This report presents a final evaluation of the Chapter 1, Part B Program for Neglected and Delinquent Children, Citywide/District 75 Institutionalized Facilities Program. This program was designed to provide after-school supplementary instruction in prevocational skills, activities of daily living, and academic remediation to students between the ages of 7 and 21 who reside in group homes and institutions for the delinquent and disabled throughout the five boroughs of New York City (New York). Its main purpose was to prepare students to be independent after leaving the institution. The following chapters are included in this report: (1) "Introduction"; (2) "Evaluation Methodology"; (3) "Evaluation Findings"; and (4) "Conclusions and Recommendations." The following topics are covered in Chapter 3, "Evaluation Findings": (1) program organization; (2) program personnel; (3) site selection; (4) student selection; (5) student characteristics; (6) program setting; (7) curriculum; (8) student instruction; (9) instructional materials; (10) program procedures; (11) limits on program effectiveness; and (12) student outcomes. The strengths of the program are discussed, and improvements are suggested. Findings indicate that the pupil mastery objective was attained by 91 percent of the population served. Teachers also reported that the majority of students showed marked improvement in self-esteem and attitudes toward work and school. Five tables are included. (JS)
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The E.C.I.A. Chapter I, Part B Program for Neglected and Delinquent Children, Citywide/District 75 Institutionalized Facilities Program was designed to provide after-school supplementary instruction in prevocational skills, activities of daily living, and academic remediation to students who reside in group homes and institutions for the delinquent and disabled throughout the five boroughs of New York City. Sponsored by the Division of Special Education (D.S.E.) of the Board of Education, the program was designed to prepare students to be independent after leaving the institution.

OREA collected data retrieval forms for all student participants, surveyed all supervisors and teachers (and interviewed 20 percent of those teachers), and visited 46 percent of participating institutions (19 percent of program sites) to evaluate program implementation and outcomes.

During 1988-89, program staff provided supplementary career education and daily living skills instruction to 2,577 students aged seven to 21 residing in 39 institutions (146 sites) for the neglected and delinquent. The program was staffed by one program coordinator, 13 supervisors, and 160 teachers.

The program was implemented as proposed. Implementation was greatly enhanced by the teachers' use of individualized instructional methods and program curriculum, their ability to respond to the diversity of students' age, educational preparation, length of residency, and emotional characteristics. Program staff emphasized the importance of maintaining good rapport with site staff and expanding job-related opportunities for students by creating a job counselor's staff position, establishing an ongoing relationship with a job trainer or placement agency, and organizing a youth job fair.

Other strengths of the program were: the excellent flow of information and support to the program due to the cooperation between tutors and supervisory staff, the availability of in-service training and advisement to teachers provided through regular meetings and site visits, and teachers' willingness to encourage students' trust and respect.

The pupil mastery objective was attained by 91 percent of the population served, well above the proposed goal of 80 percent. Teachers also reported that the majority of students had shown marked improvement in self-esteem and attitudes toward work and school.

Based on these findings, OREA offered the following recommendations.

- Expand the formal avenues for obtaining part-time and summer employment for students by creating a job developer position, establishing a formal relationship with job placement agencies, and organizing a job fair.
Monitor and encourage institutional staff cooperation through the personal intervention of the program coordinator or supervisor.

Expand the program's ability to provide computer-based instruction by acquiring computers and word-processors and by providing in-service training in computer literacy to program staff.

Provide funds or other support to publish the Institutionalized Facilities Procedures Manual which would facilitate teacher training and data recording, and inform site staff about the program.
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I. INTRODUCTION

The E.C.I.A. Chapter I, Part B Program for Neglected and Delinquent Children, Citywide/District 75 Institutionalized Facilities program provides after-school supplementary instruction in prevocational skills, activities of daily living, and academic remediation to students who reside in group homes and institutions for the delinquent and disabled throughout the five boroughs of New York City. Sponsored by the Division of Special Education (D.S.E.) of the Board of Education, the program is designed to prepare students to be independent once they leave the institution.

PROGRAM GOALS AND OBJECTIVES

It is the goal of the Institutionalized Facilities program to equip students with supplementary knowledge, skills, and experiences that will enable them to achieve some degree of independence and social and economic success outside the institution. The program provides instruction in prevocational skills with an emphasis on linking life goals with vocational abilities by using activities which emphasize real-world demands. Increasingly, the program has incorporated instruction in adult life skills and remedial academics where appropriate. For students who are severely handicapped and unlikely to leave the institution, the goals are limited to improving activities of daily living.

The program's 1988-89 skill objectives were detailed in a set of five assessment inventories. These inventories focus on vocational skills and awareness; activities of daily living; advanced vocational objectives, including computer competency and preparation for academic and occupational/licensing exams; and knowledge of the law and legal issues relevant to the students' institutional standing and adult responsibilities. Teachers used the inventories to evaluate and test incoming students, design individualized curricula, and record student objective mastery.
REPORT FORMAT

This report is organized into four chapters: Chapter II outlines the evaluation methodology; Chapter III describes OREA's findings; Chapter IV provides conclusions and makes recommendations for future implementation of the program.
II. EVALUATION METHODOLOGY

EVALUATION QUESTIONS

OREA's evaluation of the 1988-89 Institutionalized Facilities program addressed the following questions:

Implementation

- How was the program organized to provide services?
- What were the characteristics of students who participated in the program?
- How was student instruction carried out?

Outcomes

- To what extent did the program meet its objective that 80 percent of the participants would master 80 percent of their short-term skill objectives?
- What were other program-related student accomplishments?

EVALUATION PROCEDURES

Sample

Program teachers submitted information on all 2,577 participating students. All thirteen supervisors and 160 teachers received and returned OREA developed surveys. OREA consultants interviewed 20 percent (N=32) of the teachers at their sites. They visited 19.1 percent (N=28) of the 146 program sites, representing 46.1 percent (N=18) of the 39 institutions participating in the 1988-89 program.

Instrumentation

OREA-developed instruments consisted of a teacher survey, a supervisor survey,
a teacher interview guide, a classroom observation guide, and a student data retrieval form (D.R.F.).

Teachers maintained a record of student progress on the D.R.F.s throughout the year. Student achievement was measured by performance in the criterion-based objectives of the five curriculum inventories (see Curriculum in Chapter III). Teachers also recorded information on the D.R.F.s about students’ age, sex, reason for residence, day school registration, attendance, and reasons for leaving the program.

Data Collection

OREA distributed surveys to supervisors and teachers midway through the program and collected them at the end of the program cycle. D.R.F.s were distributed to teachers at the beginning of the term. These D.R.F.s were checked monthly by the program supervisors, assuring the completion and accuracy of these data. OREA collected these forms at the end of the program cycle. OREA consultants conducted field interviews and site visits during March, April, and May of 1989.
III. EVALUATION FINDINGS

PROGRAM IMPLEMENTATION

Program Organization

The Institutionalized Facilities program staff consisted of a program coordinator, 13 supervisors, 160 teachers, providing services to 39 institutions (146 sites). The program coordinator established and maintained communication with all institutional agency directors and key staff members at the sites, conducted training sessions, visited program sites, and met with teachers and supervisors on both a regular and an on-call basis. Supervisors and teachers served in the program after regular school hours on a per session basis. Each supervisor oversaw from six to 20 teachers at sites located within one region of the city.

Supervisors attended and lectured at training sessions, visited all sites regularly, and provided teachers with in-service training and instructional resources. They also conducted site observations, and maintained liaison with the institutional staff and regular contact with the program coordinator.

Usually one teacher was placed at a site, with six to eight students. Larger sites were staffed with six or more teachers. There was an attempt to assign teachers to the same site in successive years, allowing them to become familiar with the institutions and to establish long-term rapport with the site staff.

Program Personnel

Program staff were all highly experienced in special education teaching and supervising. Supervisors averaged 23 years of educational experience, with a mean of
Nearly 12 years as special education supervisors, and over eight years supervising in this program. Teachers averaged 10 years in special education and seven years in the Institutionalized Facilities program.

All teachers participated in an initial orientation session and in monthly staff training meetings. Nearly all teachers (94.4 percent) found the orientation meeting "somewhat" or "very useful" in presenting the program's objectives and requirements, materials, recording standards, and data retrieval procedures. The monthly staff meetings offered a forum for discussion of particular students' instructional or behavioral problems, materials and equipment needs, the relationship with the agency staff, and problems with paperwork. Teachers offered solutions or insights from their own experience.

In 1987, the staff developed an Institutionalized Facilities Procedures Manual, which presented the program's organization and policy, data collection procedures, and student evaluation information. The manual was conceived to simplify training and dissemination of program information to site staff and other interested parties. Unfortunately, the program lacked the means to reproduce the Procedures Manual in 1988-89, and as a consequence, it was not available for distribution during the 1988-89 program cycle.

Site Selection

Each year the State Education Department (S.E.D.) surveys institutions throughout the state and evaluates their eligibility. The list of eligible institutions was forwarded to the Institutionalized Facilities program coordinator. In May, prior to the beginning of the program, the program coordinator contacted each identified institution and confirmed their needs for the following year. Tutors and/or materials and equipment were allocated to each institution, depending on the expected resident population and other needs.
Student Selection

The target population for the Institutionalized Facilities program consisted of neglected and delinquent children and adolescents in group homes, long-term residential institutions, diagnostic centers, detention facilities, and other residential sites throughout New York City. Two special sub-populations were severely disabled children who, in many cases, were permanently institutionalized, and pregnant teenagers in group home facilities.

Student Characteristics. The Institutionalized Facilities program served 2,577 students during the 1988-1989 cycle. Students in the program were characterized by a wide diversity of age, handicapping conditions, legal situations, educational levels, and length of residence in their institutions. The majority of students, 52.9 percent, were female. Ninety-eight percent of the students were between the ages of seven and 21. Children and adolescents in the program were characterized as either neglected (75.3 percent), delinquent (14.5 percent), pregnant (4.5 percent), or other, mostly severely retarded (5.7 percent). This information was not reported for 75 students.

All students attended regular day school in addition to their Institutionalized Facilities classes. The majority (58.4 percent) attended neighborhood public schools, 21.7 percent attended classes at their institutional sites, and 19.9 percent were in other educational settings. No data were available for 67 students.

In 1988-89, teachers were asked to report on their students' approximate educational level. Teachers reported on more than 1,700 students in the program, and indicated that over 69 percent were two or more years below grade level in math, and 65 percent were two or more years below grade level in English. More than nine percent were five years or more below grade level in basic subjects. At individual sites, teachers
reported having students with a four or five year range in educational level, demanding a correspondingly wide range of materials and objectives.

Teachers reported that at more than half the sites, the majority of students had been resident in the institution for more than one year. Many students were participating in the institutionalized program for a second year. At 32 sites most students had been resident for less than six months, and at one site the average period of residence was less than a month. In general, the program student population had a very wide range of needs, given their age, sex, reason for residency, academic functional level, and length of residency. In many cases, each student at a site required a specifically designed instructional program. This demanded a flexible and experienced staff, a broad curriculum, and an approach that facilitated individualized instruction.

Program Setting

Institutions Served. The institutions served by the program were characterized by a diversity in size, organization, age of students, and length of student residency. The majority of the sites, about 120, were small group homes, with from five to twenty students. Half of these institutions had ten or fewer residents. The other sites were larger, and included institutions that housed from 50 to several hundred students for short periods during the year. One new site was a home for unwed mothers and their children up to age six. (See State Report for profiles of all institutions.)

Physical Setting. Teachers reported holding classes in many different settings: 35.6 percent in dining rooms; 16.3 percent in recreation rooms; 19.4 percent in offices; 6.9 percent in regular classrooms; and 10.6 percent in living rooms. Fourteen other teachers reported using bedrooms, empty rooms, libraries, and other areas.
Curriculum

The instructional emphasis of the program was vocational education, math and reading skills, and life skills training. Teachers tailored lessons to each student, considering age, educational level, interests, and length of residency. Teachers used the curriculum inventories as the basis for individualizing lessons. Each curriculum inventory focused on a specific area of prevocational or other skills, organized as a series of goals, each with a specific performance objective. In general, the objectives proceeded from relatively simple to more difficult ones.

Five curriculum inventories were used in the program in 1988-89. The Career Education/Pre-Vocational Skills Assessment Inventory covered career consciousness, orientation to work, job application, work habits and routines, attitudes, and career change. This inventory also contained the Sheltered Workshop Activities curriculum, which offered low-level vocational objectives for low functioning students. The Activities of Daily Living Skills Assessment Inventory provided a basic guide to self-maintenance skills for the handicapped. The Specialized Vocational Skills inventory provided objectives in writing, clerical, and computer-related job skills, and a section on aptitude and competency test preparation. The World of Work inventory involved more advanced objectives such as career and consumer skills, including money management, insurance, social security, consumer credit, and union-related issues.

A new inventory was added this year, entitled Law in the Community. It was designed to instill in students a basic knowledge of the law, and especially those areas which affected them as neglected or delinquent teenagers. Topics included: the criminal justice system; law and the family (including PINS procedures); teenagers, sexuality and the law; and marriage and divorce.
Table 1 summarizes the instructional use of the curriculum inventories during the 1988-89 program. The Career Education/Prevocational Skills inventory was used with 68.1 percent of the students, and clearly constituted the basic set of objectives for the program in general. Slightly more than one-fourth of the teachers used the new inventory, Law in the Community, with a total of 15.2 percent of the students at 40 sites. This acceptance of the Law in the Community curriculum demonstrated that teachers perceived a need to instruct students, not only in vocational skills, but also the larger legal and social issues of being a worker and adult in our society.

Student Instruction

Instructional Activities. The broad range of student abilities and needs required that teachers use a wide variety of pedagogical methods, materials, and equipment to ensure program success. Lesson individualization was necessary to provide appropriate instruction to each student. The approaches most often used by teachers were: individual tutoring (93.8 percent); group discussion (73.8 percent); and role-playing (58.8 percent). Homework was assigned by 71.3 percent of the teachers. Most teachers reported instructing students in consumer math (85.6 percent); having students practice check writing and budgeting (60.0 percent); completing job and driver's license applications (71.9 percent); and reading and interpreting classified advertisement (76.9 percent).

OREA consultants saw students filling out job applications and discussing the best ways to respond to questions in small group sessions. Consultants watched students role-playing a mock interview in which students checked off and discussed positive and negative responses to the "interviewer's" questions. OREA consultants also observed
TABLE 1
Number of Students Instructed in Each Curriculum Inventory
(N=2,562)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Curriculum</th>
<th>STUDENTS</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Career Education/Prevocational Skills</td>
<td>1,755</td>
<td>68.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Activities of Daily Living</td>
<td>167</td>
<td>6.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Specialized Vocational Skills</td>
<td>519</td>
<td>20.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>World of Work</td>
<td>500</td>
<td>19.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Law in the Community</td>
<td>392</td>
<td>15.2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Individual student data retrieval forms

- More than three times as many students were instructed in the Career Education/Prevocational Skills inventory than any other curriculum.

- The newly developed Law in the Community curriculum was used to instruct 15.2 percent of the students.
students being tutored in mathematics, practicing typing, participating in a group lesson on reading and grammar, and filling out tax returns.

One particularly effective activity observed by consultants was students' use of computers to practice writing business letters. OREA noted that computers enhanced student interest, and encouraged them to appreciate the skills they were learning.

Seven-and-one-half percent of the teachers accompanied students to job interviews; 12.5 percent reported inviting representatives from various businesses to speak to their classes; and the same proportion reported taking their class on visits to businesses. Among the businesses and occupations represented were social service offices, retail businesses, cultural institutions, the sports and entertainment industry, uniformed services, health workers, and clerical and professional workers.

Teachers interviewed commented that direct contact with the work world was a significant factor in enhancing students' understanding of occupational possibilities. Teachers using in-class visits as a teaching strategy reported that it was effective in educating students about the requirements of certain jobs and occupations and that it helped them evaluate their own vocational interests. Especially useful were visits to job sites, which always acted as starting points for discussion and suggested directions for curricular development. Occasionally, unexpected benefits occurred. One teacher reported that on a field trip to a local Burger King a student who showed exceptional interest by asking questions was offered a part-time job.

Instructional Materials. Teachers reported that the materials provided by the program were useful in achieving program goals and were in adequate supply. Nearly two-thirds of the teachers said they would order the same materials; slightly less than a third said they would order only "somewhat different" materials; and only a few said they
would order very different materials.

OREA observed and discussed with teachers their use of well over one hundred different commercial workbooks, texts, and study guides. These publications generally emphasized vocational and consumer education materials, though some also covered academic subjects such as African-American history, an especially relevant topic since the vast majority of the program students were African-American. Texts included *Responsibilities and Career Development* (Lysson and Lysson); *Career Exploration* (ESP, Inc); *Entering the Adult World* (Globe); *Job Hunting Handbook* (Dahlstrom and Co.); *Planning Meals and Shopping* (Lake); *Planning for an Apartment* (Fearon); *You and the Law* (Follett); *High School Equivalency Exams* (Barron's); *Typewriting* (Houghton Mifflin); *Standard Lessons in Reading* (McCall/Crabs); *Vocabulary Workshop* (Sadlier Oxford); *Entertainment Language* (Janus); *Help With Business Language* (Houghton Mifflin); *Black Americans in History* (Barnell/Loft); and *Basic Algebra* (WTC).

Teachers also used job application forms, help wanted and apartment advertisements, driver's and marriage licenses, passport applications, *The New York Times* and other newspapers, *National Geographic*, the drivers manual, and fiction at different reading levels. In addition, dictionaries, thesauruses, and a range of clerical materials as aids to teaching writing and office skills.

Teachers instructed low-functioning and younger students by using puzzles, simple games, and letter and number manipulative materials, and they involved students in simple everyday tasks such as cooking and cleaning. In addition, most teachers, (85.6 percent) supplemented materials provided by the program with work sheets and other materials which they had acquired or designed.

Teachers used typewriters, calculators, and computers at sites where they were
available. Teachers of pregnant teenagers provided instruction in typing and word processing skills with electric and electronic typewriters, and word processors.

Teachers reported that an increasingly glaring shortfall in the program was the small number of computers and word processors available for instruction. Because of the rapid changes currently taking place in workplace technology, these teachers felt that their students were being ill-prepared for competitive job-seeking by learning only typing and filing. The teachers themselves felt that they had insufficient training in computer basics, and expressed the hope that computer instruction could be provided as part of in-service training in the future.

Program Procedures

Instructional Format. Nearly all teachers, (or 98.1 percent) followed a twice-a-week schedule of classes. Session lengths varied to accommodate students' educational and scheduling needs. Session length for most students varied from 20 to 45 minutes, with some sessions lasting as long as 150 minutes. Usually, teachers held 60-minute sessions.

Instructional Assessment Procedures. Teachers were satisfied with the curriculum inventories as multi-purpose instruments for assessing student needs, evaluating student achievement, and planning group lessons as well as serving as the basis for instruction. The Career Educational/Pre-Vocational Skills inventory was used by 68.1 percent of the teachers for student assessment, 38.8 percent of the teachers for group planning, and 48.1 percent for measuring student achievement. The Activities of Daily Living assessment inventory, designed for low functioning students, was used by only 31.8 percent of the teachers for assessment, 22.5 percent for group planning, and 18.1 percent
for gauging student achievement. This is a clear increase in use of the latter inventory, possibly indicates a more general need for instruction in basic daily living activities for this student population.

Of the more recently developed World of Work and Specialized Vocational Skills inventories, there was an increase in the use of the former in 1988-89 and decline in the use of the latter. The World of Work was used by 48.8 percent of teachers to assess student abilities, while the Specialized Vocational Skills was used by 33.8 percent, compared to 40 percent of teachers who used these inventories in 1987-88. In 1988-89, 11 percent used the Specialized Vocational Skills inventory for group planning, and 28.8 percent used the World of Work for that purpose. Approximately 21.9 percent of the teachers used the Specialized Vocational Skills to evaluate student achievement, while 36.9 used the World of Work. The shift away from the use of the Specialized Vocational Skills inventory may indicate the lack of higher level vocational skills in many of the students, the recognition by teachers that clerical skills alone are not sufficient for competitive job hunting, or the lack of equipment with which to instruct students in the computer skills included in the inventory. The increase in the use of the World of Work may reflect increasing recognition of the need to instruct students in their financial, social, and legal rights and obligations at the work place.

The Law in the Community Skills inventory was used for assessment by 30 percent of the teachers, for group planning by 24.4 percent, and for evaluating individual student achievement by 18.1 percent. Nearly all teachers found the inventory curricula either "somewhat" or "very" useful. No more than 12 teachers found any one inventory "not useful."
Limits on Program Effectiveness

Teachers and supervisors reported several factors that reduced program effectiveness. The suggestion made most often was to increase the amount of time teachers spent with the students. Teachers felt that the two-day-a-week contact was insufficient to establish and maintain rapport with students, assess their needs, and consistently provide the appropriate individualized instruction.

Many teachers also felt the program was under-equipped to meet the training needs of the modern workplace. Supervisors and teachers recommended that more computer and word processing equipment be made available to the program, with adequate in-service training provided to the teachers to maximize their use of computers. Without some computer training, students in the program were severely limited in the clerical, industrial, or skilled jobs they could obtain, and ill-prepared for college-level work.

A third limitation teachers mentioned was the limited contact that some students had with the business world. Teachers found it difficult to find the time to search for cooperative businesses and organizations. Teachers suggested a variety of solutions to this problem: creating a full-time position for a job developer; linking the program to a job training or job placement organization; and an end-of-term job fair.

Many teachers felt that increasing the academic component of the program was necessary to enhance the students' occupational potential. This could be accomplished by enlarging the curriculum inventories to incorporate more academic subjects.

All teachers reported that site staff support was essential, and where staff was less than cooperative, the program had little chance of accomplishing its goal. Four teachers reported that they had less than "good rapport" with the agency staff at their sites, and this prevented them from fully implementing the program. Fewer teachers
voiced this criticism in 1988-89 than in past program cycles, but these observations indicate the ongoing need for developing teacher-program staff cooperation.

This year many teachers also found that materials and equipment were not delivered in a timely manner. Without appropriate or sufficient materials some teachers found it difficult to meet the curricular needs of the students. Though the problem of timely delivery was not a program procedure issue, it affected program implementation for the first time, and should be rectified by the appropriate offices.

**STUDENT OUTCOMES**

**Short-Term Objectives**

The evaluation objective of the Institutionalized Facilities Program was that:

- Eighty percent of the participating students would master 80 percent of their short-term educational objectives.

**Educational Objectives.** Table 2 presents the frequency distribution of the percent of educational objectives mastered. OREA found that 91 percent of the students in the program mastered 80 percent or more of their individualized objectives. Thus, the program surpassed its evaluation objective.

Table 3 presents a frequency distribution of the number of short-term educational objectives. More than 67 percent of the students mastered six or more new skills, an improvement of nearly seven percentage points over 1987-88.

**Attendance.** Table 4 provides a frequency distribution of the days students attended the program. In 1988-89, 40 percent of the students attended 20 or more sessions. This was a marked improvement over 1987-88, in which 35 percent attended 20 or more sessions. It represents a reversal of the trend of previous program cycles, in
### TABLE 2

**Frequency Distribution of the Percent of Educational Objectives Mastered**

\( (N=2,571)^a \)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Percent Mastered</th>
<th>Number of Students</th>
<th>Percent of Population</th>
<th>Cumulative Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>90 - 100</td>
<td>2,232</td>
<td>86.8</td>
<td>86.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>80 - 90</td>
<td>107</td>
<td>4.2</td>
<td>91.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>70 - 80</td>
<td>89</td>
<td>3.5</td>
<td>94.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>60 - 70</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>1.7</td>
<td>96.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50 - 60</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>1.2</td>
<td>97.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0 - 50</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>2.6</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Individual student data retrieval forms

\(^a\) Achievement data were not reported for 6 students.

- Ninety-one percent of the students mastered 80 percent or more of their objectives.
- Nine percent did not achieve the mandated goal of 80 percent mastery of their attempted objectives.
### Table 3

Frequency Distribution of the Number of Short-Term Educational Objectives Mastered

(N = 2,577)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Number of Objectives Mastered</th>
<th>Number of Students</th>
<th>Percent of Population</th>
<th>Cumulative Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>31 or more</td>
<td>394</td>
<td>15.3</td>
<td>15.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21 - 30</td>
<td>328</td>
<td>12.7</td>
<td>28.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11 - 20</td>
<td>570</td>
<td>22.1</td>
<td>50.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6 - 10</td>
<td>445</td>
<td>17.3</td>
<td>67.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 - 5</td>
<td>784</td>
<td>30.4</td>
<td>97.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>2.2</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Individual student data retrieval forms

- Over seven percent of the students mastered more than five new skills.
- Twenty-eight percent learned 21 or more new skills.
TABLE 4
Frequency Distribution of Days Attended
(N = 2,558)*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Days Attended</th>
<th>Number of Students</th>
<th>Percent of Population</th>
<th>Cumulative Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>21 or more</td>
<td>1,040</td>
<td>40.7</td>
<td>40.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13 - 20</td>
<td>347</td>
<td>13.6</td>
<td>54.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9 - 12</td>
<td>239</td>
<td>9.3</td>
<td>63.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 - 8</td>
<td>373</td>
<td>14.6</td>
<td>78.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0 - 4</td>
<td>559</td>
<td>21.9</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Individual student data retrieval forms
*Data were missing or incorrectly recorded for 19 students.

- In 1988-89, over 45 percent of the students attended 20 or more sessions.
  (In 1987-88, 35 percent of the students attended 20 or more sessions.)
which increasing numbers of students attended fewer sessions. Whether the increase
in attendance in 1988-89 is a natural variation or the result of institutional or agency policy
decisions, cannot be assessed. But it has resulted in more students attending more
sessions and receiving more instruction from the program teachers.

Program-related Accomplishments

The most tangible measure of the success of the Institutionalized Facilities Program
was the ability of students to attain educational objectives and find jobs. Teachers
reported on a variety of students' program-related accomplishments. As Table 5
indicates, 12 percent of the students were able to find part-time and summer employment
through program activities. Program teachers assisted students in this task by providing
counseling, helping them conduct job searches, and practicing interview skills.

OREA's analysis of teachers' responses identifying other student achievements
produced the following findings: 5.4 percent of the students entered or reentered high
school, 4.7 percent passed Regents or other academic examinations, and 3.5 percent
passed the General Equivalency Diploma (G.E.D.) exam; slightly over two percent were
accepted into a college program. Teachers also reported that more than ninety percent
of their students showed positive changes in their attitudes toward work and school, and
over forty percent showed improvement in their self-image or attitude concerning others.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Program-related Goals</th>
<th>Number of Students</th>
<th>Percentage of Students</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Obtained Employment</td>
<td>308</td>
<td>12.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Completed G.E.D.</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>3.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Passed Regents/Other Academic Exams</td>
<td>121</td>
<td>4.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Entered or Re-entered High School</td>
<td>138</td>
<td>5.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Accepted to College Program</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>2.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attitudinal Improvement Concerning Work, School</td>
<td>2,555</td>
<td>91.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attitudinal Improvement Concerning Self, Others</td>
<td>1,127</td>
<td>43.7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Teacher surveys

- Over ten percent of the students obtained employment during the program. A greater percentage of those who had the potential to be employed found employment, for included in the base population were several hundred students who were very low functioning or resided in institutions which did not allow them to leave.

- Over 90 percent of the students were perceived to have improved their attitudes toward work and school.
IV. CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

The OREA evaluation of the 1988-89 Institutionalized Facilities program indicates that the program successfully delivered effective supplementary education in vocational, daily living, and remedial academic skills to neglected and delinquent children and adolescents in institutional residences. The pupil mastery objective was attained by 91 percent of the population served, well above the goal of 80 percent.

The program was implemented as proposed, with individualized educational instruction in reading and math, vocational skills training, and tutoring in preparation for academic qualifying examinations. During this program cycle many students obtained employment, completed academic and occupational/licensing exams, and/or made marked educational advances, including college admission. The majority of students were considered by their teachers to have shown marked improvement in self-esteem and attitudes toward work and school. Increasingly, the program has focused on real-world occupational contact and tutoring, and counseling directed at securing employment. This focus has proved to be successful.

OREA findings suggested that implementation was greatly enhanced by the ability of teachers, in their teaching methodology and use of program curriculum, to be responsive from year to year to the diverse ages, educational preparation, length of residency, and emotional characteristics of the students.

All program staff, teachers, supervisors, and the director emphasized the importance of maintaining good rapport with institutional staff to ensure program success. Program staff developed a procedures manual to improve this communication; however, because of limited resources, the manual could not be produced during the 1988-89
cycle. Program staff also emphasized the importance of expanding job-related opportunities. The ability of students to obtain employment through the program reinforces the program's objectives of preparing them for independent life. Teachers suggested creating a job counselor staff position, establishing an ongoing relationship with a job training or placement agency, and organizing a youth job fair at the end of year for this purpose.

OREA also observed the excellent flow of information and support to the program (based on the cooperation between tutors and supervisory staff) and the availability of in-service training and advisement to teachers provided through regular meetings and site visits. Teachers reported and OREA observed that program success was facilitated by teachers' willingness to encourage students' trust and respect. Even if students learned few new skills, teachers reported that these students had gained self-respect and an understanding of their abilities to achieve outside the institutional setting.

Based on these findings, OREA offers the following recommendations.

- Expand the formal avenues for obtaining part-time and summer employment for students by creating a job developer position, establishing a formal relationship with job placement agencies, and organizing a job fair.
- Monitor and encourage institutional staff cooperation through the personal intervention of the program coordinator or supervisor.
- Expand the program's ability to provide computer-based instruction by acquiring computers and word-processors and by providing in-service training in computer literacy to program staff.
- Provide funds or other support to publish the Institutionalized Facilities Procedures Manual which would facilitate teacher training and data recording, and inform site staff about the program.