Project ASHS' Bilingual Resource and Training Center served 2,075 limited-English-proficient students, some of whom had limited ability to read and write in their native languages, at 15 sites. Most participants were older students returning to school to complete high school diploma requirements and prepare for the General Equivalency Diploma. The project provided supplemental instruction in English as a Second Language (ESL), native language arts (NLA), and high school equivalency content area courses taught bilingually. The project also offered counseling, placement, career workshops, and staff and curriculum development. Participating students were native speakers of Spanish, Haitian Creole, Chinese, Italian, and Greek. The project met one of two ESL objectives and its referral objective, but could not assess achievement of the NLA or career education workshop objective. The project met one high school equivalency instructional objective. While a majority of project students at the lowest level were promoted, less than the proposed percentage were promoted or obtained equivalency diplomas at other levels. The staff development objective and four of five curriculum development objectives were met. Program strengths were in individual programming and counseling, and in the use of checklists to track students' interests and progress. Greater efforts to recruit Greek-speaking students are recommended. (MSE) (Adjunct ERIC Clearinghouse on Literacy Education)
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Project ASHS was fully implemented. During the 1988-89 school year, participating students received instruction in English as a Second Language, Native Language Arts, and High School Equivalency bilingual content area subjects. The project offered students counseling and placement services. It also offered staff and curriculum development.

Project ASHS met its objectives in staff development, four of five curriculum development objectives, one of two English as a Second Language objectives, the arithmetic proficiency objective, one of four high school equivalency instructional objectives, and the referral objective. It partially met one curriculum development objective. The project failed to meet one English as a Second Language objective and three high school equivalency instructional objectives. Because of a lack of data it was not possible to determine whether the project met its Native Language Arts or its career education workshops objectives.

Auxiliary Services for High Schools' Bilingual Program Resource and Training Center (Project ASHS) completed the first year of a two-year extension of funding under Title VII of the Elementary and Secondary Act (E.S.E.A.). The project provided services to students of limited English proficiency (LEP), some of whom were also limited in their ability to read and write in their native language. The target population was primarily older students returning to school to complete their requirements for a high school diploma and prepare for the General Equivalency Diploma (G.E.D.) examination. The project served 2,975 students at 15 sites throughout the five boroughs.

The project provided supplemental instruction in English as a Second Language (E.S.L.), Native Language Arts (N.L.A.), and High School Equivalency (H.S.E.) content area courses taught bilingually. The project also offered counseling, placement, career workshops, and staff and curriculum development. Participating students were native speakers of Spanish, Haitian Creole, Chinese, Italian, and Greek.

The project met its E.S.L. objective for a significant gain by advanced E.S.L. students on the Stanford Achievement Test. It did not meet the objective that 60 percent of students be promoted one level of E.S.L. instruction. The Office of Research, Evaluation, and Assessment (OREA) was unable to determine whether it met the N.L.A. objective because of a lack
of La Prueba de Lectura data. Project ASHS met the arithmetic proficiency objective, and one of four high school equivalency instructional objectives. While 60 percent of the N.L.A. students on the first level of H.S.E. studies were promoted to the next level, less than the proposed percentage of students on the other H.S.E. levels were promoted or obtained their G.E.D.s. Project ASHS met the referral objective but OREA was unable to determine whether it had met the career education workshops objective because of a lack of data.

Since staff members enrolled in courses leading to a degree, and the program identified and trained staff to provide every site with a resource specialist, the project met its staff development objectives. The project developed, field tested, and implemented proposed curricula to meet four of the curriculum development objectives. It partially met the fifth objective, having failed to implement individualized instruction in reading and writing skills for Italian- and Haitian Creole-speaking students.

The program's strengths were in its individual programming and counseling, and its use of checklists to track students' interests and their courses of study. A program limitation was the small number of Greek-speaking students participating in the program.

The conclusions, based on the findings of this evaluation, lead to the following recommendation:

- Make greater efforts to recruit Greek-speaking students by publicizing the program in Greek newspapers and magazines, Greek social clubs, and the church.
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I. INTRODUCTION

This report documents the Office of Research, Evaluation, and Assessment's (OREA's) evaluation of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act (E.S.E.A.) Title VII-funded project, Bilingual Program Resource and Training Center, a sub-section of the monolingual project, Auxiliary Services for High Schools (Project ASHS). In the fourth year, the program provided services to 2,075 students at 15 sites. The project primarily addressed the needs of older students returning to school, most of whom wanted to complete requirements for the General Equivalency Diploma (G.E.D.).

The program's goals were to enable students of limited English proficiency (LEP) to attain English proficiency in the content areas necessary to pass the High School Equivalency (H.S.E.) examination and to provide them with college and vocational information and counseling. This bilingual component of Project ASHS was transitional, and students eventually entered the mainstream component of the parent project.

HISTORY OF THE PROGRAM

Since this was the fourth year of the project, a more complete history as well as a description of activities and outcomes can be found in the final evaluation reports of 1986-87 and 1987-88. It is worth noting here that while the project began as an English as a Second Language (E.S.L.) program at three sites, it expanded into a bilingual program at 15 sites.
SETTING

The project's 15 sites were scattered throughout the city's five boroughs. Seven were day sites (three in Manhattan, two in the Bronx, one in Queens, and one in Brooklyn) and eight were evening sites (two in Manhattan, two in Brooklyn, two in Queens, one in the Bronx, and one in Staten Island). The schools were situated in or near heavily populated areas that had a substantial LEP population.

PARTICIPATING STUDENTS

Targeted LEP students were recent immigrants whose native languages were Spanish, Haitian Creole, Chinese, Italian, and Greek. Fifty-two percent of the students were over 21 years of age. Forty-six percent were unemployed. Some students were attempting to support families while continuing their education.

Spanish-speaking students made up the largest group. Some had the equivalent of a middle school education, but 15 to 20 percent were deficient in Spanish and needed Native Language Arts (N.L.A.) instruction. The Chinese-speaking students were mostly from the People's Republic of China and Hong Kong. The Greek-speaking student population was part of the recent influx of immigrants from the poorer areas of Greece, particularly its smaller islands. Project ASHS provided limited information on its Haitian Creole-speaking population. It provided the Italian speakers with E.S.L. instruction only, since the population had decreased considerably.
STAFF

The project's central office was at Roberto Clemente High School. Project staff included a director, two full-time and four part-time paraprofessionals, three resource specialists, three curriculum developers, and one teacher. All staff members held professional degrees and were fluent in one of the target languages. The director of the bilingual component of Project ASHS was fluent in Spanish and held a master's degree. He was responsible for coordinating the activities of the sites. His immediate supervisor was the director of Project ASHS.

Tax-levy personnel who assisted the program included a coordinator, an assistant coordinator, a resource specialist, a career guidance specialist, and four paraprofessionals.

DELIVERY OF SERVICES

The project offered four graduated levels of instruction: N.L.A. (reading); general education (reading and mathematics); Pre-H.S.E.; and H.S.E. Prep (social studies, science, mathematics, reading, and writing). These levels were designed to move students gradually into the monolingual component of Project ASHS, so that they might complete their G.E.D. preparation. Students also received instruction in E.S.L. and in N.L.A. where available. Supplementary services included career and college counseling, career workshops, job placement, and staff and curriculum development.
REPORT FORMAT

This report is organized as follows: Chapter II describes the evaluation methodology; Chapter III reports on the implementation of the program and on the achievement of the implementation objectives; Chapter IV provides an analysis of the student outcome data; and Chapter V offers conclusions and recommendations based upon the results of the evaluation.
II. EVALUATION METHODOLOGY

EVALUATION QUESTIONS

The evaluation assessed two major areas: program implementation and outcomes. Evaluation questions included the following:

Process/Implementation

- Did the project implement instructional activities for developing English language proficiency as proposed?
- Did the project provide bilingual instruction in the content areas necessary to pass the G.E.D. equivalency exam?
- Did the project conduct staff development activities?
- Did the project carry out its proposed curriculum development?
- Did the project provide career counseling and job placement services to help students as needed?

Outcome

- What was the average gain on the Stanford Achievement Test in reading?
- What was the average gain for Spanish-speaking students on La Prueba de Lectura?
- What was the average gain in mathematics achievement on the New York City Arithmetic Computation Test?
- What percentage of participating students were promoted to the High School Equivalency preparation level (H.S.E.-Prep)?
- What percentage of participating students obtained their G.E.D.s?
EVALUATION PROCEDURES

Sample

An OREA field consultant visited three evening program sites. (The consultant selected evening sites since they served the greatest number of students.) He observed four classes and interviewed the project director. OREA provided a student data form for each participating student. The project returned 2,595 completed forms.

Instruments

OREA developed observation and interview schedules for the use of the field consultant. Project personnel used OREA-developed data retrieval forms to report student demographic, attendance, and achievement data.

Data Collection

The field consultant interviewed the project director and observed classes over a four-month period from February to May 1989. OREA distributed student data forms to the program director in April and collected them at the end of June.

Data Analysis

The Stanford Achievement Test and the New York City Arithmetic Computation Test were used to assess improvement in English and mathematics respectively. Since the program used the same level and the same form for both pre- and posttest in each subject, OREA was able to compare raw scores.
To assess the significance of the differences, OREA computed a correlated $t$-test on the pre- and posttest raw scores. The $t$-test determined whether the difference between the pretest and posttest scores was significantly greater than would be expected by chance variation alone.
III. EVALUATION FINDINGS: IMPLEMENTATION

Project ASHS provided instruction in E.S.L., N.L.A., and content area subjects taught bilingually. Its noninstructional component included college and career counseling and placement, extracurricular activities, and staff and curriculum development.

STUDENT PLACEMENT AND PROGRAMMING

To recruit students, the project placed announcements in the media and the Board of Education's "Directory of Adult Education"; canvassed dropout retrieval programs and neighborhoods surrounding each site; distributed flyers; and asked for referrals from other students. The project targeted Spanish-, Haitian Creole-, Chinese-, Italian-, and Greek-speaking students who had scored below the twenty-first percentile on the English version of the Language Assessment Battery (LAB).*

Students took tests to assess their ability in mathematics, English, and native language reading. Staff counseled those students with high scores in English to enter the monolingual English component of ASHS. Those scoring significantly higher on the native language reading test than on the English reading test were placed in instructional E.S.L. classes.

*The Language Assessment Battery (LAB) was developed by the Board of Education of the City of New York to measure the English-language proficiency of non-native speakers of English in order to determine whether they can participate effectively in classes taught in English. Students scoring below the twenty-first percentile on the LAB are entitled to bilingual and E.S.L. services.
INSTRUCTIONAL ACTIVITIES

The project implemented instructional activities in E.S.L., N.L.A., and H.S.E. content area subjects.

**English as a Second Language**

Each school offered three levels of E.S.L. courses: beginning, intermediate, and advanced. This sequence took students through a graduated approach to English language mastery.

**Native Language Arts**

Most schools offered N.L.A. for students whose native language reading proficiency was insufficient (fourth grade or lower) for them to benefit from higher-level bilingual instruction. The first of the four levels of N.L.A. instruction was reading-based, and students proceeded at their own rate.

At Louis D. Brandeis High School, the OREA field consultant observed a Spanish N.L.A. class of 20 students. A paraprofessional was present and walked from desk to desk, asking if students had problems. Readings were in Spanish and came from the Multiple Skills Series. Students read different stories according to their reading level and answered the questions at the end of the selections. The teacher stopped the reading assignment to put a spelling exercise on the board. She asked the students to pick the correctly spelled word from each pair of words and use it in a sentence.
High School Equivalency Instruction

The project provided three levels of bilingual education designed to facilitate the student's entry into the monolingual Project ASHS program and to pass the G.E.D. exam. These levels were general education (reading and mathematics), pre-H.S.E., and H.S.E. Preparation.

At J.H.S. 10, the OREA field consultant observed a general education class in Chinese. The teacher began by handing out a mimeographed sheet with three poems written in both Chinese and English. The paraprofessional passed out other materials as needed. The first poem, "Climbing the Pavilion of Stork," had references to important geographic areas in China. Reading line-by-line, the teacher translated the poem into English. He frequently paused to give historical background and explain the meaning of each line. After reviewing vocabulary, he moved to the next poem, by Li Po, "Drinking with a Friend Among the Mountains." The teacher spoke about Li Po's life and explained the nature of friendship in ninth century China. He then read the poem in English. After discussing the third poem, "Night Thoughts," the class ended with the paraprofessional leading a recitation of the poems in English.

At Louis D. Brandeis High School, the consultant observed an H.S.E.-Prep class in Spanish. Students in this class were preparing to take the Spanish H.S.E. exam. The teacher asked students to read questions referring to a graph on population growth in four American cities. Each student answered one
question; if wrong, the teacher prompted the student and restated the question. If correct, the teacher referred to the graph and reviewed the answer. The teacher discussed how their studies related to the G.E.D. exam.

The teacher then moved to the mathematics section of the exam. He discussed different kinds of numbers, gave examples, and initiated a question-and-answer period on addition, subtraction, division, and multiplication. He placed problems on the board, giving students time to solve them.

At J.H.S. 10, the consultant observed an H.S.E. Prep class in Greek. The teacher began with a discussion of American history and asked questions from the text about taxation without representation. The teacher had written a paragraph in Greek on the board, summarizing some of the main events leading to the American Revolution. Key words were left out, and a student went to the board to fill them in. The class corrected any mistakes. The teacher then read a list of true/false questions concerning the passage; students responded in unison. Next, he wrote vocabulary words on the chalkboard in Greek and asked the class to supply the English equivalents.

NONINSTRUCTIONAL ACTIVITIES

The project carried out noninstructional activities in counseling and placement as well as in staff and curriculum development. It proposed noninstructional objectives in staff and curriculum development.
Counseling and Placement

To meet the need for flexibility in addressing students' time constraints, students were assigned to one teacher. Studying time for each subject was determined for the student individually and recorded in a folder known as the "Personal Learning Schedule." Students could then proceed at their own pace through a course of study, attending at times convenient to them, and even allowing for occasional leaves of absence. A course syllabus, known as the "Check-Off Sheet," showed the topics covered in each subject and the proportion of time to be spent in native language and English language activities.

Teachers and educational advisors/counselors cooperated to meet the students' need for personal attention. Bilingual advisors helped students register in the program; plan for future jobs, training programs, or college; and offered referral advice on personal problems. Counselors also provided guidance for students whose goal of obtaining a G.E.D. diploma was not immediately realistic.

The counseling component synchronized all instructional services received by the students. Through periodic individual conferences between students and teachers, progress in each instructional component was evaluated, and a projected completion date was determined. This structuring also enabled students to become accustomed to setting and meeting goals.

The project also developed career guidance workshops designed to help educate students about access to job markets.
Staff Development

The program objectives for staff development were:

- At least 20 staff members will take advantage of the opportunity to enroll in university courses for professional improvement, leading to associate's, bachelor's, or master's degrees in some relevant field of education.

- Through the intensive and extensive training plan proposed, the program will, by the end of the funding cycle, have identified and trained sufficient staff members to provide every center with an "in-house" resource specialist, available to that center's staff.

Staff development activities were both internal and external. Internal training included supervision and observation by project administrators, conferences, workshops, and curriculum development committees. External training consisted of university courses, professional conferences, and workshops.

Twenty-seven staff members enrolled in university courses leading to a higher degree in an area relevant to bilingual education. The project met its first staff development objective.

Two new staff members received the training necessary to provide their centers with an in-house resource specialist. Each of the 15 sites had a resource specialist of its own. Project ASHS met its second staff development objective.

Curriculum Development

The program objectives for curriculum development were that by the end of the funding cycle:

- A new E.S.L. curriculum will have been developed, field tested, and fully implemented throughout all levels in all 15 centers in order to achieve a degree of
uniformity in E.S.L. structure, content, and instruction.

- A minimum of 20 lessons and/or activities for individualized instruction in reading and writing skills for Chinese-, Spanish-, Italian-, Greek-, and Haitian Creole-speaking students will have been developed.
- Writing skills development will have been introduced into the syllabi at all four instructional levels to enable students to demonstrate proficiency in this new requirement of the equivalency diploma.
- The program will have developed an English language curriculum to supplement the native language syllabi. The supplement will comprise basic English vocabulary and English language subject materials appropriate to the students' English skills. As a result, students will receive exposure to the English equivalent concepts, originally introduced in the native language to teach G.E.D. subject areas.
- Survival skills topics such as consumer education, parenting skills, etc., will be incorporated into the E.S.L. syllabi.

Project ASHS developed, field tested, and implemented a new E.S.L. curriculum. It therefore met its first curriculum development objective.

The project developed, field tested, and implemented a minimum of 20 lessons and/or activities for individualized instruction in reading and writing skills for the Chinese-, Spanish-, and Greek-speaking students. It developed, but had not yet field tested or implemented, the lessons and/or activities for Italian- and Haitian Creole-speaking students. The project partially met its second curriculum development objective.

Project personnel developed, field tested, and implemented a supplement to the preparation syllabus for the G.E.D. exam. This curriculum, introduced at all four levels of instruction, was
designed to upgrade students' writing skills to the level required to meet newly formulated standards for the diploma. Project ASHS met the third curriculum development objective.

The program developed an English language curriculum to supplement the native language syllabi. It therefore met its fourth curriculum objective.

Project ASHS developed, and was in the process of incorporating into the E.S.L. syllabi, survival skills topics, such as consumer education and parenting skills. The project met its fifth objective in curriculum development.

Of the five objectives for curriculum development, Project ASHS fully achieved four and partially met one.
IV. EVALUATION FINDINGS: OUTCOME

INSTRUCTIONAL ACTIVITIES

The project proposed instructional objectives in E.S.L., N.L.A., and content area subjects.

English as a Second Language

The evaluation objective for English language development was:

- As a result of participating in the program a minimum of six months, at least 60 percent of the students enrolled in E.S.L. will have been promoted one level of E.S.L. instruction, based on successful completion of an E.S.L. syllabus of writing, listening, speaking, and reading activities.

- After at least six months in the program, 75 percent of those students designated as advanced E.S.L. students (capable of taking a standardized English reading test) will significantly increase their level of reading comprehension and ability in English, as measured by the Stanford Achievement Test.

According to the data the project provided, 982 students attended the program for six months or longer and had complete data on initial and current E.S.L. placement. Among them, 345 students (35 percent) were promoted at least one E.S.L. instructional level. The program did not meet its first E.S.L. objective.

OREA compared the difference in mean raw scores between the pretest (fall 1988) and the posttest (spring 1989). OREA computed the statistical significance of this difference by using a correlated t-test. Program students made significant gains on both levels of the Stanford Achievement Test. The percentage of
students making gains also exceeded the objective criterion of 75 percent. (See Table 1.) The program met the second E.S.L. objective.

Native Language Arts

The evaluation objective for native language development in Spanish was:

- As a result of participating in the program, students will show significant gains in Spanish reading achievement as measured by La Prueba de Lectura.

OREA could not evaluate this objective because of the lack of necessary data.

Arithmetic Proficiency

The evaluation objective for arithmetic proficiency was:

- At least 80 percent of the students receiving individualized arithmetic instruction will significantly increase their level of arithmetic ability, as measured by the New York City Arithmetic Computation Test.

At least 95 percent of students receiving individualized arithmetic instruction significantly increased their level of arithmetic ability. The mean difference between pretest and posttest scores on the New York City Arithmetic Computation Test was 6.7 points. (See Table 2.) A correlated t-test showed that this was a statistically significant ($p<.05$) gain. Students in all language groups showed significant gains. Project ASHS met the content area objective.
TABLE 1

Pretest/Posttest Raw Score Differences on the Stanford Achievement Test, by Test Level

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Test Level</th>
<th>Number of Students</th>
<th>Pretest Mean</th>
<th>Pretest S.D.</th>
<th>Posttest Mean</th>
<th>Posttest S.D.</th>
<th>Difference Mean</th>
<th>Difference S.D.</th>
<th>t-Value</th>
<th>Percentage of Students Making Gains</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>20.3</td>
<td>23.0</td>
<td>28.5</td>
<td>24.8</td>
<td>8.2</td>
<td>6.4</td>
<td>8.56*</td>
<td>83.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1⅔</td>
<td>399</td>
<td>34.2</td>
<td>19.7</td>
<td>46.4</td>
<td>20.7</td>
<td>12.2</td>
<td>12.4</td>
<td>19.66*</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*p<.05

- Program students made significant gains on both levels of the Stanford Achievement Test.
TABLE 2

Mean Pretest/Posttest Differences on the New York City Arithmetic Computation Test

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Language Group Gains</th>
<th>Number of Students</th>
<th>Pretest Mean</th>
<th>S.D.</th>
<th>Posttest Mean</th>
<th>S.D.</th>
<th>Difference Mean</th>
<th>S.D.</th>
<th>t Value</th>
<th>Percentage of Students Making</th>
<th>p&lt;.05</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Chinese</td>
<td>150</td>
<td>18.0</td>
<td>4.8</td>
<td>25.2</td>
<td>7.5</td>
<td>7.2</td>
<td>6.3</td>
<td>13.94*</td>
<td>97</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Greek</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>20.1</td>
<td>6.4</td>
<td>24.0</td>
<td>5.8</td>
<td>3.8</td>
<td>1.9</td>
<td>9.87*</td>
<td>100</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Haitian Creole</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>19.8</td>
<td>6.4</td>
<td>24.2</td>
<td>6.9</td>
<td>4.4</td>
<td>1.8</td>
<td>7.57*</td>
<td>100</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spanish</td>
<td>237</td>
<td>6.5</td>
<td>4.8</td>
<td>13.3</td>
<td>6.8</td>
<td>6.8</td>
<td>5.9</td>
<td>17.63*</td>
<td>95</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>17.6</td>
<td>6.3</td>
<td>25.1</td>
<td>5.7</td>
<td>7.5</td>
<td>4.8</td>
<td>5.64*</td>
<td>100</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>434</td>
<td>118.9</td>
<td>7.7</td>
<td>18.6</td>
<td>9.1</td>
<td>6.7</td>
<td>5.9</td>
<td>23.89*</td>
<td>96</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*p<.05

At least 95 percent of the students in each language group made statistically significant gains in the New York City Arithmetic Computation Test.
High School Equivalency Instruction

The evaluation objectives for high school equivalency instruction were:

- After at least eight months in the program, at least 60 percent of the N.L.A. students on the first level of H.S.E. studies will be promoted to the General Education level on the basis of having satisfactorily completed the N.L.A. syllabus.

- After at least six months in a day center or nine months in an evening center, at least 75 percent of the students at the General Education level will be promoted to the Pre-H.S.E. level based on passing a criterion-referenced test developed for that level.

- After at least six months in a day center or nine months in an evening center, at least 70 percent of the students at the Pre-H.S.E. level will be promoted to the H.S.E. Prep level.

- At least 80 percent of the students at the H.S.E. Prep level will obtain their G.E.D.s, having passed the five academic subtests and the English language skills subtest on the examination.

- At least 80 percent of the students at the H.S.E. Prep level will obtain their G.E.D.s, having passed the five academic subtests and the English language skills subtest on the examination.

According to the data the project provided, 113 of the 166 N.L.A. students (68 percent) were promoted to a higher level after eight months or longer in the program. The project met the first high school equivalency instructional objective.

Of the 348 students who were initially at the General Education level and who had attended a day program for at least six months or an evening program for at least nine months, only 145 students (42 percent) were promoted to a higher level. Therefore, the program did not meet the second high school equivalency instructional objective.
Sixty-four percent of the 127 students who were at the Pre-H.S.E. level and who had attended the program for at least six months at a day center or nine months at an evening center were promoted to the H.S.E.-Preparation level. This was under the 75 percent proposed, and the program did not meet the third high school equivalency instructional objective.

According to the data provided, 407 students were initially at the H.S.E. Prep level. Of this number 239 (59 percent) were discharged, and 168 (41 percent) remained in the program. Of the 239 students who were discharged, 52 students (22 percent) passed the G.E.D. Of the 168 students who were still in the program, only 41 took the test. The project, therefore, did not meet the fourth high school equivalency instructional objective.

NONINSTRUCTIONAL ACTIVITIES

The program posed noninstructional outcome objectives for referral and career education workshops.

Referral

The program objective for referral was:

- As a result of having obtained their high school equivalency diploma with the program, at least 70 percent will be referred to college, training programs, or employment sources.

According to the data provided, 431 students either passed the G.E.D. or graduated. Among them, 414 students (96 percent) planned to enter college, training programs, or the work force. The program met the referral objective.
Career Education Workshops

The program objective for career education workshops was:

- All students will attend career education workshops, conducted in the native language and in English. As a result, at least 70 percent of the students attending five or more workshops will increase their level of awareness in career opportunities and the various factors that should be considered in choosing any career, as measured by pre- and posttesting in a test to be developed by the project.

Project ASHS did not submit data for OREA to assess this objective.
V. CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATION

The bilingual component of Project ASHS was in its fourth year of operation. The project provided day and evening classes at 15 sites throughout the five boroughs to LEP speakers of Spanish, Chinese, Haitian Creole, Greek, and Italian. Spanish speaking students were the largest group served; the Greek-speaking group continued to be the smallest. Bilingual instruction in Italian was discontinued because the Italian-speaking population had decreased, and only one site (Staten Island) served that population. Italian-speaking students focused on E.S.L. instead.

Addressing the needs of older students returning to school to complete their High School Equivalency diplomas, Project ASHS programmed LEP students into a graduated series of E.S.L., N.L.A., and H.S.E. content area courses necessary to pass the G.E.D. exam. The project also provided counseling and referral services, career workshops, staff and curriculum development.

The project met its staff development objectives, as staff members enrolled in courses leading to college degrees and enough staff were trained so that every site could have a resource specialist. It met four of its five curriculum development objectives and partially met the fifth. It developed, field tested, and implemented a new E.S.L. curriculum and a supplement to the preparation syllabus for the G.E.D. exam. The project developed an English language curriculum to supplement the native language syllabi and developed and was incorporating into the
E.S.L. syllabi survival skills topics. It developed, field tested, and implemented at least 20 lessons and/or activities for individualized instruction in reading and writing skills for Chinese-, Spanish-, and Greek-speaking students. It developed, but had not yet implemented, lessons and activities for Italian- and Haitian Creole-speaking students.

Since less than 60 percent of students enrolled in E.S.L. were promoted one level of E.S.L. instruction, Project ASHS failed to meet one E.S.L. objective. However, over 75 percent of advanced E.S.L. students significantly increased their ability in English, as measured by the Stanford Test, allowing the program to achieve the second E.S.L. objective. OREA was unable to assess the N.L.A. objective since the project failed to provide data on student performance on La Prueba de Lectura. At least 95 percent of students in each language group made significant gains on the New York City Arithmetic Computation Test. Project ASHS met the arithmetic proficiency objective.

The project met one of the four high school equivalency instructional objectives. While at least 60 percent of N.L.A. students on the first level of H.S.E. studies were promoted to the General Education level, less than 75 percent of the students at the General Education level were promoted to the Pre-H.S.E. level, less than 70 percent of the Pre-H.S.E. students were promoted to the H.S.E. Prep level, and less than 80 percent of the H.S.E. Prep students obtained their G.E.D.s.
Project ASHS met the referral objective. Ninety-six percent of students who had obtained their high school equivalency diploma planned to enter college, training programs, or the workforce. OREA was unable to determine whether the project met the career education workshop objective because of a lack of appropriate data.

Project ASHS tracked students' interests and their courses of study through checklists maintained and updated by the staff. The project's strengths were in its individual programming and counseling.

The conclusions, based on the results of this evaluation, lead to the following recommendation:

- Make greater efforts to recruit Greek-speaking students by publicizing the program in Greek newspapers and magazines, Greek social clubs, and the church.