Number of students 2.0 or above | 22 | 10 | 17 | 14 |
| Number of students 1.8 or above | 28 | 11 | 21 | 16 |
| % of students 1.8 or above | 72% | 27% | 54% | 41% |

Letter Grade Breakdown for 1st Semester Only

| | <u>Project</u> | <u>Bus.</u> | <u>Educ.</u> | <u>L & S</u> |
|-------------------------------|----------------|-------------|--------------|------------------|
| Number of A grades | 11 | 4 | 4 | 5 |
| Number of B grades | 40 | 15 | 28 | 23 |
| Number of C grades | 90 | 53 | 88 | 70 |
| Number of D grades | 30 | 44 | 39 | 37 |
| Number of F grades | 7 | 62 | 24 | 25 |
| Number of I grades | 1 | 4 | 6 | 10 |
| Number of W grades | 3 | 6 | 3 | 7 |
| Total Number of Letter Grades | 182 | 188 | 192 | 177 |
| % A & B grades | 28% | 10% | 17% | 16% |
| % A, B, & C grades | 77% | 38% | 62% | 55% |
| % D & F grades | 20% | 56% | 33% | 35% |

Summary

First semester 1968-1969 grade reports for project students and their counterparts in regular programs were produced by the university computer center for comparative analysis. The project group consisted of thirty-nine students who had experienced the experimental project treatment. The non-project samples were randomly selected students from the School of Business, School of Education, and School of Letters and Science. All non-project students were: (a) enrolled as full time students (12 or more credits); (b) on academic probation at start of semester; (c) in the same "credits earned" classification as the project group. Project and non-project groups were essentially similar in terms of high school rank, ACT composite score, previous college achievement, and courses attempted last semester.

The analysis of first semester grade reports of project and non-project students revealed differences all of which favored the project group. The project group achieved an appreciably higher GPA than each of the non-project samples. Similarly, project students received many more A and B grades and significantly fewer D and F grades. More specifically, the project students recorded 28% of their grades in the A or B category, while their counterparts in business, letters and science, and education recorded 10%, 17%, and 16% (A and B grades) respectively. On the other end of the grade scale, differences again favor the project group. Project students received 20% D or F grades, while the business students received 56%, and the education and letters and science students received 33% and 35% respectively.

METHODS, FINDINGS, AND ANALYSES SEMESTER II, 1968-1969

General Background - Pilot Students

Seven first semester pilot students were lost to the Project, but eleven new ones were added, bringing the total number to forty-eight. Statistics concerning ACT scores and rank in high school graduating class remained essentially the same as those in the first semester report. Approximately 58% were enrolled in elementary education; about 30% were in secondary; one student was in special education; two were in the School of Business; and two were undecided as to major.

Pilot Activities

Pilot activities for the group during the second semester included continuation of the personal development seminars, group counseling, learning center activities, and paraprofessional work experience. The personal development seminars and group counseling activities were scheduled as a three-credit course, but university credit was not granted.

Personal Development Seminars. The seminars were reorganized somewhat, resulting in three seminar groups, each slightly larger than each of the original, first semester groups. In an attempt to reach those students who had not previously related to the project, several students were changed from one seminar to another. The moves proved at least partially successful, indicating that, in the future, seminar leaders should be aware of the possible benefits of changing a reluctant or recalcitrant student to another group and another leader.

Seminar format was changed considerably, from emphasis on study-skill development and utilization of campus resources to emphasis on poverty, race relations, and the education of the disadvantaged. Films and speakers provided the basis for discussions and evaluations. Due to difficulties in scheduling, films and speakers were not always presented in logical or rational order;

evaluations thus are often incomplete and very likely of little concrete value. The staff and students concluded that although the films and speakers were valuable regardless of the method or time of presentation, those that adhered to some meaningful interrelationships were more effective than those presented in a hit or miss fashion. Appendix L contains information concerning seminar content and evaluation for the second semester.

Group Counseling. Project students continued to meet in small groups (6 - 8) for one hour a week with a pair of professionally trained counselors. The major objective remained the assistance of the student in his development of a more realistic perception of himself and the world around him. The only difference was that the counseling was on a voluntary basis only. Most of the students chose to participate in this component of the project; those who did reported highly satisfying experiences.

Learning Center. Center materials and activities were continued and expanded. Resources included review, reinforcement, and remedial materials, i.e. video tapes, reference materials, workbooks, audio tapes, portable tape recorders, auto-instructional materials, programmed materials, and the beginning of a test file. The tutors recruited during the first semester continued their voluntary services, and the learning center was staffed four evenings a week, at those times offering specific remedial assistance in English, biology, psychology, history, geography, music, and German.

Paraprofessional Experience. This component, designed to develop skills related to teaching, provide meaningful educational experiences, and allow those students who wanted the opportunity to work and earn extra money, continued with thirty-five students assigned to various jobs in the campus school classrooms, the head start program, the campus school library, campus school office, campus school physical education department and art department, the university and campus school audio-visual department, and the university computer center. A questionnaire administered to both the students and their respective work supervisors revealed the following:

1.) most of the students participating in the work experience program did, in fact, have experience and develop skills relevant to teaching;

2.) the students apparently spent most of their work hours on teaching related activities;

3.) the duties found to be of most value were directly related to teaching and technical skill development;

4.) taking into account the possible effect of other variables (for example, other project components), students generally had a more positive attitude toward the job, teaching, and school at the end of the year;

5.) supervisors and students evaluated the work experience as worthwhile, although the students' evaluations tended to be much higher than those of the supervisors.

Analysis of Grades - Second Semester and Entire Academic
Year 1968-1969.

The random sample of non-project students drawn at the end of the first semester, 1968-1969, was reused at the close of the second semester. Students from each category - the School of Business, the School of Education, and the School of Letters and Science, were lost due to withdrawal from the university. The subjects originally were controlled on the following variables: credits earned, cumulative grade point average, and credits attempted. Education and Letters and Science samples were also controlled on sex. All students were (a) enrolled as full-time students, (b) carrying twelve or more credits, (c) in the same credits earned classification.

Description of Subjects

| <u>Sample Numbers</u> | <u>Project</u> | <u>Bus.</u> | <u>Educ.</u> | <u>L & S</u> |
|--|----------------|-------------|--------------|------------------|
| Boys | 13 | 20 | 7 | 9 |
| Girls | <u>20</u> | <u>1</u> | <u>15</u> | <u>15</u> |
| Total - | 33 | 21 | 22 | 24 |
| Entrance Test Scores | | | | |
| Mean Composite ACT (Standard Scores) | 18.3 | 19.1 | 17.5 | 20.2 |
| High School Rank | | | | |
| Median HSR (%ile) | 48 | 44 | 38 | 46 |
| Range HSR (%ile) | 2-86 | 10-87 | 11-83 | 15-87 |
| Cumulative Grade Point Average Before 1st. Semester | | | | |
| | 1.69 | 1.60 | 1.60 | 1.60 |
| Mean Credits Attempted Fall | | | | |
| | 12.9 | 13.6 | 13.7 | 13.5 |
| Grade Point Average 1st. Semester | | | | |
| | 2.14 | 1.58 | 1.92 | 1.89 |
| Cumulative Grade Point Average * | | | | |
| | 1.9* | 1.66* | 1.74* | 1.76* |
| Mean Credits Attempted Spring | | | | |
| | 13.5 | 13.6 | 14.4 | 12.7 |
| Grade Point Average 2nd. Semester | | | | |
| | 2.07 | 1.74 | 2.05 | 1.75 |
| Cumulative Grade Point Average | | | | |
| | 1.92* | 1.72* | 1.84* | 1.78* |

* Not corrected for repeated classes

The project and non-project samples did not differ significantly in terms of entrance test scores, high-school rank, and previous college achievement.

It should be noted that whereas, in the case of repeated courses, the grade for the last attempt is the only one officially counted, the university computer center in many cases did not correct cumulative grade point averages to take repeated courses into account. For this reason, the semester grade point average rather than the cumulative grade point average should be considered.

**Percent of Credits attempted by Area
Fall Semester 1968-1969**

| <u>Area</u> | <u>Project</u> | <u>Bus.</u> | <u>Educ.</u> | <u>L & S</u> |
|-------------------------------|----------------|-------------|--------------|------------------|
| Business | 0 | 38 | 0.9 | 0.9 |
| Education | 5 | 0 | 6.4 | 1.8 |
| English-Speech- Journalism | 16.9 | 19 | 21.8 | 22.0 |
| Fine Arts | 17.5 | 6 | 12.7 | 5.5 |
| Math-Science | 15.6 | 10 | 15.4 | 21.1 |
| Physical Education- Health | 9.4 | 3 | 10.0 | 0 |
| Social Sciences | 34.4 | 24 | 32.7 | 45.9 |
| Other | 1.2 | 0 | 0 | 2.8 |

**Percent of Credits Attempted by Area
Spring Semester 1968-1969**

| <u>Area</u> | <u>Project</u> | <u>Bus.</u> | <u>Educ.</u> | <u>L & S</u> |
|-------------------------------|----------------|-------------|--------------|------------------|
| Business | 2.4 | 29 | 0 | 4.4 |
| Education | 12.9 | 5 | 7.6 | 0.9 |
| English-Speech Journalism | 18.8 | 17 | 21.2 | 20.4 |
| Fine Arts | 12.9 | 5 | 17.8 | 8.8 |
| Math-Science | 12.9 | 15 | 11.9 | 14.2 |
| Physical Education- Health | 7.6 | 3 | 13.5 | 2.6 |
| Social Sciences | 30 | 26 | 26.3 | 46.9 |
| Other | 2.4 | 0 | 1.7 | 1.8 |

**GPA Breakdown for 1st. Semester
(Fall 1968)**

| <u>Item</u> | <u>Project</u> | <u>Bus.</u> | <u>Educ.</u> | <u>L & S</u> |
|---------------------------------|----------------|-------------|--------------|------------------|
| Number of students 3.0 or above | 2 | 1 | 0 | 1 |
| Number of students 2.5 or above | 8 | 4 | 6 | 3 |
| Number of students 2.2 or above | 16 | 8 | 13 | 8 |
| Number of students 2.0 or above | 20 | 9 | 14 | 12 |
| Number of students 1.8 or above | 25 | 11 | 14 | 13 |
| % of students 1.8 or above | 75.8% | 52.4% | 63.6% | 54.2% |

**GPA Breakdown for 2nd. Semester
(Spring 1969)**

| <u>Item</u> | <u>Project</u> | <u>Bus.</u> | <u>Educ.</u> | <u>L & S</u> |
|---------------------------------|----------------|-------------|--------------|------------------|
| Number of students 3.0 or above | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 |
| Number of students 2.5 or above | 9 | 1 | 5 | 3 |
| Number of students 2.2 or above | 17 | 5 | 7 | 5 |
| Number of students 2.0 or above | 23 | 11 | 12 | 10 |
| Number of students 1.8 or above | 25 | 11 | 15 | 17 |
| % of students 1.8 or above | 75.8% | 52.4% | 68.2% | 70.8% |

Letter Grade Breakdown
1st. Semester
(Fall 1968)

| | Project | Bus. | Educ. | L & S |
|--|------------|------------|------------|------------|
| Number of A grades | 11 | 4 | 3 | 3 |
| Number of B grades | 37 | 12 | 21 | 19 |
| Number of C grades | 79 | 37 | 57 | 55 |
| Number of D grades | 26 | 24 | 18 | 20 |
| Number of F grades | 3 | 16 | 8 | 7 |
| Number of I grades | 1 | 3 | 2 | 3 |
| Number of W grades | 2 | 4 | 1 | 1 |
| Total Number of Letter Grades - | 159 | 100 | 110 | 108 |
| % A & B grades | 30.2% | 16% | 21.8% | 20.4% |
| % A,B & C grades | 79.9% | 53% | 73.6% | 71.3% |
| % D & F grades | 18.2% | 40% | 23.6% | 25.0% |

Letter Grade Breakdown
2nd. Semester
(Spring 1969)

| | Project | Bus. | Educ. | L & S |
|--------------------------------------|------------|------------|------------|------------|
| Number of A grades | 7 | 5 | 1 | 4 |
| Number of B grades | 50 | 17 | 40 | 20 |
| Number of C grades | 71 | 38 | 49 | 43 |
| Number of D grades | 21 | 14 | 16 | 20 |
| Number of F grades | 9 | 19 | 7 | 15 |
| Number of I grades | 1 | 1 | 0 | 2 |
| Number of W grades | 10 | 6 | 5 | 9 |
| Total Number of Letter Grades | 169 | 100 | 118 | 113 |
| % A & B grades | 33.7% | 22% | 34.7% | 21.2% |
| % A,B & C grades | 75.7% | 60% | 76.3% | 59.3% |
| % D & F grades | 17.8% | 33% | 19.5% | 31.0% |

It can be noted that over 80% of the credits attempted each semester by all students were in English-Speech-Journalism, Fine Arts, Math-Science and Social Sciences. The percentage of credits attempted within these major areas does not differ appreciably among the samples.

Analysis of both first and second semester grade reports of project and non-project students reveals differences, all of which favor the project group. The project group achieved significantly higher semester GPA's than the non-project samples. Similarly, project students received more A and B grades and fewer D and F grades than students from the non-project samples. It should be noted, too, that because many of the non-project samples originally selected left school for academic reasons, the non-project sample at the end of the second semester contained only those students who had survived the first semester. Project students, on the other hand, were assured of retention regardless of academic performance; therefore, none were lost as a result of receiving low grades first semester. The drop in numbers of students in each sample from the first to the second semester is due primarily to the students' withdrawal from the university.

Curriculum Development and Revision

Each curricular area in the general education program that was to be revised for the five-year teacher training program continued to proceed toward full development and implementation.

The experimental general psychology, a revised course to replace 86-301, was finalized; materials were developed; video-taping of particular concepts was done. The course (two sections, each taught by a different instructor) was placed in the summer schedule and students were enrolled. It was decided to open the course to freshmen as well as to upper-classmen. The experimental English replacing 38-101, composition, was also finalized. Two sections, one for freshmen and one for upper-classmen were entered in the summer schedule. Instructors of both courses regularly met with the project staff to implement the program ideas. They and the staff also met with the staff of the University Reading Center for assistance in articulating the various components of the seminars and the classroom activities.

Original plans called for implementation of the Social Science Semester, the Art-Music Semester, and the Science Semester in the fall of 1969-1970. However, due to the tenuous nature of funding for project activities, and due to the resignations of faculty members within the respective sub-committees, the staff decided to postpone implementation of the Social Science and Science Semester. The Art-Music Semester was scheduled for fall of 1969-1970, with the stipulation that the university provide one full-time equivalent allocation for staffing. Pilot

students were scheduled into the 12 credit Art-Music Semester, comprised of Art 22-355, Elementary Teachers Lecture and Studio Practicum in Art, and Music 73-315, Elementary Music Practicum. The two 6 credit courses provide substitutes for 22-101, 22-555, 22-328, 73-101, 73-309 and 73-515 or 73-516.

METHODS, FINDINGS, AND ANALYSES SUMMER SESSION 1969

General Background - Student Makeup

It was decided to take one-hundred new students into the Project - twenty-five freshmen qualifiers and seventy-five continuing students who were in academic difficulty. However, because of late authorization for the summer program, recruitment could not begin as early as had been planned. When authorization was received early in May, twenty-five qualifiers from those who had already been accepted in summer school and had requested admission to the project, were accepted into the project. The rest of the group was made up of students who had been on probation during the first semester of the 1968-1969 school year and were planning to attend summer school. (Qualifiers are freshman students who scored below eighteen on the ACT and were in the lower quarter of their high school graduating class. All qualifiers take two courses, Early Civilization (58-101) and English Composition (38-101). If they receive a 1.5 GPA or better for the summer work, they are admitted in the fall. Ten Project qualifiers substituted General Psychology (86-301) for Early Civilization.)

On May 1, one-thousand nine-hundred and seventy-five (1,975) letters were sent to all students who were on academic probation or had been dropped at the end of the first semester, 1969. Of this total, eight-hundred seventy (870) students were drops. These students were invited to an orientation meeting held on May 15. At this meeting the students filled out an application for admission to the Project. All the applicants (61) who had been planning to attend summer school were accepted.

The summer group was thus made up of twenty-five (25) qualifiers, sixty-one (61) continuing students and sixteen (16) pilot students who had been in the program during the 1968-1969 school year. During the summer seventeen (17) students were lost: six (6) did not show, one (1) was suspended, four (4) withdrew from the University, four (4) were dropped, and two (2) simply disappeared from the Project.

A student profile was compiled based on a questionnaire given to the students at the beginning of the summer. Copies of the profile, one for qualifiers and the other for continuing students, are included in Appendix K.

Project Activities

Personal Development Seminars. The summer students were divided into six seminar groups of between twelve and fourteen students each. Each of their seminar leaders had two seminars, each of which met three times a week. The qualifiers were mixed in with the continuing students. The general theme of these seminars was study skills, although there was a great deal of variation in content and method among the seminars.

Although the original plan for seminars had been as follows:

- Week 1 - Study Skills Inventory
Paragraph Writing
AV Orientation - Dr. Wm. Raby
- Week 2 - Library Orientation
Budgeting Time
- Week 3 - Abstracting
- Week 4 - Note Taking and Writing Exams
- Week 5 - Communication - Role Playing
- Week 6 - Library - Bibliography
- Week 7 - Open
- Week 8 - Evaluation

Examination of the individual seminar reports in Appendix L will reveal the different emphasis of each of the seminar leaders.

A final evaluation session by each seminar and a questionnaire completed by each student proved extremely helpful in evaluating the Project.

Counseling Groups. Each seminar was divided into two counseling groups, and each group met with a pair of trained (or in-training) counselors for one hour per week for eight weeks. Attendance was required. Individual personal development was the goal of all the counseling. It was discovered that detailed evaluation of the counseling groups was not a particularly effective means of understanding the impact of the sessions. It was therefore decided that the counselors would meet periodically with each other and with the staff to discuss common concerns and make meaning from the experiences. These sessions proved to be highly significant for all concerned.

Learning Center. The purpose of the Learning Center was to provide material for review, reinforcement and remediation for students as needed.

A standard-size classroom was artificially divided into areas by study carrels, files and book shelves. Portions of the room provided areas for video tape viewing - for small group discussions, and for studying. A total of thirty-three students could comfortably occupy the room at one time.

The Learning Center was open from 8:00 a.m. to 4:30 p.m. daily from the beginning of the summer session, and from 6:00 p.m. to 10:00 p.m. Tuesday and Thursday, beginning with the fourth week. It was supervised afternoons and evenings by students. The major amount of time spent by the students who utilized the facilities in the Center appeared to be for studying, viewing video tapes, theme writing, and using reference materials.

A total time of nineteen hours and ten minutes in video tape viewing was recorded. Tapes were generally viewed in groups, and thus this time represented well over 100 viewing hours. Extensive use was made of cassette recorders by students for taping lectures, text reviewing and theme writing. Recorders were generally not out of circulation for more than half a day.

Faculty used the area for individual conferences with students and for small group discussions. Project staff used the center for tutorial functions. On a number of occasions, seminar groups met in the center to view video tapes or use center materials.

Learning Center Materials

| | |
|----|--|
| 1 | Phonograph |
| 17 | Cassette Recorders |
| 1 | Standard Recorder |
| 1 | Video Tape Playback Machine |
| 37 | Video Tapes (26 in a series on "Education of Minority Groups") |

Learning Center Materials

Others:

| | |
|---|--|
| 2 | Dick Gregory on Campus Lecture |
| 2 | Saturday Adoption - TV Program |
| 2 | Introduction to Psychology - WSU-O* |
| 2 | Introduction to Geography - WSU-O* |
| 2 | Introduction to English - WSU-O* |
| 1 | Introduction to History - WSU-O* |
| | File of Student Notes |
| | File of Student Tests |
| | Study Aids - Mimeographed hints and 10 copies of "How To Study In College", by Walter Pauk |
| | Reference Books - Mainly for Freshman Composition |
| | Basic Texts and References |

Reading Center Activities. The Reading Center, as a student service, offers an individualized reading and study skills improvement program designed to assist the motivated student in reaching his academic goals. This program is voluntary, non-credit and tuition-free. It affords the student an opportunity to increase his reading rates, level of comprehension and vocabulary range, and to improve his study skills. Primarily providing a developmental reading program for students at varying levels of proficiency who desire further improvement of learning skills, Reading Center staff may give specialized help of a remedial nature, if warranted.

Each student seeking help defines his reading and study problem and self-improvement goals. Standardized and placement tests are administered and results interpreted to the student. An individualized program of selected activities is planned and reviewed with the student. Additional diagnostic procedures include visual screening and eye-movement photography.

During regularly scheduled laboratory practice sessions throughout the semester, the student uses diversified multi-level instructional materials. These include programmed manuals, workbooks, kits, mechanical devices for visual training and accelerated reading, tape recordings, and an indexed collection of reference and practice materials to strengthen specific skills. Study skills are discussed in individual conferences and students are helped in the application of these skills both to the reading and practice materials available and to their textbook assignments. Each student maintains regular progress records and his reading-study work is reviewed at each session by staff. In periodic conferences throughout the term, progress is evaluated and the student's subject-matter concerns discussed to ascertain advisable modifications in his program.

Staff is always available for guidance and counseling.

At the end of the semester, a standardized post-test is scheduled and a subjective evaluation of this program, as related to his academic program, is made by the student.

At a meeting of seminar leaders and Reading Center staff to coordinate programs, the following procedures for the Center participation were established:

Test scores (Diagnostic Reading Test, Reading for Understanding, and Word Clues) were reported by the Testing Center to both the Reading Center and seminar leaders.

Individual student conferences were scheduled through sign-up sheets in seminar groups.

Each individual student conference included test score interpretation, discussion of the student's "Study Skills Inventory" (a self-evaluation questionnaire), and an introduction to the Reading Center program and facilities.

Each student was asked if he wished to enroll in the program. Some students were strongly encouraged to enroll, but the program remained entirely voluntary.

Project Student Enrollment

| | |
|---------------------------------------|----|
| Enrolled in program - | 33 |
| Kept appointment but did not enroll - | 26 |
| Appointment missed - | 12 |
| Not on sign-up sheets - | 6 |

Because the Reading Center program is individualized, it is impossible to make any statement about group progress. Most students did work with activities designed to improve vocabulary, comprehension levels, reading rates, and study skills. However, there was considerable variation between students in activity levels, numbers of sessions attended, and activities which were stressed in particular programs.

Project students who attended the Reading Center regularly felt that they had improved their education skills. Many of those enrolled, however, did not attend regularly.

Comments:

The Reading Center staff was somewhat surprised at the wide range of abilities within the project group. Although GPA's were quite consistently low, many reading test scores were above average.

The summer session offers limited time for the attainment of lasting improvement in study habits and reading abilities. The Reading Center staff stressed to students the need for continued enrollment in the fall. Several stated that they plan to continue. Some project students who felt that work and heavy course load demands prevented Reading Center enrollment during the summer expressed a desire to start in the fall.

It is the opinion of the Reading Center staff that students who are being groomed for academic success should have a "transitional year" type program in which the academic course load is as light as possible. It seems unreasonable that the student who has been identified as having academic problems should be expected to carry a regular academic load plus programs for basic skill improvement.

To determine if there is any relationship between Reading Center attendance and academic achievement, students were ranked according to the number of times they kept a Reading Center appointment. The following table indicates attendance and summer session GPA:

| Student | Number of Visits to Reading Center | Summer GPA |
|---------|---------------------------------------|------------|
| 1 | 20 | 3.0 |
| 2 | 18 | 3.0 |
| 3 | 17 | 2.0 |
| 4 | 16 | 2.0 |
| 5 | 14 | 2.0 |
| 6 | 12 | 3.0 |
| 7 | 12 | .5 |
| 8 | 11 | 1.0 |
| 9 | 10 | 3.5 |
| 10 | 10 | 2.0 |
| 11 | 10 | 3.0 |
| 12 | 10 | 3.0 |
| 13 | 10 | 2.5 |
| 14 | 9 | 2.0 |

| <u>Student</u> | <u>Number of Visits to Reading Center</u> | <u>Summer GPA</u> |
|----------------|---|-------------------|
| 15 | 8 | 2.57 |
| 16 | 8 | 1.71 |
| 17 | 7 | 1.5 |
| 18 | 7 | 2.0 |
| 19 | 7 | 3.0 |
| 20 | 5 | 2.5 |
| 21 | 5 | 1.5 |
| 22 | 4 | .5 |
| 23 | 4 | 2.4 |
| 24 | 4 | 1.4 |
| 25 | 3 | 2.5 |
| 26 | 3 | 2.0 |
| 27 | 3 | 2.0 |
| 28 | 2 | 3.0 |
| 29 | 2 | 3.0 |
| 30 | 2 | 1.0 |
| 31 | 1 | 1.5 |

Although no statistical correlation was run, it is interesting to note that the students who used the Reading Center at least ten times achieved an average GPA of 2.3, while those who used it between once and nine times achieved an average GPA of 1.9. It must be pointed out, however, that it is impossible to attribute the difference only to the effort of Reading Center usage. The Project staff has noted, time and again, that those students who performed well were the same students whom they would describe as having developed a positive attitude toward themselves and toward school. Many of these same students were also the ones who participated extensively in Reading Center activities, as well as contributing significantly to seminars, counseling groups, and other Project activities.

Work Experience

During the summer session, fifty-five students participated in the work experience program. Students in the summer program were not primarily in the School of Education as they had been during the previous academic year. Therefore, work assignments were made on the basis of student interest, job availability, and, where possible, student's major.

Essentially the same tool for evaluation as had been used during the academic year was used again. Conclusions included the following:

1) most of the students who worked in the program during the summer performed a broad spectrum of duties in the teaching, clerical, library and audio-visual fields;

2) the students appear to have spent most of their work time on skilled duties in the teaching and clerical fields;

3) both students and supervisors expressed that those duties related to teaching and to technical skill development were of greatest value to the students;

4) there was a general trend toward a more positive student attitude concerning the job, teaching, and school;

5) there was a tendency for students and supervisors to rate the work experience program as very worthwhile, although the supervisors were inclined to evaluate it higher than the students.

For a more detailed analysis, see the summer work experience evaluation - Appendix M.

Analysis of Grades

The following data was gathered at the close of the 1969 summer session. Because a sample of non-project students would not be representative for comparison purposes, no grade analysis between project and non-project continuing students was attempted. A comparison between freshman qualifiers and project freshman qualifiers has been included. It should be noted that the data shows that the summer continuing students have near mean ACT scores of 18.1 and 18.5 respectively, and that the qualifying group have a mean ACT score of 14.4. The notation "not corrected for repeated classes" refers to the University policy of determining GPA by using only the last grade earned in any course repeated.

Description of Subjects

Summer 1969

| | <u>Pilot</u> | <u>Continuing</u> | <u>Qualifiers</u> |
|--|--------------|-------------------|-------------------|
| Boys | 9 | 30 | 13 |
| Girls | <u>9</u> | <u>17</u> | <u>9</u> |
| Total - | 18 | 47 | 22 |
| Mean Composit ACT (standard scores) | 18.1 | 18.5 | 14.4 |
| <u>High School Rank</u> | | | |
| Median HSR (%ile) | 47.5 | 31.0 | 17.1 |
| Range HSR (%ile) | 4-79 | 3-90 | 2-25 |
| <u>Commulative GPA</u> | | | |
| Prior to Summer | 2.00* | 1.32* | - |
| Mean Credits | 55.1 | 30.9 | - |
| GPA Spring | 2.11 | 1.33 | - |
| Mean Credits | 13.56 | 13.94 | - |
| GPA Summer | 2.14 | 1.93 | 1.95 |
| Mean Credits | 6.3 | 6.1 | 6.0 |
| Cummulative GPA with Summer | 2.00* | 1.42* | - |
| Mean Credits | 61.4 | 36.7 | - |

*Not corrected for repeat classes

Grade Analysis for Summer 1969

| | <u>Pilot</u> | <u>Continuing</u> | <u>Qualifiers</u> |
|----------------------------------|--------------|-------------------|-------------------|
| Number of students 3.0 or above | 4 | 6 | 6 |
| Number of students 2.5 and above | 7 | 12 | 9 |
| Number of students 2.2 and above | 8 | 16 | 9 |
| Number of students 2.0 and above | 11 | 28 | 12 |
| Number of students 1.8 and above | 11 | 29 | 12 |
| Number of students 1.5 and above | 14 | 34 | 15 |
| % of students 1.8 or above | 64.7% | 63% | - |
| % of Qualifiers 1.5 or above | - | - | 68.2% |

Letter Grade Breakdown for Summer 1969

| | <u>Pilot</u> | <u>Continuing</u> | <u>Qualifiers</u> |
|-------------------------------|--------------|-------------------|-------------------|
| Number of A grades | 3 | 8 | 6 |
| Number of B grades | 12 | 14 | 7 |
| Number of C grades | 18 | 49 | 16 |
| Number of D grades | 8 | 19 | 9 |
| Number of F grades | 1 | 7 | 6 |
| Number of I grades | 1 | 0 | 0 |
| Number of W grades | <u>2</u> | <u>4</u> | <u>1</u> |
| Total Number of Letter Grades | 45 | 101 | 45 |
| % A and B grades | 35.7% | 22.7% | 29.5% |
| % A, B, and C grades | 78.6% | 73.2% | 65.9% |
| % D and F grades | 21.4% | 26.8% | 34.1% |

Summary - Analysis of Grades

Although there was no increase in cumulative GPA for Pilot students who attended summer school, their average summer GPA was above 2.00 and 0.04 above their average spring GPA. The Pilot student as a group have earned 992 credits. Therefore, the summer average of 2.14 did not increase the cumulative 2.00 that had been earned in the spring. Continuing students raised their average cumulative GPA by 0.90 and their average summer GPA was 0.60 above their average spring GPA. Pilot students did consistently better than both the Continuing students and Qualifiers.

Summer Qualifiers

The following data includes all Project Qualifiers who attended seminar sessions throughout the summer. The non-project Qualifiers includes all other Freshman that attended the University in order to be admitted in the fall.

| Summer 1969 | <u>Description of Subjects</u> | | <u>Project Qualifiers</u> | <u>Non-Project Qualifiers</u> |
|-------------------------------|--------------------------------|-----------|---------------------------|-------------------------------|
| | | | | |
| Boys | | 13 | | 12 |
| Girls | | 9 | | 14 |
| Total - | | <u>22</u> | | <u>26</u> |
| Mean Composit ACT | | 14.4 | | 14.1 |
| Median HSR (%ile) | | 17.1 | | 16.9 |
| Range HSR (%ile) | | 2-25 | | 2-49 |
| G.P.A. Summer | | 1.95 | | 1.34 |
| Mean Credits | | 6.00 | | 5.92 |
| Number of A Grades | 6 | (13.6%) | 0 | (0.0%) |
| Number of B Grades | 7 | (15.9%) | 5 | (9.8%) |
| Number of C Grades | 16 | (36.4%) | 25 | (49.0%) |
| Number of D Grades | 9 | (20.4%) | 4 | (7.8%) |
| Number of F Grades | 6 | (13.6%) | 17 | (33.3%) |
| Number of W Grades | <u>1</u> | | <u>1</u> | |
| Total Number of Letter Grades | 45 | | 52 | |
| % A and B Grades | | (29.5%) | | (9.8%) |
| % A, B and C Grades | | (65.9%) | | (58.8%) |
| % D and F Grades | | (34.1%) | | (41.2%) |

Grade Analysis Summer 1969

| | <u>Project Qualifiers</u> | <u>Non-Project Qualifiers</u> |
|---------------------------------|---------------------------|-------------------------------|
| Number of Students 3.0 or above | 6 | 2 |
| Number of Students 2.5 or above | 9 | 3 |
| Number of Students 2.2 or above | 9 | 3 |
| Number of Students 2.0 or above | 12 | 10 |
| Number of Students 1.8 or above | 12 | 10 |
| Number of Students 1.5 or above | 15 | 13 |
| % of Students 1.5 or above | 68.2% | 50% * |

* 5 non-project Qualifiers had GPA's of 0.00

Credits Attempted by Area - Summer 1969

| | <u>Project Qualifiers</u> | <u>Non-Project Qualifiers</u> |
|---------------------|---------------------------|-------------------------------|
| English Composition | 66 | 78 |
| Early Civilization | 33 | 75 |
| General Chemistry | 0 | 3 |
| Photography | 3 | 0 |
| Piano | 1 | 0 |
| Psychology | 30 | 0 |

Summary - Analysis of Grades

This analysis of summer grade reports of Project Qualifiers and non-project Qualifiers revealed differences in favor of Project group. The Project group achieved a G.P.A. 0.61 above the non-project group. The Project group received a higher percentage of A and B grades and a lower percentage of D and F grades. Although 68.2% of Project Qualifiers would have been admitted by the University in the fall, only 50% of non-project qualifiers would have been admitted.

Special Curriculum

During the summer, two sections of General Psychology (86-301) and two sections of English Composition (38-101) were offered exclusively to Project Students. Reports in the appendix by Dr. Bruce Black, Dr. Paul Ansfield, and Mr. Thomas Dollar indicate that each of the participating faculty members believe that special curricular offerings can and do significantly assist the student in academic trouble to succeed.

Questionnaire Evaluation

A questionnaire based on the nine major components of the Project was given to the students at the end of the summer. The students were asked to rate the nine items on a 4, 3, 2, 1 scale which corresponds to "Extremely Valuable", "Quite Valuable", "Slightly Valuable" and "Not Valuable" respectively. They were also asked to rank the nine items in the order of their importance to them. The following table shows the results:

| <u>Rating</u> | <u>Ranking</u> | <u>Items</u> |
|---------------|----------------|--|
| 2 | 1 | 1. Receiving advice and encouragement from experienced advisors. |
| 9 | 7 | 2. Engaging in a significant work experience. |
| 3 | 3 | 3. Special programming and having class cards pulled for registration. |
| 1 | 2 | 4. Understanding myself and others through shared experience in a counseling group. |
| 8 | 8 | 5. Receiving special subject matter help in the learning center. |
| 5 | 6 | 6. Receiving tutoring if I have a special subject matter problem. |
| 4 | 5 | 7. Associating socially with others who have similar interexts. |
| 5 | 4 | 8. Engaging in special seminar designed to improve study skills and academic know-how. |
| 7 | 9 | 9. Earning extra money through part-time employment. |

As can be seen from the above results, advising, counseling, and special programming were of most immediate value to participating students. Of intermediate value were social interactions, academic support, and tutoring. Of least value were extra money, learning center activities, and working. It would seem, then, that personal attention and support from sympathetic staff members are of paramount importance if academic support programs are to succeed. Although many of the Project students needed financial assistance, they apparently did not regard the fulfillment of that need to be a significant factor in their gains. The only aspect that the staff had greater expectations for was the Learning Center. The relatively low rating it received can, however, be explained by the fact that although a great deal of effort went into collecting relevant materials, it was virtually impossible to stock the room with enough to even begin to satisfy the needs of the students. It is hoped that each semester the Learning Center will be able to satisfy increasingly more needs.

COLLEGE DESCRIPTIVE INVENTORY EVALUATION

The College Descriptive Inventory (CDI) is a semantic differential attitude scale designed to identify degrees of positive or negative attitude on the part of college students towards certain aspects of the college environment. Different scales are provided for 15 different aspects of college including College, College Courses, Residence Hall Program, English, WSU-O, Social Life, Grades, Assignments, Professors, Counseling, Reading, Viet Nam, History, Student Union and Beer Bars.

The CDI was used during the summer session of 1969 at Wisconsin State University-Oshkosh, as an evaluation method used as part of a special Research Project for Training Teachers of the Disadvantaged. This instrument was used as a means of determining the extent to which certain attitudes of students in the Project changed, when measured at the beginning of the summer session, and again at the end.

The scales were administered to 59 subjects on a pre-test and post-test basis. One of the important objectives of the project was to help students to achieve more success in college work, not only in increasing their knowledge and skill in areas of reading and study, but by changing their attitudes toward school and education in general. It is well recognized, of course, that attitudes function as motivations, and therefore one way to motivate students to higher achievement is to change in a positive direction their attitudes toward educational achievement and educational institutions. One important way to evaluate the success of the Project, then, was to measure with some precision certain student attitudes relevant to the Project, and the extent to which these attitudes changed during the eight weeks of summer school.

The various attitude constructs of the Inventory were each measured by the use of an Osgood semantic differential scale containing 13 sets of positive and negative adjectives, such as good--bad, beautiful--ugly, etc. Students were then asked to rate the particular construct on each of the oppositional sets according to a seven point scale labeled Very--Moderately--Slightly--Neutral--Slightly--Moderately--Very. Attitude scores were then determined by assigning one point to each degree on the rating scale. In this manner, a respondent with a maximum positive score would have 13 maximum ratings of 7 points, for a total of 91 points. A total score below 45 thus would represent a negative attitude toward the construct.

Since the purpose of this study was to determine the extent to which the students' attitudes toward the constructs changed during the eight week period of the pre-and post-tests, the scores of the two tests on each individual were subtracted, producing a positive

or negative discrepancy score indicating the extent to which each person's attitude changed, for better or for worse. The total discrepancy scores for the whole group were then computed. Table I shows the extent to which the total group gained or lost on pre- and post-test attitude scores.

TABLE I
Total Positive and Negative Changes in Attitude
Toward Certain Aspects of College Life During
the Eight Week Summer Session (N=59)

| Attitude Construct | Total Score Gain or Loss from Pre-test to Post-test |
|------------------------|--|
| College Courses | +208 |
| Student Union | +157 |
| Reading | +138 |
| Professors | +133 |
| Grades | +132 |
| English | +100 |
| Assignments | + 51 |
| Counseling | + 39 |
| College | + 16 |
| History | + 8 |
| Residence Hall Program | - 43 |
| Viet Nam | - 46 |
| Social Life | - 83 |
| Beer Bars | -129 |
| WSU-O | -173 |

Average gain or loss in attitude scores for each construct were not calculated, since it was apparent that even in the case of those constructs which showed the greatest discrepancy between pre-test and post-test, the average score change would work out to a negligible change in attitude. The point is that attitudes in general do not change very much, as measured on a rating scale, since some students gain and others lose, producing an average gain or loss which tends toward neutral. Total scores, on the other hand, seem more meaningful because they show whether the trend was generally positive or negative, and provide some noticeable spread in gains or losses when constructs are compared with each other.

Because mean gain or loss scores were not computed, it was not considered possible to attempt any measurements of statistical significance. It seems likely that no significant difference between means could be found, since average discrepancies between pre-test and post-test appear to represent only one or two points out of a possible 91. However, because the total group attitude improved on some constructs, and because there were great differences between the constructs in total positive or negative scores, it was felt that this inventory does seem to be suggestive of the general changes in attitude that took place during the eight week period.

It seemed significant that gains in attitude scores occurred in categories related to reading, study and school work generally, while the negative discrepancy scores appeared in non-academic areas such as Viet Nam, beer bars, social life and residence halls. Interestingly, the greatest decline in attitude score was toward WSU-O in general, even while the academic aspects were viewed more favorably. The conclusion would seem to be that the negative aspects of the social environment outweigh the positive aspects of the academic environment, with the result that the students' general attitude toward the institution came out strongly negative. The students' total attitude toward college in general comes out on the positive side, perhaps suggesting that students have some concept of a college that would be quite superior to WSU-O, but still not very highly regarded at any rate. Perhaps it should not be surprising that these particular students do not show very great enthusiasm either for college in general or for WSU-O, since most of them are students who have not heretofore been very successful in college work. The relatively neutral attitude toward counseling was something of a surprise, since it was felt that these students would have very positive attitudes toward a counseling program that is designed to give them special help and recognition. But possibly the students did not respond with extreme enthusiasm to counseling, simply because they were so aware of their need for special help and attention. These students also showed a great sense of independence and recognition that they were as good as anyone else. To the extent that the counseling made them aware that they were not really as good as "regular" college students, they may have developed a more negative attitude.

Perhaps it ought to be surprising, therefore, that the attitude toward counseling was positive at all. The neutral attitude toward history reflects the fact that not very many students were taking history, and therefore had neutral feelings; many, however, were taking English, and they had definitely a positive attitude, which reflects favorably upon the success of the English teacher in developing positive attitudes among his students.

This was not a very rigorous attitude study, principally because the instrument used was one for which no standardization exists; it was used mainly because printed forms for it were available. No doubt a better test could have been devised, especially one that would provide a set of attitude constructs identified specifically as being directly related to the specific content and objectives of the Program for Teachers of the Disadvantaged. But even with the limitations of the present study, it would appear that attitudes did change for the better during the eight week period of the summer session, and that the changes were most noticeable in the area of academic interests, which was a particular objective of the Project. It is the impression of the instructors in the Project that the attitude changes reflected by the CDI were changes that actually did take place in many students, since interviews with individual students frequently produced attitudinal information consistent with these CDI findings.

Other Testing

Further testing included administration of the STEP writing tests, the College Characteristics Index, and the Tennessee Self-Concept Scale. Inability to complete pre-and post-tests on sufficient numbers of students precluded their usefulness in evaluation. In general, however, the results were consistent with other findings, i.e. students' perceptions of themselves and college became more positive, and those students taking the special course in English composition improved their writing skills more than did those who did not have the course.

METHODS, FINDINGS, AND ANALYSES
During Grant Extension Period, September 1969-June 1970

A number of factors led to a request that the 1968-1969 funding -- both from the USOE and the Board of Regents of State Universities -- be extended for the academic year 1969-1970. One was the late (April, 1969) receipt of the 1968-1969 Federal Grant. This made it difficult to expend state and federal funds as planned and caused a balance of approximately \$6,000 Federal funds and \$21,000 State funds as of September, 1969. Another factor was the lack of assurance that the state would carry through the planned four and five-year sequences commencing with the 1969 summer session. An austerity budget seemed to be in the offering for the 1969-1971 biennium. This particular object (with a budget figure of approximately \$200,000 and \$300,000 for each of the years of the biennium) was placed in a special state package of programs relating to the disadvantaged. The entire package was dropped from the budget due to limited funds and efforts to have it restored were unsuccessful. A third factor was the growing conviction of the project director that by assimilating project components into the main stream of the teacher education program the impact of two years of research efforts would not be lost.

Being in every way consistent with the purposes and objectives of the first and second years of the project, it was decided to continue pilot activity during the extension year and emphasize the assimilation process.

Assimilation Process

Three project staff members with experience in conducting Personal Development Seminars and working with various facets of the project were given half-time appointments in the offices of the Coordinators of Advisement for Elementary and Secondary Education. In this capacity they would: 1) become familiar with, and skilled in, the regular advisement and admission procedures of the School; 2) introduce project components to faculty members working in the division of the School. Since two of these three faculty members (one in elementary education and one in secondary education) were continued as half-time project staff the pilot work of past years could be continued and expanded.

These faculty members became members of the elementary or secondary education departments, were represented on a school-wide committee studying the entire student personnel services area, and met with various school and university-wide groups including the other departments of the School of Education and the University Committee on Academic Success.

It was decided that one of the most effective vehicles for assimilating the Personal Development Seminar into the main stream would be the freshman course, Orientation to Public Education. This

course is required and is usually taken during either the first or second semester of the freshman year. It carries 2 credits and is listed with a laboratory hour (2+1) which is scheduled for 12 of the 18 weeks. After discussions with the coordinator of this course, the instructors and department chairmen in elementary and secondary education, meetings were planned with each department to discuss various possibilities of attaching the seminar to this course and involving sufficient faculty to man the seminars.

During the first semester several faculty members not formerly connected with the project volunteered to conduct a Personal Development Seminar. Each of these persons was given a student co-leader who had been one of the former pilot students and who had been helped by the seminar. These student co-leaders provided enthusiasm as well as contributions from past experiences. Project funds provided supervision and guidance in the learning center and enabled this component of the project to continue to operate and expand.

Though more limited than in prior years, the paid para-professional work experience was made available to many of the students in the project and means were explored by which student assistant monies from the University budget could be tapped to continue this component in the future. Their work experiences were related to the assimilation process in most cases.

Curriculum development was not continued through project activities but attempts were made to encourage departments involved in prior years to continue the development of innovative courses and instructional techniques. This was done through central administrative encouragement and through suggestions to department chairmen. The elementary education department, in reexamining its curriculum for the preparation of teachers, gave careful attention to the model set up in the project. The momentum built over the former two-year period was felt to be an important factor in assimilating this component of the project.

Results

The results of assimilation efforts during 1969-1970 will not be fully reportable for perhaps several years. There are, however, several specific results which suggest that the decision to extend the grant for one year was a wise one.

1. The offices of the Coordinators of Advisement now have faculty members familiar with, and committed to, the various components of the project.
2. A number of faculty associated with project components have now had direct experience with project components.
3. A program of informing all School of Education faculty concerning the Personal Development Seminars was

conducted and, in general, enthusiastically received. Plans for in-service training sessions of interested staff were carried out and a large percentage indicated a willingness to conduct seminars on an experimental -- and overload -- basis during 1970-1971. Plans are detailed in Appendix N.

4. Pilot activities were conducted for 169 students during Semester I and 197 students during Semester II of the extension year. Because of limited staff time complete analyses of results for pilot groups were not possible. Generally it can be reported that academic success and attitude changes were consistent with the 1968-1969 findings.

5. Several facets of the general education curriculum were modified as a result, in part at least, of project curriculum efforts in past years and are thought to be more relevant by students and more appropriate than their course predecessors by the faculty. Courses included are: Physical Science (4 credits) Appendix G, Earth Science (4 credits) Appendix F, Biological Science (4 credits) Appendix E, English Composition - Appendix J, Speech Fundamentals, General Psychology - Appendixes H and I, Music - Appendix C, and Art - Appendix D. Experimental sections have been, or are being run, in Biological Science, English Composition, and General Psychology.

6. The project continues to lend support to other emerging student and faculty concerns for curricular relevance, academic success and improvement of instruction. In particular, Project students who felt especially strongly that the services offered through the Project were vital to the success of many university students developed the concept of a student-run co-operative designed to provide academic support services to any interested students. During the second semester of the extension period, Project staff provided assistance to the students in formulating the concept and becoming a recognized entity in the University. A copy of the proposed constitution is included in Appendix Q.

7. A consortium proposal with Wisconsin State University-Oshkosh as "the helping institution" and three private liberal arts colleges in Eastern Wisconsin as "developing institutions" was submitted to the U.S.O.E. in an attempt to reduce freshman attrition on these campuses through the utilization of Project components developed on the Wisconsin State University-Oshkosh campus. Specifically the Personal Development Seminars of the School of Education will be used as models for similar development on the other three campuses. This consortium has been founded at the \$80,000 level.

CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

The project undertaken during the 1968-1969 year and continued during the 1969-1970 year as an extension period to utilize unexpended balances was designed as a transition from the 1967-1968 exploratory year to an operative phase of several years duration. This phase would ideally have built evaluation systems and controls such that conclusions and recommendations might have the full support of research evidence. Insufficient Federal or State support precluded the possibility of this phase of the project.

However, the various pilot activities and analyses of project dimensions made during the 1968-1970 period suggest several conclusions and recommendations of importance for this University in particular and higher education in general. They are not listed in a particular order of importance.

Conclusions and Recommendations

1. At the outset it is concluded that University students experiencing academic difficulty can be helped to succeed through utilization of the three major components developed in this project, namely, the personal development seminars, the learning center, and the paid work experience. Wisconsin State University-Oshkosh and many similar institutions throughout the nation have been and are each year failing or placing on probation large numbers of students under the guise that these students can not benefit from a university education because of their inability to achieve academically. Many of these students can be helped to achieve and can become independent, positive, supportive, academically successful university students with an excellent prognosis for graduation and a successful career. These students will be more successful than similarly educationally disadvantaged students not involved in the project activities. Project pilot students were consistently more successful than matched groups of non-project students from various schools of the university. Wisconsin State University-Oshkosh and other institutions of higher education should develop programs similar to the one developed in this project to better conserve the human resources who are pursuing an education beyond high school.

2. Probably each student, but certainly any student experiencing academic difficulty needs a faculty contact -- an advocate and supporter -- with whom he feels sufficiently at ease and with whom he can effectively communicate to ensure the highest possible academic success.

3. Project components such as the personal development seminar need to be employed over significantly long periods of time. Students having one summer experience only with the project were not as successful as students who had one summer plus a semester or two. As the period of contact with project activities increased so did the academic success of pilot students.

4. Project components need to be employed for different lengths of time for different students. Some students felt that small group counseling sessions were helpful for a summer session, others for a semester, others for part of one or two semesters. Similar student reactions were expressed with regard to paid professional work experiences and learning center activities. Students generally supported the idea of the unifying and central personal development seminar component for as long a period as the project had run. (This was two years and two summers for a few students.)

5. As student participation in the project components continues, students' roles tend to change from passive recipients of the help provided to active participants frequently assuming leadership roles and innovating for the improvement of the particular component. Some students with the project for a year and summer became heavy contributors to the project. Almost all students after one semester or summer session became personally committed to its goals and felt responsible for bringing its merits to the attention of other students.

6. Project components should be available to any student admitted to college as funds permit. Although some pilot project students were lost despite all efforts the number was limited. Students with very poor records made significant gains in academic success.

7. Project components should be available to students regardless of career goals. Pilot students from the Schools of Letters and Science and Business Administration responded equally well to project components when compared with education students.

8. Varying degrees of "schoolsmanship" are essential to achieving academic success in the typical large public university. Project staff members and other faculty have observed significant increases in academic sophistication (schoolsmanship) among project students as they proceeded through the various components.

9. University students need a greater role in planning and evaluating their curricular experiences. Involvement of project students appears to speed maturity and build enthusiasm.

10. Faculty working with project components should expect disappointment. Students tend to look for a panacea and are difficult to teach at first. It takes time, diligence and sometimes ingenuity to reach these students and develop motivation.

11. Rewards are extremely important at first. The external rewards such as encouragement, assistance in programming, and effecting "drops" and "adds," and paid work experiences tend to sustain students until they are more intrinsically motivated.

12. Faculty members are not as prone to examine and redesign general education courses to better meet the needs of students experiencing academic difficulty as they are to examine and redesign courses for students pursuing a major or minor in their field. Rewards in terms of consultant monies, released time and administrative commendation are important in effecting curriculum development of this sort. Curriculum development in general education and in professional areas should be continued with the same intensity made possible by this project grant. Local stimulation substitutes should be sought on campus or through Board of Regents action. The provision of special budget funds for curriculum development is seen as a desirable means of achieving such stimulates.

13. Most faculty members seem to have difficulty in suggesting or developing specific review, reinforcement and remediation materials in connection with their courses and for use in a learning center. Again, local stimulation substitutes should be found for those project activities which encouraged the development of learning center materials directly related to courses in the curriculum.

14. The small cassette-type tape recorders are an excellent aid to the student in improving the effectiveness of his notetaking and as a device for individual review. Most project students found the tape recorder a valuable asset. Several purchased their own as a result of using those available through the project. Such recorders should be available to students on campus in increasing numbers.

15. Although the project was not continued for a long enough period to test its impact upon producing excellent teachers for the disadvantaged it is interesting to note that almost all of the pilot students in education became concerned about disadvantaged children and youth and many indicated a strong commitment to teach disadvantaged children.

Summary

In summary, the process of assimilating project components, begun during the third (extension of grant) year, should continue so that the effect of these components on larger numbers of teacher-education and non-teacher education students can be evaluated. Other Schools of this University and other institutions of higher education should be encouraged to pursue experimentation with the various components of this project. Finally, it is strongly recommended that related or replicative research activities in the areas with which this project has been concerned be supported locally, at the state level and through Federally sponsored programs.