DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 083 270 TM 003 231

AUTHOR Goldsmith, Barbara C.; And Others
TITLE Evaluation of Title I ESEA Projects, 1971-1972. Volume II, School-Community Relations and Unique Staffing Patterns.
INSTITUTION Philadelphia School District, Pa. Office of Research and Evaluation.
REPORT NO R-7217
PUB DATE [73]
NOTE 62p.; DIR-1

EDRS PRICE MF-$0.65 HC-$3.29
DESCRIPTORS *Compensatory Education Programs; Elementary Grades; *Evaluation Techniques; Kindergarten; *Parent Attitudes; *Program Evaluation; *School Community Programs; Secondary Grades; Staff Role; Technical Reports
IDENTIFIERS *Elementary Secondary Education Act Title I; ESEA Title I; Philadelphia

ABSTRACT

ESEA Title I projects related to school-community relations and unique staffing patterns, carried out in Philadelphia during 1971-1972, are evaluated in this volume. The six projects in this cluster are: School-Community Coordinator Services; New Staffing Patterns in Educational Improvement Program Schools; Kindergarten Aides and Supervisors; Out-of-School Sequenced Science Experiences for Paired Schools; Education in World Affairs; and Germantown Area Schools Project. The six projects have the following objectives: to inform community residents about the objectives, programs, curricula, and services of the school, and to increase their participation in projects relating the school and the community; and to inform school personnel about the composition, needs, and concerns of their school's community, and to increase their participation in projects relating the school and the community. This report contains a cluster overview, and digest reports of the projects within the cluster in the following format: identification and description of the project (rationale, objectives, operational characteristics, previous evaluations); current evaluation procedure (scope and design, instruments, subjects, analysis of data); results; and conclusions. (For related documents, see TM 003 230, 232-233.) (DB)

EVALUATION OF TITLE I

ESEA PROJECTS 1971-1972

VOLUME II

SCHOOL-COMMUNITY RELATIONS AND UNIQUE STAFFING PATTERNS

Report #7217 Prepared by

Barbara C. Goldsmith
Research Associate

David W. Allen
Research Assistant

Yaakov S. Kanovsky
Research Assistant

OFFICE OF RESEARCH AND EVALUATION

THE SCHOOL DISTRICT OF PHILADELPHIA

THE SCHOOL DISTRICT OF PHILADELPHIA

Superintendent of Schools
Dr. Matthew W. Costanzo

Executive Deputy Superintendent
Dr. Robert L. Poindexter

Associate Superintendent for School Services
Mr. David A. Horowitz

Office of Federal Programs
Mr. Thomas C. Rosica, Executive Director

Office of Research and Evaluation

Dr. Michael H. Kean, Executive Director
Mr. Edward K. Brown, Director of Instructional Research
Dr. Stephen H. Davidoff, Assistant Director of Instructional Systems Research

Members of the Board of Education

Mr. William Ross, President
Robert M. Sebastian, Esq., Vice President
Mr. Augustus Baxter
Mrs. Lawrence I. Boonin
Dr. Philip Davidoff
Mr. George Hutt
Mrs. Edward Oberholtzer
Mr. Arthur W. Thomas
Dr. Alec Wascho, Jr.

PROJECT ADMINISTRATORS

The projects reported in this volume have been funded under Title I ESEA, USOE Grant #48-0043-51-011-01, administered through the Office of Federal Programs, Thomas C. Rosica, Executive Director. Named below are the individual project administrators.

PROJECT	ADMINISTRATOR
Education in World Affairs	Mazie Hough
Germantown Area Schools	Bernard Kelner
Kindergarten Aides and Supervisors	Frances Becker
New Staffing Patterns in EIP Elementary Schools	Milton Goldberg
Out-of-School Sequenced Science Experiences for Paired Schools	Samuel Lepow
Parent School Aides	Charles McLaughlin
School-Community Coordinator Services	George Green

SOURCES OF INFORMATION

The evaluation of the "School-Community Relations and Unique Staffing Patterns" cluster and its component projects was designed, conducted, and reported by Barbara Carullo Goldsmith, Research Associate, David W. Allen, Research Assistant, and Yaakov S. Kanovsky, Research Assistant. Mr. Kanovsky had primary responsibility for the evaluation of the project, New Staffing Patterns in EIP Elementary Schools. Mr. Allen had primary responsibility for the evaluation of the project, Out-of-School Sequenced Science Experiences for Paired Schools. The information dealing with the Parent School Aides project was provided by Charles P. McLaughlin, Coordinator of Nonpublic School Projects; these data were analyzed and reported by Stephen H. Davidoff.

CONTENTS

SCHOOL-COMMUNITY RELATIONS AND UNIQUE STAFFING PATTERNS: CLUSTER OVERVIEW

This cluster overview assesses the common impact of six projects upon the school and the community. Separate evaluations of the noncommon features of the individual projects follow this cluster overview. Each of the individual project reports should be interpreted in the context of this overview.

The Cluster of Projects

To contribute to the achievement of community-related goals, the School District has allocated a certain portion of Title I ESEA money for projects designed to foster school-community involvement. Six such projects are the components of this cluster: School-Community Coordinator Services (SCC), New Staffing Patterns in Educational Improvement Program Schools (EIP), Kindergarten Aides and Supervisors (KA), Out-of-School Sequenced Science Experiences for Paired Schools (PSSP), Education in World Affairs (EWA), and Germantown Area Schools Project (GASP).

This is the second year in which these designated projects have been examined under a cluster design. This type of design permits the evaluator to investigate simultaneously various aspects of school-community involvement for a group of related projects.

The interrelations that exist among the projects in this cluster can be found in various aspects of the designs of individual projects. In each of these projects, the staff members are residents of target areas of Philadelphia, and in SCC, EIP, KA, and GASP are living in the school communities which they serve. This staffing pattern was instituted to increase the two-way flow of information between school and community, and to increase community participation in school affairs. In addition, each project provides school staffs and community residents with information about its respective project practices. The objectives of establishing these information-channeling procedures were (a) to increase school and community knowledge of school projects, (b) to increase community participation in the school projects, and (c) to increase harmony among differing ethnic groups.

Common to the modes of operation of all projects in the cluster is the implementation of various elements of the community school concept. Four of the projects (SCC, EIP, KA, and GASP) make education a joint process involving the school and the community and also upgrade the community by employing only community residents in certain school positions. Three projects (PSSP, EWA, and GASP) draw on resources in the community for improving education by utilizing existing community facilities to house educational programs. Two projects (PSSP and EWA) provide opportunities for children from different schools to increase their knowledge of the total community by bringing them together to share a common learning activity.

The six projects have the following objectives in common:

Objective 1. To inform community residents about the objectives, programs, curricula, and services of the school, and to increase their participation in projects relating the school and the community.

Objective 2. To inform school personnel about the composition, needs, and concerns of their school's community, and to increase their participation in projects relating the school and the community.

Previous evaluations of the individual projects in this cluster have provided information about the degree to which each project has achieved its own stated objectives on a citywide basis. Although complete in themselves, they provided no information about (a) where the cluster of projects stood in relation to the attainment of the community-related goals of the School District, (b) soundness of the assumptions on which these projects have been based, or (c) the combination of factors within the school that mediate for the project's success. To provide the decision makers with this type of information, a 3-year longitudinal evaluation was initiated in 1970-1971.

The purpose of this 3 year longitudinal evaluation was (a) to examine the degree to which this cluster of projects has been contributing to the attainment of the community-related goals of the School District, (b) to test the validity of the assumptions (on which these projects are based) that information leads to participation and that information and participation have a positive effect on opinions, and (c) to identify the critical combination of factors within the school that mediate for project success.

The purpose of the 1970-1971 study was to examine where the cluster of projects stood in relation to the attainment of the community-related goals of the School District, and to test the validity of the first of the assumptions on which these projects are based--namely, that information leads to participation. It was found that the noncluster projects were providing more information about their operation and fostering more positive opinions about School-Community relations than were the cluster projects. Possible explanations for the relatively lesser degree of effectiveness of the cluster projects were (a) that the assumptions on which these projects are based are invalid, and (b) that certain factors (not yet identified) operating within the school are preventing these projects from attaining their objectives.

It was also found that within the school-community cluster, projects differed from one another in their amount of impact. Project impact appeared to be dependent upon the relationship and combined effect of the operation of a project and the operation of the school to which the project had been allocated. Differences within and between schools indicated that cluster projects had the desired impact only in schools which

had goals similar to those of the projects. Therefore, in order to maximize project effectiveness, school characteristics which are compatible with project goals must be identified.

Regarding the first part of the assumptions on which these projects are based (that information leads to participation) the data indicated that information does not lead to participation.

Current Evaluation Procedure

The purpose of this 1971-1972 evaluation was to test the validity of the second of the assumptions on which these projects are based, that information and participation have a positive effect on opinion. The cluster evaluation was focused on three questions:

1. How many parents have positive opinions about their child's school and about the school system as a whole?

2. To what extent are parents' opinions related to accuracy of information about specific Title I ESEA projects?

3. To what extent are parents' opinions related to participation in specific Title I ESEA projects?

To help in answering these questions, a School-Community Questionnaire (SCQ) was developed. The purpose of the SCQ was to measure parents' opinions about their child's school and the school system. The questionnaire was divided into four major parts. Part I consisted of 14 pairs of questions. Each pair dealt with a different condition that could exist in the school or the school system. For each pair, Question 1 asked "does" the condition exist, and Question 2 asked "should" the condition exist. To interpret the responses to each pair, the following procedure was used:

1. Opinions were considered positive if parents responded either Yes to both questions in the pair, or No to both questions in the pair.

2. Opinions were considered negative if parents responded either Yes to question 1 of the pair and No to Question 2, or No to Question 1 and Yes to Question 2.

The emphasis of the School-Community Questionnaire was placed on measuring opinion. Thus, no attempt was made to ascertain the accuracy of parental responses.

Parts II, III, and IV consisted of one question each. The

purpose of these parts was to ascertain whether schools were performing according to the expectations of parents. (A copy of the instrument is on file in the Research Library of the Board of Education.)

A stratified random sample consisting of 39 schools was chosen to participate in the evaluation. Stratification was achieved through two criteria: subdistrict location and school organization. After location within a subdistrict, each Title I school was placed in one of four school-organization categories:

(E1) Elementary with less than 750 pupils;
(E2) Elementary with more than 750 pupils;
(JH) Junior high;
(SH) Senior high.

In order to insure the representativeness of the sample, the fraction of the total Title I enrollment in each district was obtained for each of the four school types. In each district, the number of schools to be chosen (which had been determined on the basis of the relative size of the district) was then multiplied by the appropriate fractions to obtain the number of E1, E2, JH, and SH schools to be selected. The schools were then chosen at random from lists of schools with the necessary characteristics.

Parents of children in Grades 1, 6, 7, and 10 were selected to be recipients of the questionnaire. It was determined that a representative sample would be obtained if the following numbers of classes in each school were used:

1. E1 - 2 classes; grades 1 and 6 - Parents of 1 class of first graders and of 1 class of 6th graders;

2. E2 - 4 classes; 2 at grade 1, 2 at grade 6 - Parents of 2 classes of first graders and of 2 classes of 6th graders;

3. JH - Parents of 3 classes of 7th graders;

4. SH - Parents of 4 classes of 10th graders.

The selection of the classes within each school was left to the principal.

The percentages of returns for the questionnaire are reported in Table 1. The lowest acceptable rates of return had been set at 60% for elementary schools, 50% for junior high schools, and 40% for senior high schools. All returns were well above these minimums.

To insure the authenticity and validity of the data, it was decided to eliminate from further analyses all forms with more than five blank responses to the 28 items in Part I. The number of forms eliminated in this manner was less than 1% of the total sample (N=3158) and thus did not affect its representative character.

TABLE 1

PERCENTAGE OF RETURN OF QUESTIONNAIRES

District	School Type	Number of Schools	Number Issued	Percentage Returned
1	Elementary	5	478	86%
	Junior High	1	92	78%
	Senior High	1	100	67%
2	Elementary	6	520	88%
	Junior High	1	86	100%
	Senior High	1	63	51%
3	Elementary	6	335	91%
	Junior High	1	49	90%
	Senior High	0	0	0
4	Elementary	4	387	85%
	Junior High	2	122	95%
	Senior High	0	0	0
5	Elementary	4	248	91%
	Junior High	1	104	61%
	Senior High	1	85	58%
6	Elementary	1	99	83%
	Junior High	1	50	64%
	Senior High	0	0	0
7	Elementary	3	240	82%
	Junior High	0	0	0
	Senior High	0	0	0

Data analysis was performed on responses to the questionnaires, as follows:

The responses were tabulated for each of the 14 pairs within Part I. Frequencies in each of the response categories were obtained and percentages calculated. Similar techniques were used to obtain descriptive information about Parts II, III and IV.

In addition, each respondent was rated on two opinion scales.

The Opinion I scale ranged from zero to 28 and was obtained as follows: For each of the 14 pairs in Part I, the respondent was given a rating of zero, one, or two. A rating of zero indicated that the respondent had a negative opinion about the item -- a discrepancy between the "does" and "should" portions of the pair. A rating of one indicated no strong opinion about the item. A rating of two indicated a positive opinion -- an agreement between the "does" and "should" aspects of the pair. The ratings for all pairs were added to form the Opinion I score.

The Opinion II scale ranged from zero to two and measured the degree to which the respondent felt that his school was concentrating its efforts in the area he perceived to be most important to his child.

Means and standard deviations were computed for these two scales for each school. Correlations between these two scales and the information, participation, and opinion ratings of the 1970-1971 study were computed, using school as the experimental unit (N=39).

Results

Data relevant to Question 1. How many parents have positive opinions about their child's school and about the school system as a whole?

The most important facet of impact of Title I ESEA projects in this cluster, if they are concerned with school-community relations, is to foster positive attitudes about the school in the community. A measure of the amount of success they are having in achieving that objective, as well as a measure of validity of the use of information and participation to foster positive opinions, can be obtained by correlating the information and participation scores obtained from last year's study with opinion scores about the school and School District.

Part I of the questionnaire was designed to measure parents' opinions about their child's school and the school system in general. Responses to Part I are summarized in Table 2.

Proportionately more parents had positive opinions than negative opinions about 11 of the 14 conditions presented. (A research into the literature on opinion surveys indicates that this slightly favorable overall response is typical for the majority of opinion surveys administered.)

The response patterns to items on this part of the questionnaire indicated that parents were more willing to report that the school (or school system) should have the responsibility for performing certain tasks than to report that the school (or school system) should not have the responsibility for performing those tasks. This is evidenced by the relatively higher percentages of responses that appear in columns 3 and 6 on Table 2 and the relatively lower percentages that appear in columns 4

TABLE 2

SUMMARY OF PARENT RESPONSES TO PART I OF THE QUESTIONNAIRE

Conditions	Total Number of Responses	Positive Opinion (Percentage of Responses)			Negative Opinion (Percentage of Responses)		
		Condition Does Exist And Condition Should Exist	Condition Doesn't Exist And Condition Shouldn't Exist	Total	Condition Doesn't Exist And Condition Should Exist	Condition Does Exist And Condition Shouldn't Exist	Total
1. Parents are allowed to visit the school whenever it is open.	2494	80.5	4.0	84.5	12.2	3.3	15.5
2. Teachers at the school participate in the community's activities?	2473	26.4	15.4	41.8	56.4	1.8	58.2
3. The school asks parents for their ideas.	2497	48.5	6.0	54.5	43.7	1.8	45.5
4. The school uses the ideas suggested by parents.	2416	38.0	10.2	48.2	49.7	2.1	51.8
5. Philadelphia's schools are better than schools in other large cities.	2452	17.4	11.7	29.1	68.1	2.8	70.9
6. The school considers discipline to be as important as school subjects.	2468	61.5	6.2	67.7	27.8	4.5	32.3
7. The school is doing a better job of disciplining your child than of educating him.	2445	6.9	66.5	73.4	16.8	9.8	26.6
8. Teachers try their best to help children.	2490	78.1	0.7	78.8	20.7	0.5	21.2
9. Schools prepare their students to get good jobs.	2458	49.7	0.8	50.5	48.8	0.7	49.5

TABLE 2 (CONTINUED)

SUMMARY OF PARENT RESPONSES TO PART I OF THE QUESTIONNAIRE

Conditions	Total Number of Responses	Positive Opinion (Percentage of Responses)			Negative Opinion (Percentage of Responses)		
		Condition Does Exist And Condition Should Exist	Condition Doesn't Exist And Condition Shouldn't Exist	Total	Condition Doesn't Exist And Condition Should Exist	Condition Does Exist And Condition Shouldn't Exist	Total
10. The school spends more time on reading than on any other subject.	2418	26.6	32.3	58.9	31.5	9.6	41.1
11. Your child is learning more in reading than in any other subject.	2440	23.9	33.8	57.7	31.4	10.9	42.3
12. You feel welcome when you visit the school.	2508	87.9	0.7	88.6	11.0	0.4	11.4
13. The Philadelphia public schools pay more attention to activities like art, music, and sports than to subjects like reading and math.	2403	6.4	59.2	65.6	7.9	26.5	34.4
14. Most parents feel pleased with the school their child attends.	2445	44.8	6.2	51.0	45.4	3.6	49.0

and 7 of the same table. Parents were especially unwilling to report that the school (or school system) was performing certain tasks for which it should not be responsible. This is reflected by the extremely low percentages that appear in column 7 of the table.

The only exceptions to these patterns occurred in the following items:

1. The majority of parents felt that it was not the school's responsibility to do a better job of disciplining their children than of educating them.

2. A large percentage of parents, but not quite a majority, felt it should not be the school's responsibility to spend more time on reading than on any other subject.

3. A large percentage of parents, but not quite a majority, felt it should not be the school's responsibility to teach their children more in reading than in any other subject.

4. A majority of parents felt it was not the responsibility of the Philadelphia public schools to pay more attention to activities like art, music, and sports than to subjects like reading and mathematics.

To the extent that positive opinions are an indicator of impact, the projects in the cluster (with the exception of the GASP project) have had less impact on the community than the other Title I ESEA projects investigated. While opinions tended to be positive, parents in schools that had more of the Title I ESEA projects which stressed cognitive development tended to be more positive than the average of all responding parents.

Specific factors in school communities appear to be related to project impact as measured by opinion scores. In school-by-school examination of the data from each district (not presented in this report) it was noted that the distribution of opinion scores varied significantly from school to school and from district to district. This finding suggested that positive parent opinions are directly related to specific factors operating within each individual school and each individual district.

Three school-specific factors that appear to have a definite effect on impact are grade, school type, and the degree of positive correlation that exists between the principal's goals for the school and the Title I ESEA project goals. More parents with children in lower grades had positive opinions about the school (and school system) than

parents with children in the upper grades. More parents with children in elementary schools had positive opinions about the school (and school system) than parents with children in junior or senior high school. More parents had positive opinions in schools where principals ranked community participation high on their list of school goals than in schools where principals ranked community participation low as a goal.

The degree to which these school-specific factors are significant contributors to the impact of the projects in this cluster will be the partial subject matter for the third and last year of this longitudinal study, in 1972-1973.

Data relevant to Question 2. To what extent are parents' opinions related to accuracy of information about specific Title I ESEA projects?

In order to test the assumption (on which the projects in this cluster are based) that accurate information leads to positive opinions, a correlation analysis was performed to test the relationship between accurate information and positive opinion. The correlation coefficient was -.13, which indicates the lack of a significant relationship between accurate information and positive opinion. (With an N of 39 schools, a correlation coefficient of at least .31 would be required for statistical significance at the .05 level.)

This lack of relationship between opinion and information tends to confirm and explain the 1970-1971 finding that although community-oriented ESEA Title I projects generated accurate knowledge about their own existence, the opinions of accurately-informed parents about school-community relations were no more positive than those of misinformed persons.

Data relevant to Question 3. To what extent are parents' opinions related to participation in specific Title I ESEA projects?

In order to test the assumption (on which the projects in this cluster are based) that participation leads to positive opinions, a correlation analysis was performed. The correlation coefficient was +.33, which indicates that a significant positive relationship existed between participation and positive opinion.

This relationship of opinion and participation has special significance for the cluster of community-oriented projects in the light of the 1970-1971 finding that accurately informed parents participated more extensively and more intensively in projects having direct cognitive goals. Thus the more directly cognitive projects, through greater parent participation, appear to have been more effective in fostering positive community opinion than were the community-based projects in this cluster.

TABLE 3

SUMMARY OF PARENT RESPONSES TO PARTS II, III, AND IV OF THE QUESTIONNAIRE

Question	Response			
	Teaching him to read	Keeping good discipline	Teaching him Art or Music	Protecting him from gangs
II. In which ONE of these ways is this school helping your child MOST? (N=2403)	68.2%	15.1%	10.9%	5.8%
III. In which ONE of these ways is this school helping your child LEAST? (N=2418)	19.5%	20.3%	18.6%	41.6%
IV. Which ONE of these things is MOST IMPORTANT for the school to do for your child? (N=2401)	67.8%	17.0%	2.5%	12.7%

TABLE 4

SUMMARY OF 2,294* PARENTS' RESPONSES TO PART II AND PART IV OF THE QUESTIONNAIRE

Response to Part II: "Helping Most"	Response to Part IV: "Most Important"			
	Teaching him to read (N=1556)	Keeping good discipline (N=352)	Teaching him Art or Music (N=250)	Protecting him from gangs (N=136)
Teaching him to read	71.3%	62.2%	67.8%	56.8%
Keeping good discipline	13.5%	21.8%	11.9%	17.4%
Teaching him Art or Music	11.1%	6.5%	10.2%	16.0%
Protecting him from gangs	4.2%	9.6%	10.2%	9.8%
Total	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

*NOTE: The data shown were computed for those parents who responded to both parts of the questionnaire.

Complementary Data

Parts II, III, and IV of the questionnaire were designed to ascertain whether or not schools were performing according to the expectations of parents. Responses to these parts are summarized in Table 3.

Sixty-eight percent of the parents who responded to Part II of the questionnaire reported that the school was helping their child most by teaching him to read. Elementary school parents constituted the majority of this 68%. Junior high school parents constituted the majority of the 26% of the parents who reported that the school was helping their child most by teaching him art and music or keeping good discipline. Senior high school parents constituted the majority of the 6% of the parents who reported that the school was helping their child most by protecting him from gangs. Thus, parent responses to Part II of the questionnaire reflect the differences that exist between school types.

A comparison of parent responses to Part II and Part IV of the questionnaire is presented in Table 4. The majority of parents who responded to both items reported that the school was helping their child most by teaching him to read regardless of what they reported as being most important for the school to do for their child. Thus, parents concurred that the schools were achieving most in the area of reading.

Conclusions

Proportionately more parents have positive opinions about the school system than have negative opinions. However, our evidence indicates that those positive opinions were probably generated by skill-related projects (e.g., Reading Skills Centers Project). Proportionately more parents have positive opinions about the school and school system in schools emphasizing skill-related projects than in schools emphasizing community-based projects. Additionally, the number of parents in a school who have positive opinions about the school and school system is not affected by increasing either the number of community-based projects in that school or the duration of such projects in that school.

No relationship was found between positive opinions about the school and school system and accuracy of information. Those parents who expressed positive opinions about the school and school system were not predominantly those who had accurate information about the school and school system. The accurately informed parents were no more positive than their inaccurately informed counterparts. Thus, the possession of accurate information about specific Title I ESEA projects does not lead to positive opinion.

However, a significant relationship was found between positive opinions about the school (and school system) and participation in the projects. Proportionately more parents who had participated in school affairs had positive opinions about the school (and school system) than had negative opinions. Thus, participation in specific Title I ESEA

Projects does lead to positive opinion. However, since the community-based projects have less impact on parents regarding participation than do the skill-related projects, the dominance of positive opinions cannot be attributed to the projects in this cluster. Positive opinions appear to be a by-product of the operation of those Title I ESEA projects which are cognitive rather than specifically community-based.

EDUCATION IN WORLD AFFAIRS
(PBRS #211-03-556)

The Project

This project report should be interpreted in the context of the "cluster overview" in earlier pages of this volume.

Education in World Affairs (EWA) provides elementary and secondary school pupils with activities and materials on selected countries. Assemblies and field trips to the Art Museum, Civic Center, United Nations, and Washington are arranged under the major sponsorship of the World Affairs Council.

The objectives of EWA are these:

Objective 1. To provide EWA students with materials, guest speakers, and field trips including a trip to the United Nations or Washington.

Objective 2. To increase general knowledge of world affairs and specific knowledge of the history, language, geography, and customs of four countries.

Objective 3. To provide firsthand enrichment experiences involving learning about a country or issue by active participation.

Evaluations conducted in 1967-1968 and 1968-1969 indicated a statistically significant superiority of EWA junior high students over comparison groups in knowledge of the four countries but not in "open-mindedness." Findings in the 1969-1970 school year again confirmed the EWA students' greater factual knowledge and demonstrated that the amount of knowledge was directly related to the number of district meetings attended. Findings in the 1970-1971 school year showed that the EWA project continued to provide the services necessary for an enrichment program where firsthand contact with artifacts and native speakers is emphasized, as well as active pupil participation in learning about foreign countries.

Current Evaluation Procedure

In addition to the questions considered in the evaluation of the cluster as a whole (reported in earlier pages of this volume), this year's evaluation dealt with the following questions about the EWA project:

1. Have the learning activities considered essential to the EWA program in the participating schools taken place during 1971-1972?

2. Have the procedures and structural arrangements considered essential to EWA activities at the Civic Center, Art Museum, the Pennsylvania German Society, and International House been carried out?

3. To what extent are the students' best-liked EWA activities seen by the teachers as having educational value?

Question 1. Have the learning activities considered essential to the EWA program in the participating schools taken place during 1971-1972?

Systematic monitoring of elementary district programs and junior and senior high EWA club and classroom activities was conducted with the use of the Observational Checklist. (A copy of the checklist is on file in the Research Library of the Board of Education.)

Thirty-two elementary and junior high district programs (about Peru, Thailand, Germany, and Ethiopia) were observed involving some 105 participating classes. Seventeen visits to elementary and junior high club and/or class activities were made. Observed activities were listed descriptively. Classroom activities reported in teacher interviews were tallied with the classroom activities that were directly observed through monitoring. On five occasions, senior high school programs were visited (e.g., forums, model United Nations assembly, guest speakers). These observations served as the basis for assessing the degree to which prerequisite learning activities and materials were provided by the project to the students.

Question 2. Have the procedures and structural arrangements considered essential to EWA activities away from the local school been carried out?

Systematic monitoring of EWA activities was conducted with the aid of three forms of the Observational Checklist, at the Art Museum, the Civic Center, the Pennsylvania German Society, the University of Pennsylvania Museum, the Sheraton Hotel, the Academy of Natural Sciences, Inter International House, and the host schools. (Copies of these checklist forms are on file in the Research Library of the Board of Education.)

EWA meetings involving some 100 Title I schools at the elementary, junior high, and senior high levels were monitored. The data were summarized in terms of frequency of the presence or absence of specific conditions (e.g., whether the number of pupils prereported as coming actually came, and whether pupils participated in country activities).

Question 3. To what extent are the students' best-liked EWA activities seen by the teachers as having educational value?

All elementary EWA teachers were asked to indicate their opinions of both pupil interest and the educational value of the EWA activities by means of the Teacher Evaluation Questionnaire. (A copy of the questionnaire is on file in the Research Library of the Board of Education.) Teachers' responses, ranking both the educational value and pupil interest, were compared, using a rank-difference correlation (Kendall's tau).

All junior high EWA teachers were asked to indicate their opinions of the educational value of the EWA activities. In addition, pupils were requested to indicate their level of interest in EWA activities. A rank order correlation between the teacher's perception of the educational value and the pupil's perception of interest was used to determine the degree of congruence between these variables. (Both the Teacher Evaluation Questionnaire and the Pupil Evaluation Questionnaire are on file in the Research Library of the Board of Education.)

Results

Question 1. Have the learning activities considered essential to the EWA program in the participating schools taken place during 1971-1972?

The following learning activities were either observed by the evaluator during visits to EWA classrooms and club meetings or reported as having occurred by teachers.

1. In 27 instances, pupils listened to a native of the country being studied, who spoke about his or her country.

2. In 20 instances, pupils read from the country booklets.

3. In 13 instances, pupils had group discussions about the countries being studied.

4. In 12 instances, pupils saw either a film or a filmstrip about the country being studied.

5. In 11 instances, pupils listened to a record of music or folk tales about the country being studied.

6. In nine instances, pupils listened to an introductory tape on the country being studied.

7. In nine instances, pupils were preparing for a country program.

8. In seven instances, pupils gave reports about the country being studied.

9. In four instances, pupils went to the library to do further reading about the country being studied.

From this list, one sees the variety of activities taking place in the schools as a result of the EWA participating teachers, project personnel, and materials. The structural arrangement of EWA activities in the local school varies from clubs, to classrooms, to the involvement of several schools for assembly programs on a particular country. The success of the school program is largely dependent on the participating teacher and the cooperation of the school. In general, the diversity and number of activities reported indicate successful programs.

Data relevant to Question 2. Have the procedures and structural arrangements considered essential to EWA activities away from the local school been carried out?

The data obtained from observations during 39 visits are summarized in Table 1.

TABLE 1

SUMMARY OF OBSERVATIONS DURING 39 VISITS TO EWA LARGE-GROUP ACTIVITIES AND FIELD TRIPS

Desired Condition	Number of Observation Visits		
	Condition Present	Condition Lacking	Condition not Appropriate during Observation
1. The number of schools pre-reported as coming came.	34	5	0
2. The speaker was enthusiastic in his presentation.	33	2	4
3. Audiovisuals were used to supplement presentation.	13	2	24
4. Pupils were attentive during presentation.	37	2	0
5. Pupils asked questions.	35	4	0
6. Pupils saw artifacts from the country being studied.	12	0	27
7. Pupils participated in country activities.	25	0	14

Data relevant to Question 3. To what extent are the students' best-liked EWA activities seen by the teachers as having educational value?

Teachers' rankings of elementary activities and materials according to "interest" and "educational value" are presented in Table 2. A Kendall's tau correlation of .73 indicated that a high relationship exists between teacher rankings of "interest" and "educational value."

TABLE 2

RANKING BY INTEREST AND EDUCATIONAL VALUE FOR ELEMENTARY EWA ACTIVITIES

EWA Activity	Teacher-Ranked Educational Value	Teacher-Ranked Pupil Interest
Field Trips	1	2
Guest Speaker	2	1
U. N. Trip	3	4
Reading Booklet	4	3
District Programs	5	5
Listening to Tape	6	6

Rankings based on students' indications of "best-liked" EWA activities and teachers' indications of "most valuable" activities are presented in Table 3 for junior high respondents. A Kendall's tau correlation of .66 indicated that a moderate relationship exists between rankings of pupils' "best-liked" EWA activities and rankings based on teachers' indications of activities having "most educational value."

TABLE 3

RANKING BY INTEREST AND EDUCATIONAL VALUE FOR
JUNIOR HIGH EWA ACTIVITIES

EWA Activity	Rank: Educational Value Perceived by Teachers	Rank: Interest Expressed by Students
District Programs	1	2
U. N. Trip	2	1
Guest Speaker	3	3
World Fair	4	4

Conclusions

Question 1. Have the learning activities considered essential to the EWA program in the participating schools taken place during 1971-1972?

Yes, the learning activities considered essential to the EWA program at the participating schools have taken place during 1971-1972. Systematic monitoring and teachers' responses to a questionnaire have indicated that the EWA country booklets are the primary materials used to prepare elementary and junior high pupils for the country programs.

Guest speakers and background materials were supplied to senior high participating teachers to prepare their students for the forum programs (e.g., Surveillance, Drug Abuse, Do We Need Military, China in Focus, Bangladesh). However, the attendance rate of 54% indicates that many Title I Senior High Schools are not participating in the Saturday morning forum programs.

Question 2. Have the procedures and structural arrangements considered essential to EWA activities away from the local school been carried out?

Yes, the procedures and structural arrangements considered essential to EWA activities have been carried out. Systematic monitoring has shown that the EWA programs have consistently provided enthusiastic speakers to whom pupils were attentive and able to ask questions about country or issue.

Pupils also saw artifacts and/or participated in the country activities giving them a firsthand opportunity to learn about the country.

Question 3. To what extent are the students' best-liked EWA activities seen by teachers as having educational value?

In both elementary and junior high rankings of EWA activities and materials, a moderate-to-high relationship was found between pupil interest and educational value.

GERMANTOWN AREA SCHOOLS
(PBRS #211-02-595)

The Project

This project report should be interpreted in the context of the "cluster overview" in earlier pages of this volume.

The Germantown Area Schools project (GASP) located at Vernon House, sponsored by the Germantown Community Council and based on the concept of the community school, offers 50 Germantown High School juniors and seniors an alternative curriculum.

The key objectives of GASP are the following:

Objective 1. To complete state curriculum requirements for each student.

Objective 2. To enhance positive development of individual and group identity in relationship to the community.

Objective 3. To provide an alternative school environment for students that is not now possible within the regular high school framework.

The 1970-1971 evaluation of GASP was formative in nature and consisted primarily of an examination of the project as it developed throughout the year. The evaluation indicated that the project was operating as designed.

Current Evaluation Procedure

In addition to the questions considered in the evaluation of the cluster as a whole (reported in earlier pages of this volume), this year's evaluation dealt with two questions:

1. Are the opinions of GASP students about the project compatible with the project's objectives of a community-based curriculum?

2. Have the procedures and structural arrangements (i.e., enabling objectives) considered essential to GASP been carried out?

Question 1. Are the opinions of GASP students about the project compatible with the project's objective of a community-based curriculum?

To answer this question, 28 GASP students were interviewed concerning their participation in the project. The Observational Checklist was used to record student reponses during the interview. (A copy of the

instrument is available in the Research Library of the Board of Education).

Responses were recorded and summarized in terms of frequency.

Question 2. Have the procedures and structural arrangements considered essential to GASP been carried out?

To answer this question, GASP classes were systematically monitored on 28 occasions during the year. The instrument used to record project-specific conditions observed during these visits was the Observational Checklist. (A copy of the instrument is available in the Research Library of the Board of Education.)

Data from the observations were recorded and summarized in terms of frequency.

Results

Data relevant to Question 1. Are the opinions of GASP students about the project compatible with the project's objective of a community-based curriculum?

Table 1 summarizes the 28 students' responses to each item in the interview. All students who were interviewed indicated that they had become more involved in community issues and in their own academic activities as a result of their participation in the project. Ten of the 28 students who reported an increase in participation attributed it, in part, to a reduction in their fear of gangs (since GASP has no gangs).

Data relevant to Question 2. Have the procedures and structural arrangements considered essential to GASP been carried out?

Table 2 shows the number of times the desired conditions were found to exist in the 28 observations of GASP.

All members of the GASP faculty, with one exception, are residents of the Germantown community and all are specialists in the areas they teach. None of the 28 GASP classes observed had an enrollment larger than 15 students. During 24 of the 28 visits, small group discussions were in progress. During the remaining four visits, students in these classes were taking tests. During 16 of the 28 visits, classes were attended by non-GASP students from local high schools, in addition to the regularly enrolled GASP students.

TABLE 1

SUMMARY OF STUDENT RESPONSES TO ITEMS IN THE INTERVIEW

DESIRED CONDITION	RESPONSE (N=28)					
	Twice as much	2/3 more	1/2 more	1/3 more	Same	Not Applicable
1. Student participates more in GASP than regular school.	28	0	0	0	0	0
2. Student is learning more at GASP than regular school.	17	9	2	0	0	0
3. Student is less afraid of gangs at GASP than at regular school.	10	8	6	4	0	0
4. Student is more involved in community issues because of GASP.	28	0	0	0	0	0
5. Second-year courses build on first-year courses.	7	3	4	2	0	12
6. Student spends time working on projects.	5	8	7	8	0	0
7. Student spends more time in library since he entered GASP.	4	6	11	6	1	0
8. Student spends more time in community service projects.	8	5	11	4	0	0

TABLE 2

FREQUENCY OF CLASSROOM CONDITIONS OBSERVED DURING 28 CLASSROOM VISITATIONS

DESIRED CONDITION	CONDITION PRESENT					
	Entire Time	2/3 of Time	1/2 of Time	1/3 of Time	None of Time	Not Applicable
1. Teacher is a member of community.	27	0	0	0	1	0
2. Small-group discussions.	24	0	0	0	0	4
3. Topic discussed relates to community problems.	20	2	0	0	1	5
4. Students participate in discussions.	15	2	2	3	2	4
5. Time spent on affective areas of topic.	9	3	2	2	8	4
6. Time spent on cognitive areas of topic.	8	2	2	3	9	4
7. Non-GASP students attend class.	11	3	2	0	8	4

Complementary Data

Of the 52 students attending GASP, 20 had chronic attendance problems while attending regular high school. Only five of these students have chronic attendance problems at GASP. In addition, because of flexibility in the program and the dedicated efforts of the GASP staff, six students who would have had to drop out of regular high school are regular attenders at GASP.

The GASP staff also provides an extensive career counseling program. Seven of the 26 seniors who have spent two years in the program will be attending college in the fall. These students stated that they had no desire to go to college prior to their admission to GASP.

One problem in the project that should be remedied is the poor physical condition of the classrooms. The students have done some painting but much more work needs to be done if the classrooms are to be conducive to learning.

Conclusions

Question 1. Are the opinions of GASP students about the project compatible with the project's objective of a community-based curriculum?

Yes, the opinions of GASP students about the project are compatible with that objective. The majority of students who were interviewed indicated that they were actively involved in community affairs because the community tends to be the focal point of all courses offered in GASP.

Question 2. Have the procedures and structural arrangements considered essential to GASP been carried out?

Yes, the procedures and structural arrangements considered essential to the project have been carried out. Systematic monitoring has consistently revealed small-group discussions, community residents conducting classes, and discussions that center around community problems.

KINDERGARTEN AIDES AND SUPERVISORS
(PBRS #211-01-506)

The Project

This project report should be interpreted in the context of the "cluster overview" in earlier pages of this volume.

The Kindergarten Aides and Supervisors (KA) project employs community residents to assist kindergarten teachers in all phases of classroom activity. Although serving a different grade level, it is similar to New Staffing Patterns in EIP Elementary Schools (EIP) in its rationale, general objectives, and mode of operation.

The key objectives of KA are the following:

Objective 1. To free the teacher from duties not directly related to instruction, as well as from some instructional duties, so that she will be able to carry out more individualized and small-group instruction than would otherwise be possible.

Objective 2. To improve pupil performance on the Philadelphia Readiness Test.

Differences between schools in the project's mode of operation could account for the inconsistent findings of previous KA evaluations regarding individualization of instruction (Objective 1). Increases in individualization in classrooms with kindergarten aides were found in 1967-1968, 1969-1970, and 1970-1971, but not in 1968-1969. Regarding readiness test scores (Objective 2), no significant improvement over control group(s) was found in 1967-1968 or in 1968-1969.

Current Evaluation Procedure

In addition to the questions considered in the evaluation of the cluster as a whole (reported in earlier pages of this volume), this year's evaluation dealt with two questions:

1. Has the presence of the kindergarten aide reduced the number of noninstructional tasks the teacher performs?

2. Has the presence of the kindergarten aide increased the amount of individualized or small-group instruction the pupils receive?

To answer both questions, 30 teachers who have the supportive assistance of kindergarten aides were interviewed and asked about their typical utilization of their aides' services.

In addition, one kindergarten classroom in each of ten randomly selected schools was systematically monitored on three occasions when aides were scheduled to be present. The instrument used to record classroom conditions observed during these visits was the Observational Checklist. (A copy of the instrument is available in the Research Library of the Board of Education.)

Data from teacher interviews and from classroom observations were recorded and summarized in terms of frequency.

Results

Data relevant to Question 1. Has the presence of the kindergarten aide reduced the number of noninstructional tasks the teacher performs?

Table 1 summarizes the 30 teachers' responses to items in the interview. Table 2 shows the number of times the desired conditions were found to exist in the 30 observation visits made to the project.

All 30 of the interviewed teachers reported that at least a portion of the aides' time was used for noninstructional tasks. Twenty-eight of the 30 teachers indicated that the presence of the aide in the classroom had reduced the number of noninstructional tasks which the teacher performed. Of these 28 teachers three indicated that they used aides for noninstructional tasks only.

During 17 of the 30 observation visits, kindergarten aides were observed performing noninstructional tasks for some part of the visit. During each of these observations, when the aide was performing noninstructional tasks, the teacher was engaging in whole-group instruction.

Data relevant to Question 2. Has the presence of the kindergarten aide increased the amount of individualized or small-group instruction the pupils receive?

Of the 30 interviewed teachers, the 27 who used the aides for only part-time noninstructional tasks reported an increase in the amount of individual and small-group instruction (some by the teacher and some by the aide). Of the three teachers who used the aides solely for noninstructional relief, two reported that, although they were freed for more whole-group instruction, there was no increase in the amount of individualized or small-group instruction they could perform.

During 27 of the 30 visits, kindergarten aides were observed working in an instructional capacity for some part of the visit. On 22 occasions, the aides were conducting small-group instruction with the teachers present, and on three occasions they were conducting individualized instruction outside the classroom with pupils designated by the

TABLE 1

SUMMARY OF TEACHERS' RESPONSES TO ITEMS IN INTERVIEW

DESIRED CONDITION	RESPONSES (N=30)				
	Entire Time	2/3 of Time	1/2 of Time	1/3 of Time	Not at all
1. Teacher receives all aide service assigned to her.	18	6	6	0	0
2. Teacher feels aide service is useful.	13	9	8	0	0
3. Teacher uses aide mostly in an instructional capacity.	12	8	7	0	3
4. Teacher spends how much more time in small-group instruction due to aide service.	11	9	7	0	3
5. Teacher feels presence of aide has reduced the number of noninstructional tasks she performs.	25	3	0	0	2

TABLE 2

FREQUENCY OF CLASSROOM CONDITIONS OBSERVED DURING 30 CLASSROOM VISITATIONS

CLASSROOM CONDITION	CONDITION PRESENT				
	Entire Time	2/3 of Time	1/2 of Time	1/3 of Time	Not at All
1. Aide followed her daily schedule.	27	2	1	0	0
2. Aide performed housekeeping tasks.	3	5	6	1	15
3. Aide performed clerical tasks.	0	0	0	2	28
4. Aide did nothing during observation.	0	0	0	0	30
5. Teacher and aide were in classroom.	25	1	0	1	3
6. Aide was in classroom alone.	2	1	0	1	26
7. Aide conducted whole-group instruction.	3	0	1	1	25
8. Teacher conducted whole-group instruction	3	2	1	3	21
9. Aide conducted small-group instruction.	9	3	6	4	8
10. Teacher conducted small-group instruction	21	2	0	2	5

teachers. During each of the 27 observations when aides were conducting individualized or small-group instruction, the teacher was engaging in the same type of activities.

Complementary Data

For 32 of the 38 interviewed teachers, the benefits cited in Question 1 (noninstructional-task relief) and Question 2 (individualization of instruction) tended not to occur simultaneously. Individualization occurred when kindergarten aides were used for instructional tasks, but not when they were used merely to relieve the teacher of noninstructional tasks.

Conclusions

Question 1. Has the presence of the kindergarten aide reduced the number of noninstructional tasks the teacher performs?

Yes, the presence of the kindergarten aide has reduced the number of noninstructional tasks the teacher performs. Teacher interviews and classroom observations confirm widespread use of kindergarten aides for tasks which, without the aide, would encroach upon the teacher's availability for actual teaching.

Question 2. Has the presence of the kindergarten aide increased the amount of individualized or small-group instruction the pupils receive?

Yes, the presence of the kindergarten aide has increased the amount of individualized or small-group instruction the pupils receive. Teacher interviews and classroom observations indicate that such individualization occurs when kindergarten aides are used for instructional tasks, but not when they are used merely to relieve the teacher of noninstructional tasks.

NEW STAFFING PATTERNS IN EIP ELEMENTARY SCHOOLS
(PBRS #211-02-518)

The Project

This project report should be interpreted in the context of the "cluster overview" in earlier pages of this volume.

The project, New Staffing Patterns in EIP (Educational Improvement Program) Elementary Schools (EIP), has undergone considerable change since its inception. In its present state, it employs community residents to assist classroom teachers in grades one through three. In addition, funds are made available to EIP classrooms for supplementary educational materials.

Currently, the objectives of the EIP project are the following:

Objective 1. To free the teacher from duties not directly related to instruction, as well as from some instructional duties, so that she will be able to carry out more individualized and small-group instruction than would otherwise be possible.

Objective 2. To improve pupil performance in reading and mathematics.

To achieve these objectives 191 aide positions were allotted to 53 EIP schools. The allocation of aides to each school has varied from one to six aides, depending on the size and needs of each school. In general, the role of the aide is to provide supportive assistance to teachers by relieving them of most of their routine clerical and housekeeping duties. In addition, the aide instructs individual pupils and small groups in the areas of reading and mathematics.

The implementation of the project has been left largely to the principal's discretion although the project specifies that these aides be used in grades one through three. Differences among the project's mode of implementation at different schools may account for some of the inconsistencies noted in previous EIP evaluative findings.

Increases in individualization of instruction in classrooms with EIP aides were found in 1967-1968, 1969-1970, and 1970-1971, but not in 1968-1969. Improvement in the reading achievement level of EIP pupils was found in 1967-1968 but not in the next two years.

Current Evaluation Procedure

In addition to the questions considered in the evaluation of the cluster as a whole (reported in earlier pages of this volume), and as a result of changes in the EIP project, this year's evaluation focused on the following question:

Question: Has the assignment of aides to EIP schools tended to result in a uniform distribution of aide services to those schools?

A survey involving all EIP schools was conducted to determine the number of full-time and part-time aides assigned to grades one through three.

For each school, the ratio of teachers (grades one through three) to aides (full-time and/or part-time, grades one through three) was computed. The schools were grouped according to this ratio, and the number of schools in each group was tallied.

Results

Data relevant to the question: Has the assignment of aides to EIP schools tended to result in a uniform distribution of aide services to those schools?

Data relevant to the question are displayed in Table 1. The ratio of teachers to aides is an indicator of the extent of service rendered by the project.

TABLE 1

RATIO OF TEACHERS TO AIDES IN THE 55 EIP SCHOOLS

Teacher-Aide Ratio	4 or more: 1	3:1	2:1	Less than 2:1
Number of Schools	14	16	13	12

Conclusion

Question: Has the assignment of aides to EIP schools tended to result in a uniform distribution of aide services to those schools?

Disparities exist in the distribution of aide services to EIP schools. Approximately one-fifth of the EIP schools had a ratio of one aide to less than two teachers, and one-fourth of the schools had a ratio of one aide to four or more teachers.

This year's evaluation focused on the allocation of aides (grades one through three) to EIP schools. The use of aides in these classrooms has produced certain observable results as noted in previous evaluations. Aides have allowed the teacher to devote more time to teaching by assuming many of the nonteaching tasks previously done by teachers. They have been also instrumental in allowing increased small-group and individualized instruction to occur in these classrooms.

OUT-OF-SCHOOL SCIENCE EXPERIENCES FOR PAIRED SCHOOLS
(PBRS #211-02-653)

The Project

This project report should be interpreted in the context of the "cluster overview" in earlier pages of this volume.

Out-of-School Science Experiences for Paired Schools, commonly called the Paired School Science project (PSSP), brings sixth-grade children from pairs of schools having varied racial and socioeconomic backgrounds to the Franklin Institute for physical and biological science lessons one day a week over a six-week cycle, including relevant afternoon field trips.

PSSP has three major objectives:

Objective 1. To promote the knowledge and understanding of basic concepts of physical science as evidenced by the pupils' ability (a) to recall basic factual information dealing with certain physical and biological principles, (b) to define basic concepts and give relevant examples, (c) to compare and contrast different forms of energy, and (d) to solve problems involving measurement of forces and motion.

Objective 2. To facilitate an interchange of ideas and cooperative work between classmates of different races, national backgrounds, and religions.

Objective 3. To provide direct firsthand experience with science materials and facilities which are not readily available (e.g., lightning exhibit) to the home school.

PSSP has four six-week cycles per school year. Each cycle involves approximately 300 sixth-grade pupils from ten pairs of schools. Pupils from each pair of schools are randomly assigned to either of two identical three-hour workshops. Thus, each workshop group is composed of a 50% random sample from each of the paired classes. An alternate seating pattern is utilized in order to insure that children from different schools have an opportunity to work together. Each workshop includes a short lesson-demonstration, related laboratory investigations, lunch, and an afternoon field trip.

In previous evaluations (1968, 1969, 1970, 1971) it was found that pupils' scores on the Science Achievement Test were significantly higher for classes participating in PSSP than for corresponding control groups. This finding indicated that some of the cognitive objectives were being attained in PSSP which apparently were not being attained in the regular sixth-grade classrooms.

Current Evaluation Procedure

In addition to the questions considered in the evaluation of the cluster as a whole (reported in earlier pages of this volume), this year's evaluation dealt with the following questions about the project:

1. Has PSSP provided the conditions that are considered prerequisite for the attainment of its objectives?

2. Have changes in the project been implemented?

3. Have PSSP pupils demonstrated knowledge and understanding of basic concepts of science?

4. Has a reduction in social isolation occurred as a result of the pairing of schools having pupils from different ethnic backgrounds?

A measure of attitudes was used to evaluate the project's achievement of its attitudinal objective and some sociometric observations were made. Attendance and interaction between paired school pupils were monitored and teachers were asked whether they felt the pairing of pupils from different schools was constructive. Findings are included in this report as "Complementary Data."

Question 1. Has PSSP provided the conditions that are considered prerequisite for the attainment of its objectives?

Various PSSP activities (e.g., laboratory investigations, demonstrations, and classroom discussion) were systematically monitored with the use of the Observational Checklist, during each cycle of the project. (A copy of the checklist is available in the Research Library of the Board of Education.) Data from the observations were recorded in terms of frequency.

Question 2. Have changes in the project been implemented?

The new PSSP activities (e.g., field trips) were systematically monitored with the use of the Observational Checklist, during each cycle of the project. Data from the observations were recorded in terms of frequency.

Question 3. Have PSSP pupils demonstrated knowledge and understanding of basic concepts of science?

Since the project has undergone considerable change in both content and activities a revision of the Science Achievement Test was undertaken during the first three cycles: two forms, A and B, were developed (Form A, reliability coefficient .78, KR-20; Form B, reliability coefficient .75, KR-20), which were especially designed to measure cognitive learning resulting from the Franklin Institute experiences. (A copy of the test is on file in the Research Library of the Board of Education.) In evaluation

progress in the fourth cycle, students were administered on a randomly determined basis either Form A or Form B as a pretest. The alternate form of the science test was administered to each class as a posttest.

Question 4. Has a reduction in social isolation occurred as a result of the pairing of schools having pupils from different ethnic backgrounds?

A sociometric instrument, "Six American Twins On A Bus", designed to measure changes in attitude, was administered before and after the pupils' six-week experience at Franklin Institute. (A copy of the instrument is on file in the Research Library of the Board of Education.) This was supplemented with direct observation using sociograms and an interview with the participating teacher.

Results

Data relevant to Question 1. Has PSSP provided the conditions that are considered prerequisite for the attainment of its objectives?

Data obtained through systematic monitoring of PSSP activities are summarized in Table 1. Consistently favorable conditions were found.

Data relevant to Question 2. Have changes in the project been implemented?

Data obtained through systematic monitoring of PSSP activities are summarized in Table 2. Failure to achieve all the desired conditions indicates some difficulty in implementing the changes.

Data relevant to Question 3. Have PSSP pupils demonstrated knowledge and understanding of basic concepts of science?

Data in the pretest and posttest alternate forms administration of the Science Achievement Test are presented in Table 3. A t test of the difference indicated that the gain score from pretest to posttest was significant ($p<.01$).

Data relevant to Question 4. Has a reduction in social isolation occurred as a result of the pairing of schools having pupils from different ethnic backgrounds?

Data from the attitude instrument, "Six American Twins On A Bus," are presented in Table 4. The pretest-to-posttest changes in attitude toward a person of another ethnic group were not statistically significant.

A summary of sociometric interactions is presented in Table 5. The results indicate that pupils interacted socially from the paired schools and that there were differences in the amount of interaction depending on the particular pairing of schools. Five 20-minute observations were made.

TABLE 1

SUMMARY OF OBSERVATIONS MADE DURING 37 VISITS TO PSSP

Desired Condition	Number of Observation Visits		
	Condition Present	Condition Lacking	Condition not Appropriate during Observation
1. Scheduled topic was being discussed.	33	--	4
2. Science materials were available.	23	--	14
3. Pupils were constructing or working with science materials.	13	9	15
4. Pupils used materials to solve problems.	22	1	14
5. Oral instruction at pupils' level.	24	1	12
6. There was a demonstration related to the topic of the day.	20	2	15
7. Pupils were attentive to the demonstration.	16	2	19

TABLE 2

SUMMARY OF CHANGES IN PSSP OBSERVED DURING 37 VISITS

Desired Condition	Number of Observation Visits		
	Condition Present	Condition Lacking	Condition not Appropriate during Observation
1. Parents present.	15	20	2
2. Scheduled field trip.	12	0	25
3. Alternate seating on bus.	2	5	30
4. Problem-solving orientation to field trip.	4	6	27
5. Pupils attentive during field trip.	9	1	27
6. Pupils thought the field trip was educational.	7	1	29
7. Ecology was one topic mentioned.	11	10	16

TABLE 3

ANALYSIS OF PUPIL COGNITIVE TEST GAINS USING THE SCIENCE ACHIEVEMENT TEST, FORMS A AND B

Testing Period	Number of Students	Mean Score
Pretest	320	11.88
Posttest	321	14.22**

**Change was statistically significant at the .01 level.

TABLE 4

ANALYSIS OF ATTITUDE CHANGE USING THE INSTRUMENT
"SIX AMERICAN TWINS ON A BUS"
AS PRETEST AND POSTTEST

Scale	Respondent Group	Pretest Mean	Posttest Mean
Seeking association with another group	Black	4.45	4.88
	Puerto Rican	6.29	6.17
	White	4.61	5.00
Perceiving other groups as nonagressive	Black	7.35	7.32
	Puerto Rican	5.59	4.76
	White	5.31	5.72
Perceiving other groups as achievement-oriented	Black	5.50	5.25
	Puerto Rican	6.06	6.82
	White	5.76	5.80

TABLE 5

PSSP SOCIOMETRIC INTERACTIONS

School	Percentage of Pupil Interactions that were between Pupils from different Schools				
	Time 1	Time 2	Time 3	Time 4	Time 5
School A and School B	35%	46%	NOT OBSERVED	NOT OBSERVED	38%
School C and School D	35%	NOT OBSERVED	70%	56%	75%
School E and School F	39%	42%	43%	*	39%

*Too few cases to calculate a meaningful percentage.

Complementary Data

Interviews with six PSSP cooperating teachers indicated that five of the six perceived the pairing of pupils from different schools as having high social value. The 91% average daily attendance for the project tends to confirm that the PSSP pupils enjoyed their Franklin Institute experineces.

Conclusions

Question 1. Has PSSP provided the conditions that are considered prerequisite for the attainment of its objectives?

Yes, PSSP has provided the conditions that are considered prerequisite for the attainment of its objectives. Systematic monitoring has yielded consistent results: appropriate materials have been available and used; instructors have been fulfilling their specified roles appropriately; and pupils have been attentive during the PSSP activities.

Question 2. Have changes in the project been implemented?

No, the desired conditions were not consistently fulfilled in the extended afternoon program involving field trips. The pupils, however, were attentive and thought the field trips were educational. In all cases the changes in the program were being attempted although they did not produce the desired result on a consistent basis.

Question 3. Have PSSP pupils demonstrated knowledge and understanding of basic concepts of science?

Yes, PSSP pupils have demonstrated knowledge and understanding of basic concepts of science. Their mean score from pretest to posttest indicated a significant gain. Thus one may conclude that the pupils improved their knowledge of the physical and biological sciences during their six days at the Franklin Institute.

Question 4. Has a reduction in social isolation occurred as a result of the pairing of schools having pupils from different ethnic backgrounds?

Although attitude changes of one race toward another were not detected by pupil scores on the sociometric instrument "Six American Twins On A Bus", it may be somewhat unrealistic to expect substantial modifications to occur during the course of six weekly interactions. The project has provided the environment and opportunity for this goal to be attained rather than complete attainment.

SCHOOL-COMMUNITY COORDINATOR SERVICES
(PBRS #211-17-505)

The Project

This project report should be interpreted in the context of the "cluster overview" in earlier pages of this volume.

The School-Community Coordinator Services project (SCC) employs community residents as school-community coordinators to transmit information and to encourage mutual participation between the school and the community.

The key objectives of SCC are the following:

Objective 1. To increase participation of parents in school and community projects by informing the community of the objectives, programs, curricula, and services of the school.

Objective 2. To increase participation of school personnel in community-related projects by keeping the school personnel informed about the needs and concerns of the community.

Previous SCC evaluations had indicated (a) that community residents who had been visited by the coordinators were more knowledgeable about the school and participated more in school activities than those residents who had not been visited, and (b) that the coordinators had been more successful in realizing those project objectives directed toward community residents than those directed toward school staffs.

Current Evaluation Procedure

In addition to the questions considered in the evaluation of the cluster as a whole (reported in earlier pages of this volume), this year's SCC evaluation dealt with two questions about the project itself:

1. Have the structural arrangements considered essential to the SCC project been carried out?

2. Are the tasks performed by school-community coordinators compatible with the objectives of the SCC project?

Question 1. Have the structural arrangements considered essential to the SCC project been carried out?

To answer this question, visits were made to 55 coordinators in 55 schools. The instrument used to record conditions observed during these visits was the Observational Checklist. (A copy of the instrument is available in the Research Library of the Board of Education.) Data from the observations were recorded and summarized in terms of frequency.

Question 2. Are the tasks performed by school-community coordinators compatible with the objectives of the SCC project?

To answer this question, 55 coordinators were interviewed. Each interview was divided into two parts. Part I contained questions related to the distribution of the coordinator's time regarding the school and the community. Part II contained questions related to the distribution of the coordinator's time regarding specific tasks. The Observational Checklist was used to record coordinator's responses during the interview. (A copy of the instrument is available in the Research Library of the Board of Education.) Data from the interviews were recorded and summarized in terms of frequency.

Results

TABLE 1

SUMMARY OF 55 OBSERVATIONS OF SCC PROJECT

Desired Condition	Condition Present	Condition Lacking	Condition not Observable
1. School has full-time SCC.	54	1	0
2. School has part-time SCC.	1	54	0
3. School has more than one SCC.	21	34	0
4. SCC has her own office.	35	20	0
5. SCC has her own desk.	46	9	0
6. SCC has her own phone.	41	14	0

Results

Data relevant to Question 1. Have the structural arrangements considered essential to the SCC project been carried out?

Table 1 shows the number of times the desired conditions were found to exist in the 55 observations made to the project.

In 17 of the 20 schools where the coordinator did not have either her own office or her own phone, she shared these facilities with either the school nurse or school counselor. In the remaining three schools, coordinator's tended to use whatever facilities were available whenever a private office or a phone was needed.

Data relevant to Question 2. Are the tasks performed by school-community coordinators compatible with the objectives of the SCC project?

Table 2 shows the frequency of coordinators' responses to part I of the interview. Table 3 shows the frequency of coordinators' responses to part II of the interview.

Thirty of the 55 school-community coordinators interviewed indicated that at least one-tenth of their time was spent performing tasks not related to the SCC project objectives. These coordinators reported that in emergencies the principal periodically requested the assistance of the SCC in "nonrelated" activities. However, these same 30 respondents indicated that their performing of such "nonrelated" tasks was not contradictory to the SCC's role (as long as it remained periodic) since cooperating with principals in times of emergenceis tended to perpetuate good will and to reinforce the coordinator's role as an active member of the school staff.

The results presented in Table 2 and Table 3 corroborate last year's findings. The nature of coordinators' activities and the amount of time spent performing them vary from school to school depending on the needs of the school/community being served. The majority of coordinators spend the largest portion of their work week in the community. However, the portion of time which coordinators spend in the community varies from 40% to 90%.

All the interviewed coordinators reported that the coordinator's major activities varied from school to school depending on the needs of the school/community being served. Some coordinators spend the majority of their time working on school discipline problems whereas others have not been assigned to work on these problems at all. They indicated that any activity which increased the two-way channels of information and participation between the school and the community was compatible with project goals and School District goals, and that at least 80% of the coordinator's activities were directed toward this.

TABLE 2

FREQUENCY OF PRINCIPAL'S AND SCC'S RESPONSES TO PART I OF THE INTERVIEW

ITEM	NUMBER OF SCHOOLS REPORTING THE INDICATED PERCENTAGES OF TIME					
	None of SCC's Time Per Week	1-10% of SCC's Time Per Week	11-20% of SCC's Time Per Week	21-30% of SCC's Time Per Week	31-50% of SCC's Time Per Week	More than 50% of SCC's Time Per Week
Percentage of time SCC makes home visits.	0	5	7	14	16	14
Percentage of time SCC attends community meetings.	0	22	25	8	0	1
Percentage of time SCC attends school meetings.	0	39	9	7	0	0
Percentage of time SCC spends in office alone.	0	27	17	7	3	1
Percentage of time SCC performs other tasks in community.	8	37	9	1	0	0
Percentage of time SCC performs other tasks in school.	4	31	17	3	0	0
Percentage of time SCC spends on nonrelated SCC tasks.	25	26	2	2	0	0
Percentage of time SCC meets parents at school.	0	54	1	0	0	0

TABLE 3

FREQUENCY OF PRINCIPAL'S AND SCC'S RESPONSES TO PART II OF THE INTERVIEW

ITEM	NUMBER OF SCHOOLS REPORTING THE INDICATED PERCENTAGES OF TIME					
	None of SCC's Time Per Week	1-10% of SCC's Time Per Week	11-20% of SCC's Time Per Week	21-30% of SCC's Time Per Week	31-50% of SCC's Time Per Week	More than 50% of SCC's Time Per Week
Percentage of time SCC works on school attendance problems.	8	26	12	4	5	0
Percentage of time SCC works on school discipline problems.	8	24	12	5	4	2
Percentage of time SCC works on gang control.	15	31	7	1	0	1

All coordinators reported that they were working more with community residents than with school staff members and were encountering greater success in the community than in the school. Their explanation for this was that school staff members were more resistant to them and to becoming "involved" than were community residents.

Conclusions

Question 1. Have the structural arrangements considered essential to the SCC project been carried out?

Yes, the structural arrangements considered essential to the SCC project have been carried out. Direct observation indicated that in the majority of schools coordinators have all of the facilities necessary to perform their tasks effectively.

Question 2. Are the tasks performed by school-community coordinators compatible with the objectives of the SCC project?

Yes, the tasks actually being performed by the coordinators are compatible with the objectives of the SCC project. Direct observations and interviews with coordinators have confirmed widespread use of the coordinators for tasks which should facilitate the two-way channels of information and participation between school and community even though the specific task performed by SCC's varies from school to school.

PARENT SCHOOL AIDES
(PBRS #211-06-613)

The Project

This project report should be interpreted in the context of the "cluster overview" in earlier pages of this volume.

The Parent School Aides (PSA's) project utilizes paraprofessional aides as a method of extending the instructional services of the classroom teachers.

The use of paraprofessional aides as a means for extending the instructional services of classroom teachers has proven to be a useful method for providing specific assistance to pupils. Studies have shown that these persons provide additional services to teachers and their pupils by individualizing instruction, by providing additional review and drill exercises, by reading stories, and by extending the interpersonal experiences afforded the children during the school day.

These paraprofessional aides were seen as being valuable in that they could (a) provide a continuation of the community into the school setting and (b) improve the dialogue and rapport between the school and the community.

The primary objective of this project was to enable the children to be exposed to an improved learning environment by extending the instructional program.

There are 46 PSA's serving 170 first-, second-, and third-grade classes. Participants in the project were recruited and trained under the revised 1968 policy guidelines established in the "Program Outline." These specifications are consistent with the Guidelines for the Training, Assignment, Rights and Responsibilities of Paraprofessionals in Schools, Commonwealth of Pennsylvania. (Department of Public Instruction, March, 1969).

There are 45 PSA's serving 170 classes. Each PSA provides 20 hours of service per week. PSA's assigned to Grade 1 classes usually assist with the Sullivan Reading Program by working with groups of 6 to 10 pupils. PSA's assigned to work with Grades 2 and 3 provide the specified task services outlined in the Results section of this report.

Comments from previous evaluations of the project showed that PSA's have a clearly defined and interesting way of coping with school needs.

Current Evaluation Procedure

The current evaluation focused upon the tasks performed most and least effectively by aides and the implications for future paraprofessional staff development programs. The activities of all forty-five PSA's were

assessed through the use of a locally developed questionnaire, which was created to obtain the opinion of participating principals concerning the activities and services of the aides.

Eleven activities frequently performed by aides were listed. Principals were asked to consider the task and render a judgment concerning the relative effectiveness of their aides. Each principal was requested to select the five activities aides performed best, and five activities which aides had not yet mastered. Once dichotomized into the "satisfactory" or "unsatisfactory" category, each activity's frequency of designation as "most effective" or "least effective" was converted into a rank-order score. A rank of 1 within the "most effective" category represents the service principals chose most frequently as one (of the five activities) which Parent Aides do consistently well and, therefore, requires no further in-service training. Similarly, a rank of 1 in the "least effective" category represents the service principals chose in which Parent Aides require additional preparation.

Results

A summary of principal's responses to the Parent School Aide Questionnaire is provided in Table 1.

Aides in the current group were perceived as having mastered

1. The supervision of children (both individually and in small groups)
2. The tutoring of children
3. The reading of stories to classes
4. The performing of clerical/administrative tasks consistent with current guidelines.

Activities which were perceived as requiring additional in-service training were rendering assistance with respect to the following:

1. The development of programs
2. The conduct of educational/recreational activities
3. The construction, use, and presentation of learning materials.

TABLE 1

SUMMARY OF 45 PRINCIPALS' RESPONSES CONCERNING TASKS PERFORMED MOST AND LEAST EFFECTIVELY BY 170 PARENT AIDES

QUESTIONNAIRE ITEMS	RANK ORDER OF RESPONSES (1 = High; 5 = Low) Most Effective	Least Effective
Supervise small groups of children working in independent activities.	1	
Supervise individual children working independently.	2	
Provide individual assistance to those who need it (tutor).	3	
Assist with development of special programs.		1
Assist in the conduct of educational and recreational activities.		2 (tie)
Read stories to the class.	4	
Assist in the construction of materials for use in the instructional program.		3 (tie)
Assist the teacher in presentation of lesson using various audiovisual materials and equipment.		4 (tie)
Assist children in selection and use of learning materials.		5 (tie)
Perform administrative and clerical tasks consistent with current guidelines.	5	

Conclusions

The project appears to have provided aides with the kinds of experiences that permit extending the basic instructional services of the classroom teacher. Aides have developed competencies with respect to elementary tutoring and instructional supervision as well as performing essential noninstructional tasks. Higher-level skills such as program development, conducting of educational experiences, and construction, selection, and use of instructional materials (both soft- and hardware) remain to be mastered. With respect to these matters closer coordination with the in-service component of the Multimedia Centers project might be helpful in attaining mastery of these skills.

REFERENCE

School District of Philadelphia, Office of Research and Evaluation. Evaluation of Title I ESEA Projects, 1970-1971. Philadelphia: The School District of Philadelphia, August 1971.