

DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 288 179

CS 008 957

AUTHOR Johnson, Jessie
TITLE Language Development Component: All Day Kindergarten Program. Final Evaluation Report, 1986-87.
INSTITUTION Columbus Public Schools, OH. Dept. of Evaluation Services.
PUB DATE Jul 87
NOTE 23p.; For an earlier report, see ED 247 323.
PUB TYPE Reports - Evaluative/Feasibility (142)

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC01 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS Beginning Reading; Class Activities; *Extended School Day; High Risk Students; Instructional Effectiveness; *Kindergarten; Kindergarten Children; *Language Acquisition; Low Achievement; *Prereading Experience; Primary Education; Program Content; Program Evaluation; Remedial Instruction; *Underachievement

IDENTIFIERS Columbus Public Schools OH; Education Consolidation Improvement Act Chapter 1; *Full Day Programs; *Kindergarten Extended Day Program

ABSTRACT

The All Day Kindergarten (ADK) Program of the Columbus (Ohio) Public Schools was established to provide a full day of instruction for underachieving kindergarten pupils. The program concentrated on preparing pupils for successful learning experiences in first grade by providing them with an extra half day of instruction. The program served 571 children, with 18 teachers providing daily instruction for two groups of students in 18 Chapter 1 eligible elementary schools. Groups were limited to 15 pupils, and instruction time was 13.3 hours weekly. The All Day Kindergarten Program functioned during the 1986-1987 school year for 130 hours of instruction, with emphasis on activities that would increase language and reading development and enhance those skills needed; for success in first grade. For program evaluation purposes, pretests and posttests were administered to 396 students (who met the 80% attendance requirement; 379 students were present for both tests. The Normal Curve Equivalent (NCE) gain for these students was 3.0 points for each month of treatment--greatly exceeding the criterion of 1.0 NCE point that was the original program goal. Results suggest the efficacy of the All Day Kindergarten Program. Based on the evaluation results, a continuation of the program was recommended for the following school year. (A teacher census form, an inservice evaluation form, and a Chapter 1 parent involvement survey form are appended.) (NKA)

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

ED288179

Education Consolidation and Improvement Act - Chapter 1

FINAL EVALUATION REPORT
LANGUAGE DEVELOPMENT COMPONENT
ALL DAY KINDERGARTEN PROGRAM

July 1987



Written by:

Jessie Johnson
Professional Specialist

Under the Supervision of:

Sharon Bermel

and

Richard Amorose, Ph.D.

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

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

Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality

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

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

Gary Thompson

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC) "

Columbus (Ohio) Public Schools
Department of Evaluation Services
Gary Thompson, Ph.D., Director

158 8008 005



FINAL EVALUATION REPORT
LANGUAGE DEVELOPMENT COMPONENT
ALL DAY KINDERGARTEN PROGRAM
1986-87

ABSTRACT

Program Description: The All Day Kindergarten (ADK) Program served 571 pupils. Funding of the program was made available through the Education Consolidation and Improvement Act - Chapter 1 of 1981.

The purpose of the Columbus Public Schools in planning the ADK Program was to provide a full day of instruction for underachieving kindergarten pupils. The overall goal of the program was to prepare pupils for first grade. The program provided pupils with an extra half day of instruction in addition to the half day of instruction provided in the regular kindergarten classroom. The program operated on the philosophy that the additional help and attention provided by the program would better prepare underachieving kindergarten pupils for successful learning experiences in first grade.

To reach the 1986-87 program goal, 18 program teachers served in 18 Chapter 1 eligible elementary schools. Each All Day Kindergarten teacher provided daily instruction for two groups of pupils. Groups were limited to 15 pupils each, for approximately 13.3 hours each week.

Time Interval: For evaluation purposes, the All Day Kindergarten Program started on September 15, 1986 and continued through April 13, 1987. This interval of time gave 130 days of program instruction. Pupils included in the final pretest-posttest analysis must have attended at least 104 days (80%) during the time period stated above.

Activities: Implementation of the program was accomplished through daily instructional activities to strengthen and extend regular classroom instruction without pursuing the basic reading readiness textbooks. Emphasis was placed on activities which would increase language development and enhance those skills needed to be successful in first grade.

Achievement Objective: The average language/reading growth of pupils in program attendance for at least 80% of the instructional period will be 1.0 Normal Curve Equivalent (NCE) point for each month of instruction as determined by a nationally standardized achievement test appropriate to program content.

Evaluation Design: The major evaluation effort was accomplished through the administration of the Oral Comprehension Test, Form U, Level A, of the Comprehensive Tests of Basic Skills (CTBS). Analyses of the data included comparison between pretest and posttest change scores in terms of raw scores, grade equivalents, percentiles, and NCE's.

Major Findings/Recommendations: The information collected on the Pupil Census Forms indicated that the program served 571 pupils for an average of 13.3 hours of instruction per week. The average daily membership in the program was 507.2 pupils. The average days of enrollment per pupil was 109.0 days and the average attendance per pupil was 97.8 days. The average number of pupils served per teacher was 31.7.

The attendance criterion was met by 396 pupils, which was 69.4% of the 571 pupils served. Of these, 379 received both administrations of the achievement test.

The overall NCE gain for the program averaged 21.2 NCE points for the seven month treatment or 3.0 NCE points for each month of treatment. The evaluation objective set a goal of 1.0 NCE point for each month of treatment. Thus, the evaluation objective was met with the average change of 3.0 NCE points for each month of treatment, greatly exceeding the criterion of 1.0 NCE point for each month of treatment.

The analyses of monthly parent involvement indicated the greatest amount of parent involvement occurred in September, with a total of 614 parent hours. The least amount of parent involvement occurred in April, with a total of 70.5 parent hours reported. An unduplicated count of an estimated 650 parents were directly involved with the program. Areas of parent involvement included: (a) planning operation, and/or evaluation; (b) group meetings; (c) individual conferences; (d) classroom visits and field trips; and (e) visits by the program teacher to their homes.

Program teachers attended one inservice meeting during the school year. The meeting which was evaluated received positive ratings by program teachers.

The program evaluator collected process data by visiting some project schools. The visitation plan called for the program evaluator to visit program teachers in selected schools and record the results of the evaluator's observations and interviews with the teacher on the Evaluator's Visitation Log. Visitation occurred during the period from March 5 to March 17, 1987. Data gathered regarding evaluation and program concerns were generally found to be satisfactory. All teachers interviewed (4) indicated that the level of communication with cooperating teachers was very good. Coordinating instruction of the reading program was rated as very important and generally occurred on an informal basis. However, three (75%) of the program teachers rated the degree of parent response, to efforts at parent involvement, as very poor. Some concerns were expressed regarding the pupil selection process and testing procedures.

Based on the evaluation results, it is strongly recommended that the All Day Kindergarten program be continued in the 1987-88 school year. It is also recommended that school visitations be continued next year. These visits provide useful information regarding evaluation concerns and program needs; they can be of considerable value in assisting and continuing to monitor the utilization of the test series that was implemented during the 1984-85 school year.

FINAL EVALUATION REPORT
LANGUAGE DEVELOPMENT COMPONENT
ALL DAY KINDERGARTEN PROGRAM

July 1987

Program Description

The All Day Kindergarten Program was instituted in the Columbus Public Schools in January, 1972, for the purpose of providing a full day of instruction for underachieving kindergarten pupils. The overall goal of the program is to prepare pupils for first grade. The program provides pupils with an extra half day of instruction in addition to the half day of instruction provided in the regular kindergarten classroom. The program operates on the philosophy that the additional help and attention provided by the program will better prepare underachieving kindergarten pupils for successful learning experiences in first grade.

To reach the 1986-87 program goal, 18 program teachers served in 18 Chapter 1 eligible elementary schools. The schools are listed below.

Broadleigh	Kent	Reeb
Cassady	Lincoln Park	Second Ave.
Dana	Linden	Sullivant
East Columbus	Livingston	Trevitt
Fair	Main	West Broad
Fairwood	Ohio	Windsor

Each All Day Kindergarten teacher provided daily instruction for two groups of pupils. Groups were limited to 15 pupils each.

Evaluation Design

The average language/reading growth of pupils in program attendance for at least 80% of the instructional period will be 1.0 NCE point for each month of instruction as determined by a nationally standardized achievement test appropriate to program content.

For evaluation purposes, the All Day Kindergarten Program started on September 15, 1986 and continued through April 3, 1987. This interval of time gave 130 days of program instruction. Pupils included in the final pretest-posttest analysis must have attended at least 104 days (80%) during the time period stated above.

Evaluation Design

The evaluation design for the All Day Kindergarten program called for the collection of data in five areas. A copy of each instrument is found in the Appendix, with the exception of the standardized achievement test.

1. ECIA Chapter 1 Pupil Census Information

A Pupil Census Form was completed by program teachers for each pupil served to provide the following information: days of program enrollment, days of program attendance, and hours of instruction per week. The form also includes information on the pupil's grade and sex. Collection of these forms was completed in May, 1987.

2. Standardized Achievement Test Information

The instrument used to assess pupil progress in language was the Oral Comprehension Test (Form U, Level A) of the Comprehensive Tests of Basic Skills (CTB/McGraw-Hill staff members, 1981). This test which is published by CTB/McGraw-Hill has empirical norms for fall and spring established in October, 1980 and April, 1981. The program pupils were pretested the week of September 22, 1986 and posttested the week of April 6, 1987.

3. ECIA Chapter 1 Teacher Census Information

The Teacher Census Form was designed to provide information regarding the characteristics of program personnel. Data from this form included number of years of teaching experience, number of years of Title I and/or Chapter 1 teaching experience, highest college degree attained, and whether the teacher's teaching certificate includes certification in Reading as a subject area. The forms were completed by the program teachers and collected at the Chapter 1 teachers' orientation meeting held September 2, 1986.

4. Parent Involvement Information

The Parent Involvement Survey was designed to provide information on involvement of parents with ECIA Chapter 1 programs, as required in the Annual Chapter 1, ECIA, Evaluation Report. It was filled out monthly by all program teachers. Monthly data included number of parents and number of hours involved in five categories of parent involvement, including a monthly unduplicated count of parents involved. In addition, a yearly unduplicated count of parents was collected at the end of the school year.

5. Inservice Evaluation Information

The General Inservice Evaluation Form was constructed locally to collect information about the effectiveness of the inservice meetings as well as provide feedback to the program administrators.

An orientation session was presented by program staff and other presenters on September 2, 1986.

In addition to the types of data specified in the evaluation design, process evaluation data were obtained in a series of on-site visits to program classrooms during the period from March 5 to March 17, 1987. An Evaluator's Visitation Log was completed during each classroom visit to record the results of the evaluator's observations and interview with the teacher. The Log was designed to record pertinent information regarding record keeping, communication, pupil selection procedures, evaluation feedback, and facilities and program materials, as well as to increase the familiarity of the program evaluator with the workings of the program.

Major Findings

The information collected on the Pupil Census Forms is summarized in Table 1. The program served 571 pupils for an average of 13.3 hours of instruction per week. The average daily membership in the program was 507.2 pupils. The average days of enrollment per pupil was 115.5 days and the average attendance per pupil was 104.3 days. The average number of pupils served per teacher was 31.7.

The evaluation sample was comprised of those pupils who attended 80% of the program days and who received both a pretest and a posttest. The attendance criterion was met by 396 pupils, which was 69.4% of the 571 pupils served. Of these, 379 received both administrations of the achievement test. Data from testing are presented in Tables 2-5.

The analyses of pretest-posttest achievement data for raw score minimums, maximums, averages, and standard deviations are shown in Table 2. The average number of items correct on the posttest was 11.4 which is an average increase of 4.4 items or 29.3% increase of the 15 item test.

Table 1

Number of Pupils Served; Averages for Days of Enrollment, Days of Attendance, Daily Membership and Hours of Instruction Per Week; and Pupils Attending 80% of Days

Grade	Pupils Served	Girls	Boys	Average			Hours of Instruction per Pupil per Week	Pupils Attending 80% of Days
				Days of Enrollment	Days of Attendance	Daily Membership		
K	571	259	312	115.5	104.3	507.2	13.3	396

Table 2

Minimum, Maximum, Average, and Standard Deviation of the Pretest and Posttest Raw Scores

Grade	Number of Test Items	Number of Pupils	Pretest				Posttest				
			Min.	Max.	Average Correct	Standard Deviation	Min.	Max.	Average Correct	Standard Deviation	Average Change
K	15	379	0	14	7.0	2.4	3	15	11.4	2.3	4.4

Pretest-posttest percentile data are presented in Table 3. The median percentile for the pretest was 14.0, which was well below the 36th percentile. Percentile scores on the posttest ranged from 1%ile to 96%ile with a median of 51.0.

Table 4 presents pretest and posttest data in terms of grade equivalents. It should be noted that a grade equivalent of 0.0 for kindergarten can be deceptive, as it does not allow for those pupils functioning at the pre-kindergarten level. Thus the comparison of pretest and posttest median grade equivalents in kindergarten is a very conservative comparison due to the ambiguity of the 0.0 grade equivalent score. The average grade equivalent on the posttest was 0.9, a positive change during the seven month treatment period.

The presentation of achievement data thus far has included results from the analysis of raw scores, percentiles, and grade equivalents. Raw scores are equal units of measurement, but can only provide a limited interpretation of achievement data. Percentiles and grade equivalents provide comparative information but are not equal units of measure. Caution is advised in drawing conclusions about program impact from any of the scores above. Normal curve equivalents (NCE's) are generally considered to provide the truest indication of pupil growth in achievement, since they provide comparative information in equal units of measurement. Data for normal curve equivalents are presented in Table 5.

The overall NCE gain for the program averaged 21.2 NCE points for the seven month treatment period or 3.0 NCE points for each month of treatment. The evaluation objective set a goal of 1.0 NCE point for each month of treatment. Thus the evaluation objective was met with the average change of 3.0 NCE points for each month of treatment greatly exceeding the criterion of 1.0 NCE point for each month of treatment.

Analysis of the Teacher Census Form data revealed that of the 18 program teachers, one teacher had a Ph.D., seven teachers had Master's degrees, and the other ten had Bachelor's degrees. Three teachers had certification in Reading as a subject area. The average years of total teaching experience was 19.8, with 12.4 of Title I/Chapter 1 teaching.

Monthly involvement of program parents is summarized in Table 6. If total parent hours per month are used as a basis of comparison, the greatest degree of parent involvement occurred in September, with a total of 614 parent hours. The least degree of parent involvement appeared to occur in April, with a total of 70.5 parent hours reported. The number of parents involved is not additive, since a parent could be involved in more than one activity across months. Therefore, a yearly unduplicated count of parents who were involved with the program was collected from program teachers at the end of the school year. The annual unduplicated count of parents was estimated at 650.

Table 3

Minimum, Maximum, Median, and Standard Deviation
of the Pretest and Posttest Percentiles

Grade	Number of Pupils	Pretest				Posttest			
		Min.	Max.	Median Percentile	Standard Deviation	Min.	Max.	Median Percentile	Standard Deviation
K	379	3	89	14.0	15.0	1	96	51.0	28.2

Table 4

Minimum, Maximum, Average, and Standard Deviation of the
Pretest and Posttest Grade Equivalents (GE)

Grade	Number of Pupils	Pretest				Posttest				
		Min.	Max.	Average GE	Standard Deviation	Min.	Max.	Average GE	Standard Deviation	Average Change
K	379	0	2.6	0.0*	0.2	0	3	0.9	1.0	0.9

*In grade K, the comparison of pretest and posttest scores is a very conservative one, due to the fact that a score of 0.0 can represent not only those pupils functioning at beginning kindergarten level, but also those functioning at pre-kindergarten level.

Table 5

Minimum, Maximum, Average, and Standard Deviation of the
Pretest and Posttest Normal Curve Equivalents (NCE)

Grade	Number of Pupils	Pretest			Posttest			Average Change		
		Min.	Max.	Average NCE	Standard Deviation	Min.	Max.		Average NCE	Standard Deviation
K	379	12	75.0	27.9	12.3	1	88.0	49.1	20.2	21.2

Table 5

Number of Parents Involved
and Total Parent Hours
Reported by Month

Items	Months									
	Sept.	Oct.	Nov.	Dec.	Jan.	Feb.	March	April	May	June
1. Parents involved in the planning, operation and/or evaluation of your unit										
Number of Parents	33	8	2	2	1	2	5	1	28	2
Total Parent Hours	8	7	3	1	0.5	1.5	3.5	1	9	4
2. Group meetings for parents										
Number of Parents	448	96	41	10	7	48	10	7	44	35
Total Parent Hours	557.5	80.5	36	20	8.5	62	4	3.5	34	35
3. Individual parent conferences										
Number of Parents	81	120	173	41	71	205	83	68	61	26
Total Parent Hours	36.5	43.5	61	13.5	24	78	28	34	26.5	11.5
4. Parental classroom visits or field trips										
Number of Parents	10	45	24	43	27	46	30	15	44	66
Total Parent Hours	10.5	101	33.5	42	39.5	70.5	48	32	129.5	81
5. Visits by teacher to parents' homes										
Number of Parents	4	1	3	1	4	2	4	0	4	2
Total Parent Hours	1.5	1	2.5	20	3.5	1	3.5	0	1.5	1

All Day Kindergarten teachers attended one inservice meeting during the school year. The topic and date of this meeting was the Opening Conference on September 2, 1986. The Opening Conference Evaluation Form was completed by participants at the meeting. The responses of the All Day Kindergarten group are summarized in Table 7. The rating scale key is as follows: (1) SD = strongly disagree; (2) D = disagree; (3) U = undecided; (4) A = agree; and (5) SA = strongly agree. As Table 7 indicates, the ADK teachers attending the meeting agree that the information presented would assist them in their program.

Table 7

Average Responses and Response Frequencies
for Reactions to Inservice Statements

Statements	Number Responding	Average Response	SD (1)	Responses				
				D (2)	U (3)	A (4)	SA (5)	
I think this was a very worthwhile meeting.	16	4.3	0	0	1	10	5	
The information presented in the meeting will assist me in my program.	16	4.4	0	0	0	10	6	
There was time to ask questions pertaining to the presentation.	15	4.2	0	0	1	10	4	
Questions were answered adequately.	15	4.2	0	0	1	10	4	

It should be noted that the Opening Conference Evaluation Form was specifically designed to address concerns regarding the Opening Conference Inservice. For more detailed accounts of the evaluation, the reader is referred to the ECIA Chapter 1 report of the Opening Conference Inservice which was submitted to the Department of State and Federal Programs, Columbus Public Schools.

The visitation plan called for the Chapter 1 evaluator to visit program teachers in selected schools and record their perceptions on the Evaluator's Visitation Log. Visitation occurred during the period from March 5 to March 17, 1987.

The data indicated no major problems regarding scheduling, evaluation feedback, facilities, space, materials, nor the environmental noise level. All teachers (4) interviewed indicated the level of communication with cooperating teachers was very good; coordinating instruction for the reading program was rated as very important and generally occurred on an informal basis. The data indicated 3 (75%) of the program teachers rated the degree of parent response, to efforts at parent involvement, as very poor. The ratings of two (50%) teachers indicated the selection process and testing procedures were inadequate. However, all interviewed (4) stated that the program had goals and objectives, with each having varying interpretations, and utilizing diverse strategies to see them attained.

For a more detailed account of the evaluation, the reader is referred to the ECIA Chapter 1 Report of School Visitations to All Day Kindergarten Classrooms, 1986-87, which was submitted to the Department of State and Federal Programs, Columbus Public Schools.

Summary/Recommendations

The All Day Kindergarten Program provided underachieving kindergarten pupils in 18 schools with an extra half day of instruction, in addition to the half day they received in a regular kindergarten classroom. The goal of the program was to prepare pupils for first grade. The program served a total of 571 pupils, of whom 379 met the two criteria for inclusion in the evaluation sample: (a) attendance for 80% of the program days; and (b) administration of both the pretest and the posttest. The evaluation objective called for an average gain of 1.0 NCE point for each month of program instruction. This would amount to an average of 7.0 NCE points for the 130 days of program instruction.

The average normal curve equivalent gains of 21.2 NCE points in language is three times the average gain of 7.0 NCE points required to meet the evaluation objective. There is a very strong indication of success in the program's overall goal, to better prepare underachieving kindergarten pupils for first grade.

The total number of program teachers was 18. The number of teachers having master's degrees was seven, or 38.9% of the teaching staff with one teacher having a Ph.D. The number of teachers having reading certification was 3, or 16.7% of the program teachers. Program teachers reported an average of 12.4 years of Title I/Chapter 1 teaching experience, and an average of 19.8 years of overall teaching experience.

An unduplicated count of approximately 650 parents were directly involved with the program. Areas of parent involvement included: (a) planning operation, and/or evaluation; (b) group meetings; (c) individual conferences; (d) classroom visits and field trips; and (e) visits by the program teacher to their homes.

Program teachers attended one inservice meeting during the school year. The meeting which was evaluated received positive ratings by program teachers. Teacher comments highlighted areas of concern and possible consideration in future inservice planning.

The program evaluator collected process data by visiting some project schools. The visitation plan called for the program evaluator to visit program teachers in selected schools and record the results of the evaluator's observations and interviews with the teacher on the Evaluator's Visitation Log. Visitation occurred during the period from March 5 to March 17, 1987. Data gathered regarding evaluation and program concerns were generally found to be satisfactory. All teachers interviewed (4) indicated that the level of communication with cooperating teachers was very good. Coordinating instruction of the reading program was rated as very important and generally occurred on an informal basis. However, three (75%) of the program teachers rated the degree of parent response, to efforts at parent involvement, as very poor. Some concerns were expressed regarding the pupil selection process and testing procedures.

Based on the evaluation results, it is strongly recommended that the All Day Kindergarten program be continued in the 1987-88 school year. It is also recommended that school visitations be continued next year. These visits provided useful information regarding the evaluation needs and general program and evaluation concerns.

References

CTB/McGraw-Hill Staffwriters, Comprehensive Test of Basic Skills,
Monterey, California: CTB/McGraw-Hill, 1981.

Appendix

1986-87
Teacher Census Form

Social Security Number _____

Name _____

Program Code _____

School Assignment _____

Cost Center _____

Circle only the program you are in:

ECIA Chapter 1 Programs:

- (1) ADK
- (2) CLEAR-Elementary (1-5)
- (3) CLEAR-Elementary-CAI (4-5)
- (4) CLEAR-Middle School (6-8)
- (5) CLEAR-Middle-CAI (6-8)

DPPF Programs:

- (6) SDR (9-10)
- (7) SDR-CAI (9-10)
- (8) HSCA
- Other (Specify) _____

^aNumber of Years of Teaching Experience _____

^bNumber of Years of Title I/Chapter 1 Teaching Experience _____

^cI am certified in reading as indicated by the subject area on my teaching certificate.

_____ Yes _____ No

Highest College Degree Received _____

Full-Time Employee _____

or

Part-Time Employee _____

^aTotal all years of experience, including those which may have occurred outside of the City of Columbus. Please include present school year.

^b1. For every full year taught in Title I/Chapter 1 give yourself 10 months experience. Please include the present school year.

2. For every summer term you taught in Title I give yourself 2 months experience.

3. Add in any miscellaneous experience, a part-year perhaps.

4. Add the totals for 1, 2, and 3 and divide by 10. Place the resulting quotient in the blank for question b above.

^cCertification is defined as having one of the following:

1. reading specified on Bachelor degree.

2. reading specialist certificate.

3. M.A. in reading as a subject.

GENERAL INSERVICE EVALUATION FORM

Inservice Topic: _____

Presenter(s): _____

Date: _____ (e.g., 03/05/86)

Session: _____ a.m. or _____ p.m.

Circle only the program you are in:

ECIA Chapter 1 Programs:

- (1) ADK
- (2) CLEAR-Elementary (1-5)
- (3) CLEAR-Elementary-CAI
- (4) CLEAR-Middle School (6-8)
- (5) CLEAR-Middle School-CAI

DPPF Programs:

- (6) SDR (9-10)
- (7) SDR-CAI
- (8) HSCA

Other (Specify) _____

Circle the number that indicates the extent to which you agree with statements 1-4.

	<u>Strongly Agree</u>	<u>Agree</u>	<u>Undecided</u>	<u>Disagree</u>	<u>Strongly Disagree</u>
1. I think this was a very worthwhile meeting.	5	4	3	2	1
2. The information presented in this meeting will assist me in my program.	5	4	3	2	1
3. There was time to ask questions pertaining to the presentation.	5	4	3	2	1
4. Questions were answered adequately.	5	4	3	2	1

5. What was the most valuable part of this meeting? _____

6. What was the least valuable part of this meeting? _____

7. What additional information or topics would you like to see covered in future meetings? _____

CHAPTER 1 EVALUATION
PARENT INVOLVEMENT SURVEY

mailing label
goes here

Name _____

School _____

For the month of _____

	(A) <u>Number of Parents</u>	(B) <u>Total Number of Hours</u>
1. Parents involved in the planning operation and/or evaluation of your unit	_____	_____
2. Group Meetings for Parents	_____	_____
3. Individual Parent Conferences	_____	_____
4. Parental Classroom Visits or Field Trips	_____	_____
5. Visits by you to Parent Homes	_____	_____
6. Totals	_____	_____
7. Estimated Unduplicated Count of Parents	_____	

- DIRECTIONS:**
1. Complete all information; fold over so back is showing; staple; and place in school mail.
 2. Place a parent in only one activity for any one meeting.
 3. Total hours equals the number of parents times the number hours spent, e.g., a group meeting for 10 parents which lasts 3 hours would result in 10 parents (Column A) and 30 hours (Column B); 15 parent conferences each for 30 minutes would result in 15 parents and 7.5 hours. Please round all figures in Column B to the nearest half hour. Enter half hours as .5; no fractions please.
 4. Item 7 - This is total parents seen not total in 6A. If you had 16 parent conferences but 10 conferences were with 1 parent the unduplicated count is 7 parents - you saw 7 parents but had 16 conferences. Do not count a parent more than once. The figure in Item 7A should not exceed the figure for Item 6A.

Please return by Friday, November 7, 1986.

CHAPTER 1 EVALUATION
PARENT INVOLVEMENT SURVEY

SCHOOL YEAR ESTIMATE OF PARENTS

NON-CHAPTER 1 STUDENTS

Name _____

School _____

<u>Activities</u>	<u>(A) Number of Parents</u>	<u>(B) Number of Parent Hours</u>
1. Parents involved in the planning operation and/or evaluation of your unit (do not include Parent Advisory Council members).	_____	_____
2. Group Meetings for Parents (do not include Parent Advisory Council meetings).	_____	_____
3. Individual Parent Conferences	_____	_____
4. Parental Classroom Visits or Field Trips	_____	_____
5. Visits by you to Parent Homes	_____	_____
Estimated Unduplicated Count of Parents	_____	

DIRECTIONS: Please complete all information; indicate a 0 if the number of parents or hours is actually zero--otherwise enter the number.

Column A (Number of Parents) lines 1-5: Please place a parent in only one activity for any one meeting.

Column B (Number of Parent Hours) lines 1-5: Indicate the sum of the hours each parent spent in an activity. For example, a group meeting with 10 parents which lasted 3 hours should result in a 10 on line 2/Column A and a 30 on line 2/Column B (each parent met with the teacher 3 hours and there were 10 parents). Please round all figures in Column B to the nearest half-hour. Enter half hours as .5; no fractions please.

For the Estimated Unduplicated Count of Parents do not count a parent more than once (even if a parent is listed in more than one activity).

Having completed all the information on this survey; fold it so the back is visible; staple and place it in the school mail.

Thank you.

CHAPTER 1 EVALUATION
PARENT INVOLVEMENT SURVEY

Mailing Label Here

IMPORTANT

ANNUAL
UNDUPLICATED
COUNT

Enter on the line to the left the annual unduplicated count of the number of parents you have involved in any of the Activities 1-5 below. COUNT EACH PARENT ONLY ONCE FOR THE YEAR. If you have questions regarding this count, please call Sharon Bermel at 222-3011 or bring your question(s) to the end-of-the-year inservice meeting.

COMPLETE THE REST OF THIS REPORT FOR JUNE ONLY

Activities	(A) Number of Parents	(B) Total Number of Hours
1. Parents involved in the planning operation and/or evaluation of your unit	_____	_____
2. Group Meetings for Parents	_____	_____
3. Individual Parent Conferences	_____	_____
4. Parental Classroom Visits or Field Trips	_____	_____
5. Visits by you to Parent Homes	_____	_____
6. Totals	_____	_____
7. Estimated Unduplicated Count of Parents	_____	_____

DIRECTIONS

1. Complete all information; fold over so back is showing; staple; and place in school mail.
2. Place a parent in only one activity for any one meeting.
3. Total hours equals the number of parents times the number hours spent e.g., a group meeting for 10 parents which lasts 3 hours would result in 10 parents (Column A) and 30 hours (Column B); 15 parent conferences each for 30 minutes would result in 15 parents and 7.5 hours. Please round all figures in Column B to the nearest half hour. Enter half hours as .5; no fractions please.
4. Item 7 - This is total parents seen not total in 6A. If you had 16 parent conferences but 10 conferences were with 1 parent the unduplicated count is 7 parents - you saw 7 parents but had 16 conferences. Do not count a parent more than once. The figure in Item 7A should not exceed the figure for Item 6A.

RETURN RIGHT AWAY BUT NO LATER THAN FRIDAY, MAY 29, 1987