

Rowan University

Rowan Digital Works

Theses and Dissertations

5-31-1999

A risky business: a study of retention

Sue H. Kinsey
Rowan University

Follow this and additional works at: <https://rdw.rowan.edu/etd>



Part of the [Educational Leadership Commons](#)

Recommended Citation

Kinsey, Sue H., "A risky business: a study of retention" (1999). *Theses and Dissertations*. 1831.
<https://rdw.rowan.edu/etd/1831>

This Thesis is brought to you for free and open access by Rowan Digital Works. It has been accepted for inclusion in Theses and Dissertations by an authorized administrator of Rowan Digital Works. For more information, please contact graduateresearch@rowan.edu.

A RISKY BUSINESS: A STUDY OF RETENTION

by
Sue H. Kinsey

A Thesis

Submitted in partial fulfillment of the requirements of the
Master of Arts Degree
of
The Graduate School
at
Rowan University
May 1999

Approved by _____
Professor

Date Approved May 1999

ABSTRACT

Sue H. Kinsey
A Risky Business: A Study of Retention
1999
Dr. Ronald Capasso
Educational Leadership

The purpose of the study was to describe and evaluate the effectiveness of an intervention program of remediation and academic mentoring on the academic success of students failing grade seven who were placed in grade eight. The study was conducted in the Clearview Regional Middle School during the summer preceding and including the 1998-99 academic year.

Data was gathered from test scores, mid-marking period progress reports, marking period grade reports, summer session teacher reports and interviews, and weekly and monthly classroom teacher reports. Information was also provided through parent, teacher, and student questionnaires. The data was analyzed using percentiles to determine the effectiveness of the program. Progress reports and marking period grade reports supported by weekly and monthly reports were analyzed to determine the extent of academic success both in points and percentiles of increase/decrease.

At the conclusion of the study the academic success of most of the students was evident. With few exceptions students increased grade averages over their grade seven final averages. Parents, teachers, and students affirmed the success of the program though some changes were implicated.

MINI -ABSTRACT

Sue H. Kinsey

A Risky Business: A Study of Retention

1999

Dr. Ronald Capasso, Educational Leadership

The purpose of the study was to describe and evaluate the effectiveness of a program of remediation and mentoring on the academic success of students failing grade seven who were placed in grade eight. Through the analysis of surveys, interviews, and material culture, it was determined that the program was effective.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

First, I wish to thank Mr. David G. Kelk, assistant principal at Clearview Regional Middle School, for his advice, assistance, and sponsorship as my mentor during the internship and throughout my program of graduate studies. His support and guidance were invaluable in setting me on this course and in following it through to completion.

Second, I would like to thank Dr. Ronald Capasso for his assistance and guidance throughout the internship. His leadership served as a model of educational professionalism.

Third, I wish to thank my family for their support, patience, and understanding during the course of my graduate program. Their cooperation and assistance helped me reach my educational goal.

Finally, I would like to thank the superintendent, Mr. Michael Toscano, the principal, Mr. Charles Bishop, and the Community Adult School director, Mr. Greg Amiriantz, for their advice, guidance, and assistance during my internship. I also wish to thank the several staff members at Clearview Regional Middle School who assisted me in various ways throughout the graduate experience.

Table of Contents

	Page
Acknowledgements.....	ii
List of Tables	v
Chapter 1 Introduction.....	1
Focus of the Study.....	1
Purpose of the Study.....	1
Definitions.....	2
Limitations of the Study.....	2
Setting of the Study.....	3
The School District.....	4
Significance of the Study.....	6
Organization of the Study.....	6
Chapter 2 Review of Literature.....	8
Definition of Retention.....	8
Definition of At-Risk Students.....	8
History of Retention.....	9
Rationales for Retention.....	9
Current Statistics.....	10
Current Research.....	10
Reasons for Retention.....	12

Effects of Retention.....	13
Cost of Retention.....	14
Beliefs About Retention.....	14
Alternatives to Retention.....	16
Chapter 3 Design of the Study.....	19
General Description.....	19
Development and Design of Instrumentation.....	19
Sample and Sampling Techniques.....	21
Data Collection Approach.....	22
Data Analysis.....	22
Chapter 4 Presentation of the Research Findings.....	25
Conceptualization of the Program.....	25
Program Goals and Objectives.....	25
Participation and Process.....	26
Implementation of the Summer Program.....	26
The Mentoring Program.....	32
Chapter 5 Conclusions, Implications, and Further Study.....	51
Conclusions.....	51
Implications.....	52
Organizational Change.....	54
Further Study.....	54
References	56
Appendix	61
Biographical Data.....	79

List of Tables

	Page
Table 1 Stanford Diagnostic Test.....	29
Table 2 Math Diagnostic Test.....	30
Table 3 Student Marking Period Grades.....	40
Table 4 Subject Grade Averages.....	43
Table 5 Student Mid-Marking Period Progress Reports.....	46

Chapter 1

Introduction

Focus of the Study

An innovative response to the problem of retention is being implemented at Clearview Regional Middle School. This alternative program provides a summer school session for students failing grade seven in which skills remediation occurs as well as instructional support to improve the student's work ethic and attitude toward school. The student's placement in grade eight is supported by an academic mentoring program designed to provide additional instructional support and to monitor the student's progress.

This study will focus on an examination of this alternative program. The summer session and the academic mentoring program will be described. Students' performance will be followed and documented as they progress through the year. Students, their parents, and teachers involved in the program will be surveyed and interviewed to provide data for the study project.

Purpose of the Study

The intern wishes to determine the effectiveness of this remedial and academic mentoring program developed and implemented in lieu of retention of seventh grade students. The study will describe and evaluate the program through an examination of student performance as a result of the summer school session and progress through the mentoring program. Using an action research design performance data will be reported

from weekly and monthly evaluations, mid marking period progress reports, and marking period grade reports.

Definitions

The criteria used for evaluation was largely developed from recommendations of the summer session teachers. To clarify these terms and recommendations several terms need definition. “Support” and “back-up” were defined by the summer teachers as guidance provided by assigned adult mentors directed toward the improvement of work quality. “Monitoring” refers to the function of these mentors of checking completion of student work as well as frequent progress assessment. Student performance demonstrating organizational skills and consistent effort is noted as “work ethic”.

Limitations of the Study

This study will examine the academic progress of students identified as failing grade seven who have completed a remedial four week summer session. These students have been placed in an academic mentoring program in grade eight in lieu of retention in grade seven. The project will examine the academic progress of the sample population based upon weekly and monthly progress evaluations, mid-marking period progress reports, and marking period grades. Participants’, teachers’, and parents’ responses to survey questionnaires will create a picture of that progress and provide information with which to evaluate the program.

This study will report results of innovations used in this district at the middle school level which may not be applicable to other districts or other levels within this district due to variables of teacher personalities, criteria used in assigning grades, the grading scale, or unanticipated circumstances. However, it will report the effects of these innovations on student achievement in this particular program as it unfolds.

Setting of the Study

This project will take place in a rapidly developing community made up of two adjacent municipalities, Mantua and Harrison Townships. Located approximately 11 miles south of Camden, New Jersey, Mantua Township is situated in the center of Gloucester County. It covers more than 19 square miles and includes the towns of Barnsboro, Centre City, Mantua, and Sewell. To the north it is bordered by West Deptford and Greenwich Townships; to the east by Washington and Deptford Townships and the Borough of Wenonah; to the south by the Borough of Pitman and part of the Borough of Glassboro; to the southwest by Harrison Township; and to the west by East Greenwich Township (Wrotney, 1976).

The population of Mantua Township was reported as 10,074 persons in the 1990 census, a 9.6% increase since the 1980 report. This population was comprised of 3.3% minorities predominately African American (Beineman, 1998). Persons under the age of five made up 7.1%, 18.1% by persons between age five and seventeen; 64.3% between age eighteen and sixty-four; and 10.5% age sixty-four or older (Beineman, 1998). The median family income reported was \$45,411 (Hamer, 1995). From 1987 to 1995, 1,572 building permits were issued (Beineman, 1998; Hamer, 1995). Enrollment projections predict an increase of 272 students in the grades K-6 population by the year 2006-07 (Beineman, 1998).

Harrison Township shares a border with Mantua Township in the northeast. It is located south of East Greenwich Township, east of Woolwich Township, north of South Harrison and Elk Townships, and west of the Borough of Glassboro (Hearnes Brothers, 1988).

The population of Harrison Township was reported as 4,715 persons in the 1990 census, an increase of 31.5% since 1980 (Gloucester County Planning Department, 1993). This population was comprised of 5.9% minorities predominately African America (Beineman, 1998).

The median family income reported by the 1990 census was \$51,511. From 1978 to 1996, 1,750 building permits were issued (Beineman, 1998; Hamer, 1995). Enrollment projections predict an increase in the grades K - 6 population of 413 students by the year 2006-07 (Beineman, 1998).

The community is very supportive of education. In the last ten years the budget has been approved each year with one exception. In April, 1994, the budget was voted down as a result of a community vote not to approve the elementary district budget. This vote fell over into the regional district (Crispin, 1998).

The School District

Each municipality runs a separate preK-6 grade elementary district. In Mantua Township grades K-4 are housed in the J. Mason Tomlin and Sewell Schools. The Centre City School also services grades K-4, the preschool handicapped class and all grades five and six. Harrison Township School contains all grades K-6 in one school. Construction of a new building to house grades five and six is in the planning stages (Beineman, 1998).

Grades seven to twelve are accommodated by the Clearview Regional High School district supported by both townships. The campus contains two separate buildings. The senior high school built in 1960 originally held grades seven to twelve. Increased enrollments resulted in the construction in 1968 of the second building to house grades seven, eight, and nine. This junior high school became a middle school servicing grades seven and eight in 1996. The high school now houses grades nine to twelve. Expansion

of the high school facility was completed in 1997.

Continued population growth and projected increases in enrollment predict numbers in excess of building capacities within the next ten years. By the year 2006-07 projected enrollments of 1606 and 1464 for Mantua and Harrison Townships respectively will impact the regional facilities (Beineman, 1998).

This study will take place in the Clearview Regional Middle School. Enrollment figures for 1996-97 show 246 students in grade eight and 258 students in grade seven (1996-97 School Report Card). Current figures reported to the state show 250 students in grade eight and 272 students in grade seven (Clearview Regional Middle School ASSA Report, 1998). The building is staffed by a principal, an assistant principal, two counselors, 44 full time teachers, three part time teachers, three instructional aides, one nurse, and three full time and one part time secretarial staff.

Instruction is delivered by four core subject teams, two in grade seven and two in grade eight. Core instruction includes language arts, mathematics, science, and social studies, and a study skills/reading course.. In grade seven students rotate through seven cycles of exploratory courses such as cooking, sewing, music, art, computer literacy, technology education, choir, and band. Grade eight students may choose full year electives in band, choir, foreign languages or success in language, or quarter courses in art, music, cooking, sewing, technology education, or conflict and tolerance. Both grades also receive instruction in health and physical education.

Criteria for promotion to the next grade require a final grade of 70 or better in all but one subject. Grades below 70 in two or more subjects constitute grade level failure. This study will document the progress of grade seven students who failed two or more courses who were placed in grade eight in lieu of retention. This placement was

conditional to attendance in a summer session followed by a mentoring program during the grade eight year. Twenty-two students were identified and placed in this program. Their progress and the development of this program will be documented.

Significance of the Study

This study will make a contribution to scholarly research and scholarly literature by furnishing a documented example of an alternative program to retention policies. It will report on student progress through the program, describe the program development as it occurs, and measure its effectiveness. Through its evaluation problems and solutions will be reported as well as recommendations for further implementation. Problems not resolved through development will also be recorded.

Students will be able to evaluate their own progress through instruments developed in this study. Parents will receive detailed reports of their child's progress more often. Teachers involved will gain a better understanding of the individual need of each student. Through participation and involvement, these teachers will see first-hand how a research based program performs.

Organization of the Study

The literature on retention and alternative strategies is examined in Chapter 2. In this chapter the implementation of, rationales for, and beliefs about retention are discussed. Current research studies and statistics on retention and its effects are also reported. Concluding the chapter research based interventions and alternatives are presented.

Chapter 3 describes the study population selection and instrumentation used to gather data from the students, parents, and teachers. Participants, teachers, and parents provided information through survey questionnaires and interviews. Additional data was

available from student evaluations which measured progress.

In Chapter 4 the sample population is described in more detail through a description of the summer session program. The mentoring program, its implementation and development, is also reported. Student progress was measured by periodic teacher evaluations, marking period progress reports, and marking period grade reports. Program effectiveness is addressed through student progress measures, student reactions to the program, as well as parent and teacher reactions and opinions.

The effectiveness of the program is determined in Chapter 5. Needed modifications of the program and issues of program expansion are addressed. Implications for further study of the program are also discussed.

Chapter 2

A Review of Literature

An alarm was sounded over twenty-five years ago. No reliable evidence existed at that time to indicate retention in grade results in better achievement than promotion (Jackson, 1975). Since that time many studies have been done on various aspects of the retention question, some with seemingly conflicting conclusions.

Definition of Retention

Retention is synonymous with terms such as “failure,” “flunking,” and “non promotion” (Balow and Schwager, 1990; Holmes and Matthews, 1984). In actual practice it has many forms. Generally speaking retention means repeating a grade. Recycling is a form of retention in which students repeat the same grade without additional resources or special programs. Retention is used as an alternative after failure when students repeat the same grade but receive some form of additional help or special program. Transitional programs are also a form of retention. Here the student is placed in another year program with some change or modification to instruction (Karweit, 1991; Shepard, 1989). Another variety is partial promotion in which the promoted student must repeat some courses from the previous year (Karweit, 1991).

Definition of At-Risk Students

Children who receive, or are in danger of receiving, this treatment are usually labeled “at-risk.” The “at-risk” student is one who may fail a course, be retained in grade, drop out of school, be abused mentally or physically, use drugs, threaten or attempt suicide

(Frymier and Gansneder, 1989). Often they are “slow learners.” Slow learners make up 22% of the general population (Johns, 1990). At-risk students have been described as those who do not have adequate skills with which to complete their education (Slavin and Madden, 1989).

History of Retention

In the 1840’s graded schools appeared in America. Schools now expected students to master a certain curriculum in a specified amount of time. Problems developed in the schools if students did not reach these standards, so standards for promotion and retention were created (Balow and Schwager, 1989). During this period as many as 70% of all students were retained. By the 1900’s percentages started dropping. In Iowa each year 50% were retained. By the 1930’s Iowa’s rate decreased to 25%. By the 1960’s social promotion practices further reduced the rate to 10% (Balow and Schwager, 1990; Karweit, 1991).

Following the publication of A Nation At Risk in 1983, the reform movement increased the emphasis on standards. State mandated promotion standards and graduation requirements are causing retention rates to increase as much as 7% each year (Karweit, 1991).

Rationales for Retention

The use of retention practices is based on several rationales. One assumes that curricula are appropriate for all learners in a grade level (Balow and Schwager, 1990). “When the curriculum is taken for granted as correct, the child who does not keep pace is labeled as a failure” (Smith and Shepard, 1987, p.132). Differences in grade levels are large. Students are blamed if they do not master the curriculum according to a set of standards. Another assumes students only need more time to learn. Retention, as the

treatment, would be less traumatic than falling farther behind if promoted (Balow and Schwager, 1990).

Current Statistics

Currently actual retention statistics are difficult to determine since no national records contain them. Therefore, researchers have been forced to estimate these figures based upon relative factors in census information and deduction. According to Gottfredson (1988), more than 20% of the students were retained in first grade alone. In Florida 6% of kindergarten students were retained in 1985, 12% (17,107) in 1988, and 19,016 in 1989. It is believed that 2.6 million children are retained in the U.S. each year and that this figure increases by 20% each year (Sherwood, 1993). Some have estimated that 5-7%, or one in fifteen students, were retained annually (Shepard and Smith, 1990). Others made estimates of 15-19% (Darling-Hammond and Falk, 1995). Urban areas are especially significant where 50% of the students are retained at least once (Gottfredson, 1988; Karweit, 1992; Slavin, Madden, Dolan, Wasik, Ross, and Smith, 1994; Shepard and Smith, 1990). Specific populations are highly affected. It has been predicted that one in two students will be retained by the end of third grade (Karweit, 1991). In Texas 37% of the migrant student population have been retained (Texas Education Agency [TEA], 1987). Retention rates increasing annually create concern.

Current Research

A meta-analysis of 44 studies of the effects of retention on elementary and junior high school students which compared retained students with promoted students. Five areas were measured: academic achievement, personal adjustment, self-concept, attitude toward school, and attendance. The promoted students performed higher than the retained students in each area, the highest in academic achievement (.44 standard

deviation) and personal adjustment (.27 standard deviation)(Holmes and Matthews, 1984). A later expansion of this study included 63 studies. Again using meta-analysis, it was found that in 54 of them retention produced .15 standard deviation lower than promoted groups. Retention in the upper elementary grades results were more negative than in the lower grades. Academic achievement was the area with the largest negative effect (.4 standard deviation). The other areas previously mentioned were measured in 50 of these studies, all resulting in negative effect sizes. When 25 matched studies were examined, the negative effect increased to .3 standard deviation (Holmes, 1989).

Gredler reviewed studies in 1984 also. He concluded that kindergarten retention was ineffective. Lorrie Shepard reviewed these studies again in 1989 and included 15 new empirical studies. Her review concurred with Gredler's original findings.

Shepard and Smith conducted their own research and concluded that kindergarten retention does not improve achievement, produced no difference or harm on social/emotional factors, does not benefit slow learners nor immature learners. Its effects are no different than those of later retentions (1987, 1989). An eight year longitudinal study was conducted in Michigan. The results showed that males were retained twice as often as females, and these males were more likely assigned to special education. No long-term benefit of retention nor achievement differences were found. Promoted students outperformed similar retained students, and this higher performance continued over time (Delidow, 1988).

A study of 243 matched students was conducted over a five year period. In this study retainees gained some, but the promoted group outperformed them raising their reading grade equivalent .75. These differences widened over time (Baenen,1989).

These, and many other studies like them, attest to the inefficiency of retention as a solution to low achievement problems in most cases. There have been positive results shown by some studies, but only in limited situations. As early as 1979 it was found that only three students in ten gain by retention (Koons, 1979). A study where retention was combined with specific instructional goals or a specially designed program using individual instruction plans showed positive gains for retained students (Peterson, DeGracie, and Ayabe, 1987). Holmes found seven studies in his second meta-analysis with positive gains claimed, but the positive effects diminished within two to three years (1989). This finding was later supported by another researcher because the bases of comparison were identified making the results more valid (Karweit, 1991).

Another negative aspect of retention is seen in its correlation with dropout rates. In a California study dropouts were reported five times more likely to have been retained than students who graduated. This correlation increased to 100% when the student was retained twice (Center for Policy Research in Education [CPRE], 1990; Association of California Urban School Districts, 1985, as cited in Shepard and Smith, 1990). Retained students are 2.7 times more likely to drop out. Most first and second grade repeaters do not graduate from high school (Baenen, 1988). Others agree that 20-30% of retained students are more likely to drop out. They also say that the figure for African-American males rises to 75% (Grissom and Shepard, 1989).

Reasons for Retention

Who are these kids and why are they being retained? Students are retained for several reasons. Low achievement and immaturity (American Federation of Teachers [AFT], 1997; Karweit, 1991), absenteeism, poor curriculum, poor educational practices, and lack of motivation are usually mentioned (AFT, 1997). As the research is reviewed a

profile of a retained student emerges. He is usually male, younger than his classmates, African-American or Hispanic, a behavior problem, immature, economically disadvantaged, unmotivated, has low self-esteem, and has a poor self-concept as a learner (Byrnes, 1989; Byrnes and Yamamoto, 1986; Delidow, 1989; Karweit, 1991; Slavin, 1991). Reasons for failure vary. They may be based on reading skill deficits (Slavin, 1991), physical, social, or emotional maturity (AFT, 1997), marks and standardized test scores (Cadigan, Entwisle, Alexander, and Pallas, 1988). Specifically in middle schools, failure is the result of failing core subjects, though each school differs in its policies (AFT). Since this paper will focus on middle school retention alternatives, specific statistics are relevant.

Most middle schools base failure upon various criteria. Fifty-eight per cent are based on teacher assigned grades and 45.9% on teacher recommendations. Other factors evaluated are social/emotional adjustment (39.5%), standardized test scores (35.3%), and attendance (27.1%) (AFT, 1997). The actual decisions to retain are made by principals, teachers, parents, or in combination with each other and other support personnel (AFT).

Effects of Retention

Generally the research reports the effects of retention on children as negative ones. Holmes and Matthews measured negative effects on both academic and social/emotional outcomes in 1984. Children perceive failure as punishment, demeaning, and a stigma (Byrnes and Yamamoto, 1985; CPRE, 1990; Slavin, 1991). When interviewed 87% of the children said they feel “bad, sad, upset, or embarrassed” (Byrnes, 1989; CPRE). In another study it was reported that children considered retention as bad as wetting in class or being caught stealing. Only losing a parent or blindness were considered worse (Yamamoto, 1980). The same opinions were obtained in a later study of post high school

students where the same view was held by 95% of those students (Berliner, 1986).

Other effects include increased risk for dropping out of school (AFT, 1997; CPRE, 1990; Hill, 1989; National Association of School Psychologists, 1988), segregation and stratification creating barriers for the disadvantaged (Smith and Shepard, 1987), alienation from school, emotional and behavioral problems (AFT, 1997), and cost.

Cost of Retention

The evidence of the inefficacy of retention in solving the low achievement problem is pervasive. Is its continued use, then, based on economical reasons? Are retention practices cheaper than the alternatives? Researchers investigating this question state that retention increases the cost of educating a child by eight per cent (Smith and Shepard, 1987). If 2.4 million students are being retained the cost amounts to \$10 billion each year for one extra year of education (CPRE, 1990). Not only taxpayers, but each retained child pays with one year of his/her life (Smith and Shepard, 1987). Alternatives such as summer school are more economical, \$1300 per student as compared to \$4051 per student for retention (CPRE).

Beliefs about Retention

Why, then, do 74% of the principals, 65% of the teachers, and 59% of the parents still think that retention is usually or always the best treatment (Byrnes and Yamamoto, 1986)? The explanation may be philosophical as well as political and bureaucratic. As a solution it is easier to implement in the present school structure (Byrnes, 1989). It is the logical answer to competency-based education (Holmes, 1989). It is a quick fix for an unsatisfied public, but, more importantly, it is an entrenched traditional belief (Byrnes).

Teachers subscribing to the “nativist” philosophy believe that students progress through physiological stages of development related to certain types of learning readiness.

“Nativists believe these stages can not be changed by any outside intervention. Learners’ minds are “empty vessels” until knowledge is “poured” into them (Peterson, 1989). One researcher describes this as a linear process which is unalterable. Remediation, tutoring, method changes, and personal guidance have no effect. These teachers retain 30% of their students because the students are not in the appropriate stage (Smith, 1989). Another researcher describes this belief that learning the whole is dependent upon learning the parts in sequence (Karweit, 1991).

Other teachers, “remediationists,” provide all the help possible by varying instruction modes, tutoring, giving remedial instruction, individual attention, and having high expectations. These teachers believe all legal age children are teachable if given the appropriate opportunity. These teachers retain only 1- 2 % of their students (Smith, 1989).

Recent research states that the mind constructs knowledge on its own by relating new facts, concepts, and experiences with the existing body of information stored in the brain to create new knowledge (Riley, Greeno, and Heller, 1983, as cited in Peterson, 1989). In view of this information, retention becomes blatantly illogical.

With this latest research contradicting the “nativist” view, it should follow that retentions would decrease. However, many teachers rely on practical knowledge, not research. When a child repeats a grade the teacher sees some improvement in performance compared to the previous year and concludes that retention works. What they can not see is what a similar child who is promoted can do (Smith, 1989). The public supports retention as proof of high academic standards (CPRE, 1990; Doyle, 1989; Sherwood, 1993). Some teachers believe that early retention prevents later retention, and that retention is free of cost and risk (Smith and Shepard, 1987). In an Arizona study, the

community leaders favored retention (Doyle, 1989). Twenty-five years of research has not made a great impact on school policy, practice, or public opinion.

Alternatives to Retention

Though still generally used as the remedy for low achievement, many schools are creating new alternatives based upon this research. Several research studies determined that the use of specific instructional goals, specially designed programs, or individual instruction plans resulted in positive gains for children (Peterson, DeGracie, and Ayabe, 1987; Leinhardt, 1980) . Other alternatives and interventions currently supported by research include promotion to the next grade combined with one or more of the following strategies:

technology assisted instruction

small classes/groups

individual instruction plans

flexible scheduling

peer and/or cross-age tutoring

extra homework

parent involvement

basic skills instruction

special instruction materials

special teachers

psychological referrals

heterogeneous classes/groups

increased time per subject

community involvement

teaching to perceptions
informal class designs
on site counseling
experiential learning
cooperative learning
summer school
reduced class load
supportive social services
diagnostic testing
frequent assessment
team teaching
looping
direct instruction
linkage with life experience
delayed accountability for early elementary
instructional aides
accelerated schools
parent education
mentoring

(compiled from AFT, 1997; Baenen, 1988; Byrnes, 1989; CPRE, 1990; Karweit and Wasik, 1992; Cuban, 1989; Frymier and Gansneder, 1989; Johns, 1990; Peterson, 1989; Schultz, 1989; Shepard and Smith, 1990; Slavin and Madden, 1989; Smith and Shepard, 1987, 1989; TEA, 1987). Programs using combinations of these strategies and conferencing have been developed in Houston, Albuquerque, Cincinnati, Baltimore, and

elsewhere (AFT). One well known program which has been replicated successfully in several places is “Success for All” (Slavin, Karweit, and Wasik 1992-1993).

Chapter 3

Design of the Study

General Description

Using an action research design, this study examined the academic progress of students failing grade seven as they progress through an alternative to retention program. This study was situated in the middle school of the Clearview Regional High School district where the sample population is housed. This alternative to retention program consisted of a summer remediation program and an academic mentoring program during the school year. This study was limited to the population which attended either or both of these programs for the time period which included the summer program and the first and second marking periods of the regular school year in grade eight.

Information for the study was obtained from material culture, interviews of teachers in the summer program, and survey questionnaires administered to students, parents, teachers, and mentor teachers. The results were quantitatively and qualitatively analyzed to determine the existence of positive gains in academic achievement by the sample population.

Development and Design of Research Instrumentation

Information from the study was provided by marking period grade reports, marking period progress reports, monthly and weekly student reports, and survey questionnaires to parents, students, classroom teachers, and mentor teachers.

Marking period grade reports were common throughout the district. Grades in each subject area are reported according to a numerical scale where 0-69 is failing (F), 70-74 is a D, 75-84 is a C, 85-92 is a B, and 93-100 is an A.

Marking period progress reports differed by team. One eighth grade team reported numerical grade status with academic and behavioral comments. The other eighth grade team reported academics and behavior as “very good,” “good,” or “poor.”

Weekly and monthly reports were designed by the intern to measure progress on factors affecting success identified during the summer remediation program. Weekly reports reflected homework completion, student attitude, work ethic, attentiveness, class participation, and scores or grades on tests, quizzes, and/or projects earned during that week. Monthly reports addressed homework completion, student attitude, work ethic, attentiveness, organization skills, reading comprehension, writing skills, oral communication skills, math computation and problem-solving skills. Both were developed to provide data for this study, for use as a self-evaluation tool for the mentored student, and as an instructional guidance tool for the mentoring teacher.

Survey questionnaires were developed by the intern with input from the administration to measure satisfaction with, and effects of, the intervention program. In addition, these questionnaires provided suggestions for change and improvement of the program. Information was obtained using multiple choice and open-ended questions.

Parent questionnaires were designed to obtain information regarding student attitude toward the program, convenience of dates and times of the summer program, value of the program, gains made by the child, suggestions for change or improvement, and recommendations for continuation and expansion of the program. Student questionnaires were designed to obtain information regarding the worth of the program,

skills or behaviors gained as a result of the program, recommendations for continuation and expansion of the program, and prediction of personal need for the program during the next summer. Follow-up student questionnaires were designed to gather the same information regarding the mentoring program and were administered at the completion of the second marking period.

Classroom teacher questionnaires were designed to provide information pertaining to the value of the program, identification of problems or concerns, recommendation for continuation and expansion of the program, and recommendations for change or improvement. Questionnaires for mentoring teachers provided the same information in addition to techniques used in the mentoring classroom and procedures developed as need arose. Interview questions were designed by the intern to obtain information regarding the summer remediation program.

Sample and Sampling Techniques

The population studied consisted of all the students identified as failing grade seven. Twenty-two students were identified as failing grade seven based upon their final grade point averages of 69 or less in two or more subject areas. These students were placed in a four week summer remedial program concentrating on reading, writing, English grammar, and math computation and problem solving. Upon completion of the program students were placed directly into regular eighth grade classes. Some were also placed in an academic mentoring program to provide support in mathematics, English, reading, and writing. Some were recommended for evaluation by the child study team.

The original sample to be studied consisted of all twenty-two students who attended the summer session. Any data gathered from, or conclusions drawn regarding, the summer program reflected this original sample.

During the first three months of the school year, three students in the original sample transferred out of the district. The sample being studied through the mentoring program, as well as those placed in classes without additional support, consisted of the remaining nineteen students.

Data Collection Approach

Information was qualitatively and quantitatively obtained from a review of material culture, survey questionnaires, and interviews. Material culture included grade seven final grade point averages, recommendations for failure by teachers and counselors, pre- and post test scores from the summer remediation program, and recommendations and reports of the teachers involved in the summer program. Other material culture reviewed included grade eight marking period grade reports for first and second marking periods and supportive information from mid-marking period progress reports. Additional supportive information was obtained from weekly and monthly student reports completed by classroom teachers on a voluntary basis and submitted to the intern.

Survey questionnaires were administered to students and parents after completion of the summer program at the beginning of the school year. Students, classroom teachers, and mentor teachers were surveyed at the completion of the second marking period for the purpose of this report. Interviews were conducted by the intern at the completion of the summer program with both teachers involved.

Data Analysis

The purpose of this study was to measure positive gains in behavior and achievement of at-risk students who have participated in this alternative to retention program. All data collected was analyzed to determine if positive gains could be

measured.

Scores from pre- and post tests administered in the summer program were compared to identify any change. Measures were also computed from marking period grade relationships in each subject area by each student from one marking period to the next. Marking period grades and grade seven final averages used in this study include those earned in English, mathematics, social studies, science, and reading/study skills. The reading/study skills course in grade seven is called Language Development, the eighth grade course is Success in Language. This report reflected these measures from the final grade point averages of each student in grade seven through the second marking period of grade eight. These relationships were reported as grade point and percentile increases or decreases.

Progress reports were used as supportive data. Since each eighth grade team progress reports differed, one rating academic progress as “very good,” “good,” or “poor,” and the other using numerical grade averages, the intern made classifications. For the purpose of this report, comments of “very good” and “good” were equated with numerical grades of 75 to 100 (C, B,A), and comments of “poor” were equated with numerical grades of 0 to 74 (F, D), as the latter would place the student at risk of failure for the year. Comments were coded as “positive” or “negative” whether referring to academic performance or behavior. These comments were compared as positive or negative numerical totals and percentiles.

Information from weekly and monthly reports were analyzed as positive or negative relationships of homework completion, attitude, work ethic, attentiveness, class participation, academic performance, organization skills, reading comprehension, writing, oral communication, and math skills. These relationships were reported for each student

in each subject area. Relationships were also reported for each student per item across subject areas as available. Weekly and monthly reports were only completed for students in the mentoring classes. Corresponding information on students who were not receiving this support was not available. Since these reports were a voluntary practice on the part of the teacher, information was not available for every subject. As such, these reports were used, when appropriate, to complete the descriptive nature of this report, but were not used in the final determination of the program's effectiveness.

Results from survey questionnaires to parents, students, mentor teachers, and classroom teachers were analyzed to determine their views on the effectiveness of the program. Methods of instruction, content, delivery, attitudes, time use, and student achievement and behavior were examined. Problems, concerns, suggestions, successes, and reasons were also analyzed. Information provided by these questionnaires was compiled and the results were reported as percentiles per question on multiple choice questions. Answers to open-ended questions were coded as to which area they applied and were reported as descriptive narrative and as percentiles per question when common responses occurred. Information provided by interviews provided much of the descriptive narrative included in the report of the summer program.

Chapter Four

Presentation of the Research Findings

Conceptualization of the Program

This alternative to retention program was conceived to provide a summer program to remediate students who demonstrated academic deficiency either by failing or by scoring low on standardized tests. Secondly, it provided an academic mentoring program similar to study skills classes during the regular school year for these students, as needed. It also allowed for other students to be identified during the year after each marking period or at semester break. As part of this program administrators, team teachers, and the student's guidance counselor collaborated to develop and monitor an Individualized Student Instructional Plan (I.S.I.P.). Finally parent support and participation were enlisted.

Program Goals and Objectives

The goals of the program were to maintain low class size (6-10 students), to focus on the basic skills of reading, writing, mathematics, and oral communication, and to reteach and apply such skills as organization, developing study habits, and creating and using daily and weekly planners. Instruction was to be provided through hands-on activities and the use of computers by quality instructors with the necessary resources for success.

Participation and Process

Students were recommended for the program based upon failure of English or math, language development, or more than one subject. Students scoring in level III in any area of the E.W.T., or were recommended by a guidance counselor and the team, were also eligible.

Students were identified through a review of student records by the guidance department, followed by meetings with the team teachers and administration. After students were identified, meetings with the building principal, the guidance counselor, and the student's parents were held to discuss the program and the student's Individualized Student Instruction Plan (I.S.I.P.). The I.S.I.P. was created for each student with input from team teachers, the guidance department, necessary support staff, and the administration. Parental support, review of the plan, and participation by providing similar educational experiences at home were expectations of parental responsibility. At the conclusion of the summer program, the teachers involved filed reports of each student with the guidance office and building principal. These reports were reviewed with the parents of each student.

Implementation of the Summer Program

The summer program met Monday through Thursday for four weeks from June 29 to July 23. Students attended from 8:30 a.m. to 11:30 a.m. daily. These three hours were divided into time periods for reading, writing, English grammar, and/or math computation.

Two staff members were required to work three and one-half hours daily receiving a stipend of \$1400.00 per teacher. Of the two teachers filling these positions, one was a reading teacher with a master's degree, the other was an English teacher with a doctorate

degree and a special education background.

Twenty-three grade seven students were identified for this program. They were divided into two groups. For this report they were labeled Group 1 and Group 2. The three hour time segment was divided by the teachers into two sessions with a fifteen minute break between sessions. During the first session, Teacher A met with Group 1 for reading and writing while Teacher B met with Group 2 for math and speaking. During the second session Teacher A met with Group 2 for reading and writing and Teacher B met with Group 1 for math and speaking. All twenty-three students attended the reading/writing sessions, but two of these students were not required to attend the math session. Calculations included in this report were computed accordingly.

Both summer school teachers were interviewed about the program (See Appendix A). The teachers described the purpose and the goals of the program as an opportunity to develop a program to prepare students for “more success in the next academic year,” to “increase motivation and work ethic,” and “to address global academic skills and attitude.” They developed the program through the use of diagnostic tests in reading, writing, and mathematics. The Stanford Diagnostic Test and the TOWL 3 test of written language were used. Teacher-prepared pre- and post tests were used for math. From these results teachers developed “high interest activities to address the physical and cognitive needs of the early adolescent” using “diverse instructional style[s].”

The teachers described the components of the program as “reading comprehension/spelling, mathematics, writing using a workshop approach to encourage success, and speaking and listening.” Their reasons for developing the program this way were to “address areas of weakness, keep students focused and motivated, and to allow for daily monitoring and adjustment.” Curriculum and content were collaboratively

developed by both teachers. Diagnostic testing, specific middle school goals, and grade seven skills expectations determined the curriculum.

When asked about grouping, both teachers replied that students were grouped by skill level as determined by the diagnostic testing. Social needs and potential interaction problems were also considered.

Student performance and progress were measured and evaluated through several means. Teacher B cited standardized testing, teacher tests and observation, as well as student self-assessment. Teacher A also included weekly quizzes, independent practice, and review. Student success was defined by both teachers as “improvement in skills, attitude, and work ethic.” Teacher A also considered attitude and motivation levels. At the conclusion of the summer session both teachers were required to make recommendations regarding placement in eighth grade and/or child study team evaluation. They were also asked to suggest that placement with or without support and monitoring. Nineteen out of twenty-two students improved on the Stanford Diagnostic test at the completion of the program. See Table 1. The raw score mean of the initial administration was 37.50, the final mean was 43.14, an increase of 5.63 points (15%). The percentile mean of the initial administration was 25.36%, the final mean was 38.59%, an increase of 52.17%. Math pre-tests and post tests differed in content so the results were converted to percentages for comparison. Thirteen out of twenty students improved 65%. Two of the original twenty-two students were not required to take the math session and were not administered the post test. See Table 2.

Table 1.
Stanford Diagnostic Test

Student	%ile 1	%ile 2	Raw 1	Raw 2	pts incr	% incr/decr
1	58	77	50	54	4	7.41%
2	22	58	39	50	11	22.00%
3	22	8	39	30	-9	-30.00%
4	49	24	48	40	-8	-20.00%
5	1	3	16	23	7	30.43%
6	16	32	36	43	7	16.28%
7	24	38	40	45	5	11.11%
8	38	49	45	48	3	6.25%
9	24	45	40	47	7	14.89%
10	42	58	46	50	4	8.00%
11	58	77	50	54	4	7.41%
12	22	26	39	41	2	4.88%
13	38	67	45	52	7	13.46%
14	4	10	25	32	7	21.88%
15	3	11	22	33	11	33.33%
16	29	58	42	50	8	16.00%
17	22	42	39	46	7	15.22%
18	9	32	31	43	12	27.91%
19	42	54	46	49	3	6.12%
20	1	13	16	34	18	52.94%
21	8	49	30	48	18	37.50%
22	26	18	41	37	-4	-10.81%
MEAN	25.3636	38.591	37.5	43.14	5.636364	13.28%

Table 2.
Math Diagnostic Tests

Student	Pretest	Post test	Post test/calc	pts incr	% incr/decr
1	55	50	85	-5	-9.09%
2	68	85	90	17	25.00%
3	36	30	60	-6	-16.67%
4	64	45	90	-19	-29.69%
5	18	30	35	12	66.67%
6	64	90	95	26	40.62%
7	41	65	90	24	58.54%
8	27	60	80	33	122.22%
9	36	85	90	49	136.11%
10	64	NA	NA	NA	NA
11	46	80	90	34	73.91%
12	41	45	60	4	9.76%
13	46	30	90	-16	-34.78%
14	36	55	60	19	52.78%
15	50	50	55	0	0.00%
16	50	45	80	-5	-10.00%
17	41	55	60	14	34.15%
18	41	60	80	19	46.34%
19	59	NA	NA	NA	NA
20	77	95	100	18	23.38%
21	32	35	75	3	9.38%
22	55	30	35	-25	-45.45%
MEAN	47.5909	56	75	9.8	27.66%

The mean of the pretest was 47.59, the mean of the post test was 56.00, an increase of 18 %. The post test was administered a second time allowing students to use a calculator resulting in a mean of 75, an increase of 58 %. The mean rate of increase was 27.66%. A writing post test was not given as the the teachers decided that the four week period was

too short to make a meaningful change in the students' writing performance. Since some improvement in skills was noted, the program appeared to positively affect the success of the students.

Summer session teachers described their feelings at the beginning of the program as "excited" and "enthusiastic," but "uncertain of expectations." At the midpoint of the program, Teacher A was "comfortable with the format" and Teacher B felt "very secure with continued enthusiasm." At the completion of the program they expressed satisfaction that "students were given every opportunity to improve" but also disappointment that "some students did not improve, even with effort." Teacher A also stated that some areas could be improved instructionally. They recommended changes in the program which would allow more than one-half hour preparation time. One teacher suggested that students be made aware of stipulated consequences for inappropriate behavior before the program begins. Other concerns were mentioned by the teachers. Pre- and post testing took two days away from instruction. One teacher experienced some rapport problems as she was the teacher who had originally assigned some of the students failing grades. Summer teachers suggested extending the program to five or six weeks in order to have more time for math and writing as well as time for content instruction in science and social studies. However, concern was expressed whether or not students would remain motivated or would "burn out" before the conclusion of the program.

When asked about the mentoring segment of the program which would begin in September, both teachers expressed agreement as to its appropriateness as well as some concern. Since both teachers work in grade seven, working with the program students in a grade eight curriculum would be difficult. Teacher B also recognized the need for grade

eight mentor teachers who “catch the vision for the program.” They also described their idea of the mentoring program as one where homework and assignments would be monitored and students would be given instructional support by the mentor teacher using a different approach. Mentor teachers would operate as student advocates.

At the conclusion of this program six students were recommended for child study team evaluations. Twenty-two students were recommended to be placed in grade eight. Placement into eighth grade with monitoring of studying and work completion was recommended for four students. Placement into grade eight with support was recommended for the remaining eighteen students: three with support in English, nine with support in reading, ten with support in math, and five with support in writing.

The Mentoring Program

All students from the summer program were placed in eighth grade. Of the original twenty-two, six were placed in regular education classes with no support and sixteen were placed in regular education classes with support provided in a first period mentoring class. The mentored group was loosely divided into two groups, each meeting with an eighth grade mentor teacher, one specializing in math, the other in English, reading, and writing. Members of the mentored groups switched back and forth between the two groups as needed. In these groups students received supplemental skills instruction, homework supervision, and help reviewing and studying for quizzes and tests.

Nineteen students were surveyed at the beginning of the year to obtain information regarding their opinions and feelings about the summer program and their early experiences in the mentoring program (See Appendix A). Eighteen of the nineteen students stated that the summer program was worthwhile. There was one exception.

Fifteen students said the mentoring was helping them for several reasons. Five said “no,” two students stating that they already knew the “stuff” or did “everything at home.” Students listed several accomplishments over last year’s performance. Eight students stated that they “can do math problems.” Five said that they “can do homework,” and two said that they “know how to study.” Other responses included better organization skills, better test scores, better note taking skills, and “know more.” Three students saw no difference or could not identify any specific changes.

Nineteen students recommended continuing the program and seventeen favored expanding it to include grade eight students. Only one student believed it possible/probable that he/she might need to attend a similar program the following summer. The other students cited the following reasons for not having to attend: (7) “doing well,” (3) “better than last year,” (3) “doing homework,” (2) “studying for tests,” (2) “getting good grades,” “paying attention,” “being more dependable and organized,” and “trying harder.” One student suggested providing transportation in the future.

Parents of the summer session students were also surveyed (See Appendix A). Six out of twenty-two parents (27%) responded. These parents stated that their child’s attitude before the summer program was either positive (3) or apprehensive (3). Attitudes became or remained positive throughout the program. Dates and times of the summer session were thought to be convenient by all but one parent due to employment constraints. The program was believed to be worthwhile by all but one parent who was “unsure.” With no exceptions, all stated that the program should continue and that it should be expanded to include grade eight students. Gains made by their children were reported as organization, discipline, and self-confidence in ability (3). Small class size and one on one help from the teachers were seen as the most valuable aspects of the program.

Changes and suggestions made by the parents included extending the program to eight weeks, using more hands-on projects, and more communication regarding student development. One parent added that “this program [...] gave my daughter a big chance to show that she can do good work and pass.” Another , who is a teacher, commented that she was “impressed with the impact (positive)” on her son and that it “also helped build his self-esteem.”

The fourteen mentored students were surveyed again at the end of the second marking period (See Appendix A). At that time all fourteen (100%) stated that the program was helping them. Nine reported that the mentoring period helps them “get homework done.” Three replied that they are “better organized,” are receiving “better grades,” and that they “study.” Other responses included being “better prepared for eighth grade,” knowing “how to study,” “improved,” and “understand[ing] the work.” None responded that needed help was not being provided.

When asked what they were able to do in the current year that they could not do in the previous year, four students responded “homework,” three said “study,” and three replied “math.” Other responses included “got an A in math,” “understand what I’m doing,” “ more organized,” “get high test grades,” “keep good grades,” “join clubs and not get pulled out because of poor grades.” One student reported “nothing.”

When asked what problems from the previous year continued to be a problem, five students (36%) reported no problems continuing. Four replied “none” and one student said “all my problems have gone away.” Nine reported various problems. One student said that “there were problems at the beginning of the year, but no more.” Two students responded “test grades.” Other responses included “science,” “ passing reading,” “homework still a problem,” “how to write in certain forms,” “studying for

quizzes and tests,” “I get bored easily.” One student replied, “everything, failing.”

Thirteen students (93%) indicated that previous problems had been resolved, corrected, or improved. Six reported that homework was no longer a problem. Three replied that tests and quizzes had improved while three other students said the program provided time for them to study which improved test and quiz grades. Other responses indicated class participation, studying techniques, and improved grades. One student referred to averaging “3 F’s per marking period” previously.

Thirteen students (93%) stated that the program was worthwhile for various reasons. Four stated that “it helps me do homework.” Three others mentioned “it helps.” Two said it provides “time to study” and two others that “it raised grades.” Others stated reasons such as “it helps the people that need help the most,” “it teaches you skills,” it “improves understanding,” and “it helps me pass the year [so I can] go on next year knowing things.” Five students (36%) stated that the best part of the program was “time to do homework.” Two others appreciated the time for “reading.” Others mentioned “the nice teachers,” “[it] keeps me caught up,” “getting my report card,” “[getting] a couple minutes of a break,” “everything.” When asked about the worst part, five students responded “nothing.” Others mentioned becoming bored, two cited “doing work,” “studying,” and the “time schedule.”

Eleven students (79%) felt they were experiencing the most success in math. Two cited social studies, science, or English. One student reported the most success in reading. Classes in which they saw themselves as least successful were science, math, English, civics, and Success in Language. Seven students (50%) reported difficulty in science, two in civics and two in Success in Language. One reported problems in both English and math. Another student reported experiencing some success in all classes.

Only three students (21%) suggested ways to make the program better. These suggestions included lengthening the mentoring period or having it “more than just one period per day” and emphasizing “more math and reading.”

Marking period grades for these students reflected their feeling of success. Over two marking periods student success rates improved from 6% to 47% above grade seven final averages. The mean rate of increase was 25%. The mean grade average in grade seven was 52.39. The mean grade average for first marking period was 86, for second marking period, 83 in grade eight. See Table 3.

In English the mean grade was 63 in grade seven. In grade eight the mean was 77, an increase of 22%. In social studies the grade seven mean was 68. In grade eight the mean was 76, an increase of 12%. In math the grade seven mean was 68. In grade eight the scores included one “incomplete,” so the mean score was based upon eighteen students, rather than nineteen, creating a mean of 88, an increase of 33%. In science the grade seven mean was 63. The grade eight mean was 79, an increase of 24%. Overall the mean increase of grade eight semester averages over grade seven final averages was 23%. See Table 4.

Progress reports gave interim glimpses of performance. Since each eighth grade team had their own progress report design, one using grade point averages per subject and the other using a comment system of “very good,” “good,” and “poor,” grades/comments were converted to positive or negative measures. Comments of “very good” and “good” were equated with (+) as were grade averages from 75 to 100. Comments of “poor” and grade averages 74 or less were equated with (-). The four academic subjects being used in this study were either given a (+) or a (-) for each interim marking period. Thirteen students (68%) received a (+) interim grade in three or more subjects during the first

marking period. Four (21%) students received a (+) in two subjects and a (-) in two subjects. One student (5%) received one (+) and three (-) grades. One student (5%) received four (-) grades. In the second marking period eight students (42%) received (+) interim grades in three or four subjects. Six (32%) of these eight received (+) in all four of the academic subjects. Seven students (37%) received (+) in two subjects and (-) in two subjects. Three students (16%) received (+) in one subject and (-) in three subjects. One student (5%) received (-) in all four academic subjects. The mean number of subjects receiving (+) interim grades in the first marking period was 2.79. The mean number in the second marking period was 2.47. See Table 5.

Weekly and monthly reports were also available but were filled out inconsistently by the teachers (See Appendix A). Non-mentored students were not included in these reports. Information was gathered regarding homework completion and quality, attitude, work ethic, attention, participation, organization, oral communication, reading comprehension, writing, and math skills. Weekly reports filed with the mentor and/or the intern varied from one to as many as twenty-two per student during the period of Nov. 19, 1998, to Feb. 8, 1999. One hundred sixty-six weekly reports were filed for 15 mentored students. Results of these reports on three students varied for each student by teacher/class for the same period of time. For these students responses regarding the items varied from one extreme to the other. In these reports 96 (58%) responses indicated that homework was completed on time. Sixty-one (37%) responses indicated homework was not completed on time. On hundred one (61%) responses indicated that homework was done well, 44 (27%) that it was not. Students' attitude toward class was rated "usually positive" 85 times (51%), "vacillates" 46 times (28%), or "usually negative" 32 times (19%). Students demonstrated a work ethic that showed "consistent

effort” 50 times (30%), “erratic effort” 72 times (43%), or “little effort” 44 times (27%). Student attentiveness was rated “consistent” 72 times (43%), “inconsistent” 77 times (46%), “improving” 31 times (19%), and/or “in need of improvement” 54 times (33%). Student participation was rated “often” 35 times (21%), “sometimes” 77 times (46%), “rarely” 23 times (14%), “not at all” 24 times (15%). Participation was sometimes rated “appropriate” 36 times (22%) or “inappropriate” 4 times (2%). However, this item was not rated as often as the others. Other items were not always evaluated which accounts for less than 100% totals.

Monthly reports were filed on ten students. A total of 28 reports were received ranging from two to four reports per student. Homework completion was “consistent” 11 times (39%), “inconsistent” 14 times (50%). Homework was rated as “improving” eight times (29%), or “in need of improvement” 12 times (43%). Student attitude was considered “excellent” 6 times (21%), “good” ten times (36%), “improved” four times (14%), “in need of improvement” two times (7%), or “usually negative” three times (11%). Student work ethic was rated “excellent” three times (11%), “good” six times (21%), “improved” six times (21%), “in need of improvement” eight times (29%), or “usually negative” five times (18%). Student’s attention in class was described as “excellent” five times (18%), “good” eight times (29%), “improved” three times (11%), “in need of improvement” five times (18%), or “minimal” four times (14%). Students were rated as demonstrating organization skills “consistently” six times (21%), “inconsistently 19 times (69%). Their organization skills were rated “strong” three times (11%), “adequate” seven times (25%), “weak” 12 times (43%), “improving” three times (11%), and/or “in need of improvement” eight times (29%). Reading comprehension skills were rated “strong” two times (7%), “adequate” ten times (36%), “weak” 12 times

(43%), “improving” one time (4%), and/or “in need of improvement” five times (18%). Writing skills were not rated “strong”, but were rated “adequate” 11 times (39%), “weak” 13 times (46%), “improving” two times (7%), and/or “in need of improvement” five times (18%). Oral communication skills were described as “strong” six times (21%), “adequate” nine times (32%), “weak” seven times (25%), “improving” two times (7%), and/or “in need of improvement” four times (14%). Math computation was only rated four times, three as “adequate” (11%), and once as “weak” (4%). Skill in math word problems was not rated.

In a self-evaluation 14 students provided information regarding problems or skills identified by teachers in the summer program (See Appendix A). Two students (14%) stated that their homework is “always” done, whereas 11 (79%) replied that it is “usually” done. One student (7%) responded “sometimes”, but no students chose “never.” Seven students (50%) stated that they “always” work hard at school work. Four (29%) said “usually” and three, “sometimes.” Paying attention in class was characterized as “always” by five students (36%) and “usually” by eight. Only one student (7%) replied. “sometimes.” In class participation two students (14%) chose “always,” eight (57%), “usually,” and four (29%), “sometimes.” Organization of work, papers, and notebooks was “good” according to three students (21%). The other 11 (79%) stated that they were “improving.” No one said that they “need help.” Eight students (57%) stated that they were “good” in reading. Three students (21%) said they were “improving” and three (21%) still “need help.” Feelings about school were “usually” good for eight of these students (57%). Five (36%) responded “sometimes” and one (7%) replied “never.”

Table 3.
Student Marking Period Grades

Student	Subj.	Gr 8 MP1	Gr 8 MP2	Sem. Avg.	Gr 7 avg pts	incr %	incr/decr
A	Eng.	80	85	82.5	62	20.5	33.06%
	SS	76	69	72.5	68	4.5	6.62%
	Math	87	87	87	59	28	47.46%
	Sci	72	60	66	66	0	0.00%
MEAN		78.75	75.25	77	63.75	13.25	21.78%
B	Eng	87	85	86	62	24	38.71%
	SS	81	83	82	64	18	28.12%
	Math	90	90	90	70	20	28.57%
	Sci	76	79	77.5	75	2.5	3.33%
MEAN		83.5	84.25	83.875	67.75	16.125	24.68%
C	Eng	50	51	50.5	52	-1.5	-2.88%
	SS	60	70	65	75	-10	-13.33%
	Math	80	80	80	51	29	56.86%
	Sci	61	61	61	61	0	0.00%
		62.75	65.5	64.125	59.75	4.375	10.16%
D	Eng	70	69	69.5	59	10.5	17.80%
	SS	72	68	69	55	14	25.45%
	Math	95	92	93.5	54	39.5	73.15%
	Sci	81	86	83.5	52	31.5	60.58%
MEAN		79.5	78.75	78.875	55	23.875	44.24%
E	Eng	70	88	79	74	5	6.76%
	SS	76	69	79	55	24	43.64%
	Math	86	75	80.5	61	19.5	31.97%
	Sci	77	76	76.5	62	14.5	23.39%
MEAN		77.25	77	78.75	63	15.75	26.44%

Student	Subj.	Gr 8 MP1	Gr 8 MP2	Sem. Avg.	Gr 7 Avg.	pts incr	% incr/decr
F	Eng.	83	83	83	70	13	18.57%
	SS	80	76	78	74	4	5.41%
	Math	84	90	87	68	19	27.94%
	Sci	72	76	74	67	7	10.45%
MEAN		79.75	81.25	80.5	69.75	10.75	15.59%
G	Eng	87	88	87.5	72	15.5	21.53%
	SS	80	74	77	67	10	14.93%
	Math	95	91	93	86	7	8.14%
	Sci	91	81	86	68	18	26.47%
MEAN		88.25	83.5	85.875	73.25	12.625	17.77%
H	Eng	86	87	86.5	66	20.5	31.06%
	SS	90	80	85	75	10	13.33%
	Math	76	74	75	65	10	15.38%
	Sci	90	93	91.5	76	15.5	20.39%
MEAN		85.5	83.5	84.5	70.5	14	20.04%
I	Eng	82	72	77	70	7	10.00%
	SS	75	83	79	73	6	8.22%
	Math	97	94	95.5	59	36.5	61.86%
	Sci	88	82	85	52	33	63.46%
MEAN		85.5	82.75	84.125	63.5	20.625	35.89%
J	Eng	90	95	92.5	60	32.5	54.17%
	SS	90	91	90.5	61	29.5	48.36%
	Math	96	97	96.5	62	34.5	55.65%
	Sci	84	86	85	66	19	28.79%
MEAN		90	92.25	91.125	62.25	28.875	46.74%
K	Eng	78	79	78.5	70	8.5	12.14%
	SS	71	82	76.5	70	6.5	9.29%
	Math	91	93	92	66	26	39.39%
	Sci	73	76	74.5	56	18.5	33.04%
MEAN		78.25	82.88	80.375	65.5	14.875	23.46%

Student	Subj.	Gr 8 MP1	Gr 8 MP2	Sem. Avg.	Gr 7 Avg.	pts	incr %	incr/decr
L	Eng	83	82	82.5	58	24.5		42.24%
	SS	84	81	82.5	80	2.5		3.12%
	Math	81	85	83	63	20		31.75%
	Sci	92	94	93	69	24		34.78%
MEAN		85	85.5	85.25	67.5	17.75		27.97%
M	Eng	85	86	85.5	63	22.5		35.71%
	SS	80	76	78	62	16		25.81%
	Math	72	78	75	56	19		33.93%
	Sci	74	73	73.5	60	13.5		22.50%
MEAN		77.75	78.25	78	60.25	17.75		29.49%
N	Eng	83	81	82	65	17		26.15%
	SS	74	82	78	68	10		14.71%
	Math	80	84	82	70	12		17.14%
	Sci	82	80	81	62	19		30.65%
MEAN		79.75	81.75	80.75	66.25	14.5		22.16%
O	Eng	74	60	67	61	6		9.84%
	SS	66	50	58	59	-1		-1.69%
	Math	61	INC		58			
	Sci	71	68	69.5	60	9.5		15.83%
MEAN		44.5			59.5			
P	Eng	68	64	66	64	2		3.12%
	SS	81	85	83	78	5		6.41%
	Math	92	95	93.5	81	12.5		15.43%
	Sci	90	94	92	76	16		21.05%
MEAN		82.75	84.5	83.625	74.75	8.875		11.50%
Q	Eng	80	81	80.5	54	26.5		49.07%
	SS	73	67	70	58	12		20.69%
	Math	97	99	98	67	31		46.27%
	Sci	85	88	86.5	53	33.5		63.21%
MEAN		83.75	83.75	83.75	58	25.75		44.81%

Student	Subj	Gr 8 MP1	Gr 8 MP2	Sem. Avg.	Gr 7 Avg.	pts incr	% incr/decr
R	Eng	78	71	74.5	61	13.5	22.13%
	SS	73	67	70	72	-2	-2.78%
	Math	88	88	88	67	21	31.34%
	Sci	68	55	61.5	60	1.5	2.50%
MEAN		76.75	70.25	73.5	65	8.5	13.30%
S	Eng	59	75	67	59	8	13.56%
	SS	79	81	80	79	1	1.27%
	Math	88	85	86.5	64	22.5	35.16%
	Sci	80	77	78.5	62	16.5	26.61%
MEAN		76.5	79.5	78	66	12	19.15%

Table 4.

Subject Grade Averages

Subject	MP1	MP2	Sem. Avg.	Gr 7 Avg.	pts incr	% incr/decr
English	80	85	82.5	62	20.5	33.06%
	87	85	86	62	24	38.71%
	50	52	69.5	52	17.5	33.65%
	70	69	69.5	59	10.5	17.80%
	70	88	79	74	5	6.76%
	83	83	83	70	13	18.57%
	87	88	87.5	72	15.5	21.53%
	86	87	86.5	66	20.5	31.06%
	82	72	77	70	7	10.00%
	90	95	92.5	60	32.5	54.17%
	78	79	78.5	70	8.5	12.14%
	83	81	82	58	24	41.38%
	85	86	85.5	63	22.5	35.71%
	83	81	82	65	17	26.15%
	74	60	67	61	6	9.84%
	68	64	66	64	2	3.12%
80	81	80.5	54	26.5	49.07%	
78	71	74.5	61	13.5	22.13%	
59	75	67	59	8	13.56%	
MEAN	77.5	78	78.73684	63.2632	15.474	25.18%

Subject	MP1	MP2	Sem. At	Gr 7 Avg.	pts incr	% incr/decr
Soc. St.	76	69	72.5	68	4.5	6.62%
	81	83	82	64	18	28.12%
	60	80	70	75	-5	27.27%
	72	68	70	55	15	31.82%
	76	69	72.5	55	17.5	5.41%
	80	76	78	74	4	14.93%
	80	74	77	67	10	13.33%
	90	80	85	75	10	8.22%
	75	83	79	73	6	48.36%
	90	91	90.5	61	29.5	9.29%
	71	82	76.5	70	6.5	2.50%
	83	81	82	80	2	25.81%
	80	76	78	62	16	14.71%
	74	82	78	68	10	14.71%
	66	50	58	59	-1	-1.69%
	81	85	83	78	5	6.41%
	73	67	70	58	12	20.69%
	73	67	70	72	-2	-2.78%
	79	81	80	79	1	1.27%
MEAN	76.84	76	76.421	68.05263	8.3684	14.47%
Math	87	87	87	59	28	47.46%
	90	90	90	70	20	28.57%
	80	80	80	51	29	56.86%
	95	92	93.5	54	39.5	73.15%
	86	75	80.5	61	19.5	31.97%
	84	90	87	68	19	27.94%
	95	91	93	86	7	8.14%
	76	74	75	65	10	15.38%
	97	94	95.5	59	36.5	61.86%
	96	97	96.5	62	34.5	55.65%
	91	93	92	66	26	39.39%
	81	85	83	63	20	31.75%
	72	78	75	56	19	33.93%
	80	84	82	70	12	17.14%
	61	INC		58		
	92	95	93.5	81	12.5	15.43%
	97	99	98	67	31	46.27%
	88	88	88	67	21	31.34%
	88	88	88	64	24	37.50%
MEAN	86.11	87.78	87.639	64.57895	22.694	36.65%

Subject	MP1	MP2	Sem. Avg.	Gr 7 Avg.	pts incr	% incr/decr
Science	72	60	66	66	0	0.00%
	76	79	77.5	75	2.5	3.33%
	61	61	61	61	0	0.00%
	81	86	83.5	52	31.5	60.58%
	77	76	76.5	62	14.5	23.39%
	72	76	74	67	7	10.45%
	91	81	86	68	18	26.47%
	90	93	91.5	76	15.5	20.39%
	88	82	85	52	33	63.46%
	84	86	85	66	19	28.79%
	73	76	74.5	56	18.5	33.04%
	92	94	93	69	24	34.78%
	74	73	73.5	60	13.5	22.50%
	82	80	81	62	19	30.65%
	71	68	69.5	60	9.5	15.83%
	90	94	92	76	16	21.05%
	85	88	86.5	53	33.5	63.21%
	68	55	61.5	60	1.5	2.50%
	80	77	78.5	62	16.5	26.61%
MEAN	79	78.16	78.7368	63.3158	15.421	25.63%

Table 5.

Student Marking Period Progress Reports

Student	MP1 (+)	MP1 (-)	MP2 (+)	MP2 (-)
A	3	1	2	2
B	2	2	2	2
C	0	4	1	3
D	2	2	2	2
E	4	0	4	0
F	4	0	1	3
G	4	0	4	0
H	4	0	2	2
I	3	1	4	0
J	4	2	4	0
K	2	1	4	0
L	3	2	4	0
M	2	1	2	2
N	3	1	2	2
O	3	1	0	4
P	3	1	3	1
Q	3	1	3	1
R	1	3	1	3
S	3	1	2	2
	53	24	47	29
MEAN	2.78947	1.26316	2.47368	1.5263

In surveys done by regular classroom teachers of these students, ten teachers commented on various aspects of the program (See Appendix A). When asked to rate the program, two teachers (20%) saw the program as “very effective,” four (40%) thought it was “somewhat effective,” and four others (40%) stated that the program “needs improvement.” One of the latter group said that he/she was unable to answer because

he/she was unfamiliar with the program. This individual did not answer any other questions. When asked for suggestions for the summer program, three teachers replied “none,” and one teacher felt not familiar enough with the program to respond. Other teachers suggested putting all students who attend the summer session into the mentoring program and to use the recommendations of the summer teachers to create students’ schedules for the following year. Two teachers recommended focusing on skill remediation and increasing assessment of individual needs. One of these teachers also suggested less “attitude” work while another teacher said more emphasis was needed on student attitudes and responsibilities. Another teacher suggested increasing the involvement of the guidance department. Teachers’ perceptions about student attitudes also varied. Three teachers didn’t “know” or “hadn’t heard any.” Two teachers perceived students thought of the program as “fun” or “fun and games.” One described it as a “first period study hall.” One teacher remarked, “some see it as a second chance, some as a free ride.” Another believed students didn’t “take it seriously, they think they will pass automatically.” Another teacher perceived a negative attitude toward science.

Positive results were described by all but one teacher. Teachers saw the program as an “opportunity to study and get help.” Others observed that “some are doing much better,” “about one-third are doing a satisfactory job,” or “all but one are doing well in my class.” Others noticed “increased self-confidence, students are more assertive and responsive to questioning.” Homework was mentioned as the “most positive attribute of these students.” When asked about the effectiveness of program components, two teachers did not respond to either question and one replied “don’t know,” another, “not sure.” Other teachers responded that teaching organization skills and the first period mentoring class were the most effective. Other teachers thought that two students

improving and one student learning to succeed were the most effective. The least effective components were listed as note taking and studying skills, not enough emphasis on homework, and the opinion that the mentoring period had little effect on grades or responsibilities. Also mentioned were teacher recommendations which were not reflected in student schedules and the slowness of the child study team referral process. "The system takes too long for critical needs kids."

Problems which evolved as a result of the program were described by teachers as well. Three teachers believed that students thought if they failed again they would be given another opportunity in summer school. One teacher saw repeated failure as a problem. Another felt that classroom teachers are "not equipped to address serious deficiencies." Two teachers identified no problems and one was "unsure."

Needs and concerns identified by teachers included communication, monitoring, slowness of child study team processes, scheduling of some students, and student attitudes reflecting an "easy way out." Other concerns reflected the need for intensive reading instruction, the difficulty in bringing skills up to level in a short summer session, and the need to address deep emotional and adjustment problems. Two teachers identified no concerns or needs.

Several teachers had suggestions for the mentoring program. Two teachers suggested either retention in grade if the student fails four major subjects or attendance at regular summer school in some other district. Other teachers suggested putting more emphasis on organization, note taking skills, studying skills and reading. Improving communication from classroom teachers to mentor teachers was recommended as well as making the staff aware of what the program is about. Another suggested assigning a specific teacher to each one of these students, perhaps rotating to diffuse personality

conflicts. Another suggestion proposed holding the mentoring program one-half hour per major subject after school. One teacher made no recommendations.

Both mentor teachers were also surveyed (See Appendix A). Both believed the program was “somewhat effective” and one believed it “needs improvement.” The mentor teachers agreed that students must be held “accountable for their performance” by either correlating their work with the Core Curriculum Content Standards or by setting goals which, when attained, could lead to exiting the program.

Techniques used by these teachers included checking notebooks and homework assignments, reviewing for and giving practice quizzes and tests in a “give and take atmosphere.” Surveys and evaluations done by classroom teachers were also discussed with the students.

Both mentors found the students’ attitudes “generally positive.” “Most students find the extra period helpful.” Both teachers also mentioned that students having difficulty with organization waste time and need “prodding.” Both teachers saw positive results in the program. One mentor stated that most students’ math scores improved. He also stated that students commented that “school is a better place this year.” The other mentor described one student as “more academically focused,” but noticed no change in two others.

Problems seen by the mentors included lack of accountability for poor performance in subject areas and lack of mentoring for all subject areas. Another problem was that students had to give up exploratory courses in order to have the mentoring period. One mentor expressed concern for the effect of this loss on the student’s self image. Problems described by the mentors included other people’s perceptions of the period as a reading skills improvement class when neither mentor was a reading teacher.

Another problem existed on days when students “had nothing to do” and the mentor felt responsible to “keep them busy.”

When asked about the effectiveness of the program, one mentor had “no idea whether or not this program is effective.” The other mentor stated that the mentoring period provided the opportunity for students to do homework which otherwise would be neglected. The least effective component was seen by both mentors to be the lack of accountability.

Needs and concerns identified by the mentors included communication and curriculum. Mentor teachers needed to know student assignments and time lines. One mentor requested some type of study skills curriculum in a tutorial format for use during the year in the mentoring class.

Suggestions for the program included building more structure and accountability into the program. Specific suggestions were to require classroom teachers to notify mentor teachers of evaluations or assessments, projects, and problems. It was also recommended that students whose performance was lacking should meet with the administration, counselor, team leader, teachers (if necessary), parent, and mentor.

Chapter 5

Conclusions, Implications, and Further Study

The purpose of this study was to describe and evaluate the effectiveness of an intervention program of remediation and academic mentoring on grades of students failing grade seven. Program effectiveness was defined as student academic success.

Conclusions

At the completion of the summer session, reading scores increased overall (13-28%). Math results were more dramatic, increasing to 27.7%. Of the twenty-two students who were to be retained, six were placed directly into grade eight with no mentoring support. Teachers, students, and parents expressed satisfaction with the program and reported various positive academic and emotional gains. Most favored continuing the program as well as expanding it.

Perhaps the best indicator of success were marking period grade reports. Over two marking periods all but three students showed gains of 25% over seventh grade performances. One of these three showed a decrease in two measured subjects. The other two showed negative gains in one subject each. The small decrease from the first marking period to the second of 4% could be considered a normal occurrence. First marking period usually includes review of previously learned material enabling students to do well. Presentation of new material, content, and skills in the second marking period could explain the slight decrease in grades. The novelty of being back in school had also dissipated. Marking period grades for each subject improved within a range of 14.5% to

36.7% of the four subjects measured. Progress reports showed students maintaining success at interim stages by passing more than 2.5 subjects. Most students improved from the mid-marking period point to the end of the period as evidenced by the marking period grades. Weekly and monthly reports showed inconsistent results at times contradicting each other. Information from these reports was gathered from only a few teachers inconsistently filing the reports. As such, the data was limited and not representative of the entire sample.

Effectiveness of the mentoring program was expressed by students through the first and second questionnaire where specific positive results were reported by each individual. Self-evaluations reflected feelings of success where students attested to gains or improvement in skills such as studying and doing homework, taking tests and quizzes, and organization. They also reported having good feelings about school more often than before the program. Teachers (60%) and both mentors also affirmed that the program exhibited success. This success was observed in student performance, attitude, and improved self-esteem.

Implications

In its initial stage, the program appeared to be effective, but not without the need for improvement and change. Lack of sufficient time for writing and instruction in other content areas expressed by the summer teachers reflected a need to expand the length of the existing summer session. Providing more preparation time for the summer teachers also appeared to be needed for discussion and collaboration. The need for development of defined consequences for student behavior problems was reported by the summer teachers. These consequences should be developed before the next summer session and students apprised of them. Mentoring teachers affirmed the need for performance

accountability measures of some kind for the students placed in the mentoring program. Some structure for that period in the form of tutorials or skills instruction was also desired.

Evaluating students for learning disabilities was also an on-going problem. Six children were recommended for child study team evaluation at the close of the summer session. However, the process required formal referrals to be filed, which were not. By February only one of these six children had been evaluated. Two others were still being processed. Nothing had been filed on the others, or parents would not give their consent. This situation clearly needed to be addressed. Summer teachers could file the referrals at the end of that session thereby beginning the process immediately. The need for specialized reading instruction for students with severe skill deficits also surfaced. Concern expressed by teachers reflected frustration for some in dealing with students who had severe weaknesses. The need for staff development in instructional strategies, classroom management, motivational strategies, and dealing with the "at risk" student became apparent.

Weekly and monthly reports were ineffective for their purpose. They should be redesigned with classroom teachers and mentor teachers collaborating on a format which will better serve their purpose. Some form of communication and/or evaluation from classroom teacher to mentor teacher needed to be consistently provided. Teachers needed to be made aware of the importance of this information for the student and the mentor in order to maximize the effectiveness of the mentoring period.

Lack of awareness of the program and lack of communication were important problems. Teachers' responses, or lack of them, drew attention to the fact of this unawareness. Many of their suggestions reflected aspects of the program already in

practice either in the summer session or in the mentoring program of which they were unaware. Teachers stating unfamiliarity with the program reflected the need for communication to the entire staff of the goals and objectives as well as the research base upon which it was conceived. Some responses reflected unawareness or non-acceptance of the research that retention does not positively affect student achievement. Some believed that the present program was a form of “social promotion.” These beliefs or attitudes exhibited the need for definition of terms, discussion of the research, and clarification of the goals and objectives of the program by the administration with the entire staff, to some degree, and with those intimately involved, in detail.

Organizational Change

The district committed to the program. After a presentation of the program results from one marking period, the board of education discussed extending the program to include students failing grade eight and those students from sending districts entering grade seven who fit the criteria. Other changes were evident in teacher behavior. Teachers who examined the files of student work from the summer session gained a clearer perspective of what these students were capable of doing and of the problems, both academic and emotional, with which they were contending. These teachers made changes in their instructional strategies and/or personal interactions with these students which helped them remain successful or helped them to improve.

Further Study

Further research is needed because of the limited scope of this report. This study needs to be continued for the remainder of the year. The request for continued study was made by the assistant principal of the middle school who implemented the program. True success of the program can only be determined over time. Seventh grade students have

also been placed in a similar mentoring program which began after the first marking period. Their performance should also, or separately, be documented. If continued over time, additional data in the form of standardized test scores, Grade Eight Proficiency Assessment scores, and High School Proficiency Assessment scores would be available for comparison. These additional sources of information would increase the validity of the study. Extending the study would demonstrate if the program's effectiveness continues over time. It remains to be seen if and how the program will be expanded. If it were to be expanded where would classes be held since air conditioned rooms are limited in number? If it were expanded would students eventually be required to pay a fee for the summer program? What resources would be available for the financially insecure "at risk" student?

REFERENCES

- American Federation of Teachers. (1997, September). Passing on failure: District promotion policies and practices (Item No. 249). Washington, DC: Author.
- Baenen, N. (1988, April). Perspectives after five years: Has grade retention passed or failed? (Publication No. 87.35). New Orleans, LA: Educational Research Association. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED300424)
- Balow, I., & Schwager, M. (1990). Retention in grade: A failed procedure. Riverside, CA: University of California, California Educational Research Cooperative. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED315710)
- Beineman, D. (1998). A study of the feasibility of expansion of the purpose of the Clearview Regional High School District, April 21, 1998.
- Berliner, D., & Casanova, U. (1986). Do failing students benefit from being retained? Instructor, 95 (8), 14-16.
- Byrnes, D. (1989). Attitudes of students, parents, and educators toward repeating a grade. In Shepard, L., & Smith, M. (Eds.), Flunking Grades: Research and Policies on Retention (pp. 108-131). Philadelphia, PA: The Falmer Press.
- Byrnes, D., & Yamamoto, K. (1985). An inside look at academic retention in the elementary school. Education, 106, 208-214.
- Byrnes, D., & Yamamoto, K. (1986). Views on grade retention. Journal of Research and Development in Education, 20 (1), 14-20.
- Cadigan, D., Entwisle, D., Alexander, K., & Pallas, A. (1988). First grade retention among low achieving students: A search for significant predictors. Merrill-Palmer Quarterly, 34 (1), 71-88.
- Center for Policy Research in Education (1990). CPRE Policy Briefs. Rutgers University, Michigan University, Stanford University, University of Wisconsin-Madison.

- Center for Research on Elementary & Middle Schools (1989, February). Success for All. Baltimore, MD: Author. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED329631)
- Christman, J., & Pugh, W. (1989). Implementing a systemwide promotion policy: Dilemmas for principals and teachers in urban schools. Journal of Negro Education, 58 (2), 163-176.
- Clearview Regional Middle School ASSA Report, November, 1998.
- Cuban, L. (1989). At-risk students: What teachers and principals can do. Educational Leadership, 46 (5), 29-32.
- Darling-Hammond, L., & Falk, B. (1995). Using standards and assessments to support student learning: Alternatives to grade retention. Report to the Chancellor's Committee on Grade Transition Standards. New York: Teachers College, Columbia University, National Center for Restructuring Education, Schools, and Teaching.
- Delidow, S. (1989). A longitudinal study of retention in the C.O.O.R.ISD area. Roscommon, MI. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED303558)
- Doyle, R. (1989). The resistance of conventional wisdom to research evidence: The case of retention in grade. Phi Delta Kappan, 71 (3), 215-220.
- Frymier, J., & Gansneder, B. (1989). The Phi Delta Kappa study of students at risk. Phi Delta Kappan, 71 (2), 142-146.
- Gloucester County Planning Department (1993). Gloucester County data book. Gloucester County, New Jersey.
- Gottfredson, G. (1988, April). You get what you measure, you get what you don't: Higher standards, higher test scores, more retention in grade. Paper presented at the annual meeting of the American Educational Research Association, New Orleans, LA.
- Gredler, G. (1984). Transition classes: A viable alternative for the at-risk child? Psychology in the Schools, 21, 463-470.
- Grissom, J., & Shepard, L. (1989). Repeating and dropping out of school. In Shepard, L., & Smith, M. (Eds.), Flunking Grades: Research and Policies on Retention (pp. 34-63). Philadelphia, PA: The Falmer Press.

- Hamer, T. (1995, February). Economic data for southern New Jersey. Glassboro, NJ: Rowan College of New Jersey, The Management Institute.
- Hearnes brothers (1988). polynomic projection map of Gloucester County, New Jersey. Daytona Beach, Florida: Champion Map Corporation.
- Hill, K. (1989). Grade retention and dropping out of school. Paper presented at the annual meeting of the American Educational Research Association. San Francisco, CA.
- Holmes, C. (1989). Grade level retention effects: A meta-analysis of research studies. In Shepard, L., & Smith, M. (Eds.), Flunking Grades: Research and Policies on Retention (pp. 16-33). Philadelphia, PA: The Falmer Press.
- Holmes, C., & Matthews, K. (1984). The effects of nonpromotion on elementary and junior high school pupils: A meta-analysis. Review of Educational Research, *54* (2), 225-236.
- Jackson, G. (1975). The research evidence on the effects of grade retention. Review of Educational Research, *45* (4), 613-635.
- Johns, K. (1990). Slower learners: Students at risk. Instructional Leader, February, 8-12.
- Karweit, N. (1991, May). Repeating a grade: A time to grow or denial of opportunity? (Report No. 16). Baltimore, MD: Center for Research on Effective Schooling for Disadvantaged Students.
- Koons, C. (1977). Nonpromotion: A dead-end road. Phi Delta Kappan, *58* (10), 701-702.
- Leinhardt, G. (1980). Transition rooms: Promoting maturation or reducing education? Journal of Educational Psychology, *72* (1), 55-61.
- Madden, N., Slavin, R., Karweit, N., Dolan, L., & Wasik, B. (1992, March). Success for All: Longitudinal effects of a restructuring program for inner-city elementary schools (Report No. 28). Baltimore MD: Center for Research on Effective Schooling for Disadvantaged Students.
- National Association of School Psychologists (1988). Student grade retention. Forum, July.

- Peterson, P. (1989). Alternatives to student retention: New images of the learner, the teacher and classroom learning. In Shepard, L., & Smith, M. (Eds.), Flunking Grades: Research and Policies on Retention (pp. 174-201). Philadelphia, PA: The Falmer Press.
- Peterson, S., DeGracie, J., & Ayabe, C. (1987). A longitudinal study of the effects of retention/promotion on academic achievement. American Education Research Journal, 24 (1), 107-118.
- Schultz, T. (1989). Testing and retention of young children: Moving from controversy to reform. Phi Delta Kappan, 71 (2), 125-129.
- Shepard, L. (1989). A review of research on kindergarten retention. In Shepard, L., & Smith, M. (Eds.), Flunking Grades: Research and Policies on Retention (pp. 64-78). Philadelphia, PA: The Falmer Press.
- Shepard, L., & Smith, M. (1987). Effects of kindergarten retention at the end of first grade. Psychology in the Schools, 24 (4), 346-357.
- Shepard, L., & Smith, M. (1989). Academic and emotional effects of kindergarten retention in one school district. In Shepard, L., & Smith, M. (Eds.), Flunking Grades: Research and Policies on Retention (pp. 79-107). Philadelphia, PA: The Falmer press.
- Shepard, L., & Smith, M. (1989). Introduction and Overview. In Shepard, L., & Smith, M. (Eds.), Flunking Grades: Research and Policies on Retention (pp. 1-15). Philadelphia, Pa: The Falmer Press.
- Shepard, L., & Smith, M. (1990). Synthesis of research on grade retention. Educational Leadership, 47 (8), 84-88.
- Singer, H., Balow, I., & Ferrett, R. (1988). English class as preparation for minimal competency tests in reading. Journal of Reading, 31, 512-519.
- Sherwood, C. (1993). Retention in grade: Lethal lessons? Position paper of Collier County Public Schools, Naples, FL.
- Slavin, R. (1991). Chapter 1: A vision for the next quarter century. Phi Delta Kappan, 72 (8), 586-592.

- Slavin, R., Karweit, N., & Wasik, B. (1992-1993). Preventing early school failure: What works? Educational Leadership, 49 (4), 10-17.
- Slavin, R., & Madden, N.(1989). What works for students at risk: A research synthesis. Educational Leadership, 46 (5), 4-13.
- Slavin, R., Madden, N., Dolan, L., Wasik, B., Ross, S., & Smith, L. (1994). Whenever and wherever we choose: The replication of Success for All. Phi Delta Kappan, 75 (9), 639-647.
- Smith, M. (1989). Teachers' beliefs about retention. In Shepard, L., & Smith, M. (Eds.), Flunking Grade: Research and Policies on Retention (pp. 132-150). Philadelphia, PA: The Falmer Press.
- Smith, M.,& Shepard, L. (1987). What doesn't work: Explaining policies of retention in the early grades. Phi Delta Kappan, 69 (2), 129-134.
- Texas Education Agency (1987, March). Alternatives to Social Promotion, Grades 7-12. Austin, TX: Author.
- Wrotney, N. (1976). A bicentennial look at Mantua Township. Paulsboro: Paulsboro Printers.
- Yamamoto, K. (1980). Children under stress: The causes and cures. Family Weekly, Ogden Standard Examiner, 6-8.

1996-97 School Report Card

APPENDIX A
Research Instruments

Summer Remediation Program Teacher Questionnaire

1. What is the purpose of the program?
2. What are the objectives of the program?
3. How was the program developed?
4. Who was responsible for developing it?
5. What are the components of the program?
6. How do they contribute to its effectiveness? (Why was the program developed this way?)
7. How was curriculum/content determined?

8. How were students identified for this program?

9. Were they grouped in any way? If so, how?

10. What tools or techniques were used to measure/evaluate progress/performance?

11. What criteria were used to determine “successful” program completion?

12. What kinds of recommendations are you expected to make as to the students’ placements next year?

13. How did you feel at the beginning of the program?

At the mid-point?

At the completion?

14. What changes would you make or recommend for the summer program if it continues?

15. What problems developed during implementation?

16. What thoughts/concerns do you have?

17. What thoughts/concerns/recommendations do you have concerning the mentoring component?

Alternative to Retention
Summer Session/Mentoring Program
Student Questionnaire

As members of the first group of students to attend the alternative to retention summer session, your opinions, ideas, and feelings are very important. They can help us to continue to provide support for you and to improve the program. Please answer the following questions and return it to Ms. Kinsey. All of your answers will remain confidential, so please do not sign your name.

1. Was the summer school session worthwhile to you? (circle one)

yes

no

If so, how?

If not, why?

2. Is the program helping you this year?

yes

no

If so, how?

3. What are you able to do this year that you couldn't last year?

4. Would you recommend that this program be continued?

yes

no

(over)

5. Would you recommend that this program be expanded to include students who fail eighth grade?

yes

no

6. At this time do you feel that it is possible that you may have to attend a retention program next summer?

yes

no

Please explain.

Thank you for taking the time to provide this information. Your effort is greatly appreciated and will help to improve this program for you and others in the district.

Alternative to Retention
Summer Session/Mentoring Program
Parent Questionnaire

This questionnaire represents our request for your help in providing us with important information regarding your child's summer session experience. All information will remain completely confidential. Please take a few moments to complete the questionnaire, but do not sign your name.

1. How would you describe your child's attitude toward this program before attending? (Please circle one)

positive apprehensive negative

During the summer session?

positive apprehensive negative

At the completion of the summer session?

positive apprehensive negative

Comment:

2. Did you find the dates and times of the summer session convenient?

yes no

If no, what suggestions would you make?

3. Based upon what your child is currently doing in grade eight, do you think the program is worthwhile?

yes no

If so, what do you feel your child gained from the program?

4. What parts of the program were most valuable?

5. What changes or improvements do you suggest?

6. Would you recommend that this program be continued?

yes no

7. Would you recommend that this program be expanded to include students failing grade eight?

yes no

Additional comments:

Thank you for taking the time to provide us with this information. Your effort is greatly appreciated and will contribute to the improvement of this program for your child and others in the district.

Partners for Success

Mentoring Program

Follow-up Student Questionnaire

As members of the first group of students to attend this program, your opinions, ideas, and feelings are important. They can help us to continue to provide support for you and to improve the program. Please answer the following questions and return this questionnaire to Ms. Kinsey. All of your answers will remain confidential, so please do not sign your name.

1. Is the program helping you this year?

_____ yes

_____ no

If so, how?

If not, what other help do you need that is not being provided?

2. What are you able to do this year that you could not last year?

3. What problems did you have last year that continue to be problems this year?

4. What problems did you have last year that have been corrected, solved, or improved?
5. Is this a worthwhile program?
___ yes ___ no
Why , or why not?
6. What suggestions do you have to make it better?
7. What is the best part of the program?
8. What is the worst part of the program?
9. In which classes do you feel most successful this year?
Why?
10. In which classes do you feel least successful?
Why?

Thank you for taking the time to provide this information. Your effort is greatly appreciated and will help to improve this program for you and others in the

Partners for Success
Weekly Evaluation Report
for

Name: _____

Date: _____

Check one response:

1. Is student completing and handing in all homework on time?
yes no
- If appropriate, is homework done well?
yes no

2. The student's attitude toward class is
 usually positive vacillates usually negative
3. The student demonstrates a work ethic which shows
 consistent effort erratic effort little effort

Check all that apply:

4. The student is attentive in class Attentiveness is
 consistently improving
 inconsistently in need of
improvement
5. The student has participated in class
 often sometimes rarely not at all
 appropriately inappropriately
6. This week the student has received these scores on
tests _____ quizzes _____ projects _____

Additional comments:

Partners for Success
Monthly Student Report
for

Name: _____

Date _____

Check one:

Teacher _____

1. Homework is completed when due

____ consistently ____ inconsistently

Homework completion is

____ improving ____ in need of improvement

2. The student's attitude is

____ excellent ____ good ____ improved
____ needs improvement ____ usually negative

3. The student's work ethic is

____ excellent ____ good ____ improved
____ needs improvement ____ usually negative

4. The student's attention in class is

____ excellent ____ good ____ improved
____ needs improvement ____ minimal

Check all that apply:

5. The student demonstrates organization skills

____ consistently ____ inconsistently

6. Organization skills are

___ strong ___adequate ___ weak
___ improving ___ in need of improvement

7. The student demonstrates skills in reading comprehension that are

___ strong ___ adequate ___ weak
___ improving ___ in need of improvement

8. The student demonstrates skills in writing that are

___ strong ___ adequate ___weak
___ improving ___ in need of improvement

9. The student demonstrates oral communication skills that are

___ strong ___ adequate ___ weak
___ improving ___ in need of improvement

10. If pertinent, the student demonstrates skills in math computation that are

___ strong ___ adequate ___ weak
___ improving ___ in need of improvement

If pertinent, the student demonstrates skills in math word problems that are

___ strong ___ adequate ___ weak
___ improving ___ in need of improvement

Additional comments:

Partners for Success
Student Self-Evaluation

Name: _____

Please circle the best choice for you:

1. My homework is done on time
 always usually sometimes never
2. I work hard at school work
 always usually sometimes never
3. I pay attention in class
 always usually sometimes never
4. I participate in class (by answering questions or talking about the lesson)
 always usually sometimes never
5. In organizing my work, notebooks, and papers I
 am good am improving need help
6. In reading I
 am good am improving need help
7. In writing I
 am good am improving need help
8. In speaking I
 am good am improving need help
- 9.. In math I
 am good am improving need help
10. I feel good about school
 always usually sometimes never

Partners for Success
Summer/ Session Mentoring Program
Classroom Teacher Questionnaire

As teachers of the first group of students to attend this program, your opinions, reactions, and ideas are important. They can help us to improve the program and to provide effective support for these students. Please answer the following questions and return it to Ms. Kinsey. All of your answers will remain confidential, so please do not sign your name.

1. How would you rate this program at the present time? Please check all that apply:

___ very effective ___ somewhat effective ___ needs improvement

2. What recommendations or suggestions do you have regarding the summer session?
3. What do you perceive students' attitudes toward the program to be?
4. What positive results have you seen from the program?

5. What was the most effective component of the program?

6. What was the least effective component?

7. What problems, if any, have evolved as a result of this total program for the students?

8. What needs/concerns have you identified?

9. What recommendations or suggestions do you have for the mentoring program?

Thank you for taking the time to provide this information. Your effort is sincerely appreciated.

Partners for Success
Summer Session Mentor Program
Mentor Questionnaire

As mentor teachers of the first group of students to attend this program, your opinions, reactions, and ideas are important. They can help us to improve the program and to provide effective support for these students. Please answer the following questions and return it to Ms. Kinsey. All of your responses will remain confidential, so please do not sign your name.

1. How would you rate this program at the present time? Please check all that apply:
____ very effective ____ somewhat effective ____ needs improvement

2. What suggestions or recommendations do you have regarding the summer session?

3. What techniques or strategies do you use with these students?

4. What do you perceive students' attitudes toward the program to be?

5. What positive results have you seen from the program?

6. What problems, if any, have evolved as a result of this total program for the student?
7. What problems, if any, have evolved as a result of this program for the mentor?
8. What was the most effective component of the program?
9. What was the least effective component?
10. What needs/concerns have you identified?
11. What suggestions or recommendations do you have for the mentoring program?

Thank you for taking the time to provide this information. Your effort is sincerely appreciated.

Biographical Data

Name	Sue H. Kinsey
High School	Woodstown High School Woodstown , NJ
Undergraduate	Bachelor of Arts Secondary Education Lebanon Valley College Annville, PA
Graduate	Master of Arts School Administration Rowan University Glassboro, NJ
Present Occupation	French and Spanish Teacher Clearview Regional Middle School Mullica Hill, NJ