In 1975-76, an outreach activities component enabled REPSAC (a highly successful early childhood bilingual intervention program) to provide replication services to various local education agencies requesting such services. Training was taken to the replication centers by a specially designed and equipped motor coach. During the year, the Fort Sumner, Artesia, and Carlsbad (New Mexico) school districts requested replication services. In addition, the Clovis-Portales Bilingual Early Childhood Program made replication, with training sites in Clovis and Portales. Teachers and aides were trained through visits by the outreach training team and a workshop at the parent center. Evaluation was conducted via objective evaluations of the formal course; classroom visits; site-visits with administrators, teachers, and aides; self-evaluation questionnaires from the trainees and trainers; and a review of various records/ logs maintained by the outreach training team. A follow-up of former REPSAC students in grades 1-4 was conducted. Findings included: teachers gained a good understanding of handicapping conditions and how to adequately screen their children; the training workshop had a positive effect on the participants' teaching behavior; and the follow-up study indicated a downward trend for Spanish language development, a slightly upward trend for English language development; and a rather stable trend for learning aptitude. (NO)
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Beginning with school year 1975-76, an outreach activities component was added to the Responsive Environment Program for Spanish American Children (REPSAC), a highly successful early childhood bilingual intervention program conducted by the Clovis Municipal Schools, Clovis, New Mexico. This outreach component gave the program the capability of providing replication services to various local education agencies requesting such services. A unique feature of this replication service was the capability of taking the training to the replication centers by a specially designed and equipped motor coach, the Mobile Learning Resource Center.

Three school districts, all in isolated areas and having a large number of target children, requested replication services during 1975-76. These school districts were: Fort Sumner; Artesia; and Carlsbad, are located in eastern New Mexico. In addition, replication by two other school districts had already been completed. This replication was made by the Clovis-Portales Bilingual Early Childhood Program (ESEA-Title VII) with a training site in each school district (Clovis and Portales, New Mexico).

Training was provided to teachers and aides at the replication center as well as at the parent center, in the form of visits by the outreach training team using the Mobile Learning Resource Center and by conducting a workshop at the parent center.

The evaluation design of the training function mainly consisted of various research/evaluation questions. To answer these questions, a variety of measures were used which included: objective evaluation of the formal course; classroom visits using a specifically designed classroom
observation form; site-visits with administrators, teachers, and aides; self-evaluation questionnaires from the trainees and trainers; and a review of various types of records/logs maintained by the outreach training team. In addition, this evaluation study consisted of a follow-up of former REPSAC students who were, this year, in grades 1-4.

Major findings included: (1) Teachers trained at the replication centers had a good understanding of handicapping conditions and knew how to adequately screen their children; (2) The training workshops conducted at the parent center had a positive effect on the teaching behavior of the participants as well as being considered extremely effective by the participants; (3) The motor coach was effectively used in the training program; and (4) The follow-up study of former REPSAC students who were, this year, in grades 1-4 indicated that the trend set in terms of past performance is departing substantially from the expected growth pattern toward a downward trend for language development in Spanish, a slightly upward trend for language development in English, and a rather stable trend for learning aptitude (IQ).
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YEAR-END EVALUATION REPORT

SECTION I

INTRODUCTION

This report describes an external evaluation study of the Outreach Activities of the Responsive Environment Program for Spanish American Children (REPSAC), Clovis Municipal Schools, Clovis, New Mexico during the period November 29, 1974-June 30, 1976. This report is part of a continuation evaluation study being conducted by B.E. Askins and Associates which is an independent consultant and service organization with its direction primarily through various faculty members of the College of Education Texas Tech University. This report is submitted in accordance with the approved revised Evaluation Proposal dated October 10, 1975 and the Educational Evaluation Agreement dated October 17, 1975.

The Parent Center - REPSAC

The major purpose of REPSAC is to serve as an effective early educational intervention for 3-, 4-, and 5-year-old "high risk" Spanish American children living in the area served by the Clovis Municipal Schools, Clovis, New Mexico. Children are considered "high risk" as a result of their low birth weight, 51/2 pounds or less, and who will probably have accompanying handicaps as they enter the first grade. This program attempts to demonstrate that such an early intervention can provide such children the experiences necessary to succeed and remain in the educational mainstream.

REPSAC, which has been operating since September, 1971,* is a group educational program as contrasted to an individual clinical project. The program aims at providing successful experiences using the concept of responsive environment for Spanish American children in the areas of developing language ability in English and Spanish and in improving cognitive and affective development. REPSAC is considered a demonstration project and, in developing, has drawn heavily upon three experimentally developed models in early childhood education: the New Nursery School: the responsive environment concept and Project LIFE (Language Instruction to Facilitate Education). Also, the Piaget-Early Childhood Curriculum (parts translated in Spanish) are used.

Purpose of the Outreach Activities Component

The purpose of adding the outreach activities component to the parent center (REPSAC) was to give the program the capability of providing replication.

*For references pertaining to the first, second, third, and fourth years of operation, see Bibliography (4, 5, 6, and 7).
services to various local education agencies requesting such services. A unique feature of this replication service is the capability of taking the training to the replication centers by a specially designed and equipped motor coach.

The outreach component was implemented in two phases. The first phase consisted of needs assessment and developmental planning (November 29, 1974-August 31, 1975), and the second phase consisted of the implementation procedures (September 1, 1975-June 30, 1976).

Three school districts, all in isolated areas and having a large number of target children and within a reasonable distance of the parent center, requested replication of all or part of the REPSAC curriculum during the 1975-76 school year. These school districts were: Fort Sumner, Artesia, and Carlsbad, all located in eastern New Mexico. In addition, replication by two other school districts had already been made completing their third year of operation. This replication was made by the Clovis-Portales Bilingual Early Childhood Program (ESEA, Title VII) with a training site in each school district (Clovis and Portales, New Mexico).

The outreach activities component is designed to have three major functions: advisory and training, diffusion, and evaluation.

Advisory and Training

This function pertains to staff development of faculty at the replication sites as well as at the parent center. This involves the training of teachers and teacher-aides to acquire competencies in working with young, high risk, and handicapped children using the concept of responsive environment. The training team consists of specialists in the area of special education; speech therapy, early childhood education, and bilingual education.

Diffusion

The parent center operates as a service and demonstration center for the state of New Mexico and parts of West Texas. Workshops and conferences were held so as to provide information to administrators, agency heads, state school officials, and other decision-makers concerning the program and its offerings.

Evaluation

Evaluation of the outreach activities was conducted internally and externally. The internal evaluation was conducted by the director and staff of REPSAC, and the external evaluation was conducted by an outside evaluation team as previously described. Although the external evaluator is not located specifically in the Clovis, New Mexico area, the proximity of Lubbock (Texas) to Clovis is such that frequent contact can be made with REPSAC and the replication centers.

* For references pertaining to the evaluation of this program, see Bibliography (8, 9, and 10).
Purpose of the External Evaluation

The purpose of the external evaluation is to collect and provide information necessary for decision-making relative to the objectives of the outreach activities component. This external evaluation is considered a way to improve; therefore, much emphasis was placed upon formative evaluation procedures.

Major elements of the external evaluation were:

1. Providing a variety of professional personnel appropriate to the evaluation of the outreach activities including: personnel to administer survey instruments, perform site-visits, providing feedback to the training staff, analysis, report writing, and coordination.

2. Developing and following the evaluation design for each of the two primary functions of the outreach activities component - advisory and training and diffusion. (The evaluation design for each function is described later).

3. Continuing the follow-up study of former REPSAC students who were, during school year 1975-76, in the first, second, third, and fourth grades.

4. Analyzing data collected and subject data, when appropriate, to statistical treatment which will include summaries of data and narrative description of findings.

5. Preparing two interim and the end-of-year evaluation reports.
SECTION II
EVALUATION DESIGN

The external evaluation of the outreach activities consisted of formative and summative types of evaluation of the two primary functions, advisory and training function and the diffusion function. Also, as part of the evaluation of the outreach activities, a follow-up study of former REPSAC students is being conducted as they progress through various grades (1-6) in public and private schools.

The evaluation design for each of these areas is described in the following paragraphs.

Advisory and Training Function

The major goal of this function was to assist the teachers and aides at the replication centers to acquire certain knowledge and skills so as to be more effective while working with young, high-risk, handicapped, and vulnerable children using the concept and processes of responsive environment.

Needs Assessment

The first step in implementing the advisory and training function was to work with the communities, parents, and faculty/staff to develop cooperation/trust and assess training needs, and generally secure information so as to design and implement a training program sensitive to the needs of the participants. A training needs assessment of the participating personnel was conducted during August and September, 1975.

Research/Evaluation Questions

As an element of the evaluation of this training, the director and teachers who conducted the training posed several questions they wanted answered during/after the training which included:

1. What kind of rapport exists between personnel at the replication centers with the training staff?

2. Are the teachers being supported in their efforts by their administration?

3. Do the teachers have adequate availability of professional materials in the areas of bilingual and early childhood education?

4. How effective was the teaching of the 17 instructional units of the course in Concept Development in Early Childhood?
5. Are the teachers using the responsive environment concept in their teaching including flexible room arrangements and learning centers?

6. Do the teachers have knowledge of handicapping conditions?

7. Do the teachers know how to screen children?

8. How effective were the training workshops conducted at the model center?

9. Are the teacher-aides effective in their role in the classroom?

10. Was the motor coach utilized effectively in the training program?

Procedures to Collect Data

A variety of measures was used to collect data to evaluate and answer the research questions pertaining to the effects of the training. These included evaluation of the training workshops; an objective test over the course in Concept Development in Early Childhood; classroom visits (kindergarten classes only) using a specifically designed classroom observation form; site visits with administrators, teachers, and aides; self-evaluation reports from the trainees; and a review of various types of records/logs maintained by the training staff.

Evaluation of Workshops. Various in-service training workshops were conducted during the school year for teachers and teacher-aides from the replication centers as well as the parent center. The procedure for evaluating the workshops consisted of 1) assessment of the workshop goals/objectives by the method of participant reaction/response, and 2) observation of the activities of the workshop by the evaluator. The instrument used was the McCallon Workshop Evaluation System. This instrument, which was completed at the conclusion of each workshop, solicited participant reactions to the workshop on seven dimensions which were: Organization of the Workshop, Objectives of the Workshop, Presenters; Content (ideas and activities); Scope (coverage); Benefit; and Overall Effectiveness. The participants responded to questions on each of the seven dimensions on the Workshop Evaluation.

Scale (1= poor to 7= excellent). The McCallon Workshop Evaluation System provides normative data, and the participant feedback scores are compared against these norms so as to have reliable analysis and interpretation of effectiveness. The evaluation results were presented in three ways. The results of the observations of the workshop were presented in narrative form, and the results of the Workshop Evaluation Scale were reported in two forms, tabular and on the Workshop Analysis Report Form. The evaluation data of each workshop were reported in a separate report and was submitted to the project director.

Objective Test. An objective test over the 17 instructional units of the course in Concept Development in Early Childhood was administered as a pretest to all trainees at the beginning of the training and at the end of the school year. Statistical analysis of the differences between the scores of the posttest and the pretest was conducted.

Classroom Observations. Members of the evaluation team made periodic classroom visits of participating teachers (Kindergarten classes only) to observe using a specifically designed classroom observation instrument. The form was designed to note such things as: availability of bilingual and early education materials; learning centers; use of the responsive environment concept; and evidence of long and short range instructional planning.

Site-Visits. Members of the evaluation team conducted periodic site-visits involving administrators, teachers, and aides so as to acquire their verbal reaction/responses to the training activities.

Self-Evaluation Reports. At the end of the year, another facet of evaluation was in the form of Self-Evaluation Reports so as to obtain: Administrators' responses (strengths and weaknesses) to the training activities; Teachers' and aides' responses (strengths and weaknesses) to the training activities; and Trainers' responses (strengths and weaknesses) to the training activities.

Records/Logs. The type of information that was obtained from the various records/logs included: Number of visits to schools; Number of trainees; Number and qualifications of trainees; Type of activities; Materials distributed; Utilization of motor coach - whether coach was used for participant training, screening demonstrations, materials demonstration, individual conferences, etc.; Number of teachers trained to screen; Number of children screened; Number of children referred; and Number of children under treatment.

Reporting the Data

An on-going evaluation was conducted by the evaluator, and feedback was provided to the training staff on a recurring basis (October, February, and April). Thus, evaluation and observation data was used to yield
formative evaluation results to guide the training staff in selecting content and instructional procedures.

Results of the objective tests, classroom observation, site-visits, review of records/logs, and self-evaluation reports are reported later in this report.

**Diffusion Function**

This function pertained to the dissemination of information and activities of the outreach activities component. Some means of dissemination included: workshops, conferences, preparation of a commercially prepared 16 mm film, and preparation of various brochures and reports.

Four workshops/conferences were conducted as part of this function, as well as advisory and training function.

**Procedures to Collect Data**

The workshops and conferences were objectively evaluated using the McCallon Workshop Evaluation System (instrument was previously described). The other dissemination activities were evaluated on a subjective basis.

**Reporting the Data**

A separate evaluation report was submitted to the project director after each workshop or conference, and a summary of each is included in a later section of this report.

Also, an on-going evaluation was conducted by the evaluator, and feedback concerning various diffusion activities were provided to the director and staff on a regular basis (October, February, and April). Thus, evaluation and observation data were used to yield formative evaluation results to guide the development of dissemination activities.

Summary objective evaluation data of the workshops and conferences and the subjective evaluation data of the other activities are reported in a later section of this report.

**Follow-Up Study of Former REPSAC Students**

A basic concern to those who have worked in REPSAC during the past several years is the status of former students now enrolled in public and
private schools. This concern has generated a continuation of the follow-up studies of former REPSAC students which were completed in 1974 and 1975 and was conducted at the end of the 1975-76 school year.

Projected Number of Students

The projected number of students for the 1976 follow-up study were:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Grade Level</th>
<th>Estimated Number</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>55</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Procedure For Collecting Data

The 1976 follow-up study was conducted using the following procedures:

1. Gathering descriptive data:

   A questionnaire was submitted to teachers of former REPSAC students seeking information about their academic and social progress in school. In addition, personal interviews were held with teachers and other school personnel to supplement the questionnaire data.

2. Administering of standardized tests:

   Standardized tests were administered to the former REPSAC students in grades 2-4. The tests administered were the same instruments used during the former students' tenure in REPSAC; therefore, the test scores can be reviewed for a span of years beginning 1971. The tests administered were as follows:

   - Peabody Picture Vocabulary Test - English version
   - Peabody Picture Vocabulary Test - Spanish version
   - Hisker-Nebraska Test of Learning Aptitude (IQ)

Analysis

Data obtained from the follow-up study were analyzed in two ways:

1. A descriptive analysis of the questions and interview information.
This analysis yielded a profile of former REPSAC students currently enrolled in public and private schools.

2. A time-series analysis.

This analysis was conducted on the test data in an effort to assess the test score statistics over a period of years. The specific element of the time-series used in analyzing these data was the "secular trend." This "line of best fit" method presents a basis for comparing the theoretical trend with the observed trend. (The specific program used is described in Statistic Package for the Social Sciences, version 6, Texas Tech University Computer Center.)
EVALUATION DATA CONCERNING THE ADVISORY AND TRAINING FUNCTION

The advisory and training function pertained to staff development primarily at the three replication centers (Fort Sumner, Artesia, and Carlsbad, New Mexico) as well as at the parent center. In addition, this training assisted two other school districts who, as of this year, had completed their third year of operation using the replication of REPSAC. This replication was made by the Clovis-Portales Bilingual Early Childhood Program (ESEA, Title VII) with a training site in each school district (Clovis and Portales, New Mexico). Also, this training assisted the kindergarten program at Dora, New Mexico as well as assisted several teachers from various elementary schools in Clovis and Portales including one parochial school. The total number of the outreach participants during the year, who were directly or indirectly affected by the advisory and training function, was approximately 75. (This figure does not include the number effected by the diffusion function).

This training assisted teachers and teacher-aides to acquire competencies in working with young, high risk, and handicapped children using the concept of responsive environment. The training team consisted of specialists in the area of special education, speech therapy, early childhood education, and bilingual education.

A unique feature of this training was that the parent center had the capability of taking the training to the replication centers by a specially designed and equipped motor coach, The Mobile Learning Resource Center.

In short, training was provided to teachers and aides at the replication centers, as well as at the parent center, in the form of visits by the outreach training team using the Mobile Learning Resource Center and by conducting of a workshop at the parent center. The training visits to the replication centers included a presentation of a course (Concepts Development in Early Childhood Education divided into 17 units) and demonstration of materials and screening procedures.

Needs Assessment

The first step in implementing the advisory and training function was to work with the communities, parents, and faculty/staff to develop cooperation/trust and assess training needs, and generally secure information so as to design and implement a training program sensitive to the needs of the participants.
A training needs assessment of the participating personnel was conducted using the Early Childhood Training Inventory during August and September, 1975. The purpose of this inventory was two-fold: (1) To identify needed training experiences for teachers, aides, and administrators of early childhood programs; and (2) To identify preferences of future workshop participants concerning various modes of instruction. The summary and analysis of this needs assessment was prepared by the evaluator in a special report dated September 15, 1975, and these data were used as a basis for developing specific objectives of the training program. The training began in October, 1975.

Research/Evaluation Questions

As an element of the evaluation of this training, the director and members of the outreach training staff posed several questions they wanted answered by the evaluator during/after the training. The evaluation team used a variety of measures to collect data in answering these questions. These measures included: objective evaluation of the training workshops; an objective test for the course Concept Development in Early Childhood; classroom visits (kindergarten classes only); using a specifically designed classroom observation form; site-visits with administrators, teachers, and aides; self-evaluation questionnaires from the trainees; and a review of various types of records maintained by the training staff. The evaluation questions posed and answers found by the evaluation team are as follows:

Q 1. - What kind of rapport exists between participants at the replication centers with the outreach training staff?

Based on information obtained from site-visits at the beginning and at the end of the training sessions and from self-evaluation questionnaires from the trainees and their administrator, much evidence was found which indicated an overall excellent rapport between the two groups.

Q 2. - Are the teachers at the replication centers being supported in their efforts by their administration?

Based on information obtained from site-visits at the beginning and at the end of the training sessions and from self-evaluation questionnaires from the trainees and their administrator, evidence was found to indicate that the teachers at the various centers believed that they were being supported in their efforts by their administration. The majority of the administrators viewed the training and results of the training in a favorable light, especially the part pertaining to the screening of the kindergarten children.
Q 3. - Do the teachers have adequate availability of professional materials in the areas of bilingual and early childhood education?

During the site-visits at the beginning and at the end of the training sessions, the evaluator noted at each center a lack of permanent materials (classrooms as well as professional library) pertaining to bilingual education. However, teachers did have access to such materials as they could be borrowed from the Mobile Learning Resource Center.

Q 4. - How effective was the teaching of the course, Concept Development in Early Childhood, at the various replication centers?

This course, divided into 17 units, was taught by the outreach training team as they visited the replication centers. A total of 34 people enrolled for the course and were eligible to receive credit from Eastern New Mexico University. The course was to be evaluated by administering a pre and posttest and to conduct a statistical analysis of the difference between the mean scores of the two tests; however, training was started before the pre-test was administered. Consequently, the pre-test scores became invalid. The posttest was administered as scheduled, and the mean score of the posttest was 28.9 (SD = 5.62) out of a possible 40. It was concluded that the teaching of the course was effective.

Q 5. - Are the teachers using the responsive environment concept in their teaching, including flexible room arrangements and learning centers?

Based on information obtained from site-visits at the beginning and at the end of the training sessions and using the specifically designed classroom observation form, a marked change in teaching strategies was found. Several teachers had questions about the organization and use of learning centers. Differences were noted by school, but overall, effects of the training were observable.

Q 6. - Do the teachers have a knowledge of handicapping conditions?

Based on the information obtained from site-visits with certain teachers (kindergarten) and from the results from the self-evaluation questionnaires from all the teachers, they indicated a relatively high degree of understanding of handicapping conditions.
Q 7. - Do the teachers know how to screen children?

Based on the information obtained from site-visits with certain teachers (kindergarten) and from the results from the self-evaluation questionnaires from all the teachers, they indicated a relatively high degree of understanding of screening children. The teachers did indicate a need for additional training in the area of instructional planning after results of screening were known.

Q 8. - How effective were the training workshops conducted at the model center?

Evaluation data of these workshops were reported in a separate report dated April 15, 1976 which was submitted to the project director. A summary of this report is presented as follows:

Seven in-service training workshops, Teaching Young Children, were conducted during the 1975-76 school year for the various teachers and aides from the replication centers as well as for teachers who were working or were expected to work with preprimary children. Each workshop consisted of five days of training and was conducted at the parent center (REPSAC). Dates of the workshops were: Nov. 3-7, 7-11, 1975, Jan. 12-16, Feb. 9-13, 23-27, and March 22-26, 1976.

The purpose of each workshop was to provide training on the practical problems of organizing, planning, and implementing an effective preprimary program for children in New Mexico. Special emphasis was given to techniques for working with high-risk, developmentally slow or disabled children. Activities included orientation; guided observation, participation, seminars, demonstrations, independent study, and constructing and using learning materials.

A total of 55 participants attended the 7 workshops which included 41 teachers, 13 teacher-aides, and 1 administrator. The participants were representatives from 22 municipal school districts and one from a state university, all in New Mexico. Each participant received $100 stipend for the training period plus mileage to/from his/her school district. Of the total participants, 36 received college credit (1 semester hour) for participating in the workshop through Eastern New Mexico University.

Using the McCallon-Workshop Evaluation System (See Section II), the mean ratings on the seven dimensions of the Workshop Evaluation
Scale were well above average (6.33-6.80 on a 7.00 point scale), and the mean rating of the Overall Effectiveness of the workshops was 6.56. The narrative concerning the observations of the workshop was very positive. In short, the series of workshops achieved the objectives and were extremely successful.

Q 9. - Are the teacher-aides effective in their role in the classroom?

Based on information obtained from site-visits at the beginning and at the end of the training sessions, it was found a majority of the teachers believed that the teacher-aides were effective in the classroom. Several teachers did mention that when teachers and their aides attended the same training workshop, there should be certain times when the two groups should be separated and appropriate activities be conducted for the differing needs of the two groups.

Q10. - Was the motor coach, The Mobile Learning Resource Center, utilized effectively in the training program?

The Mobile Learning Resource Center was used by the outreach team as they visited the replication centers. The motor coach was stocked with materials for use of the visited sites and included:

- Books for children; 122 titles, Spanish and English
- Educational Activities; games, multimedia kits and equipment to help children learn specific concepts or skills -- 69 in Spanish and 163 in English
- 57 Curriculum Kits in both Spanish and English
- Filmstrips for Children; 16 perceptual development packages, 27 language/reading programs and 38 others
- 44 Records for Children; Spanish, Spanish and English, and English
- 73 Teaching Transparencies
- 82 Spanish and 105 English Books and Materials for Teachers and Aides
- 41 Films and Filmstrips for Teachers, Aides and Parents
- 14 Evaluation and Screening Instruments
All of the above materials are available at no charge to the schools and teachers participating in the outreach activities. The materials could be checked out for approximately two weeks or until the next stop of the Mobile Learning Resource Center.

During the 1975-76 school year, the Mobile Learning Resource Center (motor coach) was driven 12,384 miles (personnel drove an additional 8,745 miles in their personal automobiles on outreach business) and made 148 visits to schools in New Mexico. Schools visited were in Clovis (20 visits), Ft. Sumner (33 visits), Artesia (30 visits), Portales (10 visits), Carlsbad (42 visits), Dora (7 visits), Hobbs (2 visits), and Farmington (4 visits). Activities conducted during the visits to schools included: the screening of children, training teachers and aides how to screen children, following through on the results of previous screening, checking out and demonstrating materials and attempting to provide whatever services teachers requested. The mobile Learning Resource Team provided weekly classes in the course Early Childhood Education for 34 teachers in Carlsbad, Artesia, Portales, Ft. Sumner, and Carlsbad.

During the year, tests were administered to 1,277 children. Of this number, 160 were screened for speech and hearing defects; 269 children were referred for treatment; and approximately 42 teachers and 48 teacher aides were trained in screening children.

The evaluation team visited the schools serviced by the Mobile Learning Resource Center and interviewed a number of administrators and teachers. In every case, the responses to the service and effect of the outreach activities were favorable; many stated that without the service of the Mobile Learning Resource Center that they would be unable to help their handicapped young children.

Based on these data, it was conducted that the motor coach was effectively utilized in the training function.
SECTION IV
EVALUATION DATA CONCERNING THE DIFFUSION FUNCTION

This function pertained to the dissemination of information concerning the program activities. Some means of dissemination included: workshops, conferences, preparation of a commercially prepared 16 mm film, and preparation and distribution of various brochures and reports.

Workshops/Conferences

Five workshops/conferences were conducted during the year as part of this function, as well as advisory and training. Evaluation data of these workshops were reported in a separate report and submitted to the project director immediately after each workshop. The workshops were evaluated using the McCallon Workshop Evaluation System which was described in Section II. A summary of these reports is presented in the following paragraph.

First Workshop - ENMU

The first workshop, Workshop on Implementation Procedures on Early Prevention of School Failure, was conducted at Eastern New Mexico State University, May 28-30, 1975. This workshop was conducted by a dissemination team from the Early Prevention of School Failure Program, a nationally validated ESEA Title III project, located in Peotone, Illinois.

This workshop, focusing on kindergarten age children, was designed to provide school personnel knowledge and skills necessary to implement screening programs in their respective schools. In addition, the workshop attempted to assist the participants in the planning of educational experiences for kindergarten children with certain developmental lags. Specifically, the workshop participants were expected to: 1) Acquire the skills necessary to implement a screening model for kindergarten age children; and 2) Develop strategies designed to meet the unique educational needs of each child.

A total of 84 attended the workshop which included teachers, teacher-aides, administrators, and related school personnel (parents, university faculty, and students). The participants represented the school districts (New Mexico) of: Portales, Clovis, Ft. Sumner, Carlsbad, Elida, and Dora. Of the total participants, 63 received college credit (1 semester hour) for completion of the workshop through ENMU.

Using the McCallon Workshop Evaluation System (See Section II), the mean ratings on the seven dimensions of the Workshop Evaluation Scale were well above average (6.73 - 6.30 on a 7:00 scale), and the mean rating of the
Overall Effectiveness of the workshop was 6.60. The narrative concerning the observation of the workshop was very positive. Also, personal comments from the participants indicated a high degree of satisfaction.

Second Workshop - EMU

The second workshop, Early Childhood Bilingual/Bicultural Education: Why and How, was conducted at Eastern New Mexico State University, August 18-20, 1975. This workshop was conducted by three faculty members of the Metropolitan State College, Denver, Colorado.

This workshop, focusing on kindergarten age children, was designed to provide teachers and teacher-aides knowledge and skills necessary to implement/improve programs in early childhood bilingual/bicultural education. Some topics of the workshop included: Introduction to Bilingual/Bicultural Education: Cultural Activities for Classroom Use; Implementing Bilingual Activities in the Classroom; Learning Centers; Developing Oral Language; and Professional Development.

A total of 44 attended the workshop which included teachers, teacher-aides, and administrators. The participants represented the school districts (New Mexico) of: Portales, Clovis, Dora, and one parochial school in Clovis. Of the total participants, 42 received college credit (1 semester hour) for completing the workshop through EMU.

Using the McCallon Workshop Evaluation System (See Section II), the mean ratings on the seven dimensions of the Workshop Evaluation Scale were well above average (5.90-6.60 on a 7.00 scale), and the mean rating of the Overall Effectiveness of the workshop was 6.40. The narrative concerning the observations of the workshop was very positive. Also, personal comments from the participants indicated a high degree of satisfaction.

Third Workshop - Carlsbad

The third workshop, Carlsbad Workshop on Implementation Procedures of Early Prevention of School Failure, was conducted December 1-2 and 6, 1975 at the Carlsbad Head Start Center, Carlsbad, New Mexico. This workshop was conducted by a member of the dissemination team from the Early Prevention of School Failure Program, a nationally validated ESEA Title III project, located in Peotone, Illinois.

The workshop was designed to train school personnel in the skills necessary to implement a method of screening kindergarten age children relative to pre-academic skills in the areas of audition, language, vision, speech, motor development, attitudes toward learning situations, and emotional or social factors which could affect ability to profit from school experience. The workshop also assisted the participants in the planning of educational experiences for kindergarten children with certain developmental lags.
A total of 39 attended the workshop which included teachers, teacher-aides, administrators, and one school nurse. The participants represented the school districts (New Mexico) of Carlsbad, Artesia, and Clovis. Of the total participants, 19 received credit (1 semester hour) for completing the workshop through ENMU.

Based upon data obtained with the McCallon Workshop Evaluation System, it was evident that the workshop was extremely successful. Participant reaction to the workshop goals, objectives was very favorable, and the majority of the personal comments indicated a high degree of satisfaction with the workshop.

Using the McCallon Workshop Evaluation System (See Section II), the mean ratings on the seven dimensions of the Workshop Evaluation Scale were well above average (6.10-6.70 on a 7.00 scale), and the mean rating of the Overall Effectiveness of the workshop was 6.70. The narrative concerning the observations of the workshop was very positive. Also, personal comments from the participants indicated a high degree of satisfaction.

Fourth Workshop - Farmington

The fourth workshop, Early Childhood Education: Why and How, was conducted April 5-6, 1976 at Farmington Head Start Center, Farmington, New Mexico. This workshop was conducted by the REPSAC outreach training staff using the Mobile Resource Learning Center.

The purpose of this workshop was to provide the staff of the Farmington Head Start Project with training relative to the identification and working with young handicapped children.

A total of 25 attended the workshop which included teachers, teacher-aides, and administrators.

Using the McCallon Workshop Evaluation System (See Section II), the mean ratings on the seven dimensions of the Workshop Evaluation Scale were well above average (6.58-6.88 on a 7.00 scale), and the mean rating of the Overall Effectiveness of the workshop was 6.88. The narrative concerning the observations of the workshop was very positive. Also, personal comments from the participants indicated a high degree of satisfaction.

Fifth Conference - Albuquerque

The fifth conference, Early Childhood Education Conference, was conducted in Albuquerque, New Mexico, April 29-May 1, 1976. The REPSAC outreach component was co-sponsor of this conference which was attended by approximately 200 administrators, teachers, and teacher-aides from throughout New Mexico. Presentors included nationally known speakers as well as the REPSAC
outreach training staff who presented information and various training sessions. Also, there were representatives in attendance from eight nationally validated Title III early education programs. In addition, the conference participants drafted a resolution pertaining to state government support of development of early childhood education, which was later presented to the Governor at the People's Forum on Education on May 21-22, 1976 in Albuquerque.

The purpose of the conference was: 1) To provide planning assistance to administrators who are responsible for kindergarten programs; 2) To provide training in a variety of approaches to teachers and administrators; 3) To provide techniques and approaches to indentifying and mainstreaming young handicapped children; and 4) To draft a resolution pertaining to state government support of development of early childhood education.

A total of over 200 attended the conference at one time or other, and approximately 57 attended the training sessions conducted by the outreach training staff.

Using the McCallon Workshop Evaluation System (See Section II), the mean ratings on the seven dimensions of the Workshop Evaluation Scale were well above average (6.23-6.63 on a 7.00 scale), and the mean rating of the Overall Effectiveness of the workshop was 6.63. The narrative concerning the observations of the workshop was very positive. Also, personal comments from the participants indicated a high degree of satisfaction.

Summary of Narrative Comments on Workshop/Conferences:

As part of the McCallon Workshop Evaluation System, the participants often made narrative comments concerning the strong and weak features of the workshop/conference. A representative sample of such comments are as follows:

**Strong Features**

1. Purposes clearly presented
2. Explanation of screening procedures
3. Participant involvement
4. Best workshop I ever attended
5. Presentation on culture
6. Excellent ideas for classroom use
7. Materials which were distributed
8. Becoming familiar with good materials
9. Small group and explanation of the different tests
10. Organization, presentors, and pertinent information
11. Finding out about the National Diffusion Network and the different projects
Weaker Features

1. Not enough time
2. Not enough small group work
3. More practice in administering screening tests
4. Not being able to work enough with children
5. Not enough sessions presented in Spanish
6. Food lousy and too expensive
7. Not enough materials demonstrated
8. More explanation on scoring and interpretation of tests

Other Dissemination Activities

Other types of information concerning the outreach activities were disseminated by such means as described in the following paragraphs.

Over 6,000 copies of the brochure, "Parents: Do You Know the Early Warning Signs of Children with Special Needs," were distributed in the vicinity of the replication centers of Ft. Sumner, Carlsbad, Artesia, and Dora.

The development of six 1 minute video cassette spots for use on television. These were developed in cooperation with KENW-TV, ENMU, and they were presented to the Governor's Commission for Public Broadcasting in March, 1976.

Members of the outreach training team made presentations of the project, including outreach to: the annual meeting of the New Mexico Speech and Hearing Association at ENMU, Portales, April, 1976; various classes in Child Development at ENMU; and to the ENMU chapter of the Council for Exceptional Children.

A 16 mm, 28 minute color film, was commercially prepared so as to disseminate information concerning the program as well as for use in various in-service training programs.

The project used student teachers from nearby Eastern New Mexico University and thereby disseminated information through the university.

Progress reports were submitted to the local central administration office, school board, local area news media including nearby Cannon Air Force Base, the State Department of Education, the U.S. Office of Education, and the U.S. Senators from New Mexico.

Site visitation by many professional individuals and groups as well as parents.

Also, much publicity was received when the project received an invitation from the National Diffusion Network for the Clovis program to serve as a national demonstration site for the Early Prevention of School Failure Project of Peotone, Illinois.
SECTION VI
STRENGTHS AND WEAKNESSES OF THE OUTREACH ACTIVITIES

Another measure used in the evaluation process of the outreach activities during the year was for the evaluation team members and the outreach training staff to list the strengths and weaknesses of the outreach activities as they perceived them. The following represents a summary of such lists.

Strengths

1. The outreach training team's true dedication and commitment in their efforts to assist teachers and aides at the various replication sites.

2. Provided opportunities for many teachers to see and receive information about a wide variety of early childhood and bilingual materials as well as an opportunity to check out materials for classroom use.

3. The Mobile Learning Resource Center (motor coach) which gave the project the capability to take the needed training to the replication centers which are located in isolated areas of eastern New Mexico.

4. Provided excellent in-service training for the Head Start Centers.

5. Provided a catalog of appropriate materials and address of publishers concerning early childhood and bilingual education.

6. Provided excellent on-site training during the series of seven workshops at the parent center which involved Head Start personnel, kindergarten teachers, special education teachers, and teacher-aides.

7. Disseminated needed information concerning the identification and needs of handicapped children.

8. Provided resource people and specialists which the various replication sites did not have within their systems.

9. Provided teachers at the replication sites (isolated areas) with an opportunity to take a college course in conjunction with in-service training.

10. Provided resource and supportive classroom materials for the teachers and instructors on how to use them.
Weaknesses

1. The inability of outreach to formally commit training services to the replication sites, as well as other schools, because of the delay of BEH getting the project funded on time. A related weakness is the funding of the project is not by government fiscal year or even school year. The funding is Jan - Jan which causes many administrative problems.

2. Outreach tried to accomplish too much in such a short period of time.

3. Absence of a long-range planning schedule concerning the use of the mobile coach as well as a systematic way of recording data concerning the use of the coach.
The basic assumptions on which early intervention programs is based, such as REPSAC, is that stimulation for children who possess characteristics not conclusive to school achievement will increase their chances of achieving in the regular school program. REPSAC, a planned intervention program for "high risk" Spanish-American pre-school children, was developed and has been operating to offer 3-, 4-, and 5-year-old children educational and social stimulation designed to assist them to achieve in school.

Purpose

The purpose of this follow-up study is to test this assumption in the case of children who attended REPSAC during the years 1971-1974. More specifically, the study attempted to answer the following questions:

1. What type of changes in learning aptitude, language development in English, and language development in Spanish have occurred from time of entry into REPSAC to the end of the regular school year 1976?

2. What is the status of former REPSAC students with regard to:
   a. Grade placement
   b. Promotion/retention
   c. Special assistance

3. How do teachers view former REPSAC students with regard to:
   a. Academic performance
   b. Social adjustment
   c. Overall School Performance
   d. Major strengths and weaknesses

Subjects

Subjects for the study were 29 former REPSAC students currently living and attending school in Clovis, New Mexico. Of the 29 subjects included in the study, 11 were in the second grade, 14 in the third grade, 1 in the fourth grade, and 3 in special education.
Procedure

The procedure for this study consisted of the following steps:

1. Identifying the former REPSAC students by location and grade level. This step was accomplished by the project staff.

2. Conducting a questionnaire survey of teachers. This was accomplished by a member of the evaluation team. Personal interviews with teachers of former REPSAC students were also concluded by a member of the evaluation team.

3. Testing students who were in the second, third, and fourth grade. The instruments used were the same as those used in the previous evaluations of REPSAC. The tests used were: the Hiskey-Nebraska Test of Learning Aptitude and the Peabody Picture Vocabulary Test (English and Spanish versions).

Data were analyzed by descriptive measures and by use of a trend analysis.

Findings

The findings of this study were as follows:

1. Test performance of the former REPSAC students tested indicate that:
   a. Learning aptitude scores (IQ) have remained relatively stable from the initial testing in the Fall of 1971 to the testing in the Spring of 1976. The largest increase occurred following the first year of interventions.
   b. Language development scores in English gained substantially after the first year of intervention and again at the end of the second year of intervention. From the REPSAC exit point in the Spring of 1973, scores have tended to remain stable.
   c. Language development scores in Spanish show the largest increase at the end of the second year of intervention. A rather substantial decrease was noted from the REPSAC exit point in the Spring of 1973 to the Spring of 1976. These data are presented in Table 1.
TABLE 1
MEAN TEST SCORES OF FORMER REPSAC STUDENTS, 1971-1976

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TEST</th>
<th>FALL 72</th>
<th>SPRING 72</th>
<th>FALL 73</th>
<th>SPRING 75</th>
<th>SPRING 76</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>HISKEY (IQ)</td>
<td>89.00</td>
<td>98.71</td>
<td>94.64</td>
<td>99.45</td>
<td>99.65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PEABODY (ENGLISH)</td>
<td>27.82</td>
<td>41.94</td>
<td>40.45</td>
<td>59.82</td>
<td>60.82</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PEABODY (SPANISH)</td>
<td>16.94</td>
<td>28.53</td>
<td>28.09</td>
<td>66.64</td>
<td>59.76</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

d. The time-series analysis of the data indicate that the trend set in terms of past performance is departing substantially from the expected growth pattern toward a downward trend for language development in Spanish, a slightly upward trend for language development in English, and a rather stable trend for learning aptitude. Figures 1, 2, and 3 present these data.
FIGURE 1

LANGUAGE DEVELOPMENT SCORES IN SPANISH OF FORMER REPSAC STUDENTS, 1971-1976, ORIGINAL DATA AND TREND LINE
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FIGURE 2

LANGUAGE DEVELOPMENT SCORES IN ENGLISH OF FORMER REPSAC STUDENTS, 1971-1976. ORIGINAL DATA AND TREND LINE
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FIGURE 3
LEARNING APTITUDE SCORES OF FORMER REPSAC STUDENTS, 1971-1976, ORIGINAL DATA AND TREND LINE
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2. The data indicate that 26 (90%) of former REPSAC students are in regular classrooms and 3 (10%) in special education classes. Three of the 23 students in regular classes were retained and only 3 of the 26 students in regular classes have required special assistance. These data are presented in Table 2.

### Table 2
**CURRENT STATUS OF FORMER REPSAC STUDENTS**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>STATUS TYPE</th>
<th>NUMBER</th>
<th>PERCENTAGE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>GRADE PLACEMENT</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>REGULAR</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SPECIAL</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PROMOTION/RETENTION</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PROMOTED</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>88</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RETAINED</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SPECIAL ASSISTANCE</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>YES</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NO</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>90</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Tables 3, 4, and 5 present the results of teachers' views regarding academic performance, social adjustment, and overall school performance of former REPSAC students. As noted in these tables, the majority of former REPSAC students were rated in the middle one-third or above on academic performance and social adjustment and average or above on overall school performance.

### Table 3
**TEACHER RATINGS OF FORMER REPSAC STUDENTS ON ACADEMIC PERFORMANCE**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>RATING CATEGORY</th>
<th>NUMBER</th>
<th>PERCENTAGE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>UPPER ONE-THIRD</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MIDDLE ONE-THIRD</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LOWER ONE-THIRD</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
TABLE 4
TEACHER RATINGS OF FORMER REPSAC STUDENTS
ON SOCIAL ADJUSTMENTS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>RATING CATEGORY</th>
<th>NUMBER</th>
<th>PERCENTAGE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>UPPER ONE-THIRD</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MIDDLE ONE-THIRD</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LOWER ONE-THIRD</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

TABLE 5
TEACHER RATINGS OF FORMER REPSAC STUDENTS
ON OVERALL* SCHOOL PERFORMANCE

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>RATING CATEGORY</th>
<th>NUMBER</th>
<th>PERCENTAGE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>GOOD</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AVERAGE</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>POOR</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Teachers were asked to rate each student in terms of overall performance, i.e., motivation, willingness to learn, attention, and academic progress.

Conclusions

From the data obtained and analyzed for this study, the following conclusions appear warranted:

1. In general, former REPSAC students are performing very well in the regular school programs. The majority of the students have followed regular grade placement, been promoted, required no
special help, were rated by their teachers in the middle one-third of their class on academic performance, were rated by their teachers in the middle or upper one-third of their class on social adjustment, and were rated as average on overall school performance.

2. Based on the test information and analysis, a trend toward a substantial decline in Spanish continues, a slight increase, but less than normal in language ability in English can be expected, and a definite leveling of measured learning aptitude seems apparent.

Discussion

It should be noted that the performance of former REPSAC students can be interpreted more accurately by considering their situations at times of entry into REPSAC. The mean IQ of this group was 89.00 with English and Spanish scores of 27, 82, and 16.94 respectively. This low performance level, along with other personal and social characteristics, placed these children in a "high risk" category with respect to school survival. Considering this, the achievement of these children in 1976 is quite remarkable.
SECTION VII

SUMMARY, FINDINGS, CONCLUSIONS, AND RECOMMENDATIONS

Summary

Beginning with school year 1975-76, the outreach activities component was added to the parent center (REPSAC) to give the center the capability of providing replication services to various local education agencies requesting such services. A unique feature of this replication service was the capability of taking the training to the replication centers by a specially designed and equipped motor coach, The Mobile Learning Resource Center.

The outreach component was implemented in two phases. The first phase consisted of needs assessment and developmental planning (November 29, 1974-August 31, 1975), and the second phase consisted of the implementation procedures (September 1, 1975-June 30, 1976).

Three school districts, all in isolated areas and having a large number of target children and within a reasonable distance of the parent center, requested replication services during the 1975-76 school year. These school districts were: Fort Sumner; Artesia; and Carlsbad, all located in eastern New Mexico. In addition, replication by two other school districts had already been completed. This replication was made by the Clovis-Portales Bilingual Early Childhood Program (ESEA, Title VII) with a training site in each school district (Clovis and Portales, New Mexico).

Training was provided to teachers and aides at the replication centers, as well as at the parent center, in the form of visits by the outreach training team using the Mobile Learning Resource Center and by conducting a workshop at the parent center. The training visits to the replication centers included a presentation of a course (Concept Development in Early Childhood Education divided in 17 units) and demonstration of materials and screening procedures.

The outreach activities were generally classified into two major functions: advisory/training, and diffusion.

The evaluation design for the advisory and training function mainly consisted of 10 research/evaluation questions. To answer these questions, a variety of measures were used which included: objective evaluation of the training workshops; objective evaluation of the course Concept Development in Early Childhood; classroom visits (all kindergarten classes) using a specifically designed classroom observation form; site-visits with administrators, teachers, and aides; self-evaluation questionnaires from the trainees and trainers; and a review of various types of records/logs maintained by the outreach training team.
The evaluation design for the diffusion function consisted of objectively evaluating the workshops/conferences and subjectively evaluating the other dissemination activities.

In addition, this evaluation study consisted of a follow-up of former REPSAC students who were, this year, in grades 1-4.

Findings

The major findings of this evaluation study, including the follow-up study of former REPSAC students, were:

1. The needs assessment, Early Childhood Training Inventory, provided adequate data for developing objectives for the training program.

2. Excellent rapport existed between the outreach training team and the teachers and aides at the replication centers.

3. A lack of permanent classroom materials, as well as professional library materials pertaining to bilingual education, was evident at the replication centers.

4. Although the pretest scores of the test over the course Concept Development in Early Childhood were invalid, it was found that the teaching of the course was effective.

5. Teachers trained at the replication centers had a good understanding of handicapping conditions and knew how to adequately screen their children.

6. The teacher-aides at the replication centers were considered by their teachers as being effective and useful in their role in the classroom.

7. The training workshops conducted at the parent center had a positive effect on the teaching behavior of the participants as well as being considered extremely effective by the participants.

8. The motor coach, The Mobile Learning Resource Center, was utilized effectively in the training program. The coach was driven 12,384 miles (plus an additional 8,745 miles driven by personal auto) while making 148 training visits to the replication centers.

9. The workshops/conferences (ENMU, May 28-30, 1975; ENMU, August 18-20, 1975; Carlsbad, December 1-2, 6, 1975; Farmington, April 5-6, 1976; and Albuquerque, April 29-May 1, 1976) as part of the diffusion function, were well conducted and considered extremely effective by the participants.
10. In addition to the workshops/conferences, the other dissemination activities (brochures, media releases, film, reports, presentations, and visits to parent center) were found to be more than adequate for the purpose designed.

11. As pertains to the follow-up study, test performance of former REPSAC students who were this year, in grades 1-4 indicated that:

a. Learning aptitude scores (IQ) have remained relatively stable from the initial testing in the Fall of 1971 to the testing in the Spring of 1976. The largest increase accrued following the first year in the intervention.

b. Language development scores in English gained substantially after the first year of intervention and again at the end of the second year of intervention. From the REPSAC exit point in the Spring of 1973, scores have tended to remain stable.

c. Language development scores in Spanish show the largest increase at the end of the second year of intervention. A rather substantial decrease was noted from the REPSAC exit point in the Spring of 1973 to the Spring of 1976.

d. The time-series analysis indicated that the trend set in terms of past performance is departing substantially from the expected growth pattern toward a downward trend for language development in Spanish a slightly upward trend for language development in English, and a rather stable trend for learning aptitude.

e. It was found that 26 (90%) of former REPSAC students were in regular classrooms, and 3 (10%) in special education classes. Three of the 23 students in regular classes were retained and, only 3 of the 26 students in regular classes have required special assistance.

Conclusions

Based upon the findings of this evaluation study, the major conclusions were:

1. The advisory and training function of the outreach activities operated as generally planned and was extremely effective. It was very obvious that this training, with the services of the Mobile Learning Resource Center made it possible for the replication center to assist their young and handicapped children. Without these services, such assistance would have been impossible.
2. The diffusion function provided the necessary dissemination of the outreach activities.

3. In general, former REPSAC students were performing very well in the regular school programs. The majority of the students have followed regular grade placement, been promoted, required no special help, were rated by their teachers in the middle one-third of their class on academic performance, were rated by their teachers in the middle or upper one-third of the class on social adjustment, and were rated as average on overall school performance.

4. Based on the test information and analysis, a trend toward a substantial decline in Spanish continues, a slight increase, but less than normal, in language ability in English can be expected, and a definite leveling of measured learning aptitude seems apparent.

5. Members of the outreach training team were very dedicated and committed to their assigned task.

6. Although it was obvious that many problems were encountered and that all personnel associated with the outreach activities experienced many frustrations, ample evidence was found to conclude that the outreach activities component functioned as planned and in accordance with the approved proposal document during the period November 29, 1974-June 30, 1976. Also, it was concluded that the capability and effectiveness of the outreach activities was instrumental in the parent center (REPSAC) receiving an invitation from the National Diffusion Network for this program to serve as a national demonstration site for the Early Prevention of School Failure Project. In short, accomplishments of the outreach activities during 1975-76 were remarkable.

Recommendations

Based upon observations, site-visits, findings, and conclusion of this study, the following suggestions or recommendations are made:

1. That the funding period of the outreach activities component be adjusted so as to correspond with the dates of the school year rather than on a loose calendar year basis.

2. That future outreach training include additional emphasis on 1) development of specific instructional activities after screening; and 2) guidance in development of more teacher-made materials.

3. A systematic way be developed for the outreach training team to record data concerning the use of the motor coach.

4. That the Kindergarten Implementation Guide be continued to be developed so as to be used in various training activities.
5. That a long-range planning schedule be implemented concerning the scheduled use of the motor coach.

6. That measures be taken to insure that all members of the outreach training team understand the difference between direct and indirect services while planning and conducting outreach activities.

7. That the follow-up study of former REPSAC students be continued so as to gather data on the students through the sixth grade.

8. That the outreach activities component continue to develop and serve as an extension of the model parent center.
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