A 5-year experimental project, the Bilingual Mini-Head Start program is an early education program for children of migrant farm workers. The program has 2 components: the mobile and the stationary components. In the stationary program, 2 year-round centers are operated in Connell and Moses Lake (Washington). These centers' purpose is to demonstrate how services may be provided with maximum effectiveness to a very unstable population group. In the mobile program, teachers are selected from adults whose families move with the crops. These teachers accompany small clusters of children from La Grulla (Texas) to various work stops providing continuing educational services. This program's purpose is to demonstrate how much benefit can be gained by providing continuity in an educational program as the children move. Based on the program objectives outlined in the May 1973 proposal under which the program is currently operating, this report presents an evaluation of the program's progress to approximately the 27th month of operation. The evaluation covers the instructional, staff development, parent involvement, materials development, relocating delivery system, and management components. (NQ)
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SUBJECT: Evaluation of Progress

The report which follows represents an evaluation of progress to approximately the 27th month of program operation of bilingual Mini Head Start, a five year experimental project. This report is the fourth evaluation in the series prepared on this program.

The report is based on the program objectives outlined in the May, 1973 proposal under which the program is currently operating. However the period of operations reported begins at the end of January, 1973 which point marked the closure date for program operations reported in the third project evaluation.

The findings of this evaluation have been audited by Dr. Mark Green, of the Northwest Regional Education Laboratory. He has checked the adequacy of testing of children and reviewed all data collection instruments. He has also cross checked the accuracy of all data summaries and the completeness of documentation for all claims made in this evaluation.
The BILINGUAL MINI HEAD START program is an early education program for the children of migrant farm workers.

The program has two components: the stationary program and the mobile program. The stationary program operates in two locations: Moses Lake and Connell, Washington. These centers operate year round serving migrant children on an in and out basis, and other children of settled out migrant families as space permits. The purpose of these centers is to demonstrate how services may be provided with maximum effectiveness to a very unstable population group.

The mobile program operates during the winter months in La Grulla, Texas, a small town located by the Rio Grande River within only a few miles of old Mexico. It is estimated that nearly 90% of the population of La Grulla moves north each year where families do seasonal farm work in a series of locations, later returning to La Grulla in September and October. In this program the teachers are selected from adults whose families move with the crops, and these teachers accompany small clusters of children providing continuing educational services in several relocations during "the season". The purpose of this program is to demonstrate how much benefit can be gained by providing continuity in an educational program as the children move. Whenever children of migrant families have moved in the past it has meant totally new teachers, new materials, new methods, and many adjustments for the child. With the mobile program at least part of the child's educational experience is with the same teachers, materials and methods at each temporary location. Where a local program exists the Grulla children attend the local program (public school or preschool) but the Mini Head Start teacher either works in that program or provides a supplementary tutoring to produce the continuity. And where no program exists, the Mini Head Start operates a "mini" center, usually serving from five to eight children if the teacher is alone. Sometimes two or three teachers combine where the concentration of children is large enough. The name of the program derives from the fact that teachers are prepared to move in as many directions as necessary to follow the families they serve in "Mini" centers.

The basic operating grant for this project comes from a grant from the Division of Bilingual Education, Office of Education bureau of Elementary and Secondary Education.

Support for the teaching salaries and basic operating costs of the mobile program comes from Texas' Migrant Council which operates with funds from the Indian and Migrant Program Division of Head Start. Operating costs for the Washington state preschool centers comes from Title IVA Social security funds administered by the Dept. of Social and Health Services of the State of Washington. Funds for the operation of a school are extension of the program has come from Title I Migrant funds administered by the Texas Education Agency and from Urban and Rural Racially Disadvantaged funds of the Wash. Dept. of Public Instruction.
INSTRUCTIONAL COMPONENT

1.1 CHILDREN WILL LEARN PRESCHOOL CONCEPTS OF RELATIONSHIP

(These concepts include time relationships: sequence of events and causality. It includes space relationships: comparative location, movements. It includes making comparisons such as length, size, weight, etc. as well as comparisons of number. And it includes the recognition of similarities and differences necessary to sort, match or group objects in classes by appearance or use.)

GOAL: At least 75% of project children age 3 to 5 will demonstrate their understanding of preschool concepts by scoring within the upper quartile range of scores attained by children of comparable age in the project normative group, when tested individually in their primary language after cumulative attendance intervals of 100 days, using the Conceptos test.

FINDINGS:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Period of attendance</th>
<th>Number of children in test group, in each attendance category</th>
<th>Number scoring above 75th percentile of norm group for their age category</th>
<th>Percent of children in upper quartile range.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>100 days</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>56%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>200 days</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>70%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>300 days</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

INTERPRETATION OF FINDINGS:

(A) Information on the test instrument used and the norm group

The test instrument is a project developed test entitled the Conceptos test. This is a 36 item test, requiring approximately 15 minutes to administer. It is given individually in the child's primary language, either Spanish or English.

The test items were developed to correspond to the eight concept areas included in the curriculum taught to children during daily individual tutoring periods. It therefore has a high validity as to the curriculum content of this particular program.

A statistical analysis of reliability, by the split half method, corrected by the Spearman Brown formula, yielded a reliability for the test of .85.

The norm group has been developed over a two year period, and consists of the pretest scores achieved by children who
### Table 1.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DAYS ATTENDED</th>
<th>AGE 3.0 - 3.5</th>
<th></th>
<th>AGE 3.6 - 3.11</th>
<th></th>
<th>AGE 4.0 - 4.5</th>
<th></th>
<th>AGE 4.6 - 4.11</th>
<th></th>
<th>AGE 5.0 - 5.5</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Norm</td>
<td>36%</td>
<td></td>
<td>44%</td>
<td></td>
<td>51%</td>
<td></td>
<td>58%</td>
<td></td>
<td>71%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>100+ N = 7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>100+ N = 6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>200+ N = 3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>300+ N = 1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>43%</td>
<td></td>
<td>61%</td>
<td></td>
<td>62%</td>
<td></td>
<td>64%</td>
<td></td>
<td>71%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>69%</td>
<td></td>
<td>70%</td>
<td></td>
<td>72%</td>
<td></td>
<td>73%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>75%</td>
<td></td>
<td>82%</td>
<td></td>
<td>82%</td>
<td></td>
<td>83%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Each bar represents the average score of the children in each category. The 100, 200, and 300 day attendance groups in each age category are children in the current test score. The "Norm" bars represent the total scores of a much larger group, and are considered to represent the expected score of children in the population without any program.
took the test some time within the first 30 days after they entered the program. It was felt that no appreciable program effect would be reflected within that time limit, and that the tests therefore represented the "no program effect" of how migrant children in our population group might be expected to score with no program at all. Children represented every age between three and six when they entered the program, so the sample provides a comparison for every age group. The total number of children in the norm group is 125. Of these the following numbers were in the various age categories: 21 children 3.0 - 3.5; 22 children 3.6 - 4.11; 24 children 4.0 - 4.5; 26 children 4.6 - 4.11; 20 children 5.0 - 5.5; 12 children 5.6 and over.

(b) Effects of longer periods of attendance within age groups

Table 1 (on the facing page) shows the average, or mean score, for children of each age group, in categories based on the amount of attendance the child had when he was tested.

This analysis was done to answer the question: if you hold the age factor constant, does the length of time he has been in the program make a difference in his level of achievement? It seems clear that there is a measurable difference in achievement related to longer periods of attendance.

As this is the first evaluation in this program in which a sufficient number of children with 200 and 300 day periods of attendance were available for testing to analyze their scores separately, this finding that the second and third 100 days show continued gain is of significance. In the past eight years several experimental preschool programs have shown a rapid initial gain followed by a leveling off or decline in test scores. Apparently this "wearing off" of benefits is not happening within this program.

(C) Comparison of project test findings with a nationally standardized test.

Because the Conceptos test is a project developed test, the results do not allow comparison with children in other programs. However this year the project has administered a nationally standardized test called the Preschool Inventory to all children enrolled in the program this fall. This test, developed by Bettye Calcwell, is published by Educational Testing Service, and has been standardized using a national sample of 1531 children tested in over 150 Head Start classes throughout the United States in the Fall, 1969.

The content of the Preschool Inventory is very similar to that of the Conceptos test; e.g., space relationships of comparative location, identification of body parts and following commands for movements; color and shape recognition; etc. The raw score of correct answers on this 44 item test can be
AVERAGE PERCENTILE RANK ON THE PRESCHOOL INVENTORY

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DAYS ATTENDED</th>
<th>AGE 3.0 - 3.11</th>
<th>AGE 4.0 - 4.11</th>
<th>AGE 5.0 - 5.11</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Less than 100</td>
<td>47%</td>
<td>33%</td>
<td>57%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>100+</td>
<td>66%</td>
<td>69%</td>
<td>63%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>200+</td>
<td>80%</td>
<td>77%</td>
<td>60%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>300+</td>
<td></td>
<td>88%</td>
<td>81%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N = 7</td>
<td>N = 8</td>
<td>N = 7</td>
<td>N = 3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 2. Each bar represents the average score in terms of national percentile rank of the children in that age and attendance category.

This Table is based on scores of children from the Grulla, Texas site.
INSTRUCTIONAL COMPONENT (Fl.1 continued)

converted to a percentile rank for different age groupings. This "percentile score", if it was 88, would mean that 88 percent of the children of the same age in the national sample scored lower than the child who got that score for the test.

Table 2 (on the facing page) shows the results from the Grulla, Texas center (the only one to have completed testing with the Preschool Inventory at the time of this evaluation).

The scores of children new to the program (less than 100 days attendance) indicate that without this program the children of Grulla would mostly score in the lower half of the scores achieved by the children tested in all parts of the nation. However, all of the children who had attended the program even 100 days scored in the upper half of the national rankings, and children who had been in the program over 300 days averaged scores above the 80th percentile.

Table 2 tends to confirm the findings of the Conceptos test, that children's achievement of understanding of basic preschool concepts is significantly affected by longer periods of attendance in Bilingual Mini Head Start.

A concept lesson in progress at La Grulla.

Concept learning moves outdoors if child has to choose a color coded swing.
INSTRUCTIONAL COMPONENT

H1.1 LESSONS ON PRESCHOOL CONCEPTS

GOAL: Teachers will provide each child lessons in each area of the curriculum covering preschool concepts reported on the weekly progress reports, including as many lessons as required to enable him to advance at least one level in each concept area during each 100 days attendance period.

FINDINGS: Weekly progress reports from each teacher are on file indicating which concept area was taught each day, and the primary language of instruction. However concept areas have not been set up with "levels", nor has there been a testing system devised for determining a child's advancement in understanding from one level to another. It is therefore impossible to report findings on this objective.

INTERPRETATION OF FINDINGS:

A great deal of trial and effort has gone into the attempt to devise levels, and to systematize curriculum and check-point tests so that a progressive mastery level could be established. Part of the difficulty is that the project has found a number of curriculum sources valuable for teaching these concepts and has been hesitant to limit itself to one curriculum, in which the organization of mastery levels would have been at least partly done by the author of the curriculum materials. Another difficulty is that in many cases the levels are purely arbitrary since learning of one concept does not clearly relate to mastery of the one "below".

This discussion of difficulties does not deny the need for the achievement of this goal, and the project is giving high priority to fulfillment of this objective.
INSTRUCTIONAL COMPONENT

F1.2 LANGUAGE COMPREHENSION IN FIRST AND SECOND LANGUAGE

GOAL: At least 50% of project children will show at least a 5 point raw score gain on the Peabody Picture Vocabulary Test in both their first and second language after each 100 days cumulative attendance in the program.

FINDINGS:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Child's Primary Language</th>
<th>Number in test group</th>
<th>Number who gained 5 pts. or more.</th>
<th>Number who gained less than 5 pts.</th>
<th>Percent who met goal.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Spanish</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>57%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>English</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>67%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>61%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Child's Second Language</th>
<th>Number in test group</th>
<th>Number who gained 5 pts. or more.</th>
<th>Number who gained less than 5 pts.</th>
<th>Percent who met goal.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Spanish</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>33%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>English</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>26%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>29%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

INTERPRETATION OF FINDINGS:

In the three to five year age range, any given period of six months would represent about a 5 point raw score gain as the child got older. The average gain in the children's raw scores in their primary language was 8 points in Spanish and 9 points in English. Since the interval between 100-day tests averages about 6 months, this means that the program is accelerating language development by a gain of about 1 and 1/2 months, per month, in the project.

This is the first test group that has failed to meet the goal for gains in their second language in the project as a whole, since the program began. One of the permanent centers in Washington state (Cornell) did meet the goal with children for whom Spanish was a second language gaining an average of 5 points and children for whom English was a second language gaining an average of 7 points, with 60% of the children tested showing a language gain of 5 points or more. One difference between this center and the others in the program is that the educational director conducted training in this center on how to do dual language teaching last summer, and returned and observed teachers individually on their skills in helping children develop a second language.

The Educational Director conducted the same training at the other Washington center but the effect of training was lost when all but one of the teachers who had participated left the program. He plans to do training and observations for the other centers soon.
H1.2 USE OF BOTH LANGUAGES FOR INSTRUCTION

GOAL: Teachers will use both Spanish and English as a language of instruction following the plan for alternating language use recommended to them by the educational director, as verified by site visit reports by the educational director reporting his observation of every teacher regarding both the adequacy of her conduct of dual language teaching and the adequacy of her planning for dual language development of every student. The criterion for meeting this objective shall be a site visit report of satisfactory for every teacher at least once during each evaluation period.

FINDINGS: Although site visits were made to the two permanent Washington sites, no observations reports on dual language teaching rating individual teachers have been given to the evaluator. There are therefore no findings to report on this objective, at this time. The educational director expects to do most, if not all of those observations within the next two months.
INSTRUCTIONAL COMPONENT

FL.3 ACHIEVEMENT IN MATH SKILLS

GOAL: At least 50% of project children will have advanced by at least one month in grade equivalent level score for each 20 days cumulative attendance since their previous test on the preschool math section of the Wide Range Achievement test, administered individually in the child's primary language.

FINDINGS:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Number of children for whom both pre and post tests were available.</th>
<th>Number who increased their grade equivalent total group who rank by at least one month for each 20 days cumulative attendance between tests.</th>
<th>Percent of total group who met this goal.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>52</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>67%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

INTERPRETATION OF FINDINGS:

The project adopted curriculum materials in the math area and began implementing their usage in the two permanent centers in Washington state in late March, 1973. The Texas mobile centers were just getting ready to relocate at that time so the new curriculum materials were not introduced to teachers in the mobile program until July (when a "between crops" drop in attendance allowed a better time for a curriculum workshop).

The initial testing at each site was done for all children during the first few weeks the curriculum materials were put into use, or children enrolling later in the program were given the WRAIT as part of the pretest battery. All enrolled children were then retested this fall provided they had accumulated at least 20 days attendance since the earlier tests was given. The period of time between tests, therefore, varied from approximately 3 1/2 months to 7 1/2 months.

The Wide Range Achievement Test is a nationally standardized test which has published "grade equivalent" tables which correspond to different raw scores. The lowest is N-5 (Nursery level, 5th month—based on a nine month school year). "Nursery appears to correspond to three year olds, Pk— or pre-kindergarten, to four year olds, K— kindergarten to five year olds, 1—to first graders, presumably six years old. Using the child's chronological age as a measure of where, presumably, he should be based on the grade equivalent scores, the test scores were examined to see how many children were at or above their "grade equivalent" level for
INSTRUCTIONAL COMPONENT (P1.3 continued)

their age on the pretest, and how many on the post test, with the following result:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Number of children</th>
<th>Number at or above grade level for age</th>
<th>Percent at or above grade level based on age.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>PRE TEST</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Spring, summer '73)</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>42%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>POST TEST</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Fall, '73)</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>62%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The results above appear to indicate children have made measurable gains in the short period of time the math curriculum has been in use.

The evaluator has some reservations about the standardization of the WAT at the preschool level since the standardization group included children age 5.0 and up, and no reliability was given for any younger age group, nor any explanation given in their manual for the method used to determine the grade equivalent ranks at the nursery and pre-kindergarten levels.
INSTRUCTIONAL COMPONENT

H1.3 INSTRUCTION IN MATH SKILLS

GOAL: Teachers will present lessons to each child using the Sincer Math curriculum, or project developed readiness materials in sitration skills, documenting pupil progress through these materials at the end of each week. This objective shall be considered fulfilled if every child is reported as having advanced by one or more levels in the materials during each evaluation period.

FINDINGS: At the time analysis was done for this evaluation a report system, using levels in the curriculum materials, had only been in use for one month at the Texas centers, and for two and a half months in the Washington centers.

Based on this short period the advancement by levels was as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Number of children for whom reports were available</th>
<th>Number increasing by one or more levels during the evaluation period</th>
<th>Percent of total meeting goal of &quot;at least one level&quot;</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>45</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>84%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

INTERPRETATION OF FINDINGS:

Setting a criterion level of "at least one level" in this objective was purely arbitrary since at the time it was written the curriculum materials were not in use and we hadn't devised levels based on coverage of a certain amount of material.

From analysis of the reports for the limited time we have them, it appears children are averaging an advancement of about one and a half levels per month in the math materials. As soon as the project has another two or three months experience to go on, the criterion levels for expected rate of advancement by levels through the curriculum materials must be revised.
INSTRUCTIONAL COMPONENT

F1.4. ACHIEVEMENT IN WRITING SKILLS

GOAL: At least 50% of project children will have advanced by
at least one month in grade equivalent level score for
each 20 days cumulative attendance since their previous
test on the pre-spelling subsection of the Wide Range
Achievement test, administered individually in the
child's primary language.

FINDINGS:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Number of children for whom pre and post tests were available.</th>
<th>Number who increased their grade equivalent rank at least one month per 20 days attendance between tests</th>
<th>Percent of children who met this goal.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>52</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>81%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

INTERPRETATION OF FINDINGS:

The pre-spelling subsection of the Wide Range Achievement Test is actually more closely related to writing skills than to spelling. It consists of a series of marks which the child must attempt to copy, and the request that he "write" his name giving credit for any two letters printed.

This nationally standardized test published "grade equivalent" scores based on the raw score the child receives. These begin with nursery level, e.g., N-5 (fifth month of nursery school, assuming a nine month school year). Using the child's chronological age, in years and months, to correspond to nursery, pre-kindergarten, kindergarten grade equivalents of three, four, and five years respectively, the pre and post test scores were analyzed to see how many children were at or above the "grade equivalent" score for their age. The results were as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Number of children in test group</th>
<th>Number at or above their grade level above grade by a.e.</th>
<th>Percent at or above grade level for a.e.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>PRE TEST (Spring, summer '73)</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>POST TEST Fall '73</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>42</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Since the standardization group for this test did not include children younger than age 5.0, and no reliability is reported on the preschool sections of the test, there must be some reservations in using this data. However the results do appear to indicate a significant gain in writing skills by children between pre and post test.
INSTRUCTIONAL COMPONENT

H1.4 INSTRUCTION IN WRITING SKILLS

GOAL: Teachers will present lessons to each child using the Write and Sea handwriting curriculum or project developed readiness materials in writing skills, documenting pupil progress through these materials at the end of each week. This objective shall be considered fulfilled if every child is reported as having advanced by one or more levels in the materials during each evaluation period.

FINDINGS: The reporting system by levels had been in use 2 1/2 months for the Washington permanent site, and only one month for the Texas center when the following analysis was made:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Number of children</th>
<th>Number increasing by one percent of total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>for whom writing program reports were available</td>
<td>or more levels in the curriculum period during the evaluation period</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>45</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

INTERPRETATION OF FINDINGS:

The criterion level of "one or more levels" set as a goal in this objective was purely arbitrary since the levels had not been determined for the curriculum materials at the time the evaluation plan was written. There was no way of setting up a more realistic standard of how much progress a child should make in the levels as eventually established. An analysis of children's progress for the time they have been reporting indicates that the average advancement in the handwriting materials is nearly two levels per month. After a few more months experience, a new objective should be written with a more realistic criterion level for advancement through the materials.
GOAL: At least 75% of project children ages 3 to 5 will score at or above criterion level on the Test of Cultural Knowledge administered individually, in their primary language, after 100 days or 200 or more days cumulative attendance in the program thereby demonstrating their familiarity with objects or holidays depicted in pictures which are celebrated in a special way by persons with a Mexican cultural heritage. At 100 days, the criterion level shall be 65% or better correct responses; after 200 days the criterion level shall be 100% correct response on this test.

FINDINGS:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Children in test group</th>
<th>Number who scored 65%</th>
<th>Percent of total who met goal</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>with 100 days attendance</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>and better on Test of Cultural Knowledge</td>
<td></td>
<td>73%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Children in test group</th>
<th>Number who scored 100%</th>
<th>Percent of total who met goal</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>with 200 days attendance</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>and better on Test of Cultural Knowledge</td>
<td></td>
<td>13%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

INTERPRETATION OF FINDINGS:

The test of Cultural Knowledge is a project developed test (which, by recording the responses also doubles as the test of Verbal Fluency). It is administered in the child's primary language, individually and takes about three minutes to administer.

It is a very limited sample of the child's information on the vast curriculum area included in the cultural heritage area. It consists of a picture which is very typically representative of the celebration of the Posadas holiday events, and the child is asked what the people are doing, and then given two prompts to get him to tell more about it or simply describe what he sees in the picture. He is then shown a small pinata and asked what it is and what it is used for, again with four prompts to get him to tell more or simply to describe the object. He gets credit for one correct answer if his response indicates he knows anything about the Posadas, another correct answer if he can identify the pinata by name, another correct answer if his response indicates he knows what the pinata is used for.

No attempt has been made to do a statistical analysis of this little test as to its reliability.
H1.5 ACTIVITIES FEATURING MEXICAN CULTURE

GOAL: Within each evaluation period teachers will provide one or more activities featuring a pinata and one or more activities featuring the celebration of the Posada, as documented by description of these activities reported on their weekly pupil progress report.

FINDINGS: During the period February through October, no activities were reported having to do with the Posada. It seems apparent that teachers prefer to teach children about holidays in the proper season.

Only a scattering of teachers mentioned use of a pinata. From on-site visits and from talking with teachers it would appear that this is "under reporting" rather than a failure to use pinatas. They are used so routinely in connection with various fiestas planned by the centers, or in the celebration of birthdays, that no special mention is being made of them in the curriculum reports.

INTERPRETATION OF FINDINGS:

What is most evident from examination of the reports on cultural heritage activities in the centers is that the program is far richer in the variety of activities than would seem indicated by the project goal. In the nine months she was with the program, the talented Maria Teresa Cruz developed a large repertoire of cultural materials for our use: songs, dances, stories, finger plays, art materials, special activities for holidays.

For example, although children were not taught anything about the celebration of the Posadas holiday during this particular evaluation period, cultural heritage curriculum reports indicate the following holidays were featured through a variety of activities at the centers:

- Dia del ejercito - Febr.
- Carnaval  - Febr.
- Valentine's Day  - Febr.
- Dia de la Bandera - Febr.
- La Primavera - March
- El dia del Niño - April
- El dia de la Madre - May
- El dia del padres - June

For "Children's Day" (El dia del Niño) each teacher made baleiros (a stick and cup toy) to give her children, and a special puppet show play was written and "livened" as part of a small fiesta for the children held in each center. For Carnaval children had a story with pictures as background information (used for language development, discussion). They made costume items, learned dances, and a son; the types of activities varied with each holiday theme.
INSTRUCTIONAL COMPONENT

F1.6 VERBAL FLUENCY IN PRIMARY LANGUAGE

GOAL: at least 75% of the children attending the program will demonstrate their verbal fluency in their primary language by scoring at or above criterion level on the Test of Verbal Fluency. After 100 days cumulative attendance the criterion level would be that the child meet one or the other of the following criteria, after 200 days that he meet both criteria: (1) use of two or more complete sentences three or more words in length in his response; (2) use of fifteen words or more in his total response.

FINDINGS:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Number of children in each attendance category for verbal fluency:</th>
<th>Number who met one criterion</th>
<th>Percent who met goal:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>100 days - 49</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>59%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>200 days - 48</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>58%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

INTERPRETATION OF FINDINGS:

The Test of Verbal Fluency has been described under discussion of objective F1.5 (Test of Cultural Knowledge). By recording children's responses to the three questions and four prompts to the presentation of a picture and a small pinata, a very rough measure of a child's expressive ability is obtained. Since the only other language measure being used in the program, the Peabody Picture Vocabulary Inventory, does not require the child to say anything -- only to point to a picture identified by a clue, this small project-developed test was used to measure a child's ability to use expressive speech in his primary language. No statistical analysis of test reliability has been carried out.

The pre test scores for the 49 children in the 100-day group were examined to get a measure of the expressive ability of this group of children when they entered the program, with the following results:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Number of children for whom pre tests were available:</th>
<th>Number who met one criterion</th>
<th>Percent who met goal:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>39</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>33%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Post test:</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>59%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

These scores seem to indicate a considerable gain in verbal fluency, even though final test scores fell short of the goal.
H1.6 HIGH TEACHER CHILD INTERACTION

GOAL: To assure each child a high level of opportunity to develop verbal skills, each teacher, after four months of training and experience, will teach children using a method which provides an opportunity for children to make a verbal response at least once a minute during directed teaching periods, as measured by the Richarz interaction scale.

FINDINGS:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Teachers observed</th>
<th>Opportunities for response provided during 20 minutes directed teaching</th>
<th>Rate per minute</th>
<th>Meets criteria verbal response recorded during same 20 minutes</th>
<th>Actual child response</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>2.45</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>3.7</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>3.9</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.</td>
<td>88</td>
<td>4.4</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>3.2</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.</td>
<td>116</td>
<td>5.8</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>64</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.</td>
<td>111</td>
<td>5.55</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8.</td>
<td>88</td>
<td>4.4</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9.</td>
<td>79</td>
<td>3.95</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10.</td>
<td>89</td>
<td>4.45</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11.</td>
<td>77</td>
<td>3.85</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12.</td>
<td>92</td>
<td>4.6</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>62</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13.</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>3.6</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14.</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>2.4</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15.</td>
<td>77</td>
<td>3.85</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>33</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

INTERPRETATION OF FINDINGS:

The Richarz Interaction scale is an instrument on which a trained recorder notes both verbal and gestural interchanges between teacher and children during a timed period of observation. The inter-rater reliability between trained observers using this instrument was .83 in terms of their agreement on number and category of actions noted. (Reliability tested winter, 1972)

The above scores represent definite actions taken by teachers during 20 minutes of teacher planned learning activities which would encourage a child response. The range of scores reported above is from 48 to 116 during 20 minutes of observation. To put this in perspective, the range of scores for opportunity for response provided ranged from 7 - 52 in a 20 minute period when most teachers were new paraprofessionals during the winter of 1972. By summer of 1972 the range was from 41 - 83. The range found during the winter of 1973 was from 46 to 81. The scores above therefore represent a peak performance in terms of teachers providing a highly interactive teaching environment.
STAFF DEVELOPMENT COMPONENT

F2.1 IN SERVICE TRAINING

GOAL: While teaching children under the observation of the trainer, the teacher trainees will demonstrate the teaching behaviors identified on the observation forms as measured by accompanying unit checklists, with each trainee achieving at least 75% of the items included on the checklist.

FINDINGS:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TEACHERS</th>
<th>A</th>
<th>B</th>
<th>C</th>
<th>D</th>
<th>E</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>G</th>
<th>H</th>
<th>I</th>
<th>J</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>MONTHS EMPLOYED</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FROM 2/1 - 9/30/73</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CHECKLISTS WITH SCORE OVER 75%</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TEACHERS</th>
<th>K</th>
<th>L</th>
<th>M</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>O</th>
<th>P</th>
<th>Q</th>
<th>R</th>
<th>S</th>
<th>T</th>
<th>U</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>MONTHS EMPLOYED</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FROM 2/1 - 9/30/73</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CHECKLISTS WITH SCORE OVER 75%</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

PERCENTAGE OF TEACHERS EMPLOYED FULL EIGHT MONTHS MEETING GOAL - 100%

PERCENTAGE OF TEACHERS EMPLOYED LESS THAN 8 MONTHS MEETING GOAL - 50%

INTERPRETATION OF FINDINGS:

The information on number of checklists completed is somewhat misleading as to the number of training units completed because some checklists cover a series of training units. For example in the first nine units of training, there are only three checklists. Thereafter, there is a checklist with every unit of training, so it makes quite a difference which part of the training curriculum a teacher is in as to how many checklists will have been completed.

One unsolved problem affecting the mobile program is how to provide on-going training during the season while centers are moving about in the northern states for teachers who are beyond driving distance of the two trainers with the mobile program. These two trainers each rode circuit serving teachers at more than one location, sometimes covering centers up to 150 miles apart, in Washington state. Training was simply suspended for very short term centers which operated beyond this range, e.g., in Lynden, Washington on the Canadian border, for five weeks, and at Burley, Idaho for three weeks.

One teacher, however, serves a small group of Grulla children at Hoopston, Illinois for almost a six month period. The first

**No checklist is accepted until the score is at least 75%. This therefore represents 100% of the checklists completed.**
STAFF DEVELOPMENT COMPONENT (12.1 continued)

summer a regular staff trainer made approximately a one week trip to Illinois. She did intensive testing and training while she was there, and she also looked for someone with training in early childhood education who would be willing to act as a trainer, on a consulting basis, for our Illinois based trainee. This did not work out very well. The "consulting trainer" employed was no doubt competent in her field, but she did not receive enough orientation in our training methods or materials to use them effectively. Our training observation forms call for recording descriptions of actual behavior observed, and quoting teacher and child interaction so the trainer can then mirror back to the trainee what she has done reinforcing teaching techniques done correctly and making very specific suggestions where omissions or incorrect techniques were found. For example a training unit of questioning techniques might record "helped child solve problem by giving him a choice question--is the truck green, or is it blue?" Instead of this kind of specifics, the observations sent back by the consultant trainer would be of the following nature "Lovely manner with children" "So enthusiastic about teaching" "I continue to be amazed at her understanding".

Concluding that it required a period of training of the trainer to use our materials, the second summer we simply discontinued training while this teacher was beyond commuting range.

As we are trying to develop a model which can scatter teachers as widely as necessary to service the children they are following, the discontinuance of training for teachers in remote areas does not seem an adequate solution. Also it is not fair to the teacher involved since pay raises are tied to training received, and the project feels an obligation to further career development of all staff.

One solution which may be feasible to try in the coming season would be to have someone at the local site video tape the teacher while she is demonstrating techniques contained in a given training unit. These could be sent in to our regular staff trainers for evaluation and feedback, either written or by phone.

Another solution may be to try again the local consultant trainer. The project has now developed three training units for trainers, which systematically introduce a prospective trainer to the skills of demonstrating, observing, and conferencing with a teacher trainee. With this more systematic approach to orienting a person to the use of our training materials, a more satisfactory result might be possible than our first trial.

Some solution to this matter will require the attention of staff in the coming months.
STAFF DEVELOPMENT COMPONENT

H2.1 IN SERVICE TRAINING PRESENTATIONS

GOAL: The trainers will present training to each teacher trainee consisting of at least the following elements: (a) discussion of the written material (b) a demonstration by means of video tape, role playing, or a live demonstration with children, (c) observing the trainee in a teaching situation recording his use of the target teaching behaviors, (d) discussing the observations with the trainees; as documented in weekly training reports submitted to the evaluator.

FINDINGS:

A training chart is maintained on an ongoing basis for every trainee. Training reports are submitted by trainers every week on what presentations, demonstrations, observations and conferences have been held with trainees.

These records document that this objective has been fully met.

INTERPRETATION OF FINDINGS:

A sample of the master chart on training is shown below:

4. (using appearance and words Ch.1, Lesson 3) Presentation and Demonstration: 4/3/73 and 5/2/73
Observations completed: 6/13/73 and 6/20/73

5. (Use of questions, Ch. 1, Lesson 4) Presentation and Demonstration
Observations completed: 7/11/73 and 7/16/73

*(Checklist covers units 2, 3, 4, 5) Checklist and Score.
7/19/73 (18/20)

6. (Making transitions) Presentation and Demonstration (Ch. 2, Lesson 1)
Observations completed: 8/20/73 and 8/30/72 and 9/5/73

7. (Giving clear directions Ch.2,2) Presentation and Demonstration
Observations completed: 9/13/73 and 9/20/73

The above training record is for one trainee. Because of differences in times of employment, trainees are nearly all at different places in the training curriculum at any one time.
STAFF DEVELOPMENT COMPONENT

F2.2 CLASSROOM INTERACTION PATTERNS

GOAL: After completing at least six months of teacher training, 75% of teacher trainees will demonstrate a pattern of interaction with children during forty minutes of classroom observation recorded on the Richarz classroom interaction scale, which meets the criterion level in at least nine out of the following 12 categories:

1. Number of statements used, not less than 40.
2. Number of questions asked, not less than 20.
3. Number of opportunities for response provided, not less than 60.
4. Response elicited from children, both verbal and nonverbal, not less than 60.
5. Non-verbal communication used (gestures etc.) not less than 30.
6. Behavior intended as encouragement, not less than 20.
7. Behavior intended as restriction, not more than 10.
8. Behavior intended as direction (teaching), not less than 40.
9. Behavior intended as management, not less than 30.
10. Approach with approval, not less than 20.
11. Approach neutral, not less than 60.
12. Approach with disapproval, not more than 10.

FINDINGS:

Categories in which criterion was met, by teacher:

A. 10/12  E. 10/12  I. 10/12  M. 9/12
B. 9/12  F. 10/12  J. 11/12  N. 10/12
C. 11/12  G. 10/12  K. 11/12  O. 9/12
D. 11/12  H. 11/12  L. 11/12

Percent of teachers meeting criteria in 9 of 12 categories -- 100%

INTERPRETATION OF FINDINGS:

The findings above represent the fourth administration of the Richarz Interaction Scale. It was given in winter of 1972 when all teachers were new, and the scores achieved by inexperienced teachers at that observation became the baseline from which to measure later change in teacher behavior. The criterion levels for interaction shown in the above chart were levels reached by no more than 25% of the teachers in the first round of observation, so that the attainment of criterion levels represents a significant change in teacher interaction patterns gained from experience and training.

Illustrative examples of the changes are shown below:

Number of questions asked. Criterion level at least 20 in 40 min. obs.
Inexperienced teachers range: 8 - 35 4/16 over criterion level.
Teachers this evaluation: 32 - 75 15/15 over criterion level.
Opportunities for response provided. Crit. level at least 60 in 40 min.
Inexperienced teachers range: 17 - 77    2/16 over criterion level
Teachers this evaluation: 84 - 165      15/15 over criterion level

Behavior intended as direction. Crit. level at least 40 in 40 min. obs.
Inexperienced teachers range: 11 - 50    3/16 over criterion level
Teachers this evaluation: 55 - 130       15/15 over criterion level

Behavior intended as encouragement. Crit. level at least 20 in 40 min.
Inexperienced teachers range: 4 - 17      0/16 over criterion level
Teachers this evaluation: 18 - 48         12/15 over criterion level

Because there has been some turnover of teachers since evaluation began two years ago, some but not all of the teachers are the same in the groups shown above as "inexperienced teachers" and the present group. This evaluation group reports only teachers who had acquired at least six months of training and experience.

The general pattern of the inexperienced teacher is that she watches over children and works around them but is not skillful in interacting with them or involving them in a learning process. For example, the Richarz Interaction scale has four categories which deal with the "intent" of the interaction between adult and child. These are: encouragement, Direction, Management and Restriction. Management would be all those statements made to control behavior or to get the child from one activity to the next--such comments as "It is time to go in now" or requests asking the child to sit down, or asking if he would like more milk. Direction, on the other hand, would be all comments, requests and questions whose primary purpose is to instruct the child, such as "Your pants are the color brown, and your shoes are brown, too. What color are my shoes?"

In custodial care situations management interactions dominate, because "direction" is, strictly speaking, unnecessary conversation not required to keep the child safe and busy. The training curriculum for this program has units intended to increase the conversational exchange with children to make learning experiences out of every activity throughout the day, not just the teacher planned learning periods. It also has specific training in use of questions to begin to involve the child more actively verbally in the learning process, and in the use of requests for children's physical involvement in the learning process (both verbal and non-verbal behavior are included in the category given above "opportunities for response").

Most teachers in the program now are involved in training that should enable them to use encouragement much more effectively, and to reduce their use of "restriction" replacing it with more positive modes of behavior. In last summer's evaluation 5 out of 15 teachers failed to meet criterion either on their use of encouragement, or in having two high use of restriction. It is anticipated that the next evaluation would demonstrate a change in interaction in both these categories.
STAFF DEVELOPMENT COMPONENT

H2.2 REACHING AND MAINTAINING INTERACTION LEVEL GOALS

GOAL: To reach and maintain a high level of interaction, trainees will complete three or more units of training within their first six months after employment, and between each evaluation date, as documented by their employment record and the master chart of training completed kept by the evaluator.

FINDINGS:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Teachers, with months they were employed between 2/1/73-9/30/73.</th>
<th>Training units completed during evaluation months</th>
<th>Teachers meeting criteria (at least one training unit per two months)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 - 3 mo.</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 - 5 mo.</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 - 8 mo.</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 - 9 mo.</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 - 11 mo.</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6 - 8 mo.</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7 - 9 mo.</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8 - 10 mo.</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9 - 11 mo.</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10 - 12 mo.</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11 - 13 mo.</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12 - 14 mo.</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13 - 15 mo.</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14 - 16 mo.</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15 - 17 mo.</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16 - 18 mo.</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17 - 19 mo.</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18 - 20 mo.</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19 - 21 mo.</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20 - 22 mo.</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21 - 23 mo.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Percent of teachers meeting criterion for amount of training received: 80%

INTERPRETATION OF FINDINGS:

The pace of training showed quite a bit of variation between the different centers and trainers in the program. Administrative action is being taken, based on this evaluation, to bring the training effort up to an acceptable standard in all centers.
STAFF DEVELOPMENT COMPONENT

F2.3 TRAINING IN BICULTURAL EDUCATION

GOAL: For every six weeks the bicultural education resource teacher is assigned to work with a center, teacher trainees in the center will have demonstrated their ability to teach an activity in the bicultural education curriculum under observation of the bicultural education resource teacher at least once, as documented by notes on individual observations of teachers recorded by the resource teacher.

FINDINGS:

The Bicultural resource teacher was assigned to the Mobile centers for 12 weeks during the home base period. Goal at least 2 observations per trainee.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Trainee</th>
<th>Observations Completed</th>
<th>Trainee</th>
<th>Observations Completed</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>G</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>H</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>I</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>J</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The Bicultural resource teacher was assigned to the permanent centers approximately 18 weeks. Goal at least 3 observations per trainee.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Trainee</th>
<th>Observations Completed</th>
<th>Trainee</th>
<th>Observations Completed</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>G</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>H</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>I</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>J</td>
<td>1*</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*employed only one month during this period.

The objective was met for 12 teachers, not met for 8.

INTERPRETATION OF FINDINGS:

The Bicultural Resource teacher had three basic areas of responsibility: (1) the development of materials; (2) the training of staff and trainers in the use of these materials and (3) the involvement of the parents and community in the program through fiestas and other events using the bicultural theme.

During the period of her assignment to the mobile center during its home base months only one fiesta was held for the community. She, therefore, concentrated her work during this period on the production of materials and the training and observations of staff.
During the period of her assignment to the permanent sites in Washington state, the parent and community involvement aspect was far more demanding. Three festeas were held, drawing hundreds of people and very actively involving the parents at both center sites. The quality of the training she had given was evident as the children and staff performed many dances, songs, skits and other activities related to the bicultural theme.

The reputation of Bilingual Mini Head Start as a resource in the field of bicultural education spread. The program therefore sponsored a workshop through Columbia Basin Community College on the subject of "Bicultural Materials for Preschool Children". This workshop was prepared by and taught by Senorita Cruz and by Imelda Guerra, staff trainer from the mobile center part of the program.

In summary, the failure to meet this objective in doing formal observations of teachers in the Washington sites represents a readjustment of time, and was probably appropriate to the needs and best interests of the program.
STAFF DEVELOPMENT COMPONENT

H2.3 TRAINING IN BICULTURAL EDUCATION

GOAL: The Bicultural education resource teacher will present training each week at the center to which she is assigned, providing demonstrations of bicultural activities appropriate for project age children, including in each six month period between evaluations at least one activity involving the Posada and the use of pinatas as documented by the weekly training report submitted to the evaluator.

FINDINGS:

The Bicultural Education Teacher submitted training reports for almost every week during her 9 months with the program, indicating a very full schedule of training in use of bicultural materials. Materials on making a pinata (its history and usage) and on the Posada were distributed during the evaluation period, meeting this objective.

INTERPRETATION OF FINDINGS:

In addition to making and use of the pinata, and the Posadas, a small sample of the types of materials developed, and training of staff in use of bicultural materials is given below (taken from Senorita Cruz’s training reports)

Dances taught:  Ritmos:  Rimas:
La Raspua  Ritmo de Cascabelles  Rima a la Bandera
Polka  El Masico  Con Mucho Amor
La Bamba  La Batalla del Calentamiento  Limpieza
Jarabe Tapatio  Miento  La Ensalada
Los Inditos  Un soldadito pasa  La Fruta
Danza de Venado  merchando  Primavera

Cantos y Juegos Infantiiles:  Coros:
Dona Blanca  Las Mananitas
Patito Patito  Di Borrequito
La Paloma Azul  Temprano
San Serafin del norte  Mama y Papa Preparan
Dona Blanca y Caballito Blanco  Noche de Paz
Asi palmadas damas  Golondrinita
Los dedos  Coro a la Bandera
Las horas  Cancion De Colores
A la rueda juzuramos  La estudiantina
El Patio de mi Casa  Los Inditos
En el agua clara  Yo Quiero ser Soldado
La Pelota  Himno Nacional Mexicano
La Bamba
As noted earlier, the training and curriculum in bicultural education was also developed by our regular training staff to include a great many songs, finger plays, dances, and histories of holidays unique to the United States. A set of paper dolls and art objects was obtained bringing in the culture and costume of yet other nations, and activities carried out on various international themes.

Senorita Maria Teresa Cruz, on guitar, with dancers from Moses Lake, Washington Bilingual Mini Head Start, in parent made costumes.
STAFF DEVELOPMENT COMPONENT

F2.4 CAREER DEVELOPMENT

GOAL: At least 90% of project full time staff members who have not attained a high school diploma or its equivalent, or a college degree, will progress toward an academic diploma or degree by passing one or more subtests toward their GED and/or by receiving one or more college credits for course work completed within every evaluation period, as documented by notices of successful completion of GED tests by grade notices or transcripts issued by the institution attended.

FINDINGS:

16 staff members of the program had less than a high school education, or GED equivalent, when first employed by the program.

Of these: 11 have enrolled in classes to work toward their GED since employment;
3 have passed their GED since employment
3 have passed one or more of the required tests toward a GED since employment.

22 staff members (teacher trainees, site coordinator and secretarial) had no college training when first employed by the program. (This includes the staff members who had not finished high school as well as six others who had their GED or high school diploma but no college).

These staff members have acquired the following college credits through the program since employment:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Quarter Hours</th>
<th>Quarter hours</th>
<th>Quarter hours</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. 24</td>
<td>9. 8</td>
<td>17. 25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. 7</td>
<td>10. 24</td>
<td>15. 25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. 25</td>
<td>11. 16</td>
<td>19. 24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. 25</td>
<td>12. 25</td>
<td>20. 24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. 25</td>
<td>13. 25</td>
<td>21. 25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. 25</td>
<td>14. 25</td>
<td>22. 0 secretary</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. 25</td>
<td>15. 25</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. 25</td>
<td>16. 9</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

3 staff members (trainer, and site coordinator and sec'y) had some college credits when employed, but less than a degree. These have earned college credits since employment as follows:

1. (15 qtr. hrs when employed) 25 qtr. hrs
2. (60 sem. hrs when employed) 5 qtr. hrs
3. (60 sem hrs. when employed) 25 sem. hrs since employment

Percentage of staff lacking high school or college degrees at the time of employment, who have continued their education since employment: 24 out of 25...96%
STAFF DEVELOPMENT COMPONENT

H2.4 CAREER DEVELOPMENT OPPORTUNITIES

GOAL: The Project Manager (for Washington sites) and the Educational Director (for Texas sites) will work out a plan for career development with every staff member who has not yet attained a high school diploma and/or college degree and assist them to enroll in courses appropriate to their needs, as documented in a memo to the evaluator outlining by individual the courses being taken, if any, by each, or reasons for not taking courses.

FINDINGS:

A memo from the Project Director, and from the Texas site coordinator, confirm that all staff members are either currently enrolled in college courses or will be during the coming quarter, having begun work with the program too late for enrollment under the current quarter. These reports also indicate that the project has helped arrange for high school GED classes for trainees at all sites and has counseled staff members about their continuing education.
PARENT INVOLVEMENT COMPONENT

F3.1 FAMILY MEMBERS PARTICIPATING IN EDUCATIONAL ACTIVITIES

GOAL: Members of families equal to at least one-third of the enrollment capacity for each permanent site, will participate in the educational program for children in any of three ways; (a) participating in a planned home teaching program, (b) participating in the center's program working directly with the children (c) contributing to the programs' bicultural education activities. These types of family member participation (family member includes parents, brother or sisters, grandparents, aunt, uncle or guardian) will be documented by payroll records for family members employed as staff and by vouchers for volunteer services (earning payment to parent group) by family members who are not paid staff.

FINDINGS:

Analysis of employees who are parents of children in the program, and of parent vouchers for various types of services performed, indicates that at least the minimum of 20 parents at Grulla, 10 at Moses Lake and 8 at Connell were directly involved in the educational program for children. The enrollment capacity at Grulla is 60, at Moses Lake it is 30, and at Connell 24 so criterion is met.

INTERPRETATION OF FINDINGS:

Parental involvement at the Grulla site and at Connell was largely limited to help with special programs and fiestas, and to supervision of children on trips.

In Moses Lake the types of help given by parents and other family members is far more varied. This is the only site which regularly reports parents helping staff in the classroom, or even filling in for staff who are out on vacation. The Moses Lake site has had more programs and fiestas involving parents and the community than any other center. It is the only site where parents meet regularly (rather than on-call). The contribution of the parents, and the site coordinator who has mobilized the parents and community members in behalf of the program, seemed especially worthy of notice in the evaluation of this component.

This particular objective only calls for listing of parental activities related to the children's educational activities. In all sites parents have done a great many services for the program -- example one parent made 10 easels for the Washington centers; parents have made smocks for the children and many many costumes which have enriched the cultural heritage program. Parents have contributed a great deal (especially at Grulla) to rehabilitation of the centers, cleaning, painting, building. Parents handle all laundry for the program at Connell. Records turned over to the evaluator on types of parent involvement indicate that this has been a rich resource to the project.
PARENT INVOLVEMENT COMPONENT

H3.1 SOLICITING PARENT INVOLVEMENT

GOAL: Staff will contact parents and other family members soliciting assistance with the educational program, as documented by parent contact reports submitted by site coordinators and trainers and teacher reports on home visits and/or staff-parent conferences submitted by teachers. At least 50% of families will be contacted regarding participation in the educational program.

FINDINGS: The reporting system of the project enables the evaluator to have information on parent contacts by the site coordinators, but not parent contacts by teachers or trainers who have no forms for recording or reporting such contacts. The goal above stated anticipates that parent contact is the responsibility of teachers and trainers as well as the site coordinator, but a data collection system has not been implemented that would allow reporting on this objective.

At present the job descriptions for the site coordinator, for teacher trainees, and for trainers are not specific on the type of responsibility each position carries for developing parent participation in the program, nor what allocation of their time it is expected will be devoted to this objective. If administrative action were taken to clarify this responsibility it would be possible for the evaluator to design a monitoring instrument to see if this objective is being met.

INTERPRETATION OF FINDINGS:

Although the evaluator lacks data to compute a percentage of parent contacts, informal data from site visits indicates that parent contacts are taking place and the program is instituting some steps which will increase parental involvement. A new training unit is just being put into use centered around the skills a teacher needs for successful parent-teacher conferences. In addition, a home survey instrument is being used at all sites: the teachers completing it at one site and the site coordinators at the other sites, which obtains information about the home and its educational resources for children. A third change that might be noted is that parents at the Moses Lake center have paid tuition and are sending a group of parents to a workshop to learn how to use a "home lending library of toys" which can help develop preschool concepts. All of these changes should lead to an increasing parental partnership role for the children in Bilingual Mini Head Start.
PARENT INVOLVEMENT COMPONENT

F3.2 FAMILIES PARTICIPATING IN PROGRAM MANAGEMENT

GOAL: A parent and community advisory group formed in each permanent site will be active in management of the program, defined as making decisions or taking action in the following areas:

(a) organizational matters including election of officers, setting of meeting times, parent projects, etc.
(b) review of funding proposals or work program changes;
(c) personnel actions
(d) Plans for earning and spending parent funds
(e) discussion of the educational program—parent choices as to content, methods, equipment or ways in which parents may participate in educational program.

Action shall be taken in each area, if appropriate, within each evaluation period for fulfillment of this objective. (By "if appropriate" is meant elections of officers if the date for reelection of officers comes during this period of the year, or recommendation of people for jobs if a vacancy occurs, review of proposals if a new proposal or program change is being submitted during the evaluation period, etc.) This action shall be documented by minutes.

FINDINGS:

A content analysis of the minutes of parent meetings at each site classifying actions into the five categories above is as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>BRULLA</th>
<th>MOSES LAKE</th>
<th>CONNEIL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3/14 Explain</td>
<td>9/10 elect officers</td>
<td>8/12 Set up 4 parent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Co-op, nomination of board members.</td>
<td>choose parents</td>
<td>nominating committee for Board members.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(a) Organizational matters.</td>
<td>(b) Review of funding proposals</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4/24 Letter submitting Title VII proposal for PAC review.</td>
<td>4/24 Letter submitting Title VII proposal for PAC review.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4/26 Discuss IMPD delegate agency contract.</td>
<td>5/2 Discussed Title VII proposal.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7/8 Discuss plans for seeking TitleI funds, budgets.</td>
<td>8/7 Changes in Title parents write letters.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Survey of 31 parents supporting need for school-age tutoring program, UHRD proposal to fund it.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### (c) Personnel Actions

**GRULLA**
- **2/6 Personnel committee selects site coordinator (one applicant)**
- **2/14 reviewed applications for trainee: 4 applied 1 chosen.**
- **7/8 approved hiring former teacher for one month as substitute for teacher on leave. Decided to defer hiring new trainer or sec'y until program gets back to Texas. From one candidate, hired cook.**

**Moses Lake**
- **2/16 approved rehiring of former teacher to replace one leaving.**
- **7/24 from 2 applicants chose 1 for cook-driver.**

**Connell**
- **2/16 interviewed 4 candidates; selected 1 teacher.**
- **11/5 interviewed 11 candidates, chose 2 teachers and 2 substitutes.**

### (d) Plans for earning and spending parent funds

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Action</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3/14</td>
<td>Report on amount in fund; plans to earn more through volunteers for field trip supervisors.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5/2</td>
<td>Agree to donate $200 to MCDCEF.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4/4</td>
<td>Agree on $100 to buy toys; appoint parent committee to select.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9/10</td>
<td>Discuss how to earn money for fund, agree to buy refrigerator.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10/24</td>
<td>Agree to pay $50 for toys for people to attend toy lending library workshop.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### (e) Discussion of educational program

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Action</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3/14</td>
<td>Planning for zoo field trip.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8/10</td>
<td>Plan for fall fiesta. Ask parents to set up parents committees if MHS should take children to fair.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4/4</td>
<td>Agree to participate in community fiesta.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6/7</td>
<td>Discuss need for parents to help in classes while teachers are on vacation.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9/10</td>
<td>Trainer explained children for learning new curriculum children are using, showing materials, discussed.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
PARENT INVOLVEMENT COMPONENT

H3.2 WORKING WITH PARENT-COMMUNITY ADVISORY GROUP

GOAL: To provide the parent-community advisory group with information it needs to perform management functions, the on-site supervisory and/or training staff shall meet with and report to the parent community advisory group monthly or as often as the group chooses to meet, as documented by minutes and attendance rosters; and the project manager shall submit all proposals and work programs for review, and the evaluator supply an evaluation report at least twice a year to the parent-community advisory group, as documented by covering letters on proposals and evaluations as they are submitted.

FINDINGS:

Letters and minutes of meetings document that the Title VII proposal was submitted for review, the Head Start summer proposal discussed, the Title I proposal discussed, the Title IV funding discussed, and the URRD proposal discussed in parent meetings.

Minutes document that the evaluation report was presented to the Board in Texas in February; no similar presentation was made to the Washington centers.

Site coordinators, the educational director and trainers are present and participating in parent and community advisory meetings according to rosters of all parent meetings.
GOAL: The bicultural education resource teacher will make and publish curriculum materials for bicultural education with activities and the materials to carry them out reflecting the cultural traditions of Mexico and the United States primarily. These will include more than one of each of the following types of materials: songs, rhythm games or dances, poems, stories, and histories or legends concerning special days that are celebrated. The materials will include written materials in Spanish, audio tapes where music is required, video tapes for dances, and patterns and pictures for materials to go with special days and the stories and activities to celebrate them. Documentation of this objective shall be the published materials and tapes.

FINDINGS:

The reader is referred to the Staff Development Component objective on Training in Bicultural Activities. It contains a partial listing of the materials developed by the bicultural resource teacher. This far exceeded the minimum requirement in every type of material, except video tapes for dances. No video tapes were made, because of equipment problems. Three audio tapes were made, and the titles of music and instruction contained on those tapes is on file as well as printed words of songs to go with the tape.
MATERIALS DEVELOPMENT COMPONENT

H4.1 CULTURAL HERITAGE THEMES

GOAL: The Bicultural education resource teacher will select a monthly theme and develop materials around that theme supplying copies of materials to each center and for the project central file, as documented by materials submitted and weekly reports on materials developed and their distribution.

FINDINGS: Themes were developed for each month (sometimes more than one per month if several holidays occurred during that month) and a wide variety of materials developed related to each, and these materials were supplied to each center. Most teachers developed their own file with a complete set of cultural heritage materials, and the three audio tapes developed to go with them were reproduced so that every teacher in the mobile program could have her own copy (the permanent centers had center tapes rather than individual copies). (The purpose of individual copies for the mobile center teachers was that several of the teachers have to handle a group of children in a location where they are working alone; therefore each needs her own materials to carry with her.

Some Themes developed in cultural heritage materials:

La Estudiantina (Children’s chorus and orchestra as used in many schools in Mexico. How to make instruments, appropriate costumes, how to teach singing, songs and marching as group activities)

La Bandera (Background of flags in Mexico and U.S., songs, salutes, formations for presenting the flags.)

Partes del Cuerpo (Songs, games, fingerplays and dances that help a child to learn parts of his body, and his own name and that of others.)

Fruta y legumbres (Fruit and vegetables) Games (such as at the right where child stands on cut outs on floor, says the name and classifies it as a fruit or vegetable) Poems and songs on this theme.

Ninos de Otra Paises (children of other countries)

La Primavera (the first day of Spring)

Etc.
FINDINGS:

The following materials for training have been developed to date:

1. Nutrition for Preschool Children
2. Dual Language Teaching (not complete yet)
3. Math skills for preschoolers
4. Handwriting skills for preschoolers
5. Motivating learning

A sixth training unit in preparation will deal with pre-reading skills.
MATERIALS DEVELOPMENT COMPONENT

4.2 DEVELOPMENT OF TEACHER TRAINING MATERIALS

GOAL: The project manager, or a consultant designated by her, shall adapt the training materials developed by Far West Lab minicourse on methods of working with children with minimal language skills into five units of in-service training materials each containing written discussion of teaching behaviors, observation form to use in observing teachers demonstrating that behavior, accompanying unit checklist outlining key behaviors which must have been demonstrated at 75% level to pass the unit. These adaptations will constitute 5 training units. The sixth unit will be on the topic of nutrition in a child development program and will contain, similar to other training units, a minimum of discussion materials, observation sheet for observing teacher demonstration of skill or knowledge in this area, and unit checklist. These materials will be submitted for review of completeness to the evaluator.

FINDINGS:

The project changed its goal as to the subject matter of the training units, because it was felt that the new preacademic materials being introduced into the curriculum each needed a specific training unit so that teachers would be using the curriculum appropriately. The unit on how to do dual language teaching was in the interest of getting greater project wide uniformity in the approach of teachers to developing language; both primary and second language. The nutrition unit was developed as planned and is in use.

The evaluator examined all materials for completeness. Each contains explanatory materials, observation forms, and the dual language teaching unit currently lacks a checklist but all other units have checklists. The sixth unit is in preparation.
MATERIALS DEVELOPMENT COMPONENT

F4.3 PUBLICATION OF PROJECT FINDINGS

GOAL: The project manager will publish, or submit to other publishers copy for them to publish, outlining special problems relating to serving migrant children to which this program is addressed, and some of its findings to date, as documented by one or more publications or copy submitted to other publishers with cover letter indicating date of submission.

FINDINGS:

The following articles were written and published:

"Bilingual Head Start Moves with Children", published in April, 1973, Your Public Schools, a publication of the Washington State Superintendent of Public Instruction.


Articles were submitted to the following newspapers for publication (as documented by covering letters on file):

Valley Monitor, McAllen, Texas
Rio Grande City Herald, Rio Grande City, Texas
Grant County Journal, Ephrata, Washington

In addition to written materials, presentations were made at the following national meetings:

The project was selected as the only Bilingual education program to be featured at the national Education Fair held in Washington D.C. in May, 1973. Our educational director, Rafael Juerra, represented the project making two presentations (with slides) describing the program and its findings. Displays with pictures of the children and some of our evaluation findings were posted, and a small flyer was made up giving brief details about the project's goals and results. The project was given an "Award of Merit" by the National Commissioner of Education at the conclusion of the Education Fair.

In November, 1973, Louise Gustafson, project manager, attended sessions of the National Association for the Education of Young Children conference held in Seattle. She made a short presentation about the program -- the special needs it is responding to, and its methods of meeting these needs. Many people thereafter made personal inquiry about the program. In addition, the project receives and responds to a steady stream of letters of inquiry about one or another aspect of the program.
MATERIALS DEVELOPMENT COMPONENT

H4.3 WRITING ARTICLES ABOUT PROJECT FINDINGS

GOAL: The project manager or other staff members designated by her shall develop one or more articles describing the special circumstances of serving migrant children and the findings from this project's experience on ways of meeting these needs, as documented by the copy for these articles. (Specific topics for articles disseminating findings of this project to be developed at a later date following staff discussion and recommendations of the project officer.)

FINDINGS:

The article published in April, 1973 Your Public Schools gives very brief overview of the needs of migrant youngsters. A brochure prepared to accompany presentation at the Education Fair, 1973 outlines the special problems in serving migrants, the Mini Head Start Approach for overcoming these problems, and some of the results of the program.

INTERPRETATION OF FINDINGS:

Although neither of the above publications does into great detail, they do meet the criteria for this goal.
RELOCATING DELIVERY SYSTEM COMPONENT

F5.1 EDUCATIONAL OUTCOMES RELATED TO CONTINUITY OF SERVICE

GOAL: To provide beginning answers to the question: Does following children with services as they move in the stream make any difference? the project proposes the following exploratory objective:

Holding the length of time in the project and age group as a constant, the project proposes to use the Caldwell Preschool Inventory and the Wide Range Achievement Test (both standardized tests with national norms) to compare the achievement of school readiness skills between (a) project children who have been served by this mobile program both at home base and instream, (b) project children who have been served only at home base, (c) migrant children enrolled in the public school preschool program who have not been served by the project in either location as a zero program effect group. No criterion level of achievement is set as this is an exploratory objective; however it is anticipated that the skill level demonstrated by group (a) will be greater than that demonstrated by group (b) which in turn will be greater than that demonstrated by group (c). Holding age constant, a further analysis of the project group would compare the scores of children as they vary by length of time in the project.

FINDINGS:

At the time of writing this evaluation several steps have been taken to develop the above objective:

(1) A Home Survey Instrument has been selected which is being administered to all project children, and to other children in the community whose parents agree that they are willing to allow them to take the tests we wish to have for non-program contrast group. This home survey instrument will be a means of equalizing the project children with the non-project group according to the similarities of their home environment in aspects adjudged to affect the child's educational advantages. Arrangements have been made in Grulla and Connell for selection of non-program contrast group, and interviewing is underway. In Moses Lake another meeting is needed with school officials before such a program can get underway.

(2) Funds have been made available in Grulla for adding three more teachers which will enable the project to accept children who will be served only in Texas and will not be followed into the migrant stream. The project has a limited number of "non-continuity" children who have been served in previous years; this will increase the size of the non-continuity group to sufficient proportions that reasonable statistical comparisons can be made.

(3) The Preschool Inventory, Wide Range Achievement Test
RELOCATING DELIVERY SYSTEM COMPONENT (F5.1 continued)

and Peabody Picture Vocabulary Test have been administered to most project children, and testing of the non-program control group is underway in Texas but not yet at the other sites.

(4) With the Preschool Inventory results, an analysis was made among project children to show the program effect by holding age constant and comparing scores of children with varying amounts of attendance. These results were reported as Table 2 in the Instructional Component.

Further analysis on this objective will be possible at the next evaluation when more of the sites will have administered the tests and home survey instrument, and comparison groups will have been tested.
RELOCATING DELIVERY SYSTEM COMPONENT

H5.1 ACHIEVING MAXIMUM CONTINUITY OF SERVICE TO CHILDREN

GOAL: At least 70% of the mobile migrant children enrolled in the Texas based program will be enrolled again at a new location within one calendar year from the date of their initial enrollment, as documented by enrollment records from successive sites as the teachers relocate.

FINDINGS:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Children served in Grulla, home base</th>
<th>These children who later enrolled in one or more northern locations 4/73-9/73</th>
<th>Percent of children enrolled at two or more locations.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>period 10/72-3/73</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>78</td>
<td>58</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

INTERPRETATION OF FINDINGS:

A new method was tried this year to help the program during the in-stream phase to quickly locate families from Grulla who had moved north to work. This was the use of a "locator card" which was given to parents pre-stamped and addressed to be mailed to the evaluator as soon as the family relocated. She, in turn, got the information to the site coordinator or trainer in the area for the mobile programs, who could then look up the family and get the children back into the program.

This was not a noticeable success. Only eleven cards were mailed to the evaluator, representing families who had 14 project children. It was the impression of the evaluator that using word of mouth information from other families, that the site coordinator made contact with the families often before the information from the cards got to him, and that the children were very quickly reenrolled.

The program showed the same flexibility it had demonstrated in its first year. Green Giant reassigned many of its workers to the Kahlotus area, so a teacher went to that area and combined with a local program sponsored by a local church group to continue to serve the Grulla migrant children. Centers were combined during some periods, and teachers transferred back and forth between center sites in order to avoid the low attendance periods "between crops" encountered mostly during July of last year.

It is already apparent that changes in crops and worker assignments by Green Giant Corp. (a major employer for Grulla families) will put the centers in still different locations next year. In short, a mobile program such as this cannot expect to return to the same locations year after year, because agriculture is too changing for work locations to be predictable. It also seems essential that staff be trained to be self sufficient because there
were six staff members who found themselves operating a
one-teacher program during at least part of the season in
order to accommodate a small cluster of students in an
isolated work location.

At Walla Walla, Kaholtus, Lynden, Duyton, in Washington,
at Hoopeston, Illinois and at Burley, Idaho, the Mini Head
Start teacher and children combined with another local
program. In all cases it was possible to work out
schedules to enable the mini-Head Start teacher to continue
to tutor children and carry on with our curriculum within
the other program. Our training program for teachers also
was continued in 3 out of 6 of the above named locations
where we had combined with another program. The problem of
how to continue training when teachers are in areas beyond
car driving distance of the trainer's location has been
discussed in another part of the evaluation.

The evaluation published a year ago compared the rate of
continuity of service to children of the Mini Head Start
model against other programs which have attempted to achieve
continuity for children at successive locations using a
variety of models. These previous efforts have reached
only about 20% of the home base children during their
in-season migration in the most successful of other models
which have tried to serve a moving population. The "Mini"
model, in which teachers can move with as few as four or
five children, seems to have demonstrated its usefulness
as a superior means of serving children "on the move".

Home base for the mobile Mini Head Start Program,
La Grulla, Texas (named for a migratory bird).
H6.1 COORDINATION WITH HOST COMMUNITIES

GOAL: In each host community to which the mobile project teacher moves, the educational director or site coordinator or project manager will contact local public school officials and any agencies providing service to migrants, exchanging information about programs and offering to coordinate with local program efforts, as documented by a master chart on coordinative contacts by the mobile program maintained by the evaluator.

FINDINGS:

Primary coordinative contacts in host communities to which Mini Head Start children moved 1973 season:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>AGENCIES SERVING MIGRANTS</th>
<th>SCHOOL CONTACTS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(1) WALLA WALLA, WASH. College Place, WASH.</td>
<td>1/18/73 with Supt. at College Place: Donald Campbell</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Migrant Day Care Center Margaret Chadek, Coord.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(2) PRESCOTT, WASH Day School, WASH</td>
<td>1/18/73 with Supt. from Prescott: Lloyd Olsen</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Migrant Day Care Center Mrs. Hileman, director</td>
<td>Supt. at Dayton, Victor Anderson</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(3) PROSSER, WASH Grandview, WASH.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parent and Child Center</td>
<td>Supt. Prosser, Glenn Powell</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(4) MABTON, WASH. TOPPENISH, WASH.</td>
<td>Principal Elementary School</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grange Officials</td>
<td>(MIS helped enroll children in migrant summer school)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Housing for center)</td>
<td>Supt. Henry Milhofer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Farm Worker's Health Clinic</td>
<td>(he agreed to be channel for our funds in URRD application)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(5) KAHLOTUS, WASH.</td>
<td>Supt. James Whitt</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rev. Bates, Director of Migrant Day Care Center</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(6) LYNDEN, WASH.</td>
<td>No school contacts</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Director for day care center</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Contacts through Judy Blythe, DSHS).</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(7) BURLEY, IDAHO</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Director of Head Start Center No school contacts</td>
<td>Barbara Jessen (by phone)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(8) HOOPESTON, ILLINOIS</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Onesimo Castillo and Oscar Villarreal</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Texas Migrant Council Day Care Center.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No local school contacts</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
MANAGEMENT COMPONENT (H6.1 continued)

Additional educational contacts for services relating to all Washington sites:

Miguel Esquivel, Consultant Title I Migrant Programs
Ignacio Hesendez, Consultant Title I Migrant Programs

Migrant and Indian Center (Title I supported center in Toppenish from which we borrowed materials.)

There were several contacts with medical services: Dayton Clinic, Farm Workers Health Service already mentioned.

There were several contacts with officials of Green Giant for whom many of the families worked, and which gave 25% of the cost of salaries for teachers in some areas in which we operated.

The mobile program at Dayton cooperated with the County Extension agents and the Mini Head Start families operated a booth at the fair. Our children performed many of the songs, dances, etc. which are part of our cultural heritage curriculum in community programs attended by hundreds of people; one of these programs from Dayton was televised.

Dayton, Washington, Thursday, June 14, 1973

55 Children Attend 2 Day Care Centers

The Day Care Centers here in Dayton are serving as a home away from home for some 55 youngsters whose parents are working here; this summer. The children, ranging from the age of two to six, arrive many times as early as 6 a.m. at the towns two centers.

The centers, one at the Parish Hall across from the City Hall, and the other in the Methodist church, serve the children two meals, breakfast and lunch, and two snacks. The children take part in learning activities, go for walks around town, visit the park, and this week will be visiting Green Giant.

There is no cost to the parents of the migrant workers who make use of the centers. However, local children are charged a fee. Financing for the project comes from state, federal and Green Giant monies.

Most of the children are from the Rio Grande Valley in Texas, and Mexico.

Co-directors of the centers are Evelyn Maynard and Bea Hileman. Teachers include, Kathy Donohue, Miriam Davis, Debbie Roberts, and Don Schollenberger. Aides, both full and part time include Kay Laymance, Kay Eaton, Arlene Trichler, Elida Ybanez, Jean Whipple, Julie DeRuwe, and Rosa Trillayes.

A new program offered at this year's center is the Mini Head Start Program. This is a state and federally funded bilingual program for the children of the LaGrulla, Texas area.

There are 20 children at the Dayton center under this program. There are centers in cities across the state connected with this program.

The children range from the age of three to six. Their families, children and the teachers travel together from Texas to Washington every year.

According to a recent government report, this program is the most outstanding bilingual program in the nation.

The teachers in the program are training on the job and are receiving G.D. and college credit for their work.

This program is also credited with having the highest rate of continuity in the U.S.

Sylvia Johnson is the trainer, and Angela Zafate and Elia Flores are the teachers in this program.

Publicity at Dayton, Washington publicizes the program's selection as an educational program of "outstanding merit" by the U.S. Commissioner of Education, and our invitation to be the only bilingual program presented at the national Education Fair held in Washington D.C. in 1973.
GOAL: This is an exploratory objective without any criterion level of achievement since it is the first time it has been tried. The La Grulla Migrant Co-op Board will continue to function in a management capacity, performing the same management functions described in objective F3.2, during its northern phase—despite the fact that the Board members will be moving periodically and will be widely scattered during this period of mobility. Decision making will utilize such means as conference telephone calls, or assembling a partial board at some temporary location and reaching absent members by telephone to conduct business and take votes, or doing business by mail balloting. The strategies will be documented by periodic memo’s from the educational director, who is working with the Co-op Board.

FINDINGS: After the program left Texas, the Project Manager sent a report on progress during May, plus the Title VII proposal for review, to the Board Chairman in Texas.

A telephone conference was held April 26 in which the Board members in the Grandview area, the Educational Director, and the Chairman of the Board (who was reached in Grulla, Texas as he had not migrated) made several project decisions:

The Chairman agreed to contact two other Board members also in Grulla and let Mrs. Gustafson know their thoughts on the Title VII proposal so she could negotiate the contract in Seattle in May;

The Board agreed to allow the board members in the Grandview-Mabton area to select one or two other "temporary" board members so they could make decisions for the program should it be impossible to reach the Texas board members in some emergency. (There was no need for this so it was not activated).

The Board agreed on the time and place for a conference call meeting in mid-summer.

On July 8th the mid-summer meeting was held with some Board members together in Washington and others reached by telephone in Texas. Project progress was discussed; a personnel decision made on hiring a cook for the center in Grandview and a substitute teacher for the Lynden center to replace another teacher on leave. Further decisions were made to defer hiring of a new trainer and new secretary to replace staff which had left until the project returned to Texas. Agreed the educational director should return to Texas before the end of August so as to negotiate for Title I funds with Lee Frazier before the start of the school year. (For further detail on Board action and decision making refer to the evaluation report under Objective F3.2)
MANAGEMENT COMPONENT

H6.3 MONITORING FAR FLUNG PROJECT OPERATIONS

GOAL: The project manager will maintain administrative contact, and/or the evaluator will maintain evaluation feedback from all operating sites and with every person on the administrative, training or teaching staff at least once a week throughout the year with the exception of authorized non-operating periods when centers are closed for relocation or vacations. These contacts will be documented by telephone logs, correspondence, files, and data processing communication check-off records maintained by the evaluator.

FINDINGS:

A telephone log and site visit long kept by the Project Manager indicates a least once a week contact with the Washington and Texas component personnel, except during the week the project manager was on vacation and the week the Texas staff were all in transit.

Report checkin charts maintained by the Evaluator records reports on the program that come in every week from training staff, from every teacher, and from site coordinators. With only a small scattering of reports missing, this reporting system has been implemented throughout the year with one exception. There is a four month gap in reports from the Texas site coordinator. This resulted from a staff meeting held in mid-summer in which the Evaluator indicated a revised report form for coordinators was needed to relate the information they submitted more directly to the current objectives as written for our program. Developing such a revised form is the responsibility of the evaluator, who failed to develop it. However, anticipating a new form, the Texas site coordinator discontinued his reporting until the Project Manager was made aware of the situation and advised him never to wait for a new form but to continue to use the old one until a new one actually arrived. He complied and reports were resumed.

INTERPRETATION OF FINDINGS:

This program is nearly unique in that it has its operations flung out in so many locations in the U.S. Day to day supervision of program is not possible. This means that to monitor the program, keep up progress, and produce a valid program effort, it is essential to have a working reporting system using mail and telephone, supplemented by periodic site visits. The report system worked out by this project does appear to be workable and to be able to maintain integrity of all aspects of the work program, despite distance.